# PRINCETON REVIEW.

THE

# BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

# PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

## 1850.

VOL. XXII.

PHILADELPHIA:
WM. H. MITCHELL—EDUCATION ROOMS, 25 SANSOM ST.
JOHN T. ROBINSON, PRINTER, PRINCETON.

# CONTENTS OF VOL. XXII.

## NO. I.



## NO. II.

## NO. III.

## NO. IV.

THE

# PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1850.

No. I.

ART. I.—*The relations of Religion to what are called Diseases of the Mind.*

OUR attention has been particularly directed to this subject by an elaborate and somewhat ingenious article in a foreign periodical of great respectability.* In a cursory examination of the article upon its first appearance we were disposed to question some of its positions, but, in hope that it would be better and more quickly done elsewhere, the purpose was dismissed, and casually revived by a reference to some of the cases which it records in support or illustration of the author's views. A more particular examination reveals to us a vein of error running through the body of the argument, and tinging all the doctrines and inferences which it sets forth.

No one can contemplate the present provision for the comfort and cure of the insane without gratitude to God, nor without admiration of the philanthropy and science which have together

* Winslow's Journal of Psychological Medicine and Mental Pathology. April, 1848. London.

achieved such amazing results. It seems but yesterday, when to lose one's reason, was to lose all claim to sympathy or even pity from nearest and dearest friends. The sufferer was regarded and treated as a fiend. The first decided symptom of insanity was the signal for loading him with chains and fetters, and for building a pen, or digging a cave, for the hopeless exile's abode. The stoutest heart melts at the scenes of refined cruelty which an investigation of prisons, poor-houses and private families has brought to view, even within fifteen or twenty years; and to those who have been familiar with such exhibitions, a modern insane hospital, like that at West Philadelphia, Trenton, Hartford, Worcester, or Zanesville, must seem to be among the richest of heaven's blessings to a suffering world.

The patient observer of the phenomena of insanity, for a series of years, and in multiplied varieties of subjects and circumstances, a close investigation of the causes, proximate and remote, from whence it is supposed to have proceeded, and the results of the several modes of physical and moral treatment, constitute the elements of a distinct science; but it is important that the principles which are adopted as its basis shall be well considered. To subserve this purpose we venture a few remarks upon the relations of religion to what are called "diseases of the mind."

The article to which we just now referred bears the popular title of "*Religious Insanity.*" This phrase, of itself, conveys a false notion, though it is very naturally adopted from the title of the work reviewed.* We hope it will be dropped from the tables of supposed causes of insanity in our public documents.

The reviewer sets out in his examinations of Dr. Ideler's book with the singular assumption, that "the object and aim of revealed religion is to modify the earthly and false principles which natural religion includes and promulgates; and the whole of what is termed religious education ought to be conducted," he says, "with the view of bending the deductions of the untutored mind to the truths of revelation, and by a diligent circulation of sound doctrines, eradicate the false." The passage is almost obscure enough to pass for a scintillation of

* "Religious Insanity, illustrated by histories of cases; a contribution to the history of the religious errors of the age. By Dr. K. W. Ideler, Professor of Medicine and Chemical Psychiatry at the University of Berlin," &c.

transcendentalism. So far as we can comprehend it, we think it places natural and revealed religion in an attitude towards each other which their relation by no means warrants.

If we understand "the object and aim of revealed religion," it is to make known to men the true character of God—the infinity and harmony of his moral attributes—the holiness and spirituality of his law, and the condition and prospects of the human family as transgressors of it—the interposition of Christ as an atoning sacrifice—the offer of a gratuitous and perfect salvation to all who believe in him—the nature, evidences and fruits of this faith—and the covenant of eternal love which Jehovah makes with those who truly embrace it. It certainly cannot be regarded as in any sense a modifying system. It is rather revolutionizing. It introduces man into a new existence, with new relations, duties, &c. The offer of an executive pardon to a convict in his cell could scarcely be called a modification of his imprisonment, or of his sentence, or of the law by order of which he suffers. The return of the prodigal to his father's house could hardly be called a modification of his exile.

The "object and aim of revealed religion" is represented by its author to be no less than a complete and radical change of human hearts. When it is communicated to man in his natural state, and with all the helps to a knowledge of God which natural religion can supply, its appropriate effect is so completely transforming as to be but feebly illustrated by the restoration of sight to one born blind, or the return of the dead to life. Instead of modifying the earthly and false principles which natural religion includes and promulgates, it utterly repudiates and unequivocally condemns them. The knowledge of God which has been derived from nature only has always and every where degenerated into sottish idolatry. When the better portion of natural religionists have known something of the Supreme power, from the plain tokens of it which are stamped on every production of his omnipotent hand, they have not glorified him as God, nor has it been heard or known that any such revelation of his existence or attributes, as natural religion includes or promulgates has ever led a guilty man to abhor himself and repent in dust and ashes, or even to inquire what he should do to be saved. Is it not a shame to represent a poor, meager, unhelpful thing like this, as the basis or substratum

on which the faith and hope of Christianity must rest; or as that which revealed religion merely *modifies?* Or to represent religious education as a nursery man who finds all his grounds filled with desirable fruit trees, requiring only to be bent this way and that to secure their maturity and fruitfulness, instead of a field overrun with thorns and briers of rank growth—nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned, and which can be reclaimed only by instant and diligent toil and the peculiar and sovereign interposition of omnipotence.

This false position in which the reviewer places revealed religion naturally betrays him into false views of its offices. He takes the history of an ungodly world resisting the influences of Christianity, for the history of Christianity itself, striving to reconcile the world to God; and this, of course, leads him in the sequel of his article, to mistake the confusion and derangement which some minds suffer, when they contemplate the pure doctrines of religion through an obscure and distorting medium of its own, for the influence of the doctrines themselves. "If we were to look only on the dark side of the picture which the history of *Christianity* presents," he says, "we might be easily tempted to pronounce *it* a curse rather than a blessing, and despair of human happiness." But he totally misconceives the object of vision. It is not the history of JOHN HOWARD that presents a revolting exhibition of crime and squalid misery. That is all bright and glowing with warm sympathies and earnest philanthropy. It is the loathsome abodes of degradation and suffering into which he groped his way, and the wretched convicts, whom he describes as dragging out a burdensome existence within those dark and dripping walls, from which we shrink with such instinctive horror.

"The object and aim of revealed religion" is to present to the mind objects of contemplation appropriate to its highest capacities and widest desires; and to excite in the spiritual nature of man hopes and aspirations of what it is always and everywhere ignorant and incapable, without such a divine revelation. But he is naturally opposed to the contemplation of such objects. He has "a carnal mind which is enmity against God." So corrupted and perverted is his nature, and so evil are his deeds, that he loves darkness rather than light, and prefers the bondage of Satan to the liberty of a child of God! When as a

self-convicted traitor he is summoned to return to his allegiance, upon the promise of a pardon, purchased at an infinite price, and to submit thereafter to a wise and holy government—he derides and contemns the summons and persists in his rebellion. It is indeed an unnatural and offensive exhibition of guilt and madness; but it is his own memoir, and not the history of the Sovereign nor of his government, that is rendered infamous by it.

"Fanaticism, folly, knavery, insanity are traceable in the professors of every form of religious belief—very traceable in the false creeds, but too lamentably manifest in the true. The history of the church of Christ—the great teacher and promulgator of his doctrines, and the means by which many successive generations of mankind have been taught religious truths, displays an immeasurable delineation of the most dangerous errors as the necessary results of a degenerate piety and an ignorant devotion. Mad bigotry and fanaticism may be seen hand-in-hand, and darkening the fair doctrines and morals of Christian truth. The most frightfully destructive wars, the inconceivable cruelties, caused and practised by inexorable power, the deepest sagacity and the maddest insanity, have been the means used on too many occasions to root out heresy, to promulgate dogmas, or to defend a degenerate and an erroneous faith."

This picture is dismal enough, one would think. But our reviewer is not unnaturally betrayed into another error more plausible and therefore more dangerous. He evidently regards the heretic as a religious madman, to be cured, like other madmen, by a purgative. "To the psychologist," he says, "*this dismal view of our holy religion* (mark the expression) becomes the more dismal when he finds in scrutinizing the details of history, that often the heretic was only a religious madman, and that purgation by hellebore would have been the remedy for his heterodoxy rather than purification by fire. Knowing the all-engrossing nature of religion, and the intensity of the emotions and feelings that it excites, he is prepared, *a priori*, to expect every form of insane aberration from religious truth, and every form of mysticism and fanaticism. How often religious excitement is mere animal excitement! How often religious insanity is excited by religion, and how often by functional or structural diseases of the cerebrum, are important questions to

solve, inasmuch as the solution involves not only the discrimination of what is religious truth, but also the determination of the ætiology and treatment of insanity in matters of religious belief and conduct."

We readily admit the absurdity and sin of attempting to "remedy heterodoxy" by fire, and we do not doubt that the vagaries of many religious errorists have originated in some disorder of the physical system, which medical skill might have controlled. But the heresies which have been so general as to excite persecution by fire or so disastrous in their nature and results as to impart to the history of our holy religion a "more dismal" complexion than all the wars and cruelties which bigotry and fanaticism have engendered, must be something more than, here and there, a case.

And yet how can we conceive of a whole community, embracing all ages, associations, habits, and temperaments, to be seized at the same time with the same form of heresy, so as to constitute a general and simultaneous paroxysm of religious insanity! If, for example, the denial of the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ must be regarded as a heresy, we can scarcely suppose our author to mean that it could be cured by a "dose of hellebore." The great apostle to the Gentiles was not a "religious madman," when he sought authority from the high priest and set out upon his bloody mission to seize, bind, and persecute to death any disciples of the Lord whom he could ferret out at Damascus. The wonderful scene which occurred upon the journey was not fitted to restore a maniac to reason, though it was marvellously efficacious in transforming a blasphemer into a believer, and a persecutor into an apostle. The madness was in his heart: the disease was in his moral nature and not in the structure or functions of the cerebrum. He was filled with enmity to the humbling doctrines of the cross. A learned Pharisee and a disciple of the great Gamaliel could not endure the thought of submitting like a little child to the teachings of a crucified Nazarene. To accept salvation as a free gift of grace, through faith in the merits of another, was perfectly intolerable to his proud heart. He voluntarily yielded himself to the dominion of malignant passions and waged a war of extermination against the new religion, and against all who were otherwise minded than himself towards its claims. It is

substantially so with every errorist, and every persecutor. They refuse to come to Christ that they may have life. They have not his spirit; and their heresy, whatever form it may assume, is the issue of a corrupt heart, not the vagary of weak or deranged brain.

It is not "the engrossing nature of religion nor the intensity of the emotions and feelings which it excites, that shall prepare the psychologist to expect, *a priori*, every form of insane aberration from religious truth and every form of mysticism and fanaticism." The assumed cause is neither adequate nor appropriate to the product of such a result—at least not with so much uniformity as to warrant an a priori expectation of its occurrence. The true cause is the introduction of a pure principle into a corrupt nature. It is the conflict of light with darkness. It is the struggle of the strong man armed, and in his palace, with the stronger than he who comes to dispossess him. It is the war which the law in the members carries on with the law of the mind.

If the religion of the gospel did indeed absorb the whole man, and bring all "his intensest emotions and feelings" into captivity to Christ, peace would flow in upon the soul like a river, and all its purposes and desires would be and remain in perfect accordance with the divine will. In a word, such an one would be *a truly rational man*. But through some *pre-existing* moral defect or derangement in himself, religion has but an imperfect dominion over him, and hence the "insane aberrations from religious truth—the heresies and the persecutions and the endless forms of mysticism and fanaticism."

Passing over the many instances of such erratic and fanatical extravagances which history records, and to some of which the review before us alludes, we will glance at two recent and notable ones occurring among ourselves, that we may the better judge whether religion makes men insane, or whether it merely fails in many cases to bring them to their right mind. It may be said that they continue insane in spite of all that religion can do for them.

A clergyman, in infirm health, sought to amuse his listless hours by framing a puerile romance after the manner of eastern fabulists, with names, dates and localities, bearing no relation to sober history. These writings in some way, without the author's privity, came into the hands of strangers. In 1826, one

Joseph Smith professed to have found, in the town of Palmyra, N. Y., some brass plates enclosed in a box, such as is used for packing window glass. Of these plates he pretended to be the interpreter. With a stone in his hat, and his hat over his eyes, he dictated, while a man named Harris, wrote. Harris departed before the interpretation was ended, in consequence of some dispute, and one Cowdrey took his place and completed the Book of Mormon. Smith then avowed himself a prophet, and the founder of a new dispensation, and gathered many disciples, who accompanied him to the state of Missouri, where they established a city and built a temple.

The contents of the Book of Mormon were neither more nor less than the self-same tales of romance which the invalid clergyman amused himself with writing. A large number of persons, however, embraced the delusion; many abandoned a profitable business, some sacrificed large property, and not a few were ruined in soul, body and estate, by putting their trust in this bare-faced imposture.

It is perfectly obvious, we think, that a mind well informed and established in the received doctrines of the Christian faith, and endued with an usual degree of discernment, would be proof against so bold an imposture. If any intelligent and respectable persons joined the Mormon ranks, that, of itself, shows either a predisposition to insanity which this fanciful revelation was fitted to develope, but with which religion has no connexion whatever, or that there is a deficiency of discernment, or a neglect or abuse of the reasoning powers, or a morbid love of distinction and notoriety, to gratify which they are willing to sacrifice all other interests. If a judicious faithful parent or Sunday school teacher had given direction to their inquiries and furnished their minds with just and systematic, though exceedingly simple, views of the doctrines of revelation, they would have had balances wherewith to weigh the pretensions of the new prophet, and by means of these their variety and falsehood would have been made manifest.

At a somewhat later period a man named Miller, a Baptist minister, as it is said, professed to have had a revelation of the precise day on which the second advent of Christ would occur, and his people would be called to rise and meet him in the air! He and his deluded apostles or agents went from

town to town, and from house to house, leading captive silly women, and imposing upon the credulity of the ignorant. So settled was the conviction of many minds of the truth of his predictions, that they arranged their worldly affairs in reference to it, as an ascertained event; made no contracts extending beyond the designated day; prosperous citizens sold their estates, declined the ordinary avocations of life, that they might give themselves wholly to the business of preparation; and as the eventful period drew nigh, they evinced the sincerity of their convictions, by providing what they regarded as suitable apparel, for an aerial flight, and many actually assembled in groups upon summits which might be supposed most favourable to an early and easy ascension! The dupes of the false prophet were counted by thousands. Some were crazed with excitement, and others with disappointment, and many within and without the charmed circle were doubtless left to believe that all revelations are as idle and delusive as Millerism.

We need not say how the plainest scriptures must have been wrested from their true intent and meaning, nor how deaf an ear must have been turned to the voice of reason and common sense, before the mind could have surrendered itself to such a fancy. There is not a trace of insanity however, in any stage of the process. It is a simple voluntary subjection of reason to the influence of imagination or superstition, instead of a child-like submission of all the powers and faculties of body and mind to the revealed will of God. And although we may admit that such delusions have, in many instances, been the ostensible cause of insanity, as our hospital returns allege, "revealed religion" is no more responsible for it than for the paroxysms of *mania-a-potu.* It is because the plain truths of revealed religion were misapprehended or perverted, that the imposture succeeded, and the mind was led captive by Satan at his will. It is not strange that a vessel left to itself, on a stormy sea, should sooner or later go to the bottom, or fall into the hands of wreckers.

Dr. Ideler's book, as we learn from the review, consists of twenty-six pages of introduction, followed by a history of nineteen cases of what he calls *religious insanity.* His theory is represented by the reviewer as "too transcendental and impractical to suit the English mind, but in connexion with this theory."

He says, "and indeed as a principal object, he developes his ideas as to the nature of these observations of the human mind, *in matters of religion*, which becoming manifest from time to time, in great numbers of people give them the characteristics of an epidemical disease, closely analogous to insanity, if not identical with it."

We confess our inability to understand the meaning of this passage if the printer has been true to copy. What are the "observations of the human mind," and how are they manifested in large numbers at a time? We can solve the difficulty only by supposing that "observations" is a misprint for "aberrations;" and then the theory is that these aberrations on the subject of religion at times, became manifest in large numbers of people simultaneously, the characteristics of an epidemic closely resembling insanity, if not insanity itself.

As a matter of theory, we can conceive of scarcely any thing more fanciful. It involves the idea that these aberrations spring from a common cause operating at or near the same time, with substantially the same effect, upon various minds. That this idea was present to the Doctor's mind is manifest from the cases he cites in illustration. He seems to overlook the fact that no two cases of insanity ever occur resembling each other, as any thousand cases of cholera, or small-pox, or yellow fever, or other epidemic resemble any other thousand. If we take the Shakers or Jumpers for an example (being one of Dr. Ideler's cases,) we find at first, one person holding some radical doctrines which distinguishes their community. He is peradventure a blasphemer or an infidel, but having observation or shrewdness enough to select a form of imposture which fits the times or the class on which he proposes to operate, he presents himself as a prophet or a revealer of visions.. He pretends to have had communion with the invisible world, or to have been commissioned in some supernatural way to proclaim a new system of faith. He is not an insane man in any sense, except that in which all wicked men are insane. He has formed a deliberate purpose of imposing upon the weak and ignorant to whom he may have access, and though oftentimes this devilish intent is never fully disclosed, it not unfrequently shows itself sooner or later in the most revolting forms of brutal licentiousness. The impostor enters upon his baleful mission, taking, if he sees fit,

seven other spirits more wicked than himself for his accomplices, or relying on his first converts for such services. At all events, he must make his separate and distinct approach to each human mind that he deludes, and that mind must be so unprepared through ignorance or perverseness to judge between truth and error as to embrace the delusion, not from any such necessity as that which subjects the body to the prevailing fever or influenza, but from a necessity of which they are themselves the authors and disposers. One after another falls into the snare The delusion is self-propagating, and in a few months the arch-deceiver is able to count his ministers by scores and his disciples by thousands. And is not this one of the cases where great numbers of people manifest aberrations of mind to which Dr. Ideler attributes the characteristics of an epidemic disease, closely analogous to insanity, if not identical with it?

A tailor of Leyden went to live at Munster, and privately taught what was called "the doctrine of rebaptization," and won many converts among the lower orders. When an attempt was made to confute him and his co-religionists, several went running about the streets crying, "Repent and be rebaptized every one of you, lest the wrath of God overwhelm you." After a while they got worse in their insanity (?) and began to teach practices and doctrines very like those of the Mormonites of the present day. Prophets and prophetesses began to arise, and supernatural revelations were plentiful. John of Leyden, the aforesaid tailor, betaking himself to sleep, continued in a dream for three days together. Being awakened "he speaks not a word, but calls for paper. In it he writes the names of twelve men who were to be chief officers over this new Israel, and to govern all things, for such," he said, "was the will of the heavenly Father, when he had thus prepared the way to his kingdom." He propounded as a revelation from heaven, that no man was bound to one wife only, but that every man might have as many as he pleased. John himself took three; and those were considered to be the most pious and praiseworthy who had the greatest number. One of John's queens (for he was very naturally made king) thinking that it was not pleasing to God that men should die of famine, as they did during the seige of Munster,* ventured to express her opin-

* On the lofty steeple of the church of St. Lambert, in Munster, are still sus-

ion, for which John led her into the market place, and commanding her to kneel down, struck off her head!

This case is cited by Dr. Ideler as an instance of *religious insanity.* If it is fairly made out then what all men would regard as duplicity, fraud, falsehood, licentiousness, and murder, under ordinary circumstances, is changed into various developments of disease, for which the sufferers or actors are no more responsible than they would be for an ulcer. John of Leyden, for aught that appears, was a lazy, idle, worthless fellow. He may have left Leyden and come to Munster for the very purpose of finding an order of persons low enough to be duped by his shallow arts. He draws around him a few kindred spirits whom he persuades to abandon their lawful calling to become brawling propagators of his folly. Emboldened by a rapid increase of adherents, the fanatics, (if we may not better say, fiends,) proceed from one degree and phase of iniquity to another. The judgment of God upon their daring impiety does not linger. They are soon given up to a strong delusion that they should believe a lie, till at last pretended revelations are announced giving license to brutal lust, and ending in deeds of blood. How can we persuade ourselves, that the authors, abettors and partakers of such a delusion are not to be regarded as voluntary transgressors of the laws of God and man, and responsible for all the consequences. Why should the attempt be made to cloak the iniquity by a suggestion of "epidemic insanity?" The drunken trance, with all its circumstances, was a clumsy and impious imitation of the birth of John the Baptist, and the number selected as his chief coadjutors, was doubtless intended to suggest some resemblance between his spurious office and mission and those of the divine author of our faith. There is too much method in such madness to justify us in holding the subject of it guiltless, and we earnestly deprecate any attempt to confound so clear a case of imposture with involuntary "aberrations of mind."

The first which the reviewer selects from Dr. Ideler's nineteen cases of religious insanity, is substantially as follows. The patient was the son of a carpenter and was born in 1813. He

pended three iron baskets or cages which contained the remains of John and his two chief accomplices, who, after obstinately defending the city against the bishop, were made prisoners and tortured to death with red hot pincers.

was affected with scrofula from his infancy, and up to the age of sixteen had chronic ophthalmia. His father was a drunkard, had frequent fights with his wife and abused his children. It was a quarrelsome family. The paroxysms of anger in the mother brought on epilepsy, which first deprived her of reason, and, after sixteen years, of life. One would think that an infancy and childhood passed amid such scenes as these, would account for almost any eccentricity and perverseness in after life. But the reviewer in enumerating what he regards as predisposing causes of insanity, in the case, mentions "an hereditary tendency derived from both parents. The long-continued series of epileptic attacks to which the mother was subject previously to her death, and which in effect proved ultimately fatal, on the one side, and the habitual desire for alcoholic stimulants, show on the other, this predisposition sufficiently, for all experienced persons know that habitual intoxication is in many cases only another form of insanity." We presume there may be authority for regarding such a disease of the mother, though developed at an advanced period of life, and attributable to a known and specific cause, as predisposing to insanity in her offspring, and through inordinate alcoholic stimulation, may in rare instances be the effect as well as the cause of cerebral disease affecting the mind. We question the author's doctrine that habitual intoxication is in any case to be regarded as "a form of insanity" in the popular use of the term. It is not yet regarded as a valid defence to a criminal charge that the accused was "habitually intoxicated," though it may be that we are making rapid progress towards such a point. But to return to the patient. The disease of his eyes prevented him from attending school, so that he scarcely acquired the rudiments of secular knowledge; and hence he had not "that training of the mental faculties and that development of the intellectual powers which would have modified if not over-ruled the predominant instincts." Is this a professional phrase? "The predominant instincts" of a human being! What are they beyond those of his animal nature? For want of such training and development, says the reviewer, "the religious element of the man's character took the lowest form of religious manifestation, and the Deity was regarded as an avenging being, to be propitiated by prayers and intercessions and a scru-

pulous attention to ceremonials. It was a modification of demon-worship." Surely this is a new doctrine—that a training in secular knowledge would have prevented the patient from regarding the Deity in such a light. Have not some of the most learned of Pagan philosophers adopted such a view of his character, and among the learned and intelligent of Christian communities, do we never find those who seek to propitiate the divine favour by prayers, and intercessions, and a scrupulous attention to ceremonials? They would feel themselves sorely aggrieved if such an inference should be drawn with respect to them, or if they were regarded as using a "modified form of demon-worship."

But besides the disease of his eyes the patient had frequent times of weakness and giddiness, and, from the age of sixteen to twenty-five, a daily hemorrhage from the nose. At twenty-two he suffered from a determination of blood to the head and chest, violent palpitations, intense head-aches and flashings before the eyes. From seven years of age, through life, he had spectral illusions, changing their character as he advanced in years. "He considered them as but phantoms of the imagination, and it was only with increasing *religious* terrors that he began to think them visions of the devil."

Among other eccentricities of conduct it is mentioned that "having persuaded his brother to receive the sacrament, he insisted upon washing his feet in imitation of Christ who washed the feet of his disciples." On another occasion his sister presented him with a small sum of money for some purpose, and accompanied it, as he conceived, "with a peculiar grimace; at the same moment he observed an old broom placed against the wall which if met in the morning, according to an old superstition, indicates bad luck, and might even call up the devil himself. The thought came like a flash of lightning, that his sister was the devil, and that he had taken her form to give him the money and thereby bind him to his service. Just at this time a piece of glass wounded his foot through his boot, and this he considered to have happened through the agency of the devil, who was continually meeting him. He now took to continued prayer or perusal of the Bible for assistance and consolation. A passage in the tenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles in which Peter addressed Cornelius to the effect that his prayer

was heard, suddenly excited the idea that God might be induced to hear his supplications if he should fast as this centurion did, and he fasted from Sunday till the Monday-week following! During this time he felt no hunger. He occupied his time with a continual perusal of the Bible and was constantly haunted with spectres having almost exclusive reference to the devil. After reading Christ's announcement (prediction) of the destruction of Jerusalem, he was convinced that the world was coming to an end, and that Berlin would be destroyed by fire. Under this impression he set forth with a piece of wood as an amulet, to bless the houses of his friends and thereby preserve them from the impending destruction. He walked before the house fixed upon for this purpose murmuring—In the house of God the Father, &c. He went about blessing public buildings and institutions as well as private houses. The day after this he was admitted to the hospital, fed with a tube, &c. He remained but a short time, though he was soon after re-committed, and was under treatment eight months, when he was restored to his friends in tolerable health of body and mind."

These are the predominant features of the case, and what there is in them to give it the character of "religious insanity," the reader will judge. We cannot divine.

We are informed in the course of the narration that "the religious teaching made a deep impression on his mind; so that he viewed the mimicry and mockery of the minister by other boys with lively displeasure; and often prayed earnestly to God to deliver his mother from her afflicting malady." What this "religious teaching" was, or from whom, or at what period of life received, we are not informed. Both the health of the mother and the habits of the father would seem to forbid, even the usual parental care, and there is an intimation in the narrative that after the mother's death there was a lamentable alienation among the members of the father's household. Certainly such a house is far enough from being propitious to a healthful, religious inculcation or development. We should not be surprised to know that some superstitious shrivelled, petulant, old schooldame had filled his excitable brain with stories of fairies and hobgoblins before he was out of petticoats. For though he seems to have gathered some fragments of scripture history—such as a child's memory easily retains—the statement does not furnish

ground to believe that he ever had a single just or abiding impression of any religious doctrine or precept whatever, during his whole life. On the contrary, it furnishes the clearest evidence that those delusions which are used to connect the case with religious subjects are really the result of constitutional disease of the brain, and though taking their hue from the superstitious notices which he had conceived or imbibed, had really no more connexion with "revealed religion," than his belief that Berlin would be destroyed by fire had with the true theory of combustion.

In this discussion we assume that Dr. Ideler and his reviewer mean by the term "religious insanity," that form of mental alienation which manifests itself upon religious subjects—as when one conceives himself to be God or the Saviour, or takes a false or defective view of his personal relations to God and his revealed laws, as by conceiving himself to have committed "the unpardonable sin," or to be a hopelessly doomed subject of divine wrath. A gloomy or melancholic temperament, especially under the influence of false or partial teaching, may have induced this conviction. But whatever the cause, when the delusion once takes possession of the mind, it deranges its powers and spreads its pall over almost every object of its contemplation. And who ever heard that such an unhappy sufferer sought relief from his "mental troubles" in the intoxicating cup or in the haunts of courtezans? "His mental troubles were still further increased by an indulgence in illicit pleasure—this was followed by bitter remorse, and in consequence he was induced often to receive the sacrament!" On the contrary who does not know that the religiously insane, as they are called, brood with a ceaseless grief over what they suppose to be an inevitable doom, and are sometimes with difficulty restrained from rushing upon it rather than endure the anticipation of it. In the case Dr. Ideler presents, and especially in the remarkable passage of the narrative just quoted, we have two aspects of character, either of which would account for his mental troubles without connecting them even nominally with religion, viz: *licentiousness and superstition.*

The reviewer remarks that "it is very usual to attribute 'religious insanity' to religion itself." In the case which has been stated, however, he thinks no such imputation can be made."

"Nay, it seems rather probable," he says, "that the strong religious sentiment of the man guided him aright, when he would otherwise have failed, and it was rather the cerebral disease that aggravated this, than this that induced the cerebral disease and its manifestation in religious insanity." We do not know what the original narrative may have shown, but so far as the statement in the review is concerned, there is not a tittle of evidence that the man had any religious sentiment so strong as the libidinous and superstitious sentiment; nor are we informed to what it guided him. If instead of attempting to convert his brother and sister, this poor carpenter's son had gone to a shipbuilder and contracted for a ship, and then for a cargo, should we call it *commercial* insanity? Or if he had purchased a large farm and ordered ploughs, and oxen, and horses, and labourers, to improve it, would it be spoken of as *agricultural* insanity? And yet these terms would be equally appropriate, and their aid is as much needed to distinguish peculiar manifestations of derangement like these, as the term "religious insanity" is to denote the character of such a case as has been described. The most that can be said to connect it with religion is that upon that as upon all other subjects he manifested a disordered mind.

But another case is given, in which a sort of religious excitement is charged with having occasioned insanity. The man was a shoe-maker, forty-five years old, and happy and contented in his business. He was "so little given to religious duties, however, that he rarely went to church." If a man capable of religious thoughtfulness, lives forty-five years in this state of probation, without sufficient concern for his soul's well-being to evidence the most ordinary religious habits, we must not be surprised by extraordinary phenomena, if at any time strong emotions on that subject should be suddenly excited, especially if it should take the form of some unscriptural dogma. The shoemaker was converted, not to the faith of Christ, but to the doctrine of the Anabaptists, who persuaded him to submit to baptism as the only way of escaping damnation. An account is given of the ceremony of baptism, but nothing appears to distinguish it from other administrations of that ordinance. He was afterwards involved in a sharp controversy with his co-religionists, and the excitement which this occasioned termi-

nated in a paroxysm of insanity. Now that an utterly irreligious man, whose mind was suddenly impressed, late in life, with a false view of Christian doctrine and duty, should embark in religious controversy, is of itself no slight indication of *previous* intellectual unsoundness, but that the adventure should result in the derangement of such a mind cannot surprise anybody. In the end he fell into a raving *mania* from which "he was happily recovered by tartar-emetic ointment applied to the shaved scalp."

In commenting on this case, the reviewer remarks that "it presents a series of phenomena in remarkable contrast with those of the preceding. The patient appears to have been a good husband and father, but without any religious predisposition or turn of mind. It is only when the stimulus is accidentally applied by the proselyting tracts of the Anabaptists that there is action excited. The enthusiastic character of the tracts would have an abiding influence on a mind untrained in religious discipline, and thus that morbid condition of the brain was excited which a less stimulating and a more judicious communication of religious knowledge would have led only to a religious life and conversation." The case, as stated, discloses nothing as to the nature of the tracts, whether they were tame or enthusiastic, nor does it show that an injudicious communication of religious knowledge had any more to do with the development of his insanity than the sedentary business he followed, or the temperature of the water into which he was plunged at baptism. For aught that appears, he may have been brought to the knowledge of what seven-eighths of the existing evangelical denominations regard as the cardinal doctrine of revealed religion that the grace of God and a new spiritual birth are necessary to put away sins. That this spiritual grace is signified or symbolised by the washing of water in baptism, is also an item of almost every Christian creed. Yet we should suppose from the manner of the narration that the belief of this doctrine was regarded as one of the phases of insanity! As to the state of stark madness into which the patient was afterwards thrown, there is nothing to indicate the presence of religious excitement even as a remote developing agent. Fourteen other persons were baptized at the same time with the poor shoemaker, converts to the same faith, and for aught that appears, brought to

submit themselves to the ordinance by a process quite as stimulating as that which was employed upon him, and one of the fourteen was his own daughter, fifteen years old! Were they all so well balanced or fortified as to resist or elude the influence that wrecked him? Or did they pass through the seas of religious excitement with substantially similar views and emotions up to the period when it was the shoemaker's misfortune to fall into a controversy, which had much the same effect upon him that a severe political campaign or a hotly contested lawsuit would have produced?

It is certainly a bold assumption that less enthusiastic tracts or a more discreet communication of religious knowledge would have led to a religious life and conversation. Perhaps a weaker *stimulus* would not have served to excite him at all, and a less vehement appeal than his brother sectarians made, or what our author calls a "more judicious communication of religious views," might have been entirely unheeded. At all events we cannot see from the statement made, that the "Anabaptistical enthusiasm" was the obvious exciting cause of the shoemaker's insanity. And then as to the series of phenomena in this case which stand, as our author conceives, in such remarkable contrast with those of the carpenter's son, we are at a loss to discover them unless they are seen in the physical constitution or condition, or in the fact that the mind of one is represented to have been early imbued with a deep religious sentiment and to have been denied the ordinary training process of education, while in the other there was no more advantage of intellectual cultivation, but the religious sentiment was entertained at an advanced period of life. The grand feature common to both is, that the doctrines and duties of religion were never rightly apprehended, and of course never exerted upon their hearts or habits the legitimate influence. It would be a shameful act of injustice to condemn a boat as a deodand, because the drowning man for whose rescue it was pushed out did not get fair hold of it and perished. And it is less ungracious to attribute to religion, or associate with it even by name, a calamity which it is its peculiar office, as we shall by and by show, to avert.

Passing specific cases in which religion is made responsible for such direful consequences, our author feels it incumbent upon him to notice the mental aberrations that have been ex-

cited by so called popular preachers, and takes occasion to "admonish clergymen, ministers, and priests, to study more diligently the history of religious insanity, so as to be enabled to distinguish accurately between the ravings of the insane or semi-insane and the operations of the Holy Spirit," and he proceeds to show very conclusively, that it is a most dangerous error to confound them. He thinks "men consider too seldom that as regards eternal life and a preparation for it, the access of incurable insanity is virtually death, and consequently that the wild preaching of the enthusiast have as deadly an influence on the victim's future state, as if by means of arsenic he had sent him to his account with all his imperfections on his head."

One would almost infer from such a solemn warning, that the wild preaching of the gospel is a chief agent in the production of insanity, and that it must require considerable study and no little skill so to distinguish the fruits of the ministry of the word, as not to mistake the fancies of a disordered brain for the sober convictions of truth and duty. So far from this we apprehend that the true work of the Spirit of God is indicated by tokens far more distinct and unequivocal than those by which the sanity of the men in general is determined. In other words, it is much more likely that a sane man will be found in a lunatic hospital, than that an insane man will be received with the company of believers in consequence of mistaking his morbid delusions for the fruits of the Spirit of God.

And even if it were not so, the appeal of the reviewer loses much of its pathos when it is considered that it would not aggravate the condition of an unconverted man to pass into the world of spirits in a state of insanity. So far as it abridges the term of human trial, or excludes the hope of pardon and salvation, it is a dreadful calamity to him to become insane. But if the probationary season is unimproved, and the offer of pardon rejected, and the soul finally lost, the period of his insanity and his infancy will be the only seasons of his life, the review of which will not sting him with remorse.

What our author intends by the wild preachings of the enthusiast, we have no means of determining. What we understand by the term is very rare in the United States, and we had supposed it to be still rarer in Europe. An enthusiast

preaching wildly would at once pass among us for an insane man, and his influence would extend but little if at all beyond those who are predisposed to the same class of mental aberrations or already under their power.

It is not impossible that the reviewer has in mind the same sort of preaching which drew upon the great apostle of the Gentiles the imputation of religious insanity from the lips of the Governor of Judea: "Paul thou art beside thyself, much learning doth make thee mad." Mistakes of this kind are not unfrequent in lunatic hospitals. A patient imagining herself to be a queen is surprised at the impudence of those who approach her without tokens of profound respect, and who will undertake to persuade her that the false conception is in herself. So it may be that the reviewer has false conceptions of the condition and prospects of men without hope and without God in the world; false conceptions of the gospel itself; false conceptions of the natural legitimate effect upon the character and conduct of one who receives it in faith; false conceptions of the mode of presenting it and the divine agency which imparts to it a saving power.

We have known clergymen, to whom the inquiry "What shall I do to be saved?" has been addressed with an earnestness betokening a sense of guilt and an apprehension of a judgment to come, who have directed the inquirer to try riding on horseback or a free indulgence in worldly amusements. No thoughtful mind can be at a loss to determine which is the insane party in such a dialogue, and yet we are quite in doubt how the reviewer would decide the point.

The third case which the reviewer cites from Dr. Ideler's list is that of a female in humble life who was grossly ill-treated by her step-mother; suffered divers and severe bodily diseases; was a servant at an ale-house, and then a dress-maker and was at last supplied with the same sort of mystical and fanatical tracts which worked so much mischief for the poor shoemaker. Her history was so remarkably analogous to his that we forbear farther detail. Suffice it to say that when she was received into the lunatic hospital she was registered as the victim of religious melancholy, but after less than a year's treatment she wrote an autobiography and was discharged cured. That she was deranged there can be no doubt, nor that her

derangement was exhibited in her religious habits, but there is not a particle of evidence that attention to religion or her views of its doctrines or duties had the remotest agency in producing it.

The reviewer evidently anticipates the construction which would be put upon his reasoning by those who regard revealed religion as the soother of all human woes and the antidote to all human ills; and he would fain avert it by drawing a "distinction between those deranged affections of the mind which result from the influences of false religion upon the understanding, and the healthy effect of legitimate Christianity upon the feelings and actions of men. During the course of our experience," he says, "we have never seen a case of insanity which could be clearly traced to true religion. We mean religion as inculcated by the great author of Christianity—the religion that teaches peace and good will towards men—that advocates the noble sentiments of love and charity—which inculcates the feeling of preferring others to ourselves—the religion which represents LOVE, MERCY, and FORGIVENESS as the pre-eminent attributes of the Godhead—the religion whose tendency is to make us take lowly views of ourselves, to humble human pride, to produce a cheerful, serene and happy state of mind—the religion that enables us to bear with fortitude 'the whips and scorns of time, the oppressor's wrong, and the proud man's contumely.'"

This eulogy of the Christian religion and its effects is certainly well deserved, but it has two faults. The Christian religion does something for which the eulogist does not give it credit, and he ascribes to it an important feature which it does not possess. To deny one's self, take up the cross daily and follow Christ, to forsake father and mother, brother and sister, house and lands, home and country, yea, one's own life also, for Christ's sake and the gospel's, is a far higher attainment of religious faith, than to bear with fortitude "the whips and scorns of time," &c. The former includes the latter and vastly more. And for the second error, we can say, without verbal captiousness, that we know of no *true* religion that represents love, mercy, and forgiveness as any more pre-eminent attribute of the Godhead, than justice, holiness, and truth. "Legitimate Christianity" is at best a very suspicious phrascology.

The system of doctrines and duties taught by Christ to his

followers, as contained in the New Testament, is Christianity. There is no other Christianity, legitimate or illegitimate, and this reveals God in ALL his attributes, in his truth as well as in his love, in his holiness as well as in his mercy, in his righteousness as well as in his forgiveness. He who separates these attributes, and presents to us a combination which he thinks safer or more winning, incurs a responsibility which we should be very slow to assume for any end.

That our author's views may be more clearly understood, we cite another passage: "False, fanatic, and mistaken views of our duty to God and man, of our relationship to the divine and benevolent governor of the universe have decidedly a most pernicious effect upon the feelings and intellect, and often produce unequivocal insanity. How many, with we believe the purest intentions and from the best motives, represent God, whose great and noblest attribute is love, as a God of vengeance and terror, and who have no conception of the Deity except as one riding upon the whirlwind and the storm, hurling his thunderbolts among those transgressing his laws," &c. We are all prepared to hear that false and fanatical views of religion have an unhappy effect upon the human mind. It could not be otherwise. But what the reviewer would call false and fanatical views, might seem to others just, rational and scriptural, and such as a teacher in religion would be inexcusably blameworthy for withholding. We more than suspect that his system, if fairly drawn out, would lack some of the essential features of legitimate Christianity, and though it might not craze people, it would certainly fail to convert and save them. We know of no revelation of the Almighty which authorizes us to represent love as a nobler attribute of his character than holiness, and it is surely a false, fanatic and mistaken view of his revealed nature which excludes such representations as the following, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. Rom. xii. 19. With God is terrible majesty. Job xxxvii. 22. While I suffer thy terrors I am distracted. Ps. lxxxviii. 15. The day of vengeance is in my heart. Isa. lxxxiii. 4. Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? Rom. iii. 5. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men. 2 Cor. v. 11. The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not

God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. 2 Thess. i. 7, 8.

That there may be, and often are, distorted views of the divine character given and taken, we do not deny; but we are not prepared to admit that persons of weak minds or extreme nervous susceptibilities are particularly exposed to be affected by such errors. On the contrary we have known a far greater number of instances in which persons of strong mind and well-braced nerves have suffered from the misapprehension of truth in this form. It has been their mistake to indulge in long-continued and intense meditation upon some single item of our faith, as for example, *the guilt of sin*, until the mind is incapable of any other or happier exercise. It has lost the power to turn towards the cross of Christ and the infinite sacrifice for sin which is there disclosed, and the ordinary communications of grace are not sufficient to overcome this cultivated tendency towards gloom and despair. But a weak mind is incapable of so steady and protracted a survey of the breadth and spirituality of God's law and its unyielding sanctions, and a nervous temperament would shrink from so continuous a task as the case supposes. Such a distorted view of the Christian system has not unfrequently resulted in the dethronement of reason; but religion and its ministers are no more responsible for it, than science is for the derangement of one who loses his wits in seeking out a new invention, or than the law is for one who goes mad because he loses an important case.

In the course of the discussion, the reviewer suggests a hypothesis which seems to us void of authority if not of plausibility. "On a careful perusal of those histories which modern literature affords of the great periods of religious excitement and enthusiasm and of those minor fermentations which have led to the establishment of new sects or have excited local manifestations of religious aberration, (we are not responsible for obscurities of style) we find this general principle manifested in all, viz: that the minds of men have been directed to one dogma or principle or point of discipline, in especial, either to the total eclipse of other doctrines or to their partial obscuration and neglect; and for the most part it may farther be stated, as an important fact, that the dogma, or principle, or point of discipline to which

this prominence is assigned is generally of secondary importance in the general estimate of Christendom."

It would add much to the point and intelligibleness of this passage if the author had specified some of the great periods of religious excitement and enthusiasm which he had in view. Whether, for example, he would reckon the Reformation in the time of Luther, the accession of Cromwell, or of James I., or the rise of Wesleyanism as among them. And if he does, then what dogma, or doctrine, or point of discussion was urged in each or either of these cases to such a mischievous extreme, so that we might judge for ourselves what plan it occupies "in the general estimate of Christendom." It would be desirable to know, moreover, what he would regard as among the minor fermentations" that "have led to the establishment of new sects," &c.

We are the more inclined to draw the author out on these points, inasmuch as the only example with which he favours us affords but a very lame support to his theory. He cites the various views which prevail in relation to baptism. "While all Christians maintain, with one exception, (Friends, we suppose,) that baptism is an essential rite, one sect attributes to it a sacramental efficacy, while another maintains that it is only a point of discipline or a ceremony which may be varied according to circumstances. One sect may think pedobaptism is the important thing, while another may assert the absolute necessity of adult baptism. Now the common faith of all these sects is, that abstractedly, baptism is necessary to salvation by Christ; and this, therefore, is a fundamental principle of their Christian belief, yet none assert this fundamental principle. What distinguishes each, is that baptism shall be performed in a particular age, and with a belief in certain dogmas of less importance than the fundamental principle itself."

We feel quite prepared to admit that undue importance is often given to non-essentials, but we do not see what this has to do with any theory of religious insanity, unless it is shown that these are the points on which reason is most commonly wrecked, and we cannot believe that the phenomena of insanity are sufficiently understood to enable us to classify its causes so minutely as this. We may say perhaps, in some rare instances, that an undue excitement of the mind in reference to religious

subjects generally was the first indication of its insane state, or possibly, in a solitary case, here and there, the deranged thoughts may be concentrated upon some single religious dogma or ceremony, but to affirm that the inculcation of one class or order of religious dogmas has been chiefly or conspicuously productive of what is called religious insanity, we think is quite presumptuous in the present stage of inquiries on the subject. The cases of Thomas Muncer and John of Leyden, though cited in illustration of the author's theory, seem quite insufficient to maintain it.

In view of the dangers which, the author supposes, attend the inculcation of religious truth, he exhorts "the teachers of religion and the conductors of public worship to avoid all controversial topics, all exalting services, all enthusiastic methods of teaching or preaching—to make the *precepts* of Christianity the themes of their discourse rather than the *doctrines*, and great moral duties rather than sectarian peculiarities."*

This passage reveals to us, very plainly, a grand defect in the author's religious views, and, of course, a very decided disqualification to judge of the character of religious teaching, or of its appropriate effects on the minds of others. The exhortation is addressed to preachers and religious teachers, of all orders and grades, and the rule for their government is not restricted to particular occasions or audiences. If it were to be heeded, what a ricketty, disjointed system would Christianity become. The being of a God is a fundamental *doctrine* of all religions; and what force or sanctions have his *precepts* until his nature and authority are revealed? That man has sinned and incurred the displeasure of God, is a *doctrine* of all religions, and what great moral duties can be inculcated without recognising and prominently exhibiting it? Forgiveness of injuries is certainly a great moral duty, which nothing can enforce more effectively than our Saviour's declaration, If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father which is in

* If our memory serves us, counsels, not unlike these here offered, were addressed to to the public some years ago, occasioned by an extraordinary revival of religion in the city of Hartford. The absorbing interest which was manifested in the concerns of the soul, by people of all ages and classes, led some philosophic spectator to think that the people were beside themselves, and to prevent the excitement from spreading, he attempted to show that it would turn the good city of Hartford into a Bedlam, if it were continued. We have sought in vain for the pamphlet to which we refer, but it was not a little talked about at the time.

Heaven forgive you your trespasses. But how are the magnitude and aggravation of these trespasses of ours to be estimated, apart from the infinite attributes of the law-giver and the perfect wisdom and righteousness of the law itself. If I know not what the pounds are which represent my debt to my lord, how shall I admit the insignificance of the pence that my fellow-servant owes me? The summary of the divine law-giver by the great Teacher sent from God; Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself; may be regarded as the all-comprehensive precept of Christianity; but who can understand it or obey it intelligently, to whom the character of God is not disclosed as fully and completely, as the scriptures disclose it? What love could be felt towards a governor who should suffer the laws of the state to be violated with impunity, or who should indiscriminately pardon all offenders? What safety could we feel under an administration that should forget to protect the innocent and vindicate the right, in its eagerness to excuse the guilty and to screen the condemned from deserved punishment? Is it not obvious that we must know God as the moral governor of the universe, and of course, that we must know all the *doctrines* that involve his attributes, or the revealed principles and designs of his administration, before we can properly appreciate the purity and righteousness of his precepts, the faithfulness of his promises or the terror of his threatenings. To present less than this to a rational being as a system of revealed religion, would be impious and presumptuous beyond degree. If our author's rule of teaching and preaching were observed, men would be called upon to love and obey an unknown God. Without love to prompt obedience or fear to constrain it, the very incompleteness and poverty of the scheme, and its utter inappropriateness and inadequacy to meet the felt wants of the human soul, would prove it to be spurious, and it would not be strange if such a balking of the desires and aspirations of the immortal mind should occasion not only insanity but hopeless despair.

The truth probably is that the views of sane men—even intelligent and scientific men—of the nature of the Christian faith and of its influence when truly embraced, are so indefinite, that when they are at a loss to account for any more specific cause

of "the mind's disease," they feel at liberty to ascribe it to religion, especially if in the vagaries of the disordered brain some of its half-understood doctrines are harped upon with considerable frequency. We are not prepared to say what extravagant conceptions of religious truth or ceremonies may consist with a sane mind. If any man, of standing enough to give his opinions a fair start, should announce some of the dogmas of the papal faith for the first time—such as that the body of Christ is really and truly, wholly and entirely in the whole sacrifice of the mass, and wholly and entirely in each part at the same time, or that a dying sinner's soul can be benefited by the oil that is daubed upon his dissolving body, or that after having passed into the eternal world, he can be aided in his escape from the penalty of sin by prayers purchased with money; would not such a man be regarded as beside himself, and his followers as madmen? Are the oddest conceptions of religious insanity more wild and fanciful? Suppose the renowned *Laplace* had suddenly broken off the most abstruse train of thought on the theory of probabilities and asked his assistant to cut his toe nails; or suppose Dugald Stewart had stopped in the middle of a public lecture to direct his dinner to be boiled and not roasted, would not the incident in each case be marked as unequivocal token of derangement? Yet who counted Socrates insane when he paused in the midst of his last discourse on immortality, to order the sacrifice of a cock to Esculapius!

If we would rightly understand the phenomena of insanity, we must extend our investigation of its causes or excitements to points quite remote from those presented by Dr. Ideler or his reviewer. The unsubdued temper of a child exhibits itself in paroxysms of passions. Every little disappointment occasions violent irritation. This morbid impatience ripens into sullen discontent with all the allotments of life. The unhappy creature persuades himself that an evil spirit haunts all his footsteps and rules his destiny. This conception is easily made to assume a religious phase or association, and is succeeded by settled gloom, which the hospital register or the newspaper records as a case of religious melancholy, whereas it is really a case of unsubdued temper.

We might readily illustrate our position by actual cases of disappointed ambition or affection. As where one has aspired

to high distinction, and has suffered a defeat so unexpected and mortifying as to unhinge the mind, it is natural that he should assume some exalted character, and insanely suppose himself to be a king, or even the King of kings. Or when the young affections have been so sadly blighted as to veil all the joys and hopes of life, and excite a disgust for life itself, we might expect that reason, overpowered by such a shock, would lead the sufferer into some morbid conception of herself, that would be most congenial to seclusion and a renunciation of the world; and hence she is very likely to assume the character of the Virgin Mary, or to hold herself in readiness for some extraordinary holy service as a companion of some angelic potentate. These are not fictitious cases; they have had their parallel if not their counterpart in lunatic hospitals, and in neither of them, we apprehend, could there be found a single feature to justify us in classing them among cases of "religious insanity," since religion has but the remotest connexion with their unhappy state.

If in the instances just cited, and others of like character, faith in God had been a controlling principle, the mind would probably have stayed itself on him, and its integrity would have been preserved. Have our readers never known a lone woman, in humble life, buffeting courageously with the rising tide of disappointment and sorrow, a kind and faithful husband removed by death; the means of daily sustenance straitened, perhaps almost to penury; a promising son proving reprobate; a helpful and cheerful daughter deprived of sight, and another prostrate under the power of chronic disease; in these or like circumstances reposing her trust in her covenant God, and saying with the afflicted but not despairing patriarch, "Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" or in the words of one who knew the bitterness of grief,

> "My lifted eye, without a tear,
> The gathering storm shall see,
> My steadfast heart shall know no fear;
> That heart shall trust in thee."

It is not a superior mind, nor higher moral gifts that makes this obvious difference. It is that in the one case religion is inculcated, and the mind entertains it as an infinitely pure and welcome system of divine truth, embraces its sublime and often mysterious doctrines as a little child receives the lessons of pa-

ternal wisdom, and esteems its precepts as just and good, and worthy of prompt and cheerful obedience. God's providence is regarded as directing and overruling all; and the spontaneous language of the soul is, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him. Though the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines, the labour of the olive shall fail, and the field shall yield no meat, the flocks shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stall, yet will I rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation."

In the other case a perverse, fretful, impatient spirit, indulged in childhood, falls, and is "utterly cast down" in the first conflict with the stern realities of life, and becomes the prey of fitful melancholy, if not of settled *mania.*

Esteeming it of transcendent importance, as we certainly do, to give children just ideas of God's character and government, and such a knowledge of the doctrines of revealed religion as their immature capacities can receive, we must express our unqualified dissent from the views of our author on this point. He thinks that "to prevent what is termed religious insanity, we should be careful, particularly in early life when the imagination is most alive to impressions, to avoid alluring the mind to dwell too much on the consideration of the abstractions of religion, and to keep a check upon the feelings. Religious exercise," he says, "though all-important not only in reference to this life, but to a future state of existence, ought to be kept within reasonable and healthy bounds." No sane person would hold that the religious or any other exercises of the mind should exceed those bounds. But to understand the author properly, we must know what he would regard as "abstractions," and what bounds he would consider "reasonable and healthy." It would surely be injudicious to attempt to impose upon a little child's understanding the propositions of Euclid, or a theory of the tides, though it may comprehend some of the elements which are essential to the solution of these propositions and that theory, and without a knowledge of which neither of them could have been conceived or propounded. Upon the same principle we might forbear to indoctrinate a pupil of such tender age in the high mysteries of God's foreknowledge, the introduction of evil into the world, and the inscrutable arrangements of his providential government; but there are truths revealed to the comprehension of

"babes and sucklings," which are so interwoven with those higher doctrines as to make the reception of this auxiliary to a strong and elevated faith. There is a nurture in the "milk for babes," from which the transition to the strong meat of men is almost imperceptible. Our author seems to have overlooked the simplicity of the truths which are set forth in what he would call the "abstractions of religion." Nor does he seem to be aware of the facility with which the *principle* involved in them can be made intelligible to little children. We cannot forbear to commend to him an hour's interview with the far-famed Dr. Watts, through the medium of his Divine Songs for children, in some of which this process of accommodation is beautifully exemplified; and lest so humble a production should not be found without difficulty in a learned man's library, we quote a few illustrations.

The stupendous doctrine of divine omnipotence:

"I sing the Almighty power of God
That made the mountains rise,
That spread the flowing seas abroad
And built the lofty skies."

The omniscience of God:

"Almighty God, thy piercing eye
Strikes through the shades of night,
And our most secret actions lie
All open to thy sight."

The eternal destiny of men:

"Just as a tree cut down, that fell
To north or southward there it lies,
So man departs to heaven or hell,
Fixed in the state wherein he dies.'

The mystery of human redemption—

"'Twas to save thee, child, from dying,
Save my dear from burning flame,
Bitter groans and endless crying,
That thy blest Redeemer came.
May'st thou live to know and fear him,
Trust and love him all thy days,
Then go dwell forever near him,
See his face and sing his praise."

These are what we might call, in the phraseology of school-book makers, "abstractions made easy;" nor have we any fear that a knowledge of them can be inculcated too early or too deeply upon the human mind. We detect the same misconcep-

tion of the relations and offices of religion in another caution which our author throws out. "Where there is already a predisposition to cerebral disease in a religious family, that is to say a family in which the doctrines and discipline of religion have a marked influence on their actions and habits, it is a fatal mistake to encourage the religious sentiment in early infancy and childhood, and thereby render the youth precociously religious. The irregularity of development of the mental faculties, that will necessarily arise out of this exclusively religious training, will as necessarily lead to irregularity of life and conduct, and the proverb be verified in the individual—'A young saint, an old devil.'"

"A predisposition to cerebral disease" in any family, religious or irreligious, should put all its members and friends on their guard against any influences that are likely to develope it. It should be borne in mind too, that such a tendency is quite as likely to be developed by the too eager pursuit of pleasure, or by the irregularities and extravagances of a worldly and fashionable life, as by a becoming sobriety and a diligent attendance upon religious duties. Indeed, if such a "predisposition" exists in a religious family, may we not reasonably hope that the elevating and tranquillizing influences, which never fail to attend true religion, contribute much to counteract, if not to extinguish it. The calmness and cheerfulness which are diffused through all the apartments and occupations of a Christian household, are certainly fitted to produce such an effect.

If the "doctrines and discipline of religion have a marked influence on the actions and habits of a family, the religious sentiment cannot but be encouraged" in all its members. It is scarcely possible to surround a child with more potent agencies and instruments to secure the education of the religious part of his nature, than to place him in a family "whose actions and habits are plainly ordered and governed by the doctrines and discipline of religion." To live in the midst of such influences during the impressible period of "early infancy and childhood," and yet not have "the religious sentiment encouraged," would be quite as impossible as for a colony of New Zealanders to live in Broadway or Chestnut street, without changing their habits and manners: he must therefore remove the child who suffers from such cerebral tendencies, entirely away from such associa-

tions, or we must run the risk of encouraging most effectively the religious sentiment. What our author understands by "precociously religious youth," we do not know. Samuel, Josiah and Timothy were very religious while they were very young. They have generally been regarded as examples which it would be safe for children in all generations to copy. And many parents have been stimulated by viewing the grace of God, manifested to those youth, to hope for a like early exhibition of godliness in their children. The wisest man that ever lived seems not to have apprehended the danger which our author points out, for he clearly enjoins an early encouragement of the religious sentiment in that familiar proverb of his: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." The "way" in which all religious parents would doubtless wish their children to go "when they are old," is the way of the godly. And to this end the wise man (very philosophically it must be allowed) counsels them to turn their childish footsteps into that way, in other words, to encourage the religious sentiment in early infancy and childhood, without any exception in favour of cerebral infirmities or predispositions to insanity.

The captive little maid, who waited on the Syrian general's wife, seems to have evinced the very strong controlling influence that religious faith may exert over a child without danger to its intellectual faculties; and it also shows (what many analogous cases might be cited to show) that such an early development of religious principles is not without peculiar advantages. Probably the parents of the little girl had trained her to revere the servants of the Lord, and confide implicitly in the miraculous tokens of their divine authority, and hence her confident commendation of her noble but afflicted master to the supernatural skill of "the prophet that was in Samaria." The "children in the temple," too, seem to have been quite as much excited by the presence of the son of David, as the rulers were with indignation at their hosannas, but instead of fearing to "encourage unduly the religious sentiment," the divine teacher speaks of it as the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy, that "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings God's praise should be perfected." How strikingly at variance with all this is the doctrine of the reviewer

that it is a fatal mistake to encourage the religious sentiments in early infancy and childhood.

We are at a loss to understand whence our author, in the case supposed, takes the idea of an "exclusively religious training." A child may live in a "family in which the doctrines and discipline of religion have a marked difference on their actions and habits," and may feel the happy and healthful effects of such an example, and yet go to school six hours every day, and engage to his heart's content in all the innocent and invigorating sports of childhood. He has no ill-humoured or intemperate father to frown upon him, no thriftless or negligent mother to regard his return home as a new burden of care, no selfish and quarrelsome brothers and sisters to abuse and provoke him, but he enjoys the blessing of a pleasant home, made happy and attractive by the gentle influences of religion. In such associations he is saved from countless crosses and imitations which are almost inseparable from an ungodly or worldly family, and this of itself must be of inestimable advantage in resisting any predisposition to "cerebral disease." Moreover, the idea of an "exclusively religious training" is preposterous. It cannot be. There are countless agencies, within and without every child, that are incessantly active in educating its powers of body and mind. These agencies cannot be eluded. With all the forethought and anxiety that godly parents can exercise, the religious influence will be but one of a score of influences in constant pressure upon him; and while the former acts, single-handed, against his natural desires and propensities; the latter, with combined energy, coincide with them and thus have the inestimable advantage, and they would retain it and lead the soul captive at their will, if it were not for the interposition of divine power.

But admitting our author's position to be tenable, and that an "exclusively religious training" were practicable, we could not but admit his conclusion that "an irregular development of the mental faculties" would necessarily arise out of it, nor that such a training would "necessarily lead to irregularity of life and conduct, making an old devil out of a young saint." Such false deductions arise from ignorance of the moral condition of men. If we take our opinions from Him who knows perfectly what is in man we shall be in no danger of such mistakes. He tells us

that the things which assimilate men to devils are in the HEART. There is the nest of evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, and blasphemies." These lead to "irregularity of life and conduct," and no development of the mental faculties will expel or even disturb them, but often give them a more vigorous activity. God, our creator, has clearly taught us that these native tenants of the human bosom are not to be ousted by any ordinary process. The strong man posted there is armed and will keep his place till a stronger than he shall come, and the expulsion is accomplished "not by might, not by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord." The earlier this divine work is accomplished, the better for the subject of it, the better for the world, the more for the glory of God's grace. And hence the earlier a child knows the plague of his own heart, and the earlier he is led to resort to the great Physician for a cure, the happier it must be for him and all concerned. Judicious religious training, coeval with the earliest indications of moral susceptibility, tends directly to produce these desirable results; and to defer it through fear of developing a predisposition to cerebral disease is inconsistent with all sound Christian philosophy, and must involve the parties in great guilt.

In our inquiries on such a subject as this we are apt to be so intent upon the study of immediate and present effects as to overlook general principles, by which they explained or governed. It is worth while to consider what effect we might expect to follow the offering of the Christian system to the faith of the human soul. It has been said that "the undevout astronomer is mad." Even the very partial and imperfect knowledge we can attain of the composition and magnitude, causes and revolutions, distances and relations of the heavenly bodies must prompt a sane mind to devotion. These wonders of divine wisdom and power; though material and perishable serve for a medium through which the thoughts pass upward to spiritual things that endure. The sight of them leads us to exclaim, Lord! what is man that thou art mindful of him? There are, however, fixed principles which science employs in investigations, of this nature, which seem to put the whole subject within our grasp, and we persuade ourselves that there is nothing hidden which we cannot bring to light. But the things which the Spirit of God reveals to us (eye hath not seen nor the ear heard,

nor the heart of man conceived them) are infinite. Our capacities are completely filled, the moment they are turned to the full contemplation of the glory of God, as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ.

We know that before sin entered into the world, the soul was capable of, and actually enjoyed an intimate communion with God like what is permitted to angels. The contemplation of their Maker's glory was in the highest degree beautifying to the first created pair. So that all the beauties and glories of paradise become insipid and insignificant, by reason of the excellent glory and beauty of the divine presence. They had powers essentially such as we possess, and had they retained the image of God in which they were created, this open and perfect communion would have been our glorious privilege, and we should have had capacities to receive revelations of God's character and designs of which in our fallen state we are wholly incapable. The sad effects of that one original transgression are seen not only in the pollution and degradation of the soul, but in the confusion and weakness of the intellectual powers.

When they have past through the present state of trial believers in Christ will be re-united to the society of holy beings. Their faith makes them members of Christ's body. They become one with him as he is one with the Father, and their powers and capacities are restored to their primitive state. No new capacities are said to be bestowed. It is enough that sin and its consequences are all separated from the soul, and it perhaps becomes *ipso facto*, capable as at first of holy and perfect communion with God.

It would seem then that whatever incapacities or weaknesses are inherent in our present nature, they are the product of sin, and whatever "revealed religion" does, counteracting the power, and remedying the effects of sin, it does in an equal degree towards enlarging and improving our capacities of divine knowledge. Now if the contemplation of but a minute portion of the visible wonders of creation may be expected to lead any sane mind to devotion, what must be the effect of revealing to it the moral attributes of the great Creator himself? If the mechanism of the sky, and the perfection and harmony of the intricate laws which preserve and govern its countless orbs, are so impressive as to justify us in esteeming an undevout astronomer as mad,

what must be thought of one who can receive, without the deepest emotion, the revelation of the great mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh! The stupendous scheme of man's redemption exceeds in wonder and wisdom all the visible things of creation, as much as that which is eternal and infinite exceeds that which is finite and perishing. And yet it may be comprehended in all its elevating, sanctifying and saving power by a little child! It is not needful that intricate problems should be solved, and that a life-time should be spent in elaborate investigations into the law of forces, and the combinations of light and air and motion. These exercises of the mental powers, stimulated only by the love of science or the desire of fame, must oftentimes exhaust, if not confound their powers. But when the soul, even of a little child, receives Christ by faith as its Lord and Saviour, a light is struck that no power will ever extinguish. It will shine brighter and brighter to the perfect day. The radiance of heaven is instantly shed upon the little pilgrim's path. New objects seize his attention and rivet his affections. What was before mysterious and perplexing now becomes plain and satisfying: he was blind, but now he sees: he was dead, but is alive again. Reasoning *a priori* we shall conclude that to solve the astronomer's problem, would be comparatively an easy task for powers that would strive in vain to apprehend the truths of "revealed religion;" yet the testimony of experience and observation constrains us to a very different conclusion. It proves on the one hand that he who is incapable of mastering the multiplication table, may comprehend mysteries which angels desire to look into, and on the other that one who can unlock all the secrets of human philosophy may be confounded and baffled by the simplest of revealed truths. The scriptures explain to us this paradox when they declare that the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned. This spiritual discernment is a gift, not an acquirement. It is bestowed on the humble and childlike, not on the proud and self conceited. He who has it is lifted by it above the war of elements. He observes, unmoved, the direction and fury of storms that dash in pieces cavillers, skeptics and bold blasphemers, like a potter's vessel,

and he follows with his eye the dispersing clouds as they give place to the bright outshining of the sun.

He can even reconcile the seeming inconsistencies of God's providential dealings, at which so many stumble and fall. He traces an outline of order in the wildest confusion, and discerns a cheering gleam of light where the worldling and sensual are enveloped in a darkness that may be felt. It is not strong intellectual powers that enable him to do this, nor are these the points of any carnal philosophy. So far from it, the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, has been subdued. The renewed soul receives with implicit faith and obedience all God's revelations of himself and of his will. It contemplates with equal satisfaction and serenity his holiness, justice and truth, and his love, compassion and forgiveness. The question of the religious educator should therefore be, not what predispositions may exist to "cerebral disease" and nervous excitability; but what is the temper of the mind? Is there the spirit of docility which inquires, "Lord what will THOU have me believe?" Is there a willingness to become a fool in order to be truly wise? If so, the simple saving truths of "revealed religion," including both doctrines and precepts, will show no tendency to dethrone reason nor to derange its powers. So far from it, they and they alone are fitted to enlighten, guide, sanctify and sustain it. The mind's capacity to receive new truth, or to perceive it in new and higher relations, will improve and expand by exercise, from the first throb of spiritual life in the new-born soul, until it reaches unto the measure of the stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus.

There is still another view in which the doctrine or opinion of our author is unsound. Ths history of the results of religious training shows that in a very great majority of cases parental fidelity in the Christian nurture of children has been amply rewarded even in this world by their godly walk and conversation. The most stable, useful, active and trustworthy citizens in public and private life have come out of those families "in which the doctrines and discipline of religion have a marked influence on their actions and habits." Early subjection to the restraints of a parental authority and domestic law has prepared them to govern themselves in all the relations they afterwards sustain. The dutiful and affectionate son, whom

our author might regard as a "young saint," has been called in ripe manhood to occupy the most elevated social positions; while the "old devils" have almost uniformly sprung from a neglected childhood. The attempt to encourage the religious sentiment has not been made, and the "cerebral disease" is developed in some enormous crime.

The "fatal mistake" we have to fear, according to our author's creed, is making the "youth precociously religious." The fatal mistake which has actually been made, since the world began (as history and experience shew), is to neglect the religious training of infancy and childhood, and thus encourage a precocious development of natural depravity.

Those who are so forward to ascribe mental derangement to influences connected with religion cannot be aware we think of the proper relation of cause and effect. If a drowning man is so far exhausted as to be incapable of seizing the oar or the boat that is thrown out to him, we cannot properly say that the oar or the rope caused his death. So when "the doctrines and precepts of revealed religion" are brought to bear upon a depraved and guilty creature like man, his carnal nature rises up in instant rebellion to them. This is the development of true *moral insanity.* He cavils at what would humble the pride of reason. He cannot tolerate the restraints that obedience would lay upon his sensual appetites and worldly desires and in the tumult of conflicting passions, it is not strange that the mind should be distracted and run into eccentricities and incoherencies. But religion has nothing to do with it. All that can be said of her is that she would have saved the man if he had availed himself of her proffered help, but she can in no sense be regarded as the author or cause of his calamity.

Our reviewer would evidently be a stanuch advocate for the modern theory of moral insanity. He would probably argue that as the too early inculcation of the religious sentiment tends to produce religious insanity, the too early inculcation of moral sentiments tends in like manner to the production of moral insanity. Hence he must, in all due consistency, advise that where there is a predisposition to "cerebral disease," the distinction between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, integrity and dishonesty, should not be too strenuously urged, and that where these qualities seem to be confounded, so that a man

mistakes another's watch or pocket-book for his own, or breaks open his neighbour's house under a misapprehension of the rights of property, or shoots an heiress because she will not marry him, he should be put upon strict diet, all excitement of his nervous system should be avoided, and care taken to divert his mind from the study of ethical subjects.

We are not trifling. We regard the notion of "moral insanity," lately promulgated, as a device for the protection of wicked and ungovernable men from the just punishment of their crimes, where there can be no pretence of any common type of insanity to answer the same purpose. There is such a thing as moral insanity, as we have before intimated. So intimate and mysterious is the connection between the immortal spirit of a man and its earthly tabernacle, that disease may impair or pervert for a season his moral feelings and affections, while the reasoning faculty is not materially weakened. But it is not difficult to distinguish such cases from those which in the most refined modern philosophy passes under the name of "moral insanity." The divine oracles speak of a "madness in the hearts of men" while they live. Our moral nature is, in the strictest sense, deranged, and if our being in this state exempts us from responsibility for violations of the law of God or man, we must look for an entirely new system of divine and human government. The Bible becomes obsolete at once, with all the motives and sanctions which it reveals, and the law by which every man governs himself is to do what is right in his own eyes.

As the result of the present discussion we suggest the following propositions:

I. It is as unjust to ascribe cases of what is commonly called "religious insanity" to religion, as their cause, as it would be to charge our insane hospitals with originating or confirming the cases which they do not cure.

II. There is no such thing as religious insanity: i. e. it cannot be said of religion, as it can be of grief or disappointment or chagrin that it causes or is the occasion of insanity.

III. To inculcate the doctrines, as well as the precepts, of revealed religion upon the human mind, at the earliest period of its capacity to receive them, is the clear scriptural duty of all persons who have the care of children and youth.

IV. To neglect or delay such an encouragement of the religious sentiment, from any apprehension of developing a tendency to "cerebral disease," is as unphilosophical and fatal, as it would be to withhold all food from a child through fear of strangling it or destroying its digestive organs.

V. The due apprehension and influence of religious truth, as revealed in the scriptures, constitutes the best preservative against mental aberrations, especially such as originate in moral causes.

VI. The earlier the mind is brought under the supreme influence of religious truth, the more likely it is to retain its integrity, when the exciting occasions of derangement occur.

---

ART. II—1. *The Freemason's Monitor.*
2. *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Ed. 7th. Art. *Mysteries.*
3. *The Secret Societies of the Middle Ages.* London: Charles Knight. 1837.
4. *Opinions on Speculative Free Masonry, relative to its origin, nature, and tendency, &c.* By James C. Osborne. Boston. 1836.
5. *Secret Societies.* A discourse by J. Blanchard. Cincinnati. 1845.
6. *I. O. O. F., Constitutions, Bye Laws, and Rules of Order; to which is added a Digest of the Laws of the Order.* Charleston, S. C. 1847.
7. *An Oration Delivered before the Independent Order of Odd Fellows.* By W. D. Porter, N. G., Charleston, 1844.
8. *M. W. Grand Sire's Report.* 1847.
9. *Resolutions and Reports of the Consociation of Fairfield, West Connecticut;—The Presbytery of New York;—Salem Presbytery, Mi.;—Presbytery of Ithica;—Synod of Cincinnati, &c., against Secret Societies.*

IN a former article we have considered the principles of secrecy in its relation to man's moral and religious obligations, and have endeavored to prove, that the use made of it by the various Secret Societies, now multiplying among us, can be justi-

fied neither upon the ground of philosophy nor religion, but is on the contrary, repudiated and condemned by both.

We now proceed, according to promise, to confirm our general argument against Secret Societies, by an examination into their history and results, by an exhibition of their contrariety to all the precepts, practices, and teachings of true religion,—and by a faithful exposure of their fatally dangerous character, considered as substitutes for practical Christianity.

We allude not to any recently established order. We are debating principles, and we appeal to all experience. Let us trace, then, the history of secret societies.

Secret Societies originated in the corruptions of the human heart, and through it of true religion. The religion of the Bible is essentially simple, intelligible, and free from all secrecy. It is designed for all, adapted to all, addressed to all, level to the capacities of all, and open to the examination, the experiment and the enjoyment of all. Like the atmosphere, it is in its nature, and in the nature of its mysterious and incomprehensible objects, beyond our reach of knowledge. But in all its revelations about these infinite realities; in all its operations consequent upon them, and in all its requirements and prescribed rules, it is plain, perspicuous and comprehensible. It was so in its original promulgation. The promise of a Redeemer—salvation through Him—faith in his name—the worship of God by sacrifice and prayer—these were the few and simple elements of antedeluvian religion. Man's corruption then manifested itself in infidelity and not in idolatry, and we read therefore of nothing like an attempt to mystify or secrete the dogmas or the duties of religion.

This state of things continued till after the dispersion, and men began to establish empires. The priesthood was then in the hands of the patriarch, prince, or king, and was thus identified with the power of the state. Avarice and ambition, therefore, soon suggested the introduction of articles, rites, and usages which might make religion more powerful as an engine of state, and a means of overawing, prostrating, and taxing the people. Hence came the secret societies of Egypt, in which the primitive traditions were gradually incrusted over with pageantry and form, and rendered more imposing by darkness, by secrecy, by

forms of initiation, and by the most terrible sanctions.* From Egypt these secret societies, or mysteries, were carried to Greece where they were universally adopted, under the patronage and control of the great, and became wonderfully powerful. Similar societies were established, for similar purposes, in Chaldea, Phœnicia, Persia, and in the Roman Empire.

All these associations, however otherwise peculiar, were alike in professing to inculcate true religion and pure morality;—in professedly requiring good character and good family as qualifications for admission;—in having initiatory rites of discipleship, which were often of the most severe and terrible character; in holding up to special reverence some God or Gods; in excluding, by necessity, multitudes around them; in having their oaths of secrecy, and in performing their religious rites in secret places, and by night or in darkness; in having progressive stages of initiation and advancement; in requiring fees of admission and of frequent assessment; and in promising amply remunerative benefits. These benefits, as Dr. Anthon states them, were "security against the vicissitudes of fortune, and protection from danger both in this life and in the life to come."† All these associations had also the same political effect—the concentration of power, the subjugation and enslavement of the people, whose respect, admiration, reverence, and awe they every where secured by means of superstition and terror. All offences against the mysteries were under the jurisdiction of the chief magistrate, and a court consisting only of the initiated. Even in the ordinary courts this was the case, and none but the initiated were permitted to come within hearing of any cases involving their interests.‡

It is finally true of all these institutions, that whatever may have been their original character, they became gradually corrupted in membership, in motives, in manners, and in morals. With wealth and power, came pride, carnality, riot, and indulgence, until at length they pandered to the vilest licentiousness, and catered to the most beastly appetites, so that even women carried in procession the *pudenda* of both sexes; heard in the presence of all, lectures upon their nature and use; and,

* Encyp. Brit. p. 658. Vol. xv.
† Dictionary of Antiquities, p. 652.
‡ See Anthon as above.

phrenzied with intoxication, were ready to tear to pieces the daring man who would interfere with their enormities and attempt their reformation, even though he was the son or nephew of the murderers.*

Judaism had no mysteries, in the proper and present meaning of the term. The term mystery does not properly signify that which by its very nature is above our comprehension, but that which is purposely hidden and kept back from the understanding and knowledge of man. The plain and simple truths of religion however were taught to all and not to a few, and that all might learn them, all were required to participate in the ceremonies and sacrifices by which these truths were more impressively enforced, and to submit to the clearer instruction of Levites, of prophets, of the written word, and of the synagogue services. Its holy places, and things and persons, were not secret but sacred, not unknown but reverenced, not concealed from knowledge but from profanation. Character and fitness —by preparation and knowledge—were the only limits to men of all nations enjoying the amplest privileges in the Jewish church. "The Jews were therefore positively forbidden," says Milnor, "to be initiated into the mysteries." In the Greek text of the Septuagint in Deut. xxiii. 17, a passage was either interpolated or so translated as to condemn all secret associations as peculiar to paganism, and forbidden to the followers of the true God and the true religion.†

Notwithstanding all this, however, an attempt has been made to sustain the principle of secret societies by an appeal to the scriptures. But this appearance of support is only secured by confounding what the Bible says of perfidiousness and falsehood, and against talebearing, and treachery, with the inculcation of secrecy as in itself a motive or a duty.‡ The Bible, assuredly, inculcates foresight, prudence, and discretion. It undoubtedly requires us to conceal what by its publication can only do injury and no good. It most surely enjoins honour and truth and sincerity between man and man. It does unquestionably represent the Deity as being incomprehensible in His nature and His ways. But it reveals God to us just to the

* Encyp. Brit. Vol. xv. p. 666. Milman's Hist. Christianity, Vol. i. p. 33.
† See this urged by Pritchard in his Analysis of Egyptian Mythology, p. 415.
‡ See Freemason's Monitor, p. 59, and The Covenant, p. 97.

utmost extent we require in order to know and to do our duty to Him, and it reveals this not in secrecy or reserve, but on the pages of inspiration and in the pulpits of the church, to all men. The Bible, therefore, nowhere authorizes secrecy except where the benefit of society demands it. As it regards the privileges and doctrines of the Bible, it condemns and anathematizes their concealment, and commands and requires their free and universal inculcation at all times and to all nations. As it regards Christianity, it is pre-eminently the dispensation of light—of free open and universal privileges. Its author is Himself a revelation of the inscrutable Deity—"God manifest in the flesh"—and disrobed of his darkness. Its doctrines are propounded to all. Its duties are enjoined upon all. Its blessings are offered to all. Its worship is open to all. Its privileges are conferred on all recipients. And even its ecclesiastical government is openly and fully submitted to the examination, inspection and judgment of all, and limited, in any case, only by the good of all.

Christ "went about" on his errand of mercy, and in secret, as He testifies, He said and did nothing. All barriers of age and sex and of condition were removed. Forms and ceremonies were almost entirely abolished. Instruction took the place of pageantry, and light of darkness. Christianity is therefore to be proclaimed to all, even to children. There was nothing covered but what Christ revealed, nothing hidden that he has not made known. What he told in darkness suited to the parabolic taste of the times, "That, says he, speak ye in light, and what ye hear in the ear that preach ye upon the house tops." (Matt. x. 27, and Luke xii. 3). Christians are light, not concealment, the children of the day and not of the night. They are to have nothing to do with the unfruitful works of darkness, and are expressly warned against what is believed to have been the secret and voluntary associations of the Essenes and others, in the Epistles to the Collossians. (ii. 4–18).

There was nothing in apostolic Christianity approximating to secrecy.* On the contrary, it denounced and deprecated the coming of this spirit which it foretold as the "the mystery of iniquity," the "Mystic Babylon" whose secrecy, and vows, and

* See Coleman's Christian Antiquities, p. 35.

orders, and lying wonders, and delusions, should corrupt and heathenize Christianity.

And we may go still further, and affirm that there were no secrets, no mysteries, no hidden rites or associations known to Christianity for generations after the time of the apostles. This fact is proved by Bingham, the learned High-church Antiquarian, who supports his conclusions by the testimony even of learned Romanists.* About the time of Tertullian—that is early in the third century,† when the pagan mysteries "the last hopes of the ancient religion," as Milman calls them,‡ were losing ground, Christians endeavoured to hasten their destruction by adopting their principles and adapting Christianity to the tastes, habits and opinions of the times. The sacraments, ordinations, and other services were therefore for this purpose administered in private, and as in every other case where worldly wisdom has accommodated truth to human predilections, corruptions and degeneracy fast progressed until as secrecy prevailed and the darkness settled down, Christendom became as full of secret associations, both religious and secular, lay and priestly, as ever Pagandom was.§ Christianity could then boast mysteries as great, ceremonies as gorgeous, superstition as gross, terrors as profound, ignorance as universal, and immorality as extensive as Paganism itself. It had become thoroughly contagionized, and the leprosy had eaten into the very vitals of society.

During this era the secret principle developed itself in the assassins of the east,—the Knights Templars, the Secret Tribunals of Westphalia,‖ the masonic order, the Inqusition, the order of the Jesuits, in those Anti-papal societies of which Dante, Petrarch and others were the exponents, and in numerous other societies.

In regard to all secret societies relating to social and civil matters, the author of the work on the secret societies of the Middle Ages, says: "It is an important advance in civilization

* See Bingham's' Antiquities, vol. iii. p. 98, and Oxford Tracts, vol. v. Tr. 89. p. 11. † Bingham do. p. 99. ‡ History of Christianity, vol. i. p. 31.
§ Bingham do. p. 108–110.

‖ Secret Societies of the Middle Ages, Lond. 1846. p. 407, 408. See Rossetti on the Antipapal Spirit in Literature before the Reformation, vol. i. p. 149, 150, 155, and vol. ii. p. 111, 113, 117, 143.

and a great social gain, to have got rid, for all public purposes, of secret societies—both of their existence and of their use; for, that, like most of the other obsolete forms into which the arrangements of society have at one time or other resolved themselves, some of these mysterious and exclusive institutions, whether for preserving knowledge or dispensing justice, served, each in its day, purposes of the highest utility, which apparently could not have been accomplished by any other existing or available contrivance, has been sufficiently shown by the expositions that have been given, in the preceding pages of the mechanism and working of certain of the most remarkable of their number. But it has been made at least equally evident that the evils attendant upon their operation and inherent in their nature were also very great, and that considered even as the suitable remedies for a most disordered condition of human affairs, they were at best only not quite so bad as the disease. They were instituted for preserving knowledge, not by promoting, but by preventing that diffusion of it which, after all, both gives to it its chief value, and, in a natural state of things, most effectually insures its purification, as well as its increase; and for executing justice by trampling under foot the rights alike of the wrong doer and of his victim. Mankind may be said to have stepped out of night into day, in having thrown off the burden and bondage of this form of the social system, and having attained to the power of pursuing knowledge and justice in the spirit of justice. We have now escaped from that state of confusion and conflict in which one man's gain was necessarily another man's loss, and are fairly on our way towards that opposite state, in which, in every thing, as far as the constitution of this world will permit, the gain of one shall be the gain of all. This latter to whatever degree it may be actually attainable, is the proper hope and goal of all human civilization."*

* Another illustration of the extent to which the principle had been carried and the evils to which it had led will be here given: "The importance of the change which substitutes the public and oral form of procedure for the secret sittings and written *acten* of the courts under the old German Landrecht cannot be too highly estimated. It is, in itself, a revolution. Under the old system the judge was also the prosecutor; all his ingenuity and legal knowledge were arrayed against the accused; all his skill was devoted to procuring a conviction, or driving the prisoner to a confession, often by the most cruel mental

Similar societies still, to some extent, exist.* The evil, corruption, tyranny, impiety and immorality which led to the suppression of others turned the tide of favour towards Masonry, which prevailed to a wonderful extent, until similar causes led to similar results, and the growing degeneracy of the system together with some evidences of unlawful and antisocial tendencies, led to its unpopularity, and to its open renunciation by a great number of its adherents. There are now therefore Masonic Clubs against which even the fraternity are openly warned.†

When the Odd Fellows began to exist history does not inform us, and its advocates cannot determine.‡ There is a variation between selecting the period of the Fall, the age of Christianity, and some recent period.‖ Be this as it may, the society had so far degenerated in 1813, that it became necessary to "revolutionize" in order to reform.§ "A Declaration of Independence," as Mr. Porter says it may very properly be called, was drawn up by a convention, and a new society formed, under the title of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows,"¶ a society into which the spirit of secrecy has completely emptied itself.

torture. It might be difficult under such a system for a guilty man to escape; but the position of any one unjustly accused of a crime, even in Prussia, where the Landrecht had been modified, was a frightful one. A criminal inquiry that only lasted a year from the time of the arrest till the delivery of the sentence was to be considered a speedy one, the number of sittings and examinations within that period being unlimited. An illustration of this has just occurred. Within the last few days a man named Classen, a cabinet-maker or carpenter, has been condemned to imprisonment for life for the murder of his wife; the crime was committed during the Christmas holidays of 1847, and the trial has been going on ever since. In the case of the Catholic priest Rembauer, tried for murdering his maid-servant, whom he had seduced, the documents in four years swelled to 42 folio volumes, still extant, though there was but one direct witness as to the fact. At one of the hearings the judge suddenly uncovered the skull of the victim for the purpose of surprising the prisoner into some exclamation that might reveal his guilt. At the hundredth sitting the accused became conscience-stricken, and admitted he was guilty of the crime, but with some qualification, and from a technical difficulty in proving the exact cause of death after the lapse of years, he, in spite of the 42 volumes recorded against him, escaped the punishment he deserved. The trial of the Pastor Tinnins, for two murders, robbery, and embezzlement of church funds, all committed to indulge a mania for collecting books, lasted ten years.

* They exist in a form very analogous to these, in China. See the Middle Kingdom, vol. i. p. 391, vol. ii. 280, ends of 391, 395, intimated by and degeneracy of p. 284.

† Freemason's Monitor, p. 53, and Odiorne's Opinions. ‡ Porter, p. 13.

‖ The Covenant, p. 98, 100, and Oration, p. 13. § Porter, p. 13. ¶ Oration, p. 15.

The object, aim, and end professed by this society, and to a most praiseworthy extent carried out, is of unquestionable goodness. It is free from all convivial habits, which open up an immediate entrance to corruption in such societies. And it guarantees much benefit to its members, by the number of pious and respectable members enrolled in the order.

Already, however, we perceive by the report of the M. W. Grand Sire, for 1847, that some discord, and some division and some independence, rather too independent even for Odd Fellows, has created fears for the permanence of that cordiality, subjection and love essential to the harmony of 120,000 members, and the expenditure of $300,000 per annum. "The discussion, says the Grand Sire, of the internal affairs of our institution, by a portion of the public press, claiming to be organs of Odd Fellowship, will I fear be seriously detrimental to its best interests. Many erroneous constructions of law and usage have been by means of that press, scattered abroad throughout this jurisdiction. The domestic relation of the institution, as well as the laws by which it is governed, have been made the subject of controversy and comment; paper has warred against paper, each enlisting in its support a portion of the Order; and discord has been fostered, if not created, where peace and harmony previously existed."

In estimating the claims of the Odd Fellows, however, it is to be remembered that this society is in its virgin and primitive purity and simplicity. It is only laying its deep foundations and erecting its gorgeous superstructure. And with charity as its object, and purity and wisdom as its directors, it is a most invidious task for us to prognosticate future evil. We do not wish it, and if it were in our power we would not will it. But still we have our fears, founded upon human imperfection, and past invariable experience of the course of similar societies, which are closed against the sunshine and the atmosphere of a full, free and unobstructed public canvass, opinion and review. Our objection is not to the conduct, of which we know little, but to the principle of the society. We object to all similar societies, whether Sons of Temperance, Rechabites or what not, on the following grounds: They are secret; they are therefore, anti-social and anti-republican; they conflict with the claims of friendship, of love, and of society; they endanger

the spirit and prineiples of a pure and candid heart in which there is no guile, no deeeit, no subterfuge, no pride, and no pharisaic love of distinetion and superiority; they are, because seeret, liable not only to eorruption, but to perversion; they may become the engines of politieal power, the organs of disorganizing and demoralizing faetions. We ask, therefore, as Philo did in the first century, since "nature makes all her most beautiful and splendid works, her heaven, and all her stars for the sight of all; her seas, fountains and rivers, the annual temperature of the air, and the winds, the innumerable tribes and races of animals and fruits of the earth for the eommon use of man; why then are the mysteries confined to a few, and those not always the most wise and the most virtuous." This is the general sense of a long passage.

Sueh soeieties claim to be what they are not. Charity and benevolence is the high and holy mission whieh they affirm to be their sole and entire object. The language of St. Paul is therefore, by a most gross perversion, taken as their motto: "And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, but the greatest of these is charity." But true charity "is no respecter of persons." Charity is kind to the unthankful as well as to the grateful, to the evil as well as to the good. Charity knows no distinctions, and in its eye there is neither male nor female, bond nor free, poor nor rich. Charity giveth to the poor that have nothing to return, and expeeteth not again. The charity of these societies, however, is limited by sex, by character, and by obedience to their rules—by conformity to all their views—by paying an entranee fee varying from five dollars to thirty-five dollars according to age, that is, in proportion to men's need of it and inability to afford it, and by the payment of a yearly sum varying from seven dollars to an indefinite amount. "If even a brother," says the covenant, "be more than thirteen weeks in arrears to his lodge, he is not entitled to his benefits, nor can he get into any lodge in any part of the world." "THE SYSTEM," adds this organ, "IS FORMED AS IF THE PLAN HAD BEEN ARRAIGNED BY SUSPICION ITSELF."

While, therefore, these societies claim from God and man the merit of the holy mission of charity, and while they blow a trumpet before them to let all men know that they exist only to be charitable, their nature, after all, is only that of mutual

insurance societies and this their organ is obliged to admit.* "The two great objects," says the covenant, "are to foster a regard for each other's interest and welfare, and to provide a fund for life and health insurance to its members."† To this end it accumulates funds, erects buildings, and increases power, credit, and influence among men. For self-gratification and self-exaltation, therefore, while poverty abounds around them, they provide houses, expensive arrangements, and dresses without which no one can enter a lodge or parade: they multiply orders, honours, titles, forms, obsequious salutations, and marks of respect, and thus they feed the principle of pride, vanity, aristocracy, envy, jealousy, and selfishness. And by securing universal provision for sickness and for bereaved families, may they not in many cases foster indolence, and idleness, and unworthiness, and break down the spirit of a manly independence and industrious prudence?

But our greatest objection to these societies remains, and it is, that while they unnecessarily use the bond of secrecy, (which is in no way essential to maintain their own securities,) they lay claim to the high and holy character of religion and tamper with its sacred words, offices and spirit.

"What is Odd Fellowship," asks the Talisman? "We answer in a single word it is practical Christianity."‡ In their

* "An intelligent member of the Order in question stated to the writer recently, that it was a matter of regret that the claim had ever been set up that they were a 'charitable society,' for, said he, 'the principle of benevolence has no place in our code at all; we pay out to those who are by our rules entitled to funds, and to no others: we pay out so long as members pay in, and when they stop paying, their membership ceases, and our obligations to them cease; we are in fact an extensive insurance company; if I am abroad among strangers I have a right by my well-earned membership to receive the notice of brethren of the Order; and they in return know that if they come here they have a claim on my attention, and if I refuse it, they would report me to the Order, and I should be disciplined or expelled."

† Vol. i. p. 101.

‡ "What is Odd Fellowship?—The astonishing progress which the Independent Order of Odd Fellows is making, both in this country and in Europe, renders the above question one of no ordinary importance. If there is an institution in our very midst which has made the most gigantic onward strides, and which already numbers among its members many of the most influential and powerful citizens of this great republic, and is still increasing; the inquiry is both necessary and proper. What is Odd Fellowship? We answer in a single word; *it is practical Christianity.* It combines all that is excellent in religion, pure in morals, and benevolent in practice. Beneath its sweet and gentle influences the rugged nature of man becomes softened by sympathy; the finer feelings of the heart are developed and cultivated; the social principle is strengthened; the fra-

instructions, therefore, they associate with emblems, signs and symbols "lessons from the sacred scriptures,* and distinctly recognise in their initiation office, the divine authority of the Bible and their obligation to be governed by its spirit.†

"The Bible," said one of their members to me, "is the basis of the whole order." It is therefore in every lodge room, and is carried about in every procession and is called that great "luminary of the craft."‡

These societies quote and appropriate many scriptural passages.‖ They have their prayers, their benedictions, their blessings, and their funeral services. "A good mason," or other brother can never therefore, it is said, "be a bad man."§ And "the triumphs of Odd Fellowship are those of peace and good will among men."¶

God, therefore, is the grand architect. Melchisedec, and all the prophets and apostles, not excluding the Saviour, were members of the fraternity,** and while (as they blasphemously pervert the words) the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him "here, and He will show them *his* (*their italics*) Covenant." "The faithful shall be welcomed to the grand lodge above."††

Now in reference to these allegations we remark, first, that they do not state what is the fact in the case. Christianity is in part doctrinal, and in part practical. It contains doctrines, worship, church officers, ordinances, duties, and many practical requirements. But these societies know nothing of any one of the doctrines which distinguish Christianity. They know nothing of the author, the founder, the very life and light of Christianity. They know nothing of the spiritual views, feelings, motives, and qualities, which enter into practical Christianity. They know nothing of the church, the worship, the ordinances, or the duties enjoined by Christianity. None of these things enter into the constitution of these societies. They know them not. They heed them not. Like Gallio they care for none of these things. The doctrines, the duties, the ordinances, the officers, the rules, and the government of Christ's

ternal relations cherished and invigorated. Before its onward progress, woe and crime flee away; the unhappy fiends of unholy passion shrink into their dens of shame."—*The Talisman.*

* The Covenant, Vol. i. p. 103. † Do. ‡ Do. p. 102. Fremason's Monitor, p. 103. ‖ Do. p. 128. § Monitor, p. 120. ¶ Mr. Porter's Oration, p. 19.

** Monitor. †† The Covenant, Vol. i. pp. 193, 194.

kingdom—these things which constitute the very end and essence of the Bible, as a revelation of God's will and of man's duty, are set at nought. A man, therefore, may become a partaker of this "practical Christianity," and yet neither believe, nor obey any one of the characteristic and essential doctrines or duties of Christianity. He may be a Jew, or a Mahometan, or a Heathen, or an infidel, or an ungodly sinner, or an impenitent, unbelieving, and unregenerate man, under God's frown and condemnation, and exposed to everlasting damnation, and yet according to the teachings of these societies he may be a practical Christian. Membership in an Odd Fellows' lodge is thus made a substitute for that Christian piety, without which no man can see the Lord. While claiming to reverence the Bible, God, and Christianity, the Bible is first prostituted and then suborned; Christ is annihilated as a Prince and Saviour, and God is made the "Grand Patron" of error and delusion. Pride, passion, envy, jealousy, hatred, and opposition to all but their own order, lust and unbelief, may riot in the heart, and yet their guilty victims be guaranteed comfort upon earth and happiness in heaven.

It will not do to say, as some of the advocates, to escape from conviction of such deep and dangerous guilt, do say, that the forms and ceremonies of these orders are not religious. What then we would ask are they? They are placed in juxtaposition with the Bible. They are performed in the name of God. They imply homage to Him. They refer to the soul in life and in death. And are not these elements of religion?

When, therefore, good and Christian men unite with such societies, and give them their name, influence, and sanction, do they not become responsible for taking God's name and God's word in vain, and for erecting upon the foundation of eternal and unalterable truth, (unalterable either by way of addition or subtraction under the penalty of everlasting death) "the hay, wood and stubble" of man's inventions, and man's will-worship? Do they not lead others to regard this system as in all respects sufficient for them, and are they not involving themselves and their posterity in all the evils which must and will result from these societies, as they become gradually corrupt, unless they form a singular exception to all other secret societies that have ever existed in the world? Nay the evil is already working

and producing in many Christian minds the secret leaven of ultimate and thorough-going infidelity. We are not a little astonished that sentiments like the following should be cherished and expressed by one who boldly calls himself "a humble and sincere disciple of the Lord."!!! "Both my experience and observation demonstrate the truth that there is little of Christian love in the church, and that a man in a strange land can claim nothing as a Christian that he could not claim as a worldling." Where, in this wicked world, does this Christian brother live, that he should have imbibed as truth this stale calumny of infidelity. We know not where he lives nor who he is. But we know that such feelings are the natural result of the associations and working of these secret societies. They begin by making men Pharisees, and end by transforming them into Sadducees. "To suppose that Christ Jesus, for the purpose of benefiting or reforming men, would have joined a society like the Sons of Temperance or the Odd Fellows; pledged himself to keep its transactions secret from all the female, and most of the male disciples; to receive and call the members of such societies, whether Jews, universalists, atheists, deists, or Mahometans, his brethren; that he would have listened to unconverted men pronouncing a sort of blessing in the name of the great Patriarch above: to suppose that Christ would have devoted or advised his disciples to devote the time and expense called for by such societies to such ends: that he would have put on their regalia, and walked thus in processions: that he would have entered into their meetings by the outside and inside sentinels: sat with closed doors and shutters: addressed the presiding officer by the title of 'Most worthy Patriarch,' whether the person elected 'Patriarch' 'by ballot every three months,' happened to be old or young, worthy or unworthy of such a sounding title: to suppose the blessed Jesus would have met in such a secret conclave to devise measures and execute schemes of reform, which are kept secret from the persons to be reformed: to suppose this is to betray an utter ignorance of Christ, his character, doctrines and mission. Christ was open in all his proceedings, these societies are dark. He rejected pompous titles; these societies confer them. He was a pattern of severe simplicity in person and in speech; these employ garish regalia and cabalistic jargon.

"Christ explicitly declares, and we repeat the expression, that he resorted to no secret methods of reform: 'IN SECRET HAVE I SAID NOTHING.' All the ends which he proposed, and the means by which they were to be reached, were open, and the world's scrutiny was constantly invited. This information is explicit, and it is to the point. There were no secret societies among Christ's disciples. Cabals and conclaves there were in their days; Venus had her mysteries, and Bacchus his orgies, and Jupiter his games; and these all had their processions, their badges, their signs of initiation and degrees of progress. But these were not of Christ nor for Christ. Their pretended foundation was philosophy, and their professed end happiness and light. But their practical working was fraud and imposition, superstition and lust. Every idol temple was a lodge room, and every junto of pagan priests was a lodge, who amused the multitude by shows, pageants and processions; attracted the philosophic by pretensions to wisdom; awed the superstitious by their mystic rites; gained money from all classes; and, in the name of one God or another, gratified the appetitites and ambition of cunning and corrupt leaders, while time bore generations to the tomb and to the judgment beyond."

The origin of these societies is to be found, therefore, not in Christianity, but in Christianity paganized and corrupted by popery. And hence these societies find a remarkable parallel in many Romish societies,* and hence also the principles upon which they are founded constitute the basis of the Tractarian movement in England and America, and have formed the easy pathway for many of its followers "from Oxford to Rome."†

It seems that Dr. Hook is a member of the Manchester Unity of Independent Odd Fellows, and that, influenced by his example, or "feeling confident that he could not go wrong while treading in the footsteps of the most eminent and practical parish priest of the age," a Sussex clergyman (the Rev. H. Newland, Rector and Vicar of Westborne) was induced to join the Society and advise his people to do the same. He has since preached a sermon before the members of the order at Southampton, in which his well known "Church principles" are not indistinctly stated; but there is one passage so curious, and we must say, so

* See Hall on Purgatory, p. 320, 321.
† See Oxford Tracts for the Times, Vol. 5, p. 6 and Pt. 11, §5.

suspicious, that we cannot forbear adding it. It is as follows—

"The revival of the ancient institution which we are this day met to celebrate, is but another display of that feeling which God in his mercy has stirred up in our hearts, as a fresh bulwark to the Church he has promised always to be with; it is a reverence for, it is a desire to return to the institutions of our forefathers. The name indeed is modern, it was changed, for reasons that I shall afterwards mention; but the principle is ancient, and though perhaps thirty years ago the word Odd Fellowship was unknown, yet societies similar in all respects to that which we see revived in our own days, existed 1200 years ago, and in the times of the Saxon Heptarchy.

"In those days they were called gilds, from the Saxon word 'gildan,' which means 'to pay,' because the necessary constitution of societies so called together, was that the members should pay something towards the support of the brotherhood to which they belonged. 'Gilds,' says Dr. Lingard, 'were an institution of great antiquity among the Anglo-Saxons, and in every populous neighborhood they existed in various ramifications.' In those times (as is now the case in Germany), they generally consisted of particular trades; such as the Gild of Weavers, the Gild of Masons, the Gild of Fishmongers, the Gild of Apothecaries, and the like, who used, at stated times, to meet at their Guildhall; but in our days it has been considered more convenient to do away with the exclusiveness and party feeling, which so frequently arose from the conflicting interests of the different trades, and to join them all under the general title of Odd (that is unconnected) Fellows.

"'The Gild was at all times essentially a Christian association or brotherhood, inasmuch as the ordinary members, over and above the special object for which they were associated, bind themselves to the performance of certain religious duties, with a view to their daily improvement in virtue."* Thus we—though associated for the purpose of providing relief in sickness and a payment at death, for ourselves—sanctify that object by raising a fund for the relief of widows and orphans generally, the first fruits of which we present at God's Holy Table, and thus throw the authority and protection of religion around institutions of a character otherwise secular; acknowledging that

* Bishop Gillis.

human institutions will be for the most part vain, unless we bring religion in aid of earthly wisdom.

"To show you how little altered the principle of the society is now from what it was a thousand years ago, I will transcribe a translation of part of the laws belonging to the Gild of Abbotsbury.

"'If any one belonging to our association chance to die, each member shall pay one penny for the good of the soul, before the body be laid in the grave; if he neglect it he shall be fined a triple sum; if any one of us fall sick within sixty miles, we engage to find fifteen men who shall bring him home; but if he die first, we will find thirty to convey him to the place where he desires to be buried, and the Steward shall summon as many members as he can to assemble and attend the corpse in an honourable manner, to carry it to the minister, and pray devoutly for his soul.' 'Let us act in this manner,' says the commentator, 'and we shall perform the duties of our confraternity; for we know not who among us may die first, but we believe, with the assistance of God, this agreement, if rightly observed, will profit us all.'

"'These laws, modified in some slight degree to suit the times, are the laws of the present day, and the brotherhood, as we now see it, may be defined as a benefit society, bound by general laws, and sanctified by the exercise of a religious act,—Charity towards the fatherless and widows."

Let no man then be deluded by the supposition that secret societies whether Masonic, Temperance or Odd Fellows, are "Practical Christianity" or Christian at all. They are in their origin pagan, in their tendency popish, and in their spirit antichristian. Hence they are regarded by Nolan and other writers, to form a part of the destined instrumentality by which the great predicted apostasy will effect its destructive purposes.*

Neither let any one look to these societies as the source of moral reformation. Reliance for promoting benevolence and goods morals generally, must be solely and wholly on the gospel and the grace of God. Torn from this living root, this evangelical basis, all experience shows that sound morality will quickly wither and expire. All other methods are empirical

* On the Millennium, p. 83.

and delusive. The bad tree cannot bear good fruit, and every plant which our Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up.* In proportion as we vigorously ply the gospel means for making men better, we may expect success; in proportion as we forsake them to try other devices, nothing but defeat.

Would we see what the gospel and the church have done? Let us contrast Christian with heathen lands and Christian with heathen ages. Extinguish every institution found in the former and never known in the latter, for the poor, the aged, the sick, the blind, the deaf, the dumb, the destitute, the cold and perishing, the orphan and widow, the superannuated and imbecile, the ignorant and them that have no guide. The fact is that every thing that refines and elevates society, and that soothes its sorrows, and alleviates its calamities, is the fruit of Christianity. And would we see what Christianity could do? Let all among us become Christians and let Christians be what they should be, and then there would not remain a tear unwiped, a sorrow unrelieved, or a calamity unprovided for. Yes, if all the members of our churches would thus live and act and give to the church the energy, time, activity and zeal devoted to other objects, and if they would promote among themselves as far as need be, associations for the ends contemplated by these secret societies, how would our churches, instead of being languishing and faint, arise and shine, the glory of the Lord being arisen upon them, and how would they constrain all men to see and feel that "God is in them of a truth."†

* See Bloomfield on this passage.

† We would here call attention to the Christian Mutual Benefit Societies established in New York, of which the following is a notice: "The Third Anniversary of the Christian Mutual Benefit Society, No. 3, was held on Wednesday evening, 17th ult., in the Central Presbyterian Church in Broome street. The Rev. J. C. Hopkins, of the Bethesda Baptist Church, presided; the report of the Society was read by the Secretary, and addresses were delivered by the Rev. Geo. F. Kettell, of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Vestry street, and Rev. Mr. Armitage, of the Baptist Church in Norfolk street. As this Association is a practical illustration of Christian Union, we take much pleasure in calling the attention of our readers to their anniversary. It is composed entirely of church members, and the report states that the members are attached to twenty-six different churches in this city. Their principal object is to relieve the sick, and provide for the families of those who may be taken away; being similar, in most of the details of their organization, to the Odd Fellows and Sons of Temperance, without presenting those objections which exist in many minds to secret societies. This association is organized and conducted entirely on Christian principles, and in addi-

To every Christian man who had been led into these secret associations we would therefore with all earnestness say: "Brother, you have made a mistake in 'carrying out the principles of Christ,' as you call them. His principles require us to 'do good to all men as we have opportunity, especially to them who are of the household of faith;' but you have allied yourself to a society which requires you to aid and assist all men in distress, and especially those who understand the *secret grip*. Christ never acted upon or inculcated such a principle as that. He enjoins upon his followers that while they do good to all men, they should especially feel compassion, not for those who can give a secret sign, but for those who love and follow Him. Beware, then, my brother, how you transfer your sympathies from your brethren in the church to a society which makes religion no test of membership, and bind yourself by rules which TO YOU are contrary to the inspired word."

---

ART. III.—*A Commentary on the Book of Joshua.* By Charles Frederick Keil, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, Professor of Exegesis and Oriental Languages in the Imperial University at Dorpat, and Member of the German Oriental Society. Erlangen: 1847. 8vo. pp. 411.*

THE book of Joshua contains one of the most interesting and important portions of Israelitish history. Treating of the period of their establishment as a nation, it contains the grand denouement of which Genesis was prophetic and the rest of the Pentateuch immediately preparatory. The books of Moses without Joshua would resemble an unfinished building; the plan, the dimensions all visible, much of the work accomplished, enough to lead one to anticipate precisely what is to follow, yet never

tion to its leading object must do much to do away denominational prejudices, and draw closer the bonds of Christian love and sympathy which exist in every Christian heart, but which are so often chilled for want of light and sunshine, that they wither and die, and cease to be known as distinguishing traits of Christian character."

* Commentar über das Buch Josua. Von Karl Friedrich Keil u. s. w.

completed. It would be an imposing commencement with no corresponding conclusion. And as this book is the top stone of the Pentateuch, so it is the foundation of the books that follow. It presents us with the ripened fruit of seed sown ages before, itself containing the seeds of events for ages to come. A failure to have recorded the events of this period would therefore have left a gap in the sacred history, which nothing could supply. Without it what precedes would have been imperfect, what follows unexplained. The sacred writer was directed under the guidance of inspiration to fill this chasm; and in so doing there was given him as his theme the Conquest and the Division of Canaan. It is not the life of Joshua, which he undertakes to record; not Joshua's public acts or military exploits; not the history of Israel during Joshua's life; but simply the conquest and the division of Canaan. If this be kept distinctly in mind it will explain fully and satisfactorily the selection and arrangement of the materials; we can then understand why he records what he does; why he relates some events with extreme particularity and minuteness, merely glances at others, and then again passes over whole years in silence. It is not because nothing occurred then, nor because he did not know what occurred, but simply because he was writing with a definite plan before his mind, and related whatever fell into that plan; what did not he omitted. There can be no greater mistake than that which refers the chasms of the scripture history to chance, or to caprice, or to the writer's having lived at a time when all knowledge of what happened in the period of which he fails to give an account had been lost. The historians of the Bible were not mere journalists or chroniclers writing at random, or with the view of telling everything which they could recollect; they did not write for the sake of gratifying those who in future ages might be fond of historical research, nor for the sake of detailing interesting and memorable events to their contemporaries. They are theocratical historians; their object is to trace the development and progress of the kingdom of God, to mark its epochs, and to record events important to their own and to coming generations in a religious aspect. Thus in the book before us; take as the plan of it what we have stated it to be, and everything as to the choice or rejection of materials is clear. All that the book contains

ranges itself about that plan; what is omitted would have been plainly irrelevant. The book opens with the divine direction to Joshua, who had already been designated Moses' successor, to go over Jordan and take the land which God had sworn to their fathers to give to them, and divide it to the people for an inheritance, with the promise that if he faithfully observed the laws given by Moses, God would be with him as he had been with Moses, and not a man should be able to stand before him all the days of his life. These introductory verses furnish the key to the whole book. Joshua's execution of these commands in obedience to the divine direction, and God's gracious bestowal of his promised assistance, are the sum of what it contains. The first twelve chapters embrace the conquest; not a detailed account of all the marches of every campaign, but the prominent particulars only are seized upon to be minutely related, those which really mark the progress of events, those which bring most clearly to view God's miraculous help and how necessary the condition of obedience was to its being furnished. Other events belonging to the conquest, the battles, the capture of cities, and even long expeditions, which had nothing remarkable about them, are only mentioned summarily, in such a way as not to weary with a recital of what is unimportant, and yet at the same time so as to give a general view of the whole line of operations with their ultimate success. In chapters xiii—xxi we have the division of the land among the several tribes. In chapter xxii the two tribes and a half, who had assisted their brethren in the conquest, and stood by them in the division of Canaan, return in peace to their own respective possessions. Then we pass over an interval of several years, during which Israel was settled in the land, and which consequently fell not within the scope of the writer until we come to the closing scene of Joshua's life, when that great and good man gathered Israel once more around him by their representatives, to rehearse to them what God had done for them in giving them that goodly land, and to engage them to renewed pledges of obedience to him. And thus the book closes with this solemn recapitulation of what the Lord had done in faithfulness to the promise with which it had opened, and a public covenant engagement of the people to serve the Lord who had

driven out the Amorite and all those other nations from before them.

Joshua receives the divine command to possess the land. He immediately sends out two spies as preparatory to the execution. The book minutely records what befell them, not from the interest attaching to their hazardous adventure and lucky escape, but vividly to represent how in conformity with the divine promise the terror of Israel had fallen on the Canaanites. The anxious precautions of the king of Jericho, the pursuit of the spies, the language of Rahab to the spies and of the spies to Joshua on their return—all bear on this point. Then follows the passage of the Jordan, whose waters, though unusually high, were supernaturally dried up before them. What, it may be asked, was the design of this miracle? There are no trifling, frivolous miracles in the Bible. God does not suspend the established order of nature without just reason, not unless some important end is to be answered by it. Where, then, was the necessity of emptying the bed of the Jordan in order to get the people to the other side? The same thing could have been accomplished by natural means, without requiring the interference of omnipotence. Though the river was too high then to admit of its being forded, especially by women and children, boats might have been prepared or bridges constructed, by which they could have crossed the stream in the same manner as other armies have both before and since, with only the unimportant delay of a few days. The same inquiry may be made as to the necessity of dividing the Red Sea, bringing water from the rock, giving manna from heaven, &c. There was no need of their going through the Red Sea, penetrating so deeply into the desert, or crossing the Jordan at all in order to pass from Egypt into Canaan. There is a route vastly more expeditious, as well as practicable by natural means, which travellers are every day passing over. These questions are instantly answered, however, as soon as we gain a correct view of the design of these miracles. Their necessity, and indeed that of every other miracle recorded in the Bible, was not a physical, but a moral one. The object of them is the revelation of God's power and grace. The laws of nature, which God established in the beginning, are sufficient to accomplish every important physical end; it is only to meet our

moral necessities that they are interfered with. Israel could have been taken into Canaan without a miracle; but then there would have been no such striking displays to them of God's omnipotence, of his grace, of his nearness to them. The stupendous miracles wrought in Egypt, in the wilderness, and in the subjugation of Canaan, were to teach Israel and to teach all nations, that while the gods of the heathen were no Gods, and could neither do good nor do evil, Jehovah was the living and the Almighty God of the whole earth. They were to be made sensible of his power and grace and of their own dependence. Therefore they were brought into straits from which they could not extricate themselves, in order that they might see it to be God who delivered them. They were to be made to see that it was neither their own sword nor their own bow which saved them, but the Lord's right hand and his mighty arm had gotten them the victory; Canaan was not their conquest, but God's gift. But besides this general aim of all the miracles, of which this period, as one that specially needed them, was so full, and this general solution of their stupendous character as contrasted for instance with the milder type and the more contracted scale of our Saviour's miracles, there seems a special fitness in this particular miracle, in God's interfering visibly on their behalf at this particular time. God opens by it, as it were, the doors of the land, which he had promised to give them and conducts them in. He pledges by it the subjugation of the land, which followed. At the same time, as this was the first public act of Joshua, in his new capacity as leader of the people, it gave divine legitimacy to his office in their eyes, and was, in comparison with the precisely similar miracle under Moses, a striking attestation to the divine word: 'As I have been with Moses, so will I be with thee.'

The circumcising of the people and the celebration of the passover follows next; these belong to the history of the conquest, for the conquest was conditioned on the punctilious observance of all that Moses had commanded. But how came it to pass that the people were not circumcised? Their migratory condition, to which some have referred it, does not furnish an adequate explanation. Nor can we find the reason in the sinful neglect of the people. Bad as the character of the adult generation that left Egypt undoubtedly was, frequent as were

their murmurings and their rebellions against the Lord, repeatedly as they fell into even gross idolatry in the desert, we cannot charge them with so thorough and so continued a disregard of God's worship as it would have evinced for them thus to have given up entirely the very badge of the covenant during the whole of these forty successive years. Or if this might possibly have been the case with a part of the people, would not the rest, the less wicked portion, would not at any rate the pious among them have perpetuated it in their families? And why did Moses never rebuke the people for this great sin of neglecting the covenant seal? Why did not the new and more godly generation attend to it sooner themselves? Or why did not Joshua direct it in the plains of Moab without its being deferred until the people were passed over Jordan?

The true reason seems to be that the seal of the covenant shared the fate of the covenant itself. When Israel after repeated provocations at length consummated their rebellion by despising the promised land and refusing to enter it, God sware that none but two of that generation should be permitted to enter Canaan. All were condemned to fall in the wilderness; and their children should wander about bearing their father's iniquities until the whole of them had perished. While this sentence lasted, therefore, they were a rejected people and had no right to the seals of the covenant. They were not now God's people, and had no right to mark themselves as such. A gracious God, it is true, did not utterly withdraw from them every token of his favour. The manna, the pillar of cloud, the tabernacle, were still continued to them as so many tokens that the Lord had not finally abandoned them; that though he was angry with them for a season, his favour would again return; that though he had cast off the fathers he would deal mercifully with their children. Hence we see why this ordinance was not resumed until Israel had crossed the Jordan. Then first the period of the sentence was complete. The mighty miracle then wrought gave assurance that God was again with them, and again regarded them as his people. They were now, therefore, once more fit subjects for the covenant seal. And thus the reproach of Egypt was rolled away. During the years of Israel's rejection there seemed some ground for the Egyptians' reproaches, that the Lord had brought Israel out for mischief to

consume them, (Ex. xxxii. 12). But now all occasion for such reproaches was taken away by the Lord's returning to them again, restoring to them the lost seal of his gracious covenant, and recommencing his mighty wonders in the midst of them.

To the cavils that so great a multitude of people could not have been circumcised in so short a time, and that if circumcised on the 11th of the month, that is, the day after passing the river, they would not have recovered from it by the 14th when the passover was celebrated, and that circumcising the entire host at once would have left the camp for a period defenceless, it is very easy to reply. It would take no longer to circumcise all the people, than it would a single family: for the head of each family would attend to the circumcising of his house. And even if they were not perfectly healed by the fourteenth of the month, that would not hinder them from participating in the solemnities of the passover then observed. And as to its leaving the camp defenceless, even if it were not enough to say that the Lord would be their protector, there was no insignificant number of the people, who had been already circumcised. Keil presents us with a calculation, founded on the known laws of human life, from which it appears that among the million of males who entered Canaan, there must have been 338,000 of those who left Egypt under 20 years of age and were consequently circumcised; or even if there was as great mortality among them as among the generation condemned to perish in the wilderness, there would still be 270,000 of them living.

On the morrow after the passover they did eat of the corn (not 'the *old* corn', as it stands in our version) of the land, ch. v. 11. This also was agreeable to the law. Lev. xxiii. 5–14: on the morrow after the Sabbath or first day of the passover feast, the priest was required to wave a sheaf of the first fruits before the Lord: then Israel could partake of the harvest themselves, but not before. From this time forth the manna ceased. It is not to be supposed from this that the manna was the sole food of the Israelites from the time it began to fall up to this moment, and that now it suddenly gave place to the natural products of the earth. This miracle of giving bread from heaven was wrought for the supply of their need, and consequently was only wrought to the extent that need required, and during the period that it lasted. That the children of Israel had

other food in the desert at certain times at least, besides that miraculously furnished them, is apparent from the narrative. We read of their being encamped by palm trees; their riotous feasting about the golden calf implied something more than mere bread and water; when they passed the borders of Edom, they bought food of them: when they destroyed the cities and possessed the land of Sihon, Og and other kings, they no doubt found much provision among the spoils; a large portion of the thirty-eight years of their sentence in the wilderness seems to have been spent very much in one place, and they may during that period have raised much from the soil for their subsistence; when they came to the banks of Jordan three days were spent in providing victuals: they had, besides, large possessions of flocks and herds, whose flesh and milk they could use. It would be needless to have the manna fall about them merely to be wasted, when they could supply themselves from such sources as these. It was when natural supplies fell short or failed altogether, that this bread of heaven was sent them in sufficient quantities to make up their deficiency. When they needed more, more came. When they were where no other provision could be obtained, enough fell to feed the entire host. As their necessities were greater or less, just the quantity fell which they required. And now that they had arrived in Canaan and an abundant harvest lay befor them, all need of the manna ceased and it consequently fell no longer.

Next follows the capture of Jericho, then that of Ai, then the submission of the men of Gibeon, then the two grand expeditions to the south and to the north, in which the land was finally subdued. And to conclude the first part of the book, chap. xii. contains a recapitulation of the entire conquest, as effected both by Moses and by Joshua.

Keil coincides with some other eminent scholars in giving an exposition of the passage, x. 12–15, different from that commonly entertained. Most interpreters have found there the literal stoppage of the sun in his course for an entire day. The volume before us presents quite another view of it, for which a sufficient array of reasons is given to entitle it at the least to a respectful consideration. Keil does not belong to that school of critics, who look upon miracles as difficulties in the narrative, and manifest a constant disposition to unburden it of

as many as possible. He never hesitates to admit a miracle, wherever we have the authority of the scriptures that one took place. But if it was not the design of the inspired writer to describe a literal miracle here, reverence for his authority does not require us to suppose that there was one. The ordinary objections to this miracle on the ground that it was too grand a display of power for so trifling a reason, or that it would have disturbed the harmony of the celestial bodies, or by the violence of its shock have displaced everything upon the surface of the earth, or that the nations of antiquity make no mention of the occurrence of such a phenomenon, he justly sets aside as perfectly futile. He rests the whole case upon the question as to the design of the inspired writer in this passage. Did he mean us to understand that the sun actually delayed his course in the heavens? Keil supposes not. In his view the account of the battle and the miraculous victory at Gibeon is interrupted at the end of the 11th verse, which speaks of the miraculous fall of hail stones, and that then vs. 12–15 contain not the account of another event, which took place that same day, viz. the standing still of the sun, which the writer both states in his own words and for confirmation of the fact appeals to the book of Jasher, citing from it a passage in which this was recorded, which is the common view; but these verses contain none of the writer's own words at all. They consist wholly of a verbatim extract from the book of Jasher, the source from which they are taken being indicated neither at the beginning, nor at the end, but in the middle of the citation; and they describe no new event, no literal standing still of the sun, but are a highly figurative and poetical description of the miraculous victory already described in the immediately preceding verses. The author of the sacred lyric from which this quotation is made, is celebrating the praises of God for having granted so glorious a victory to Israel and by such miraculous means. He conceives of Joshua as calling upon the Lord that the sun might wait upon Gibeon until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies; or in other words that the day might not be brought to a close until Israel had gained a complete victory. And in the liveliness of the figure he conceives of it as though the sun had actually delayed his course and waited in the midst of heaven, while the people should pursue their flying foes. If

this were the language of prose, if these were the words of the writer of the book himself, there would then be no question about their being literally understood. But they are a quotation from a triumphal song; and it is, according to the view which we are now presenting, to mistake altogether the nature of poetical language to understand this as though it were designed for literal description; as much as if, when Deborah says in her song, "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," any one should understand her to mean that the stars actually exerted an influence in procuring his defeat: or when the Lord is said to rend the heavens and come down and the mountains to flow down at his presence, this should be taken for literal description instead of poetical imagery. It was all the same whether God lengthened one day into two, or enabled the people to accomplish the work of two days in one: and the truth of poetry is preserved if its language convey the former, though it was the latter which actually occurred.

That the verses 12–15 have been taken word for word as they stand from the book of Jasher, is argued from the intimate connexion between v. 16 and v. 11, showing that all between is parenthetic; from the note of time in v. 12, "when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel," which sounds more like the words of a different author, than a continuation of the previously begun account; and because the return of Joshua to the camp at Gilgal, spoken of in the 15th verse, did not take place until all the remaining events recorded in this chapter had occurred (see v. 43). The 15th verse belongs not to the narrative, therefore, but is part of the quotation. It states in the general, that after the great event there celebrated, Joshua and Israel returned to the camp without saying whether anything else occurred in the interval or not. Then in the 15th verse the narrative commences again, where it had been interrupted by this quotation, and goes on to detail what took place before this return, the flight and concealment of the five kings, their execution, and the capture of various cities.

It is regarded as confirmatory of this view that the moon is called upon to delay its course as well as the sun, which manifestly belongs only to the poetic parallelism; for if the sun continued to shine what need would they have of the moon? And yet further it is alleged that from the relative position of

Gibeon and the valley of Ajalon, Joshua's command to the sun and moon could not have been uttered when the day was declining, and apprehensions began to be excited that darkness would come on too soon, as has commonly been assumed by those who hold the prevalent view of a literal miracle in the case: that the only time of day, when the sun could have appeared over Gibeon, and the moon at the same time over Ajalon, was in the morning when the whole day was still before them, and the necessity could not yet have made itself felt of having the day protracted.

The book of Jasher spoken of here, is but once more referred to in the scriptures, 2 Sam. i. 18, where that beautiful lament of David over Saul and Jonathan is extracted from it. From this some have drawn the conclusion that the book of Jasher could not have existed before the time of David, since it contained a piece of his composition; and hence they have argued that the book of Joshua which contains a quotation from that of Jasher could not have been written until the reign of David. Those arguments, however, are not so easily set aside, by which, as we shall hereafter see, its composition by Joshua himself, or at least by a contemporary and a participant in the events which it records may be proved. And there is no difficulty in the way of assuming what agrees with the scanty notices we have of this book, that it was a compilation of sacred lyrics, increased from time to time as new ones were composed and added to it. In the days of Joshua, it could not of course contain a poem written by David. But it had in it the ode upon Israel's victory at Gibeon which is here cited. When David wrote his lament, that was added to the existing collection; how many others had been added before, or were added afterwards. or how large the collection may have been at any given time, whether that of Joshua or that of David, we have no means of knowing. The only conjecture, which we can form as to its contents is derived from the two citations made from it, and from its name, "the book of Jasher," which means the book of the upright, i. e. written to celebrate the deeds of the chosen or peculiar people.

After seven years had been thus occupied in conquering the land, Joshua proceeds, by divine direction, to execute the other part of his commission, the division of the land among the tribes.

Moses having already assigned to two and a half tribes their possessions beyond the Jordan, in addition to the tribe of Levi, who were to receive no inheritance, nine and a half remained to be provided for by Joshua. As in the summary of the conquest (chap. xi.) the places taken by Moses are given as well as those taken by Joshua; so in the account of the division, we have in pursuance of the same plan first the territories assigned by Moses to Reuben, Gad, and one half of Manasseh, then those assigned by Joshua to the remaining tribes. Their various possessions were determined by lot, not only in order to cut off all occasion for dissatisfaction and complaint, but that each tribe might thankfully receive their portion as the immediate gift of God to them. The lot, however, seems to have determined only the position of the tribes, not the extent of their territory; this was proportioned to the size of the tribe and was enlarged or diminished after the division as circumstances rendered necessary (ch. xvii. 4. xix. 9.)

It may create surprise that the division, instead of being completed at once for all the tribes, was interrupted upon Judah and Joseph receiving their inheritance; and the remaining seven tribes show so little desire to have it continued that Joshua has to reprove them for their slackness. It is a matter of some difficulty to assign a sufficient reason for this interruption. Some have assumed dissensions among the tribes, or a gradual division advancing as the land was wrested in successive portions from the hands of the Canaanites. Keil adopts the following view of the matter, in which are skilfully combined the various facts of the history. The land had at first, in order to its allotment, been separated into nine or ten parts without previously taking an accurate description of it but simply from the general knowledge gained in their various campaigns and marches. The allotment was begun upon these data, leaving the more precise determination of the extent of each one's territory to be afterwards settled according to the size of the tribe. The tribe upon whom the lot first fell entered at once into their inheritance and occupied themselves with taking possession of it and fixing accurately its boundaries. This necessarily occupied some time; then another lot was cast determining the position of a second tribe, and they pursued the same course. Thus after the lapse of a considerable period Judah, Ephraim, and

half Manasseh had successively received their inheritance. Meanwhile the tabernacle was set up at Shiloh, in the territory of Ephraim, and the camp of Israel was removed thither from Gilgal. The remaining tribes manifested little anxiety to be settled. It was easier for them, accustomed to a nomadic life in the desert, to wander about among the Canaanites as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had done, seeking a subsistence for themselves and their cattle, especially as the inhabitants of the land were so far subdued that they had nothing to fear from them, than it would be to enter into a fixed inheritance and attempt their extermination. But Joshua, true to the task imposed upon him, urges the sluggish tribes to their duty, and enjoins it upon them to make preparation for completing the division. And as the tribe of Joseph had complained of the territory they received being inadequate, as that given to Judah proved too large, a commission was sent to take survey of the land which might furnish the basis of greater accuracy in its distribution. It was hereupon found that Judah and Joseph had taken more than their fair proportion: but as their position had been assigned them by the decision of God through the lot, they could not be disturbed in their inheritance. The only resource remaining was to leave them in their allotted places, and detach portions from the territory, which with that still unoccupied was distributed among the rest of the tribes.

There are, as it was natural to expect, many obscurities in the geographical portion of this book, and it is found extremely difficult, if not impossible to lay down with precision the boundaries of all the tribes. This arises in part, from the imperfect knowledge as yet possessed of the localities of Palestine; but even if that were more perfect, a great number of the places that are mentioned could not now be identified, for many of these names never appear again in subsequent history; they were places it may be, of little note, or destroyed perhaps and never rebuilt, or else called by other names. It is wonderful that at such a distance of time we are able to identify so many as we can.

The discrepancies in some minor details found between Joshua and Chronicles (e. g. Josh. xxi. 13–39, compared with 1 Chron. vi. 37–81) are readily explained, without the credibility of either book suffering, by supposing that the same place may

have had two names; or that in the lapse of a thousand years, which intervened between the composition of the two books, names may have been altered; or that old places may have fallen to decay and new ones sprung up; or that a city may have come into the possession of a different tribe from that to which it originally belonged; or finally, that an error may have occurred in the transcription, which in the case of such long lists of names is very possible.

The few instances where a sum is given which does not correspond with the previously enumerated particulars (e. g. xv. 21–32,) admit also of being variously explained. In this case, the cities that were subsequently taken from Judah to be given to Simeon may not have been reckoned; or the names of some villages may be given as well as those of cities, and yet only the cities counted; or here and there in the list two names may belong together as the designation of one place; or the list may originally have contained but twenty-nine names, and the writer may have afterwards inserted others of less note, without altering the amount which he had already placed at its close; or if no other explanation be deemed satisfactory, there is the last resort of assuming a corruption the number. They who deny the inspiration and even the credibility of this book, must themselves admit that any supposition is here preferable to that of an original error, unless they can believe that the author was not able to count.

That we find in different parts of the book the capture of the same place differently described, as to its time and circumstances, (e. g. compare ch. x. 36–39. xi. 21. xiv. 12–14,) does not arise, as has been sometimes alleged, from varying or contradictory accounts of the same event. They are different events: there is no difficulty in the supposition of successive captures of the same city. The places were taken once; and then, when Joshua and Israel were absent in another part of the land subduing it, the Canaanites returned, re-occupied and fenced them again: and Israel was compelled once more to drive them out.

When and by whom this book was written, we are nowhere explicitly told, either in the book itself or in any other part of scripture, and can only gather a conclusion from incidental notices in the book itself. In ch. xvi. 10 we read that the Canaanites were not driven out that dwelt in Gezer; but the Canaan-

ites dwelt among the Ephraimites unto this day. Now in the days of Solomon, as we learn from 1 Kings ix. 16, Pharaoh king of Egypt went up and took Gezer and burnt it with fire, and slew the Canaanites that dwelt in the city and gave it for a present unto his daughter, Solomon's wife. It must have been before that, therefore, that this book was written. Again, in xv. 63, we read, As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out; but the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day. Now we know that it was in the early part of the reign of David that Jerusalem was wrested out of the hands of the Jebusites and that it was thenceforth the seat of his kingdom. See also ch. xi. 8 and xix. 28, "great Zidon," whereas Tyre not Zidon was the principal city in David's time. In ix. 27 we are told that Joshua made the Gibeonites hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation and for the altar of the Lord unto this day, in the place which he should choose. From this passage we learn not only that at the time, when this book was written, the Lord had not yet chosen a place for the temple, which was done in the days of David, but that the Gibeonites still continued to perform service near the altar. Now Saul slew the Gibeonites in his reign (2 Sam. xxi. 1): consequently the composition of the book cannot be referred to a later date than this. There are other data, however, which carry us much further back. In ch. vi. 25 we read of Rahab the harlot, "she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day," and in ch. xiv. 14, "Hebron became the inheritance of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, unto this day:" from which it appears that Rahab and Caleb were still living, when this was written. From the expressions in v. 1, "the Lord dried up the waters of Jordan from before the children of Israel until *we* were passed over," and v. 6 "the land, which the Lord sware unto their fathers, that he would give *us*," we learn that its author was present at the original passage of the Jordan and the taking possession of the land.

The Jewish Talmud asserts and probably the most common belief is that Joshua himself was its author; which opinion has in its favour the analogy of Moses having written what it was thought proper to record of the events of his days, and in which he was a principal actor, so that it seems natural to expect that his successor would do the same. This conjecture receives

apparently some confirmation from ch. xxiv. 26 where we are told of the events related in that chapter, that Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God. That book of the law could not well be any other than that which contained the Pentateuch; and if Joshua wrote this closing chapter of the book bearing his name there, the presumption is that the previous chapters were written by him also. Then the closing verses, which record his death would be added by another after that event took place, just as an account of the death of Moses was appended to the Pentateuch. It may also be suggested as, though a small matter in itself, yet pointing to the same conclusion, that Joshua first receives the title 'the servant of the Lord' in these closing verses; while through the body of the work he is called simply Joshua or else Joshua, Moses' minister. The only thing which throws doubt upon Joshua's being its author is its relating events, which seem to be spoken of in the book of Judges as having occurred after Joshua was dead. Comp. ch. xv. 13–10. xv. 63. xvi. 10. xvii. 11,12, with the parallel accounts in Judges ch. i., and ch. xix. 47 with Judges ch. xviii. Here all depends upon the manner in which the dates are to be reconciled. If we consider the first verse of Judges as establishing that everything related in the book took place after Joshua's death, then the book of Joshua could not have been written until after that event, and must consequently have been the work of some contemporary who survived him. If on the other hand, the date in Judges i. 1 strictly refers only to the event recorded Judges i. 1–8, and the following particulars to which no date is prefixed may really have happened sooner, the book of Joshua may still have been written before Joshua's death, and for aught we know by Joshua himself.

To one who is at all familiar with the history of theological opinion in Germany in recent times, it is not a matter of surprise to find the integrity and early date as well as the credibility of this book vehemently assailed; the two former indeed chiefly for the sake of bringing the last into discredit, for although the truth of its contents is not necessarily dependent upon the period of its composition, yet if Joshua or a contemporary was its author, the other marks of credibility are so manifest that the truth of its recitals cannot be denied. There are three things about this book, any one of which is sufficient

to procure its unqualified condemnation at the hands of a certain school of critics; its miracles, its predictions, and the testimony it renders to the truth and Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. Miracles can in their eyes never be more than fabulous legends; predictions must have been written after the event; and as the Pentateuch is necessarily condemned by the same laws, whatever testifies to its truth must fall with it. These principles are assumed by them as indisputably true, the book sentenced accordingly, and then searched with microscopic accuracy, if perchance anything may be discovered to support their foregone conclusions. To a believer in the existence or even possibility of a divine revelation, these first principles are inconclusive and worthless; to the critic and scholar their additional arguments are equally so. The alleged contradictions when examined in detail will be found no contradictions, and become positive arguments in favour of the truth of the book, when it is seen that beneath their seeming inconsistency there is a real argument. That the citation from the book of Jasher does not prove its composition later than the time of Joshua, we have already seen. The arguments from the occurrence of the name Jerusalem (ch. x. 1. xviii. 28), and from the distinction of the southern range of Canaan into the mountains of Judah and the mountains of Israel (ch. xi. 16, 21), have now been given up by their authors. The assumption that the name Jerusalem was first bestowed on the city after its capture by David is destitute of all historical proof: and the distinction into Judah and Israel did not first arise after the separation of the two kingdoms; that separation was rather induced by the distinction already existing. The germ of it may be found as far back as the patriarchal period (Gen. xlix. 1 Chron. v. 2); it was gradually augmented by the predominance which Judah acquired in the Mosaic period by its numbers and otherwise (Num. i. 27. x. 14). But apart from this, its occurrence here is sufficiently explained by the facts of our book itself. Judah had taken possession of the south of the land; all Israel lay encamped at Shiloh; what could be more natural than that the part of the range occupied by Judah should be called the mountain of Judah, and that where all the rest of Israel lay the mountain of Israel, or inasmuch as it lay within the territory of Ephraim, the mountain of Ephraim (ch. xx. 7).

The extraordinary hypothesis, which has found so much favour among the unbelieving critics of Germany, as to the fragmentary structure of this book, might be applied with equal success and equal reason to any other book that ever has been written. Ewald has discovered that no less than five different writers have had a hand in its composition. He tells us exactly when each of them lived, and the special bias under which he wrote, and singles out in every chapter with undoubting accuracy the verses which belong to each. The utter groundlessness of such a hypothesis is a sufficient refutation, even if the impossibility of bringing it into accordance with the phenomena which the book presents did not afford an ample contradiction. The evident and consistent plan of the book, as above developed, is wholly at variance with it. There could be neither order nor consistency in such a chaos of fragments as it supposes. The theory of two writers, one distinguished by the unvarying use of the divine name God, and the other by that of Lord, whose writings became somehow blended, breaks down here most signally; and it is confessed, even by those who adopt it, that the occurrence of one or the other of these names is not of itself sufficient to decide to which author the supposed fragment belongs. And every attempt to establish a criterion by other assumed characteristic words or phrases has proved equally unsuccessful. The alleged contradictions, even were they such in reality, would prove nothing in favour of this hypothesis, unless on the supposition of an unaccountable forgetfulness or stupidity on the part of him who strung these fragments together, to whom, however, they are compelled to attribute great skill and shrewdness. The occurrence of occasional repetitions, and of sections with a formal introduction and close, has been confidently brought forward as proof of a fragmentary character; but as Ewald himself has conclusively shown in one of his earlier productions, these are peculiarities of the oriental style generally, arising in fact out of the simplicity of their language and of their mode of narration.

The morality of scarcely any book in the Bible has been more assailed by the enemies of revelation than that of the book of Joshua. It has been represented as unworthy of God, as sanctioning what is abhorrent to all just ideas of his nature, and as diametrically opposed to the mild and benevolent prin-

ciples of Christianity. The Israelites have been represented as a horde of lawless wanderers, who, having broken loose from bondage in Egypt, fell upon the inoffensive Canaanites, forcibly wrested from them their just possessions, and wantonly and mercilessly butchered them without distinction of age or sex. And when this horrible picture of injustice and inhumanity has been drawn, we are asked, Can a holy and merciful Being, can the Christian's God, sanction such proceedings? Had we space, we should have been pleased here to discuss this point, with the view of vindicating the book against such aspersions, showing the right by which Israel took possession of Palestine, and the just reasons, why God directed the extermination of its former inhabitants, at the same time inquiring into the relation in which our holy and peaceful religion stands to war. We need as much to pray to be delivered from some of the professed friends of revelation here as from its more open and undisguised enemies: for there have been those, who by undertaking to defend this point on insufficient or ill-chosen grounds have seemed to cast the mantle of Christianity over the iniquities and barbarities of modern warfare, and to justify the wholesale murders with which the civilized and Christian nations of modern times are reeking, though they call him Master and Lord who said 'Love your enemies.' These topics we are unwilling wholly to pass over without consideration. But we shall be able to do no more than in the most hurried manner indicate the line of argument which we should wish to pursue. And we should defend the right of Israel to Canaan, not on the ground of the prior occupancy of it by the patriarchs, as though a claim had then been formed to the territory, which their descendants now reasserted; nor on the ground that Israel having no land of their own after leaving Egypt could not be bound to remain forever in the barren wilderness, and if the Canaanites would not give them peaceable possession among them, they were at liberty, from the natural right of all men to life and to the means of its support, to seize upon land wherever they could find it to live upon; nor should we, calling to our aid the maxim that might makes right, defend it on what is by a grievous misnomer called the *right* of conquest. They had no right to the land founded on any

natural claim to its possession, nor any derived from the conventional usages of men. But it was theirs by divine gift. God promised Abraham to give it to his seed; that promise was reiterated to his descendants and it was in fulfilment of it that they received the land. They entered Canaan and took possession of it by the immediate command of God. The perfect legitimacy of a right thus obtained none can question, who are not prepared to deny altogether the interference of God in human affairs. It is he who appoints to nations as to individuals the bounds of their habitations. This goodly land in the exercise of his righteousness he took from the Canaanites, who had forfeited it by their sins, and in his grace he gave it to Israel with the distinct understanding that they likewise were to be deprived of it, if they proved unfaithful and disobedient stewards.

But why were the Canaanites to be utterly destroyed? The reason is repeatedly given in connexion with the command. It is not to be explained from the usual bloody character of wars in that barbarous age. But it was because of the abominations and gross idolatries of the Canaanites for which the Lord would thus punish them. God would glorify his justice by the destruction of those who would not glorify him by a willing service. Refusing to comply with this, the end of their creation, they were forced to subserve it by their utter destruction. In the days of Abraham their iniquity was not yet full; and therefore the land though promised to him was not taken from them nor given to him in present possession. The Israelites were not acting under an impulse of their own when they made war upon Canaan. They were guided neither by ambition nor by lust of conquest. They were simply the executors of the divine vengeance; just as the flood, the pestilence, and the earthquake, are commissioned by heaven to cut off those, who provoke God's judgments. Why may He not at his pleasure employ men to do his bidding in this respect as well as he may the elements? He does thus employ men constantly in his providence as the unconscious executioners of his judgments. Babylon chastises the sins of Judea, Persia humbles the pride of Babylon, Greece is the rod in God's hand against Persia, and is in its turn scourged by Rome, which itself falls before the irruptions of barbarous invaders. Where now are the nations

of antiquity? Which of them has not been made at one time the executioner of divine judgments upon others, then itself in in turn punished for its own guilty excesses? And if sinful nations thus unwittingly accomplish the righteous will of a holy God, why may not an elect and godly nation be employed as the conscious instruments of his just vengeance? There is no door left open here for fanaticism, the fancying a divine commission, and under its pretended sanction putting to death and plundering all of a different faith, or whomsoever their religious frenzy might lead them to encounter. Israel was evidently under divine guidance. Miraculous power attended them every foot of the way, and proved the commands which they received to be no fanatical ravings but the mandates of the God of the whole earth. He fed them from the skies, gave them drink from the rock, opened a passage through Jordan, threw down the walls of Jericho, slew their enemies with hail-stones. There could be no mistake that the living God was in the midst of them and directed all their proceedings. And there was a special reason too why Israel should be the executioner of the divine will in this instance, rather than that the land should be first depopulated by pestilence or by some other natural agent, and the people be brought into the land thus emptied for them. In that case they would not have felt so sensibly their own weakness and dependence on the power of God. They would have forgotten the agency of God in giving them the land, attributing all to the second causes, which he might have employed as his instruments; nor could in that case the Canaanites be, as the residue of them proved, a constant trial to Israel, whether or no they would be faithful to the service of the Lord.

But why, it has been asked, were the Canaanites thus singled out for punishment? Were they the only idolaters? Were they so much worse than others? And why punished by the Israelites, whom the enemies of religion delight in representing to be as bad if not worse than the nations they destroyed? The Canaanites were not, as is here supposed, singled out. The righteous providence of God extends over all nations, and each is punished when its cup of iniquity is full, not all to the same extent indeed, nor by the same means, but punished as he sees fit. Besides, the Canaanites were addicted to the vilest, and

most abominable practices, such as were regarded with detestation and horror by the heathen themselves. It is a slander upon Israel too to speak of the generation under Joshua otherwise than as a pious, godly race. That there were individuals among them, who were not truly pious, is of course to be supposed. But the whole tenor of the history in this book, shows them to have been scrupulously obedient to the divine will, and regardful of the divine honour. We find none of the murmurings which characterized the generation that left Egypt under Moses, none of those relapses into idolatry that fill their history in the period of the kings. They were a people in covenant with God, and mindful of that covenant, which they repeatedly and solemnly renewed. They looked upon themselves as only the organs of the divine will in this matter; they burned with the same zeal against the sin of Achan among themselves, and against the supposed transgression of certain tribes, as they did against the idolatrous Canaanites; and they were informed that the judgment, which they now by divine direction executed upon others, would be executed as terribly upon themselves, if they were unfaithful to the covenant of their God.

After what has been said, we need scarcely add that this furnishes no precedent, no justification whatever, in favour of modern wars of conquest. Where Israel's example is claimed, let the same evidences be shown of divine guidance, the same miraculous indications that such is the will of God.

Much has been written and said very loosely about the literal sense and the historical sense of the scriptures. That there is a spiritual sense to the whole bible, that is to say, that the whole bible was intended for our spiritual improvement, is obvious. It could not be what it is, in all its parts the word of God, it could not be even a religious book, unless this were the case. If there be any part of it that admits of no such use, that part is exclusively secular and has no place in the Bible. Setting out, however, with this obvious principle, some have run absolutely wild in their so-called spiritual interpretations. Some mystics have gone to the extent of affirming that there are seven distinct senses in every passage of Holy Writ, all of which they pretend to be able to discover. Some have adopted what is commonly known as the allegorical mode of interpreting scripture, and find some hidden, mostly typical meaning in every verse, too often

despising or giving up altogether its plain and natural signification. Others have gone to the opposite extreme of treating the narratives of the bible as they would mere uninspired productions, as though they stood simply upon a parallel with profane history, and were nothing more to us than a record of what had been transacted in ages long since past. A few simple principles seem to us to govern this whole matter, and to be sufficient to preserve us from the extremes on either hand. The danger on one side is that of arbitrary and fanciful exposition, which foists in meanings upon the scriptures, which the spirit of inspiration never intended, and which puts it completely within the power of the interpreter to make anything or nothing of any passage at his option, by assuming some mystical sense without reason or necessity, and parading it to the obscuration of its just and direct meaning. Under such a system of interpretation it is not the scriptures but men's own vagaries, which form their rule of faith. There is no difficulty of any man's thus making scripture teach just what he pleases. The danger on the other side is, as we have already said, that of degrading a large portion of the scriptures from the word of God, and a book designed for our spiritual improvement, to a mere secular history, finding in it nothing about Christ or eternal salvation, no new illustrations of the character of God, no fresh motives for trust in his mercy, or strenuous obedience to his holy will. Both these extremes are to be deprecated. The middle path is the true one; and the direction in which that lies remains now to be pointed out. This we can perhaps best do under three particulars.

The special intervention of God in the history of ancient Israel is to be kept in view. God interferes in all history of every age and nation; and no history is read aright unless the agency of God is sought for in it, and how the various events which occur enter into his plan of governing the world and bringing about his wise and righteous ends. But this is true in a very peculiar sense of all that befell his ancient people. They were under the particular care and the immediate government of God, as no other nation ever was. And not only so but their history was written by the pen of inspiration with the view of unfolding this special relation, in which they stood to God, and the duties, the privileges, and the responsibilities,

which it brought with it. This history shows how God dealt with his people, and how they dealt with him. Now God is the same in every age; what he was to them, he is now. He who removed every obstacle out of the way of his faithful people, even to the opening of a passage through the Red Sea, the dividing of Jordan, or casting down the impregnable walls of Jericho, will not fail to make their path clear before them now. He who supplied all their necessities, giving them bread from heaven and water out of the flinty rock, will not suffer those to famish who hunger and thirst after righteousness, nor will he permit them who fear him to lack any good thing. He who heard them ever in their hour of need and caused all their enemies to flee before them, will grant his people deliverance now from all their inward and outward foes. He who punished Israel's sins, will ever visit the transgressions of his people with the rod; yet he who graciously returned to them when they again sought his face will show himself always merciful to his repentant though backsliding people.

"As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." The men of one age live over again in those of every other. We may see ourselves portrayed in the character of Israel. We see there the workings of the natural and of the imperfectly sanctified heart under the means which God employs for its conversion and salvation. Their waywardness and disobedience, their murmurings, their hasty ill-timed zeal, their negligent remissness, all find their counterpart in us; and well is it, if the hearty penitence and the sincere obedience, which they manifested at other periods, find likewise in us their parallel. The instruction thus gained we shall for brevity's sake call the inferential use of history. This is in every case a legitimate deduction from the narrative, and the spiritual instruction thus gained is by the fairest construction a part of the meaning of the inspired record.

Next to this we shall mention what may be called the analogical use of scripture. This is done when we trace resemblances between natural and spiritual objects, and illustrate the latter through the medium of the former. There is no logical deduction here, as in the former case. We find in it not proof but illustration. Where the resemblance is striking, and especially where it extends to many particulars, it often enables the mind

easily and distinctly to apprehend what otherwise perhaps it could scarcely grasp, and even if it does not positively confirm the truth, it performs a valuable service in obviating objections. With many minds an apt analogy has all the force of a rigid proof, or is perhaps more effective because more intelligible and impressive than such a proof would be to them. It is to all a pleasing as well as an instructive way of conveying truth. We make use of analogies from the works of God in nature the better to set forth spiritual relations; and why may we not make a similar use of his word? especially as we can claim for it the example of inspired apostles, who not unfrequently drew such analogies from the Old Testament for the instruction of their hearers or readers. The propriety and the advantages of it are so obvious that it is constantly done by all Christians; and some of these analogies are so true and striking that they have stamped themselves upon our current devotional language and upon our most ordinary conception of things, to such an extent indeed, that in employing them we scarcely think that we are using figures. The wilderness world, the Jordan of death, the heavenly Canaan, are as familiar in our religious language as any literal expression we can employ. The only caution necessary in connexion with this use of scripture, is that we should remember analogies are not proofs, and even the best analogies are not perfect. They should therefore not be pressed too far; it does not follow that, because there is a resemblance however striking in some points, there must be a corresponding similarity in every other. Neither does one analogy exclude another; but the same thing may have a resemblance on different sides to various spiritual truths, and may be rightfully employed in illustration of them all. In order to learn what is the truth, we must go to those parts of scripture, where it is plainly and directly conveyed. But when the truth has first been discovered and proved from other sources, we may then resort to analogies to aid in its distinct conception and to impress it more vividly on the mind; while of course, the use of any passage by way of analogy is never to be understood as superseding or invalidating its proper historical sense.

A third use of these parts of scripture may be called their suggestive use, by which we mean the taking its language in detached portions and without any particular attention to its

connexion or to the precise sense which it must have in the place where it occurs, allowing it to suggest any profitable sense which the words may be capable of bearing, or awaken any train of devout thought which may casually connect itself with them. This of course is not interpreting scripture; the meanings or the thoughts thus suggested are never to be put forward as the true sense of the passage, with which they may be connected; and yet, we think that if indulged in sparingly, and by a person already well instructed and of sound judgment, it may not only be allowable but very profitable. It is well to have devout thoughts and important truths frequently in our minds, whatever may be the immediate occasion of their introduction. As we walk by the way or sit in the house, as we look abroad upon the works of God or upon the handicraft of man, it is of service to let every thing be an occasion of suggesting such thoughts, however remote or even fanciful the association that introduces them. Especially, then, it seems to us that when we are reading the word of God, about which every sacred association spontaneously clusters, we may at times, with profit, instead of anxiously confining ourselves to the strict and proper sense of the passage, allow our thoughts to have loose rein and yield ourselves up to any pious reflection that strikes us in connexion with it. The only danger here arises from its excessive use, tending to the neglect of that more solid study of the Bible, by which alone we can learn what it truly teaches; and from its injudicious use allowing thoughts to be suggested, which are themselves erroneous or of an improper kind. Of course these suggestions are not proved to be true from their having arisen in connexion with scripture; they form no part of the actual sense of the passage; and yet they are sometimes so easily connected with it, the language which the sacred writer employs upon his own immediate subject often admits of so ready and apt an application to some higher subject, that it would almost seem as if the language had been carefully framed to admit of both applications, and it is scarcely possible for a pious and reflecting mind to read the one without instantly recurring to the other. Thus when we read "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him," who can avoid thinking of the heavenly glory, though that is not the subject originally

contemplated by the sacred writer? When it is said of Samson, "the dead, which he slew at his death were more than they which he slew in his life," how can we help connecting it in thought with Him, who triumphed, when he fell, over all the powers of darkness? Different minds are differently affected by suggestions of this sort; so that no one can prescribe an absolute rule for the government of another. Much depends upon the turn of mind and habit of thought. What seems to one a fanciful and incongruous association may afford rich and profitable meditation to another. We should not absolutely condemn all associations of this sort, therefore, in the gross, or even in all cases those, which may seem insipid and profitless to us; they may appear differently to others. Some eminently pious and judicious men have made frequent use of the Old Testament in this way, and with the limitations we have above prescribed to it, it does not seem as though it could do any harm. Indeed the apostles themselves, not so frequently as some have alleged, yet occasionally made a similar use of the Old Testament, accommodating its language to some new idea; not thus expounding scripture in a sense foreign to the intent of the original writer, but using its familiar words as an apt vehicle of their own thoughts.

In our remarks thus far we have had primarily in view the spiritual sense, that may be elicited from or connected with scripture in order to a practical application of it to our hearts and consciences. The historical types of the Old Testament, or those persons and events in the former dispensation, which are to be considered as typical, either specifically of Christ and his work, or more generally of persons and events in the present dispensation, may be explained in the same way. And though it would savour of presumption in us to assert positively that we have a perfectly satisfactory solution of a question so much debated and on which there has been and still is so great a diversity of views even among sound and learned divines, we may venture to express our opinion that the three uses of scripture above described, the inferential, the analogical, and the suggestive, will go very far in explaining this subject. There are types in all these senses more or less explicit; some of them stated to be types by the inspired writers: others which we argue to be types, proceeding upon the same principles, which they seem to have followed. Thus to illustrate our

meaning by the case of Joshua; no one, we presume, would be disposed to doubt that he was a distinguished type of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is not expressly called so in the New Testament, it is true; but from the instances of types that we do find there it is plain that he is to be so regarded. And he may be considered as a type in all three of the senses, which have been spoken of. As the divinely constituted, divinely qualified and successful leader of God's people, he is a type of which the inferential use may be made to point to Christ; for the gracious God, who raised up the leader suited to that emergency of his people, attended him by his divine aid, by him subdued their foes and fulfilled his promises of good, thereby pledged himself to raise up at the fit time, one who should supply every other real need of his people, and who should be at once divinely appointed and qualified to bring in upon them every spiritual good which he promised and intended for them. Looking upon Joshua, therefore, they could strengthen their faith in the coming of the predicted Shiloh, and from what God had mercifully given them in the one, they could form some kind of expectation as to what he designed for them in the other. In this manner Joshua could have been regarded as a type of the coming Saviour before he actually appeared.

The suggestive use of the life and character of Joshua in its typical relation to Christ could on the other hand only be made after the great antitype had come. Now that we have learned all about Christ from actual manifestation, we can again turn back and take a fresh survey of the type, and new points of contact never observed before will be discovered between them. Thus that he should bear the name of Joshua, which is the Hebrew form of Jesus; that he should be in Egypt in his infancy, and in his infancy be endangered by the murderous edict of a cruel tyrant; that he should be forty years in the wilderness and Jesus forty days in the same; accidental resemblances like these, if we call them such, may suggest reflections more or less profitable to us, and may connect more closely in our minds the life of Joshua with that of him whom he typified; but it could never have reasonably occurred to the mind of any one to anticipate these coincidences before the Saviour had actually come.

The analogical use of this type might be made both before

Christ came and after; but only as his character and the nature of his work were known from other sources independent of the history wherein the type is found, as for instance, from the prophecies respecting Christ or his recorded life. Analogies between what one did in natural and the other in spiritual things are so obvious and abundant that we need not delay to point them out. Here again, let it be borne in mind, that it is the inferential only which strictly teaches; the analogical illustrates what is elsewhere learned; while the suggestive pleasingly and impressively carries our thoughts, though it be by trivial ways, to Him, whom we cannot too frequently contemplate.

We have thought it more conducive to the edification of the general reader to present our own views of this interesting subject than to give a more particular account of the work which has immediately suggested them, and the title of which is prefixed to this article. We desire, however, in conclusion, to invite attention to it, as a sample of an interesting and important class of German works, for which we are indebted to a wholesome reaction from the skeptical excesses of the modern school of criticism and interpretation. We desire to see the growing taste for German literature in this department directed not merely to innocuous but to salutary objects, and we therefore take pleasure in calling the attention of our biblical students to the works which have been called into existence within a few years by the example and authority of Hengstenberg. One of the earliest of these writers is the one before us, Keil of Dorpat, who has done good service to the cause of truth, not only in this work on Joshua, but in a later one on Kings and an earlier one on Chronicles. To the same general class, but with less direct dependence upon Hengstenberg, belong Kurtz, the author of several valuable works upon the Pentateuch and the Old Testament History, and Delitzsch, the author of a kindred work on the interpretation of prophecy. As co-workers, more or less directly and successfully, in the promotion of the same end, the names of Ranke, Hävernick, and Drechsler, are already familiar to our German-reading students of the Bible.

Art. IV.—*Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church.* 1849.

In some respects this is the most important document that comes forth from the various Boards of our Church. The matters it deals with are ultimately associated with the being and the perpetuity of that Church. The ministry is her standing army in the world, and whatever pertains to the recruiting and drilling and disciplining of that army must have a wide influence upon her own advancement. Those who are set over the recruiting service are bound to see that none under size, or defective in any way, are admitted to the ranks. If all are received who offer for the bounty and the pay, they may soon resemble the regiment of the fat Knight of Coventry. One able and furnished and God-sent minister is of incalculable benefit to the cause of truth. One weak and worthless one does even proportionable mischief. Your "good souls," of little native talent, hastily and poorly cultivated, will do more good any where else than in the ministry. A man might be a glory to the Christian name as a shoemaker, who would disgrace it as a minister. We do read, however, of a tinker who was not allowed to pursue the calling, but God smiled upon his birth and strewed wondrous gifts upon his cradle. The unconscious child of genius was detected by the royal gifts he bore, like Perdita among the shepherds.

These remarks are made to show, on the one hand, that great care and discrimination should be exercised in the selection of those who are invited into the ministry, by placing in their reach the means of that education which is requisite; and on the other, that no department of society is to be judged a priori incompetent to furnish good materials. Let those who are the organs of the Church for this business look into the cabin and the stately mansion, from the sunless valleys to the mountain tops, in city and country, and invite into her ranks, and arm for her conflicts, as many as the Lord our God shall call. Especially was it a happy thought, to call out those who could not otherwise attain the qualifications, who should come from those they are to return to, and operate upon. It is peculiarly fitting that they should be touched with a feeling of their in-

firmities, that like their Great Master they should possess the broadest sympathies with the great multitudes of the race, from their common lot, and common experiences, and common brotherhood. It becomes a question therefore of the very highest importance, whether those who are thus taken out of the various departments of society shall be so trained, as to be returned to them again, strong in all their religious sympathy and conscious brotherhood, or whether the culture or discipline shall be so ordered and managed as to break up that broad ground of sympathy, weaken those bonds which now tie them to those from whom they come, and unfit them, by that very education which is designed to give them power, for influencing those to whom they are sent. There are some evidences that this is the result under the present system of ministerial training, at least to some degree.

There is an increasing feeling in the mind of the Church in regard to the inefficiency of her ministry. It is not pretended that such a body of men, engaged as they are, as the Presbyterian ministry, exert no influence, or even a small influence; but the conviction is becoming more decided and clear, that in proportion to their learning and ability and zeal, they control and influence the popular mind much less than might fairly be expected. There is no question that this is true, whatever may be the causes assigned to account for it. Other denominations grow faster under the ministry of men, as a body, far inferior to them both in training and abilities, and not before them, in zeal and godliness; and men far inferior to them in every high quality of a minister of the gospel are followed by crowds, whilst they are called to preach to thin audiences and vacant seats. One of the ways in which this conviction manifests itself is in that rage for men of talents and distinction, which is seen in all our churches. From the large city congregation, which can afford to pay any price for talents that may be required to secure them, to the remote country church that worships in a rickety old log house; both too poor and too stingy to give enough support to a minister to keep soul and body together, to say nothing of a family to raise and educate; the demand comes up, Send us a great man, one of the first order of talents; we are a strong church, and need such a one to maintain its standing. Or, We are a weak church, and require

such a man to build us up. Now this may be all wrong and very foolish, but it proves this much at least, that the various churches in our connection regard the great body of our ministers as scarcely worth the having. This may be the wrong way, and doubtless is, to remedy the evil if it really exist, but it certainly goes far to establish the fact of a distrust felt by the Church in the general efficiency of her own ministry. Or it shows a degree of culture in the people in advance of the average qualifications of our preachers. This distrust is manifested also in the various ways taken for accounting for it. Some find the cause of it in our theological seminaries, and the scholastic training therein imparted, to the neglect of the old methods of pastoral instruction, or in the character of some of the professors in those institutions, who have never been actual pastors of churches, and who are supposed therefore to be so far unfit to have a share in the training of those who are to be pastors. Another very large class, and apparently the majority of our last General Assembly, find the cause of this want of efficiency in the practice of reading sermons. Others think they find a good reason for this want of power in the ministry, in what is called the secularizing of so many of its members. So many mingle the employments of teaching male and female schools and colleges, and other things less akin to their peculiar work, that their labours are less successful as preachers, and they tend to depreciate the character, and diminish the success of the whole body. All these things certainly prove this at least, that the church is sensible of the fact to a certain extent, that her ministry is not so efficient as she desires, or has a right to expect. Whether the above causes are the true ones, or whether they are sufficient to account for it if they are true and real is not now the question. We beg leave to quote here the words of the Edinburgh Witness in reference to the simultaneous agitation and discussion of the reading of sermons in the United Presbyterian Synod in Scotland, and the General Assembly in the United States. "When men have recourse to some potent medicine, we may as a rule take it for granted, not at all that they have selected the drug proper in their circumstances, but that there is really something the matter with them. We may safely hold that they feel themselves to be unwell, though their diagnosis of their own case may be a very erroneous one. Now on

a similar principle we infer that there is something the matter with the churches who are agitating this question; they feel themselves to be mysteriously unwell, and are trying to legislate themselves into health by putting down the practice of reading discourses, somewhat in the way that our ruder ancestors, when affected by some pining sickness, which they could not understand, attempted to set all right by cutting suspected old women across the forehead."

We agree with the Witness that all these things indicate that the church feels itself affected with some "complaint," and the causes assigned for it in all of them are so inadequate, as to furnish strong evidence that a correct diagnosis has not been reached, nor the proper remedies exhibited. We shall regard our labour as not entirely thrown away if it enables us to contribute anything towards the attainment of these ends.

The fault lies not in their mental power and natural ability. From a pretty extensive acquaintance with ministers, old and young, in the Presbyterian Church, we are clearly of the opinion that they will not suffer in comparison in these respects with any body of professional men in the country. And we believe this is generally conceded. If it were here that the difficulty lay however, the case would be hopeless, for there is no remedy yet found out for inherent stupidity. It is not because they are inferior in educational attainments to their brethren in other denominations, for their standard is as high as any, and higher than most, and no one can say that it is not adhered to with reasonable fidelity on the part of Presbyteries. Nor do we believe that it is found in the nature of the doctrine which they are called upon to advocate. This might be assigned as a reason by those who oppose or dislike the doctrines themselves, but to those who receive them as the very doctrines of God's word, it will be hard to show that this is the ground of the difficulty. Nor if it were shown to be so would there be any possible remedy, for it is not to be expected that God will change the character of his revelation because it is not agreeable to the mass of men. So far as this is true of the Christian religion, it is an evil which all true ministers of the gospel have to encounter, and arises out of the essential opposition of evil to good. It would avail us nothing more than to stop the inquiry therefore, should it be

agreed that this is the prime cause of the inefficiency of the ministry of our church.

We are not willing to concede, however, that the religion of Christ, when properly preached, is so distasteful to the human mind as to be a permanent hinderance to its success, or as it is frequently represented. This idea does it injustice. It was designed by its author to operate upon the soul of man, and was adapted to the purpose. It gathers up into its keeping all the minor interests of humanity, while it only hath the words of eternal life, and we are persuaded that there is enough of rationality and good feeling amongst the great body of men, to make the fair presentation of many of its doctrines and principles rather agreeable than otherwise. And it seems to possess some mysterious charm to draw many who make an effort to close their ears when they come, unless they are kept open by some wise charmer.

We are persuaded that one source of the defect is to be sought in the educational process through which the young man has to reach the ministry. It is to the consideration of this one source of the evil, however inferior it may be thought to others of a higher nature, we wish to direct our remarks. The business of the minister is with the human soul, and with the instrument by which it is affected, human speech. He has a system of truth given him by God to operate upon the soul. His first business is to learn that truth himself, to incorporate it with the very life and texture of his own soul. His next business is to communicate it to others, and the means of that communication is the speech which is understood, or rather which embodies the thought of the people to whom that communication is made. It is therefore as necessary to be perfectly acquainted with the language in which it is to be delivered to the people, as that in which it was communicated by God; and equally necessary to use that language, and none other, in communicating it. The English language is peculiar in its characteristics. The native vital stock is Germanic. It is the Anglo-Saxon stock, which furnishes and elaborates the vital sap. Upon this original stem however there have been engrafted, not only twigs and leaves, but whole boughs and branches. Many of them so remote in species as scarcely to be made inhere and grow, all of them marring its unity, and impairing its power.

The classic fountains have supplied most of the additions and importations which have in the course of ages secured permanent lodgment in it. This was begun by the violence of conquest and political revolution, and carried on by those who turned to those sources for the truth they alone contained. But those who imported the truths made the same mistake that merchants sometimes do, lumbering their rooms with the wrappings and packings of the precious products they bring from distant climes, as though they were essential to the integrity and value of the wares themselves. And sometimes these wrappings contain the seeds of noxious weeds which soon overspread a continent, defying the labours and the vigilance of the husbandman, and blasting his tender crops with their rank worthlessness.

The process of elementary education consists in a great measure in imparting to the candidate for a polite education, a knowledge of the classic tongues, and by consequence of the etymology and idiomatic character of those portions of our language which have been borrowed from those sources. This is all well enough—all right and proper. But there is too much taken for granted, or else completely overlooked in the process. It is taken for granted that his knowledge of those parts of our language which he does not study in its original sources will keep pace with that of those he does thus study, or else the essential character of those parts is overlooked by those who conduct the course of the student. He thus comes to understand best the classic department of our language, and very naturally he learns to admire it more. He sees in it the remains of those dead tongues which hold the embalmed thought of the two great educating nations of antiquity. He attaches to it somewhat of the reverence which he has been ever taught to feel for those great models that have come down through succeeding ages, the admiration and the despair of all who have truly learned their excellence. Every word he uses, coming from the language of Cicero, imparts to his thoughts something of the dignity of Cicero. The farther his mind is educated in this direction, and the more his style is fashioned in this way, the further he departs from the language of the common mind. And the result is the perfect ruin, nine times out of ten, of any power he might have as a speaker over those who know nothing

but their mother tongue. This process carried on through all the course of studies, through theological latin and exegetical Greek, until he reaches the ministry, lands the candidate so far away from the people he is to preach to, that he finds it hard to get back within hearing; and the great majority never think to look over their shoulder to see whether the people are keeping pace with them, but go on in blissful ignorance that the sheep are all going in another track far out of the reach of their voice, following a voice which they know. A more effectual scheme to unfit a man to instruct and move the masses by speaking to them could hardly be devised. It is a system by which a man is made to stand up and lecture others, time after time, first about intelligibly enough to convince them that he is talking to them, and yet to keep them in profound ignorance of what he is saying, and himself utterly unconscious all the while that he is talking unintelligibly to them. This is most likely to be the case with those who commence the study of the classics very young, before they have begun to think and reflect, and gain knowledge by listening to public addresses. He grows up with the notion that the words he is most familiar with, must be equally well known to others. And what is worse, he grows up in almost exclusive acquaintance with those words and forms of expresion which most people know nothing about. He, who comes to the study of these languages in more mature age, after he has learned to think, and express his thoughts in native English, is not in so much danger. He finds very soon that there are whole departments of the language he has known nothing about hitherto, and he has now found the key to them. He now begins to find the reason of his inability to understand the many discourses of the learned he had listened to, and he is not likely to fall into the mistake of speaking to his old companions in a vocabulary, and idiom which he now perceives he did not comprehend when he was among them and of them.

Some who jump at inferences and conclusions may say we are attacking the study of the ancient classics. If they will carefully weigh our words however, they will find nothing we have said which can be fairly construed into any such shape; so far from it, that the essential importance and necessity of that study are involved in at least two important views presented, the necessity of understanding those tongues to get at the system of

God's truth they contain, and also for the understanding those parts of our tongue borrowed therefrom. We do not object to, but urge and insist upon the thorough study of those languages, and instead of diminishing we would increase greatly the amount bestowed upon them. It is the small amount, and ill-directed character of the study they now receive, which is really a great source of the evil we complain of in the result. He who is thoroughly acquainted with the rich homogeneous picture language of the Greeks, and the more vague and indefinite but majestic tongue of the Romans, will be more likely to understand the powers and defects of our own. Our church has helped to maintain too hard a conflict against radicalism and mammonism in behalf of ancient learning for us to think of abandoning it now, and our pages from time to time have shown frequent evidences of our fidelity to the cause. It is that "little learning," which is the "dangerous thing" we complain of. And it is in the hope that our beloved church may take such a step in advance as will make the learning of her ministers still more available for those high purposes for which she requres it of them, that we pen these pages. We hope always to see her far forward in the vanguard of the hosts of Christian civilization, freeing and enlightening and elevating the human race by the power of the pure gospel preached in simplicity and power, by men learned in more than all the wisdom of the Egyptians. And it is in the hope of doing something to put a sharper sickle into the hands of the reapers she sends in her master's name to reap down the over-ripening harvests of the earth, that we call her attention to this matter.

Just here we beg leave to suggest one of the most serious evils in the practical workings of the system managed by the Board of Education. They know we do it in all kindness to them. They know that we desire to point out an evil which they are far more ready to remedy to the extent of their power, than we are to tell them of it. The young man who is taken up and placed upon their funds feels anxious to make the most of his time, as much with the desire of relieving them of the burden of his support as quickly as possible, as with the view of acquiring a fitting education. His eye is therefore singly fixed on reaching the diploma of his college in the shortest space possible. He cannot bear to be spending money not his own, and

with that feeling so honourable to his young and generous nature, he presses up through class after class, not in all cases by mastering the intermediate studies, but on the promise his industry and fidelity give, and through the mistaken indulgence of his professors. They know his circumstances, they appreciate his feelings, and they cannot deny him what they can with any sort of conscience grant. The result is that he takes degrees and is ready for the seminary one, two or three years sooner than by the regular course. And instead of being the scholar he might have been made in the full time, with his application and talents, he comes out with the smallest modicum of Greek, Latin, etc., that will entitle him by special grace to a diploma, and sent off to the seminary to finish his course after the same pattern of the foundation. His position and circumstances have kept books out of his hands in a great measure before entering college. His exclusive devotion to what is essential to get his degree leaves him no time for reading while there. And he comes out knowing as little as possible of the classics, and less of any thing else. And he enters God's great harvest with many a smooth space, and many a woful gap in his sickle.

This is not greatly his fault, for he has not the wisdom to guide himself in the right way, and to fix the right standard of attainment. It is not the fault entirely of the college professors, for they cannot entirely control him, and their kind feelings incline them to yield to his wishes as far as they possibly can; nor is the Board entirely responsible in the premises. It is more the fault of the church in doling out such a pitiful pittance to support its glorious and most important operations, and requiring such large and immediate apparent results at so small a cost. And it is greatly the fault of the ministry, in not raising and maintaining a higher standard of ministerial attainments, and enlightening the minds of the membership more fully and regularly in regard to these great matters, and their solemn duties.

We have arrived then at the conclusion, not that our ministers have nothing to say to the people, not that they have not the knowledge which they are to communicate to them, but that they are attempting to convey that instruction in something else than their vernacular, that they are speaking to them more or less in an unknown tongue. The ideas they communicate

come dim and hazy to their minds, making no definite impression, and awakening no abiding emotion. Our ministers are trained to speak over rather than to the people. We have instructive truth, warm with spiritnality, which we could not help wishing had been translated, that some one had been by, according to Paul's direction, to interpret. The great body of hearers would get almost as much benefit from God's truth, from having read to them a chapter in the Greek Testament. It is obvious, when we think of it, that the influence of the gospel is not after the manner of a charm, like the popish liturgy, but that it needs to be conveyed to the mind and really apprehended to produce its effect. If a man were to get up and read to a people, who know not a word of Greek, a chapter of some of Paul's epistles in the original, they might be greatly edified by his learning, and comforted by its mellifluous sounds, but their stock of religious knowledge would not be greatly increased, nor would the result be greatly different if he were to read a version in which all or most of the important words of the original were retained, for the sake, as he might say, of their greater accuracy and expressiveness. Nor would it help the matter much, if instead of retaining the original Greek words he were to put Latin or French in the place of most of them. Every one could see the folly of such a course at a glance. And yet many of our most gifted ministers are every Sunday doing something very like to this. They are speaking sentence after sentence, and period upon period, containing more or less important words, essential to the meaning, which are in a language really foreign to most of their hearers. And they wonder and mourn, that truth, stated with such logical exactness and coherence, and at such cost of thought, and enforced with such ardent earnestness, should produce so little effect. If any one will take the pains to observe living examples of the best and worst ministers, of the most successful and most unsuccessful ministers in our church, he will find the difference to be mainly in this very thing. They will be found, the one class to draw their vocabulary and idiom from such sources as King James's Bible, Bunyan and Shakspeare, and the other from Johnson and his school, and their Latin and Greek lexicons. When the latter read their sermons, that is the cause of the evil with some. When the others read, as they often do, the secret

of their admitted power is deemed inscrutable. When both speak without notes, a like difference is felt, and the cause is sought in the different talents.

Now it is a fact, that though the classic borrowings have been in the English language for centuries, they still make no part worth mentioning at the real English tongue as it is spoken and understood by the vast body of those who are acquainted with no other. Most, it is true, have a sort of speaking acquaintance with these forms of speech, but they are not found around their firesides. The learned have been for three hundred years trying to get them to learn their uses and meanings, that they might instruct them in the truths which they know not how to convey without them. They have rung them in their ears, and written them before their eyes, so often, that they seem to conclude that now they must know them, and the people are ashamed to say they do not, but nod and look wise. They have been fostering and cherishing the grafted branch of the tree, and trying to force into it all the sap and growth of the whole, and trying to persuade the people that the large fair apples it bears are far sweeter, and better suited to their taste, than the dwarf and homely crabs that grow on the native stock. But nature "will after her kind," and though they praise and admire the one, they still eat and love the other.

This may be all well enough for grave historians, who may agree with Hume, that this "composes the greatest and best part of our language," and for high toned moralists, who may agree with Johnson, that it is the only part that it ought to contain, yet it is obvious and certain that God's ministers must quit it. It is a system which is carried on at the cost of human souls. They at least must turn round, and instead of asking the people to study their language, must study and use the people's. If it is unpolished and inelegant, they must mend it as they may, but still they must use it. They are set to address and instruct and win to the ways of purity and love the multitudes. They must be educated to speak not only intelligibly, but with the highest power to those multitudes. They must learn God's messages in the languages which the Holy Ghost used in its communication, and they must learn and use the language of those to whom they are set to teach those living oracles. We say, if the alternative were between a polished and elegant

diction, with few to be influenced by it, and a rude and simple dialect with multitudes dependant on it for the light of life, the minister of God could make but one choice. If he must take the style of Plato, with an academy of philosophers, or the dialect of the childlike John, with the world filling multitudes of poor to whom the gospel must be preached, he must catch up the strains of the beloved disciple. Happily in this case there is no such alternative presented, but true taste and excellence, in style and vocabulary, are combined with the highest success and widest power. Shakspeare and Bunyan will forever stand up as monuments to the beauty and grace, as well as the power of the native English tongue. And a careful analysis of the whole language will show us that it is but lumbered and depraved by the fossil remains of extinct *genera dicendi*. For all the purposes of the part of the orator these are worse than useless. The native Anglo Saxon has furnished our language with more than five-eighths of all the words it contains, whilst nearly the whole of what English Grammar is made up of is of the same origin. All its peculiarities of structure and idiom, all its inflections, and nearly all the parts of speech which occur most frequently, and which are in their individual character of the most essential importance, are Saxon. To it we are indebted for the names of nearly all the objects of sense, and which by consequence recall the most vivid conceptions, and furnish so large a share of the language of poetry. Whatever in external nature we have seen and felt most strongly and loved most, gets its name from this source. Those words which we hear first and earliest, which express the dearest relations, and tenderest affections, which waken the most complicated and all-enthralling associations, those which pertain to common life and pursuits and daily business, those which make up the language of humour, of satire, of invective and scorn, and nearly all terms which are most specific and vivid, come from the same origin. The English language then, stripped of its borrowed stores, would not be a poor but a wonderfully rich one, and exquisitely adapted to the thought of the race.

What we have more to say may be summed up in a few words. Our ministers must be so trained, that they shall have the pure native English perfectly at their command, as an in-

strument of thought and of its expression. They must study it therefore in its sources, as all languages need to be. It must be studied not to the exclusion of the classics, but along with them, and with its sister the German. What we believe to be necessary to secure this, is for the Church to take measures to place the study of the Anglo Saxon on the same footing with that of Latin and Greek. It could not be done at once, because we have not the men nor the facilities, but both can be had in time. If this step is taken, it will not be long before every respectable college in the country would have it in its catalogue of indispensable studies. Those who are to be educated for lawyers and politicians would not be slow to see and appreciate its advantages, and thus by our Church taking this step in advancing the qualifications of her ministry, a most important impulse would be given to professional education and attainments throughout the country. While everything else has been advancing in the country, and while other denominations, after ridiculing and abusing an educated ministry, are gaining fast upon us in this respect, our standard remains the same that it did fifty years ago or more. If the education of the ministry were to be kept as much in advance of the general state of intelligence, and at the cost of as much labour and expense in proportion to the means, as in the days of the fathers, when the Log College sent out its students, and the foundations of Princeton and Jefferson were laid in the prayers and most self-denying contributions of those men of God, not only this, but far more would be done. We have no plan to suggest upon this matter. We rest, with presenting the desirableness and the necessity of some such measure. We have in our pages previously called attention to the increasing importance of the study of the Anglo Saxon, and pointed out some of the sources available to American students for its acquisition. We desire now to bring it more specifically before the friends of education, and the whole church, with the view of having it adopted at an early day among the essential attainments of every candidate for the ministry, before he be admitted to a Bachelor's degree. We have tried to show how the ministry needs it, and how it would multiply its power and efficiency in communicating the gospel to the multitudes of Saxon minds spread already over

this vast country, and soon to spread beyond it. Additional reasons might be drawn from the manifest relation of this great race to the cause and kingdom of Christ, and the conversion of the world, but the length to which these remarks have already run, admonishes us to hold our hand.

by John Forsyth

---

ART. V.—*History of England from the Accession of James II.* By Thomas Babington Macaulay. 2 vols. Harper, Brothers. 1849.

This is one of those rare works, which at once take rank among the classics of the language; and while they stand in no need of the heralding of reviews, every reviewer of note is nevertheless expected to make them the subject of his criticism. Mr. Macaulay, already widely known as an essayist, a poet, an orator, and a statesman, at a single bound has reached a position among the great historians of England. Reviewers of the most opposite political opinions, Tory, Whig and Radical, (with a solitary exception) have joined in a hearty and harmonious tribute of praise, re-echoing with unexampled zeal the shouts of applause with which the general public have hailed the appearance of these volumes. For years it had been rumoured that such a work was in preparation, and meanwhile the author was earning for himself a distinguished reputation as a man of letters, by a succession of brilliant essays, which, from their subjects being connected with the political and literary history of England, indicated the nature of his studies, and naturally awakened the greatest expectation. The manifold editions and the immense circulation which the work has reached within the short time that has elapsed since its first appearance, and the praise bestowed upon it, with such unusual unanimity by critics of all parties, afford decisive proof that the hopes of the public have been in a good degree realized.

These volumes will not only bear a second perusal, but, if we may judge others by ourselves, we may even affirm, that no one who omits to read them twice can really form a calm and candid estimate of their worth as a history. Mr. Macaulay is a per-

fect master in all the arts of rhetoric; the splendour of his style is so dazzling, his narrative flows on so delightfully—"puroque simillimus amni,"—his episodes are introduced with such consummate skill, his pictures of persons and of social life are so dramatic, and, in pronouncing judgment on the character of statesmen and the policy of parties, there is such an air of rigid historic justice, the faults of Whigs and the virtues of Tories are brought out with so much apparent candour, that we found ourselves on a first perusal quite unable to exercise "the right of private judgment," and were not surprised at the enthusiasm of some friends who expressed the wish that all the books of human literature were written by a Macaulay.

Even a second reading scarcely diminishes the interest awakened by the charming page. But we are more masters of ourselves; and we then detect blemishes which at first attracted little notice. Some of them we regard as of very grave importance, and seriously detracting from the value of the work as a history of the eventful times which the author has undertaken to describe.

Our first objection respects the point at which Mr. Macaulay fairly begins his narrative, viz., the accession of James II. His first four chapters are therefore only introductory, and, with the exception of the third, containing a picture of the social condition of England in the times of the Stuarts, (on some accounts the most interesting chapter in the book) they are designed to give a rapid view of the process of amalgamation of Briton, Dane, Saxon, Norman, the result of which was the English race, and of the process of development which brought out the distinctive principles of the English constitution. We must express our regret that he did not adopt a different method, and select an earlier starting point. The first two chapters would have answered admirably for a review, but as an introduction to a work like the present they are too long, as a history too cursory. James's accession to the throne was in no sense the commencement of a remarkable epoch; his reign is connected historically and politically with that of his brother Charles; there was a change of persons but not of policy. He might as well have chosen for his point of departure the middle, as the beginning of the reign of James. And in fact, the narrative flows on so uninterruptedly, broken only by the pictorial episode

respecting the physical and social state of England, to which we have referred, that the reader is quite unaware (unless he has read the title page) of his having reached the real opening of the story. No one acquainted with Mr. Macaulay's writings can doubt that he has long and deeply studied the annals of the Stuart race. All his essays indicate an uncommon acquaintance with those times. We deeply regret, therefore, that he did not take as his starting point, the accession of the Stuarts to the throne of England. That event marked the opening of a period pregnant with issues of the highest magnitude, a period the most eventful, beyond comparison, in the annals of Britain. Long before the extinction of the Tudors, the first faint notes were indeed heard of that strife of principles, which ultimately swelled into the mightiest battle ever fought upon the English soil; still the dynastic change just mentioned may be properly regarded as the outset of this notable era. Henry and Elizabeth were no less fond of power, and exercised the prerogative even more absolutely, than James or Charles; but they fought no battle for it; haughty and self-willed as they were, they had sense enough to know when to yield and how to do it gracefully; though they wielded an iron sceptre, they nevertheless contrived to retain a firm hold of the national heart. With the new family which inherited the throne, a different kind of manager appeared upon the stage; a succession of monarchs as destitute of common sense as of moral principles, under whose administration a small, and politically speaking insignificant party, speedily acquired vast numbers, wide-spread influence, in a word, an organization and an energy before which the proud and self-willed Stuart quailed. The history of the eighty-five years of the Stuart dynasty forms a complete chapter, and the historian who would do full justice to the great events included in it, must begin at the beginning. During this period, the old contest between royal prerogative and popular rights, and the more recently originated strife between conscience and human authority, were terminated, after a struggle fierce and bloody, the marks of which still exist; terminated triumphantly for the cause of liberty and religion. But for the accession of the Stuart family, it is quite possible that the indecisive skirmishing of earlier days might have been kept up till our own times. This period was, in other respects, remarkable. Our English tongue

one of the fruits of the fusion of the Saxon and Norman races, during this era, put on, in the main, its permanent form and features; our literature made an immense advance: it was the age of Shakspeare, Jonson, Bacon, Milton, Dryden, Locke, not to mention the giants in theological learning. The manners of the people were greatly improved: no previous century had witnessed an equal progress in the refinements and comforts of social life. It was in fact a wonderful age—a fit theme for a noble epic—having a beginning, a middle, and an end; and we must again express our surprise that Mr. Macaulay, instead of commencing his narrative at a point unattended by any of those circumstances which mark an epoch, and expending his strength on a reign which had already engaged the pens of Fox and Macintosh, did not undertake to give us the full story of the Stuart race.

But there are far graver objections, to which, in our judgment, his work is open. In many parts of it there are clear indications that he wants what we deem an essential qualification in a historian of those eventful times, deep and earnest religious convictions.

As we have before intimated, that which renders the Stuart period so profoundly interesting is the conflict of principles and parties. Under the Plantagenets and Tudors there were struggles between the King and his barons; many bloody battles were fought by opposing factions; during the wars of the Roses not a few noble and gentle families disappeared forever. These earlier contests were usually occasioned by some special grievance; or the appeal was made to arms to settle the question of succession to the throne. To the mass of the nation it was a matter of little moment who gained the prize. Whether the White or Red rose triumphed their condition was in no degree affected by the event, except as it might be influenced by the personal virtues or vices of the victor. But the conflicts during the Stuart dynasty involved principles of infinite value both in religion and politics; principles entering into the very life of the church and the state. The points raised by the nation in that grand debate, were—whether as Christians they should be free to follow the dictates of conscience, or be bound to worship God in a form prescribed by human authority—whether as citizens

they should be governed by law, or the arbitrary will of the prince.

Now it should never be forgotten, that while civil rights were at stake, they did not originate the contest. Religion was the occasion of it; and hence the necessity for that qualification in its historian, which, as we shall presently show, Mr. Macaulay lacks. It was the struggle to gain exemption from prescribed forms of divine worship, which aroused and quickened inquiry respecting political rights. The Puritans were the men who first unfurled the banner of freedom, and they never deserted it. Arbitrary power they always detested; the supremacy of law they always asserted. There were certain rights of the subject, and certain prerogatives of Parliament, which the English people never would suffer to be invaded; yet we venture to affirm, that if the religious differences which began under Elizabeth had been satisfactorily adjusted, if the rulers of the church had been wise enough to treat tender consciences with kindness, tolerating circumstantial diversity, when they had substantial unity among her members, the political condition of England would have been widely different from what it is. Cromwell might then have lived and died a farmer: Edgehill and Naseby had been names unknown to history. Each political grievance, as it rose, would have been dealt with as in the days of the Plantagenets—endured until it became unendurable, and then thrown off by a sudden outburst of the national energy. These spasmodic displays of the spirit of liberty excepted, the stream of popular life might have flowed on in its old accustomed channel. But grievances of conscience are widely different from grievances affecting the mere citizen. No one can be really sensible of the former, without a considerable share of religious knowledge and an earnest conviction of its importance. The men whom Elizabeth and the Stuarts fancied they could bend and mould at will, were divinely instructed in the true nature and sublime objects of religion. In their view it was a thing of infinite moment, involving transactions between their own souls and the eternal God, of awful solemnity. They felt that they had souls to be lost or saved, the fear of Him who held their everlasting destinies in his hands excluded all other fear, so that like the early heralds of the cross they could give the calm but bold challenge to the haughtiest of monarchs—

"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." But it is needless to dwell upon the character of these glorious men, who amid tears and blood planted that tree beneath whose goodly shade we sit, and every day eat of its pleasant fruits. Their portrait has been often drawn, and by no one in more glowing colours than by Mr. Macaulay himself.

We have adverted to the character of the men and the times, simply to show that no man is completely fitted to tell their story, who is a stranger to the power of godliness. He may be, as Mr. Macaulay unquestionably is, intimately acquainted with its literature, he may have all the archives of all the cabinets of Europe at his disposal, he may have all the mental endowments necessary to the historian, but if destitute of deep religious convictions he wants an essential requisite. His love of liberty, as the word is now understood, may induce him to denounce acts of oppression, to sympathize with Leighton denuded of his ears, and inveigh against the ruthless bigotry of Laud: but after all, he can have no cordial affection for the principles which Leighton loved and Laud hated; there are many transactions which he cannot comprehend, many struggles which to him can have no interest whatever. And this we conceive to be Mr. Macaulay's grand defect. He is a Christian, in the loose sense in which the term is applied to multitudes who believe that the Bible is a divine book, while at the same time they regard the manifold forms of Christianity as about equal in value. He conceives it to be highly problematical whether Popery or Protestantism has done most for Britain. We might quote numerous passages which betray a spirit of indifference to positive Christianity; passages which prove him to be culpably ignorant of the relative merits of the Calvinistic and Arminian systems, on which he nevertheless ventures to make passing criticisms with the tone of one who had studied and digested them. On several occasions it comes in his way to advert to the doctrine of a particular Providence, and he treats it as if it were a dogma too absurd to be gravely refuted, which no man can adopt unless on the bias of early education, or a latent tendency to superstition. For instance, in describing the character of William of Orange, he says—"He had ruminated on the *great enigmas* which had been discussed in the Synod of Dort, and had found in the

austere and inflexible logic of the Genevan school something which suited his intellect and temper. The tenet of Predestination was the keystone of his religion. He *even* declared that if he were to abandon that tenet he must abandon all belief in a superintending Providence." The logic of Geneva is indeed "austere and inflexible," (it would be worthless if it were not) as the enemies of the system of divine truth which Calvin taught have repeatedly found, though it is obvious from the tone of the passage that these predicates are used by Mr. Macaulay merely to give grace and roundness to the period. If his account of William's creed be correct, the prince proved himself to be a sounder logician than the historian.

Again, in illustrating the dreadful sufferings inflicted upon the Scottish people during the bloody era between the Restoration and the Revolution, some examples of which he gives from Wodrow, he says: "Some rigid Calvinists, from the doctrine of reprobation had drawn the consequence that to pray for any person who had been predestined to perdition was an act of mutiny against the eternal decrees of the Supreme Being." Then follows an account of the murder in cold blood of three labouring men, "deeply imbued with this unamiable divinity," for refusing to pray for James II. Mr. Macaulay has been highly lauded for the exactness with which he quotes his authorities, and the praise is no doubt merited where they refer to political and literary topics; but in this instance he certainly has drawn largely on his own fancy. There is not one word in Wodrow (his only authority) that warrants him in charging "some rigid Calvinists" with holding "this unamiable divinity." Wodrow simply states that the men, when asked if they would pray for the king replied, "they would pray for all within the election of grace." Major Balfour said, "Do you question the king's election": they answered, "sometimes they questioned their own." "He swore dreadfully and ordered them to be executed on the spot." Such is the story as told by Wodrow: but as thus told, it is quite too plain for our historian; he must therefore first deck it from the stores of his exuberant rhetoric, and then in the exercise of his own peculiar logic infer from it the unamiable divinity of "some rigid Calvinists." Were it necessary, we might bring other proofs of Mr. Macaulay's ignorance of the doctrines which the Puritans zealously maintained,

not as "great enigmas," but all-important verities adapted to exert a controlling influence on the life of man, and which left so deep an impress on their own character.

As a consequence of this want of sympathy with the religious principles of the Puritans, Mr. Macaulay does them great injustice, in the first place, by not bringing out clearly and distinctly *who they were.* Surely a body of men like the Puritans, whose doings belong to the history, as their writings do to the literature of England, merited if not a separate chapter, at least so careful and exact a description of them, that the reader could be in no doubt as to the persons to whom that honoured name really belongs. They figure so largely in the scenes which he describes, that he is forced to speak of them very often; he professes to give some of their peculiarities, and in occasional passages intimates that under a common name, various parties were included. Yet the tone of his narrative is such as to leave the impression on the reader's mind that the Puritans (i. e. the great mass of the party) were bitter enemies of all the elegant arts of life, denounced all popular pastimes, and during the heyday of their power were guilty of as gross and wanton tyranny as their opposers. Now, admitting that "Puritan stone masons attempted to make Nymphs and Graces, the work of Ionian chisels decent," —and that there were "lank haired" Puritans who "discussed election and reprobation through their noses," in the coffee houses where they were wont to assemble, is it true that the great body of the Puritans were distinguished by these and similar peculiarities which moved the derision of Prelatists and libertines? We venture to affirm that no one will answer this question affirmatively, who has thoroughly studied the history of the Puritans, and know who they were.

The term Puritan—the Anglican form of a Greek word in use in the Church as a party name so early as the fifth century—properly denotes, as the most recent historian of British Puritanism observes, "a body of men who were Church of England men, and not Dissenters, advocates for the establishment of Christianity and of their own views of Christianity by law."* Even in the time of Edward VI., but particularly under Elizabeth, the term was applied to all those members of the

* Prof. Stowell. History of the Puritans.

Church of England who had a warm and hearty love for the Reformation, who wished to remove from her forms of worship and discipline those relics of the ancient superstition, which so many of her sons in later times have regarded as her most glorious distinction; and who would have succeeded in their designs, if their efforts had not been thwarted by the haughty and semi-popish Defenders of the Faith. That such views were entertained by Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Cox, Jewell, and many other of their contemporaries, is put beyond all reasonable doubt, by documents published by Burnet, and more recently by the Zurich Letters. These men were Puritans. If they had been able to carry out their wishes, they would have removed from the constitution and forms of the English Church those features, which others less zealous for her purity than themselves insisted upon retaining, partly to please the Queen, and partly with the hope of gaining the Papists, who were still very numerous in certain portions of the kingdom. Hence the name applies to many who never separated, and never meant to separate from the established church, to the large number forced out of her pale by civil and ecclesiastical authority for persisting in their scruples about the use of certain rites and vestments, and finally, at a later period, to those who objected to the form of her constitution, and were in the proper sense of the term dissenters. In the days of Elizabeth and James, the Puritans were not a party distinct from and hostile to the Church; they remained in her communion; the party included all who loved the pure gospel, had a heart hatred of Popery, and wished to cultivate closer fellowship with the reformed churches on the continent. On minor matters they were not all of one mind: some would have used the pruning knife more vigorously than others, and hence the seeds of the unfortunate divisions which took place among them during the days of Charles and Cromwell.

At the breaking out of the contest between Charles and his Parliament, England was divided into two great parties, viz. the Puritan or Presbyterian, and the Prelatic.* The fact to which

* Neal. We say Presbyterians, because at this time most of the Puritans were Presbyterians. Men like Usher, Reynolds, &c., who were at heart Puritans though professing a modified Episcopacy, went, some with one party, some with the other.

we have already adverted, that the point at which reformation should stop had never been determined by the Puritans as a body, prepared the way for their subsequent divisions. The reins of ecclesiastical government were necessarily held with a slack hand during the civil troubles; and it was natural that the freedom to think and act, so suddenly gained, combined as it was with an intense religious feeling, should produce strange developments. Soon the Independents showed themselves agreeing with the Presbyterians on all subjects except church government, yet forming a distinct party. Then there were those who maintained that every Christian had the right—which they themselves exercised—of holding forth when and where he pleased; a class of enthusiasts (for we cannot consent to apply the term fanatic to men who knew how to unite the saint and the soldier to a degree never before, and never since witnessed) in the army. As for the Muggletonians, Quakers and Fifth-monarchy men, it were a dishonour to the Puritan name, to include them under that designation, as Mr. Macaulay in some places seems to do. These minor sects, and even those whom we prefer to call enthusiasts, whose peculiarities were the standing theme of ridicule to the licentious wits of the Restoration, bore an insignificant proportion, not only to the nation as a whole, but even to the great body of the Puritans. We have no doubt that the oddities of this extreme section of the Puritans have been greatly exaggerated, for a reason mentioned by Mr. Macaulay in his well known description of them, viz. that "for many years after the Restoration they were the theme of unmeasured invective and derision, were exposed to the utmost licentiousness of the press and the stage, at a time when the press and the stage were most licentious." Is it right, we ask, for any historian to rely on such authorities, when painting the character of any class of men? Yet these are the very writers to whom he refers when he represents the Puritans as distinguished by ostentatious simplicity of dress, sour aspect, nasal twang, contempt of human learning, and detestation of polite amusements. But even if the bitter enemies of the Puritans, though heaping unmeasured abuse upon them, were really faithful painters, we still affirm that they drew the picture of only a small party, and that there were thousands entitled to

and actually bearing the name of Puritans on whose countenances no such dismal features could be traced.*

Another cause of Mr. Macaulay's failure to do justice to the Puritans is his *excessive effort to be candid*; he is so far elevated above the prejudices of sect and party, that he has just as much and just as little sympathy with the Papist as the Protestant, with the Prelatist as the Puritan. Such is the impression which he seems desirous to make upon the reader's mind; as religious parties he feels no more interest in the one than the other. Is this an essential element of candour? Must the historian, who would be candid, regard all the varied forms of Christianity as equally good? Not only do we deny this, we hold that any one imbued with this sentiment, who attempts to give the history of a period like that of the Stuarts, must do injustice to the cause of truth. Such a man will be slow to recognise the connexion between true religion and social progress; there are many events whose real causes he will wholly fail to discern. As little is he to be deemed a candid historian who in dealing with this period, contents himself with simply stating the naked fact that all parties were chargeable with the same crimes and errors, leaving his reader to infer, or perhaps affirming in so many words, that in point of blameworthiness there is not much if any difference between them. The Prelatists, for example, were bitter persecutors, but so were the Puritans; the Prelatists denounced conventicles; but then the Puritans forbade the use of the prayer-book; the Royalists were to the last degree loose in their morals; but then the Puritans put on a solemn face, shut up the theatres, and passed severe laws against the "lighter vices" of adultery and profaneness.

This is Mr. Macaulay's method of exhibiting impartiality. In these volumes, and in his other writings, he invariably represents the Puritans as chargeable to a large extent with producing the unexampled licentiousness which reigned after the Restoration; the excessive morality of Cromwell's days naturally led to the excessive wickedness of Charles's. He accuses them of exhibiting a bigotry as exclusive, a tyranny as wanton, in the day of their power, as ever their enemies had exercised upon themselves; and hence he declares that the infamous

* See Stowell, p. 19.

treatment they received at the hands of the restored Cavaliers was natural and even excusable. Now we unhesitatingly assert that such a representation of the conduct of the Puritans in power, is the opposite of fair and candid.

In saying this we do not mean to deny that they committed great errors. We acknowledge that they did so, and if Mr. Macaulay instead of giving such prominence to their foibles, had clearly and distinctly exhibited their errors, he would have discharged, much more worthily than he has, the office of the historian. Our readers, we trust, will pardon us for enlarging a little on this point. The errors, into which the Puritans fell, were the result, partly of their peculiar circumstances, and partly of the principles which in that age belonged to the common faith of Christendom. All parties allowed the civil magistrate a voice in spiritual things which we in this land and age have been taught to refuse him as alike injurious to the cause of religion and the welfare of the state. The idea of a national church, with which all the Reformers were imbued, and on which the whole Protestant world had acted, was as familiar to the mind of the Puritan as the Prelatist. The former wished to remodel and reform the Church of England, but it was still to be the Church of England; all they wanted, was a purer and simpler form of government and discipline in the established church, and if the Presbyterians had not been led astray by the ignis fatuus of uniformity, this grand achievement might have been effected. Their intolerant and persecuting spirit, of which we shall presently speak, was the natural fruit of this idea.

The grand error of the Puritans was the split between the two leading sections of the party, the Presbyterians and Independents. At the breaking out of the troubles, or prior to the meeting of the Westminster Assembly, the Presbyterians were predominant in Parliament and in the country. With the exception of those who held Prelacy to be essential to the being of a church, they had no antagonists worthy of the name. The cruelties of which Prelacy had been guilty, while enforcing uniformity in rites and ceremonies, combined with its obvious affinity for absolute monarchy, had awakened the disgust of thousands who cared little for forms of worship in themselves; and the undisguised tendency of Laudism to Popery had exci-

ted alarm among the sincere friends of Protestantism; so that the conviction that the church needed to be remodelled was almost universal. Every thing indeed seemed favourable for accomplishing the good work of eliminating from the constitution of the Anglican church the noxious elements which had been incorporated with it, and thus of completing the half reformation of Edward and Elizabeth. It was one of these occasions for doing a great work, which occur only at rare intervals in the life of nations. The fair prospect was soon overclouded by the unwise rigidity of the Presbyterians, by their attempting to extirpate at once every trace of Prelacy, and to introduce in its stead a system claiming the same absolute jus divinum, and breathing apparently the same intolerant and persecuting spirit. No wonder that Milton, at first the zealous friend, soon became the determined opposer of the Presbyterians, saying that Presbyter was nothing more than "old Priest writ large." To set up Presbytery seemed to be a mere exchange of yokes.

Nor is it surprising that the Independents so rapidly grew in numbers and influence. As a party, they were not, in principle, more liberal than the Presbyterians; but as they were in a position to need toleration, they naturally became its recognised advocates. They wished to enjoy the privilege of forming churches according to their own notions of the New Testament model; they sought toleration for themselves; but liberty of worship as we understand it, was a doctrine which neither party admitted. Both were for maintaining the union of church and state; and if the scheme of compromise, or rather of comprehension, which the Independents proposed, had been consented to by the Presbyterians, the former would probably have exhibited as little fondness for sectaries as the latter. It is an instructive fact, that every sect under persecution has got a glimpse of the rights of conscience, and that every sect in power has to a greater or less extent violated them.

This, we repeat, was the first great error of the leading section of the Puritan party: by grasping at too much, by unwise efforts after absolute uniformity, the seeds of division and alienation were sown. Two parties, with the strongest possible affinities for each other in regard to doctrine, discipline, and worship, that could exist short of complete identity, parties which united might have held undisputed sway in the kingdom

and might have given stability and permanence to the incipient reformation, presented the spectacle and met the usual fate of a house divided against itself. The Independents were forced into the unnatural position of antagonism to the Presbyterians and the Parliament; and then, when the power had passed into the hands of Cromwell and the army, the Presbyterians fell into another grave error, by maintaining a sullen mood towards the greatest prince that Britain ever saw or is likely to see again. One of the finest things in these volumes is Mr. Macaulay's portrait of Cromwell. It is a particular favourite of our historian, who, however, does no more than justice to the glorious man, in whose presence the Plantagenets and Tudors shrink into pigmies. His memory has been loaded with obloquy by those who should have known better; but the world is beginning to appreciate the real character of Cromwell: a man forced to adopt many measures by circumstances over which he had no control; a man not without ambition, but it was ambition of a noble kind; who, as he won the sceptre of Britain by matchless valour in the field, proved that he was worthy to wield it by unsurpassed wisdom in the cabinet. By principle as well as from policy, Cromwell was the advocate of toleration. He was not a leader; he was not a revolutionist; he did not overthrow the Presbyterian establishment when it existed, though he could have done it by a word. An Independent in principle, he was not the enemy of Presbyterians; and if they had rallied round him as they should have done, he might have relieved himself of that extraordinary army, which was at once the main stay of his power, and the main obstacle in the way of his doing for his country all that was in his heart.

Another grievous error of the Presbyterians—the natural consequence of those just adverted to—was the share they took in the Restoration of the exiled Stuarts. If they had been wholly ignorant of the character of Charles II, their attachment to that embodiment of wickedness, would have been unwise indeed, yet excusable. But he had been in Scotland, they knew what solemn professions he had made, what solemn oaths he had taken, and how shamelessly he had cast them aside the moment he found himself safe again on the continent; they had abundant proof that he had no more conscience than a statue; they knew that he was a debased sensualist, with not one re-

deeming trait except that sort of good nature which would not inflict pain out of mere wantonness, yet which cares not how much blood is shed, or how much misery is caused, if necessary to gain an end. To restore such a man to the throne, unbound by any public and formal pledge to maintain the liberties of church or state, the Presbyterians united with a party with which they could have no real sympathy, and by which they were absolutely abhorred. Charles, who would promise any thing if he could thereby regain the throne, had indeed entered into private engagements with the Presbyterian leaders, who otherwise would not for an instant have entertained the proposal to restore him; but they were of such a nature that he could, as he did, throw the responsibility of breaking them on Parliament.

Mr. Macaulay says that "some zealous friends of freedom have without reason condemned the Restoration," and particularly the admission of Charles II., free of all conditions other than those agreed upon in private. He maintains that this course, all things considered, was the wisest that could have been chosen, and enters into a long argument in support of his opinion; but his reasoning strikes us as very unsatisfactory. We are not at all convinced by it, that the consequences, which he pronounces inevitable, would have followed, if the power had remained in the hands of the army. It was, as he himself repeatedly declares, an army the like of which had never before been seen. "Fifty thousand men, accustomed to theprofession of arms, were at once thrown upon the world; experience seemed to warrant the belief that this change would produce great misery. No such result followed. Royalists themselves confessed that in every department of honest industry, the discarded warriors prospered beyond other men." I. 142. We firmly believe that an army composed of such materials never would have permitted the establishment of a military tyranny, or any other form of absolute government. They might and probably would have introduced great political changes; they might have prevented the re-erection of the throne; they might have greatly diminished the power of the aristocracy; but so far as respected the perpetration of outrage upon the individual citizen, the restriction of personal liberty, and the invasion of personal property, we are persuaded that England had far less reason to fear such consequences from the rule of the army, than from the restora-

tion of the Stuarts. Be this as it may, the position assumed by the Presbyterians, and the consequent division of that great body which comprised the real friends of freedom and reform, was an error of which they soon had ample reason to repent.

That the Puritans are open to the charge of having persecuted, and that their laws against what our historian calls "the lighter vices" were in some respects unwise, we readily admit. This was another of their mistakes. At the same time we maintain that Mr. Macaulay gives a distorted view of their conduct in this particular, and subjects them to unmerited odium, when he says, that they were guilty of persecution as cruel as any that they themselves had endured. Now let us look for a moment at the treatment of the Prelatists, who would naturally suffer most severely at their hands. How were they dealt with? They were excluded from office in church and college; they were forbidden to use the liturgy; they were heavily fined. Keeping in view the principles respecting the relation of church and state common to all parties, we say that the Prelatists had no more right to complain of this exclusion from office, than the Papists under Elizabeth. The state had chosen to remodel the church, and to connect new conditions with the enjoyment of ecclesiastical dignities; and if they could not comply with the condition, they must forego the emolument. None could doubt the competence of the state to change the tenure of such offices, for the power had been repeatedly exercised since the days of Henry VIII. Besides, in the existing condition of the kingdom, amid the struggles of a revolution, it was impossible for Parliament to adopt any other course, and secure the object for which they had embarked in the contest with the king. To leave their deadly enemies in possession of their benefices in the church and the universities had been the height of absurdity. Such the Prelatists notoriously were. They were devoted to the king, heart and soul, they raised large sums on their estates, they melted down their plate to replenish the royal coffers; they wanted to restore him to the throne in the full possession of his prerogatives. Even after his overthrow, they were perpetually plotting against the government, and in order to gain their end, not scrupling to think about admitting an assassin as their co-adjutor. While the Parliament was in power, and afterwards under Cromwell, it was impossible to keep them down unless

by a strong hand. Politics and religion thus became so interlaced, that it is difficult to separate the one from the other, or accurately determine the proportions of suffering for religious dissent, and punishment for political delinquencies. Every rectory containing a Prelatic parson was a centre of sedition. The liturgy was as much the badge of a political party, as the symbol of religious faith; and whenever its admirers assembled, whether in conventicle or private house, it was perfectly well known that they met for other purposes than simply to worship God.

This makes an immense difference between Puritan and Prelatic persecution. The sufferings, of which the latter complained so loudly, were inflicted upon them, not merely, or even chiefly, because they could not pray without a book, nor own a church without a bishop, but on political grounds. On the other hand, the Puritans were persecuted by the Prelatists when the latter had undisputed possession of the whole power of the kingdom, in a time of profound peace, and on religious grounds exclusively. "Who can answer"—says a candid Episcopalian treating of this very period—"for the violence and injustice of a civil war? Those sufferings of the Prelatists were in a time of general calamity; these of the Puritans in a time of peace. The former were plundered, not because they were conformists, but cavaliers of the king's party."

We do not make these remarks with the view of justifying in all respects the conduct of the Puritans towards the Prelatic party. That they did persecute is not to be denied. With the rights of conscience they were imperfectly acquainted. They allowed the civil magistrate a power *circa sacra* which, if fully exercised, would produce persecution, leading him to deal with heresy as a crime against the state as well as a sin against God. They shared in the sentiment of their age. Struggling so long to gain toleration for themselves, no wonder that they were so slow to grant to others what had cost them so much toil and blood. But it deserves to be considered, that the persecuting principles adopted by the Puritans were not the native fruit of what we may call the Puritan system of Christianity; on the contrary, there is no affinity whatever between them. It is a system which makes every thing of the individual conscience, which insists upon universal Christian education, and the uni-

versal circulation of the Bible. Hence we say, that the persecuting principles of the Puritans were a mere accident of their faith, a remnant of the spirit of their own age, an element not combining with their system, but kept in contact with it by a sort of mechcanical pressure; an element at war with the fundamental principles of their faith respecting God's claims and man's duty. In quiet times it must soon have worked itself out. For these two reasons, we affirm that the Puritan, whether regarded as a persecutor in fact, or in principle, is not to be put in the same category with the prelatists and the royalists; and if Mr. Macaulay had taken the pains to compare the two, and point out the distinctions which facts and reason alike demand, instead of indulging in finely worded but empty declamation, he would have better deserved the name of a fair and candid historian.

"He who approaches this subject," said Mr. Macaulay in one of his earliest reviews, "should carefully guard himself against the influence of that potent ridicule, which has already misled so many excellent writers. Those who roused the people to resistance, who formed out of the most unpromising materials the finest army that Europe had ever seen—who in the short intervals of domestic sedition made the name of England terrible to every nation on the face of the earth, were no vulgar fanatics." This is as true as it is well said, and we deeply regret that the writer, in these volumes, has so often forgotten his own rule. Had he kept it in mind, instead of dwelling so much on the surface of Puritan character, he would have gone beneath it; and while exhibiting fully and fairly their errors, with their causes and palliations, could also have shown how much Britain and the world owe them. With all their faults, their internal divisions, their ignorance of the rights of conscience, their religious intolerance, we can say of them what cannot be said of any other party in England, that from first to last they remained true to the great principles of civil liberty. Their political creed may be summed up in two words—the title of a well-known book by Samuel Rutherford, which had the honour of being burned by the hangman, by order of Charles II. the moment he took his seat on the throne of his fathers—*Lex Rex*—the Law, the King. From this creed they never swerved. They

asserted the absolute supremacy of law—that the national will expressed by freely chosen representatives of the people ought to be more potent than the arbitrary will of any monarch, and after fifty years struggling for these vital truths, "there came out,—says Carlyle, in his quaint way,—what we call the *glorious* Revolution, Habeas corpus act, True Parliaments, and much also!" "Alas—he adds—how many earnest, rugged Cromwells, Knoxes, poor peasant Covenanters, wrestling, battling for very life, in rough, miry places, have to struggle and suffer and fall greatly censured, *bemired*—before a beautiful Revolution of Eighty-eight can step over them in official pumps and silk stockings with universal three times three."* Honour then to whom honour is due. Great as were the failings and errors of the Puritans, they are not to be named in comparison with the magnitude of their services in the cause of freedom and religion. We hold it to be foul injustice to their memory to say, as Mr. Macaulay does, that in the day of their power they proved themselves as intolerant and as meddling as Laud; and that because Puritan stone-masons attempted "to make Nymphs and Graces, the work of Ionian chisels decent," and Puritan legislators passed sharp laws against betting, adultery, masques, boxing-matches, and bear-baiting, the savage and faithless cruelties inflicted on them by the restored Cavaliers were not only "natural but excusable." He will not even allow the Puritan the credit of having been actuated by good motives when he enacted laws against "the lighter vices;" he was induced to make adultery a misdemeanor, not so much by his love of virtue as his hatred of pleasure; he denounced bear-baiting not out of compassion for the sufferings of dumb animals, but simply to deprive the spectators of their sport; he shut up the theatre not because it was demoralizing, but only on account of its being a place of amusement. And in confirmation of these statements he quotes a passage from the Diurnal, in which it is mentioned that Col. Pride, once coming into a town where a bear-bait was in progress, dispersed the crowd and ordered the bears to be killed. Now this, we are constrained to say, is worse than trifling. Mr. Macaulay not only assumes the delicate office of a judge of human motives, but he pro-

* Hero-worship, p. 131.

nounces a sentence the very opposite of that which the religious character of the Puritans, and the manifest aim of these laws would dictate. Whether they were wise or unwise, well-fitted or ill-fitted to attain their end, is a question admitting of debate: but no reasonable and candid man can hesitate to own that these laws were enacted with the view of introducing a higher and purer social morality; of putting an end to popular amusements whose exclusive tendency and inevitable effect is to degrade human beings to the level of brutes. Precisely similar laws have been passed by our own legislatures, within the last twenty years, and are at this moment in force.

In thus stating our objections to the work before us, we have dwelt particularly on those portions of it which relate to the Puritans, because we regard them as the most defective and unsatisfactory. It would be quite superfluous for us to say, that we venerate the memory of the Puritans, for their sufferings and services in the cause of God and humanity. No intelligent and candid man can doubt that they were the early heralds of those principles of religious and civil freedom, which are now incorporated with the constitutions of Britain and the United States; that they planted the tree of liberty beneath whose goodly shade we sit: and when we heard that Mr. Macaulay was engaged on a history of England, we expected that tardy but ample justice would be done them; we expected that in his volumes, his readers would find a clear and faithful account of the origin of the party, of their divisions, of their errors and mistakes, and the nature and extent of the debt which Britain owes them. For such a narrative we look in vain. While this is in our judgment the most serious defect, it is not, however, the only point in regard to which the historian is open to censure. With all his rare gifts and attainments (and there is hardly a branch of literature or science with which he does not betray some acquaintance), Mr. Macaulay is not, in the highest sense of the terms, either a philosopher or a reasoner. Soon after he entered on his literary career, Sir James Macintosh appended a note to his History of Ethical Philosophy (in which he quotes and comments on one of Mr. M.'s reviews), which seems to have been added to his work for no other reason than just to give him an opportunity of delicately cautioning his

friend to restrain his fondness for saying things in a striking way, and to guard against a disposition to substitute glittering rhetoric for plain and solid logic. The venerable man expresses, at the same time, the confident hope that "the admirable writer who at an early age has mastered every species of composition, will doubtless hold fast to simplicity." If the limits of this article permitted, we could adduce not a few passages from Mr. Macaulay's Miscellanies and his History, to prove that this complimentary expectation has not been realized to so large an extent as could be desired. When we closely examine his brilliant antithesis and rounded periods, we discover, in not a few cases, that what seems to be profound philosophy or elegant reasoning is really nothing but a bold truism or sheer sophistry. The popularity of a history, and we have no doubt that these volumes will long be popular, is a very uncertain test of its intrinsic value. Rapin has written a far more truthful history of England, than Hume; yet the latter, with all his notorious unfairness and offensive toryism, has gone through edition after edition, and even at this present time is in great demand, while honest Rapin sleeps upon the dusty shelf. The basis of Hume's popularity is rhetorical art, rather than historical research; he tells his story with so much grace, that we read it with delight, even when we have good reason to be suspicious of its truth and fairness. Of course we do not mean to put Hume and Macaulay in precisely the same category; the latter has unquestionably the highest claims to popularity. Equal if not superior to Hume as a mere writer, he has what Hume had not, a mind saturated with political and literary knowledge; he has ransacked repositories of information all covered with the dust of time; he has trodden the most retired lanes as well as the common roads in the domain of letters. In a word, he has adorned his story of the past with those refined charms which mark the highest forms of modern literature, and has told it with all that dramatic power which might be expected only in one who, having mingled in the scenes, narrates to us what he had himself seen and done.

## ART. VI.—*Cheap Presbyterian Newspaper.**

THE subject of a cheap weekly paper, to be issued under the authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, had occasionally been the subject of conversation in private circles, but had not till lately occupied much of the attention of our ecclesiastical judicatories. It is now, however, likely to receive some consideration: having been brought before the Assembly at its late meeting in Pittsburg, by the Presbytery of Huntingdon in the following

MEMORIAL.

"To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, to meet in Pittsburg:

"Extract from the minutes of the Presbytery of Huntingdon, at their sessions in Williamsburg, April 11, 1849.

"Whereas, the power of the Periodical Press is immense, and should be employed fully and judiciously in advancing the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: and especially should a good Presbyterian paper weekly visit every family connected with our church:

"And whereas, our ablest religious weeklies are held at a rate which multitudes of our people deem beyond their means. Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That a committee be appointed to memorialize the next General Assembly on this subject."

"DEAR BRETHREN—In accordance with the above recited action of our Presbytery we address to you a few remarks on the very important subject to which allusion is here made.

"The importance of a religious paper is unspeakably great. Its influence is beyond calculation. It visits, or should visit every family. It forms, guides, or modifies religious sentiment wherever it goes. It incites, directs, or suppresses religious feeling. It

* Respect for a large number of brethren, who desire some record of their opinions on this subject, leads us to give insertion to the following article; our judgment remaining unchanged as to the several points on which we have declared ourselves. See our volume for 1849, page 451. A large part of the excellent matter contained in the argument here published is worthy of all attention; but it is common to those who hold both opinions as to a cheap paper.

affects human conduct. It is intimately connected with the happiness of this life, and with the bliss of immortality. Its influence upon our pastors and elders is immense; upon parents and other adults it is perhaps still greater; and upon children and youth it is beyond estimation. It is hence an engine which the church should employ; and which she must employ, or she will perish; and employing which aright, she will spread and triumph. It should be an object of the deepest interest to put a weekly religious paper of the very best kind into every family. And to accomplish this end, religious communities in their organized capacities must exert an encouraging and directing influence. We would just as wisely leave Christian education, and theological learning, and missionary enterprise to individual efforts and to unassociated feelings, as to leave the periodical press destitute of our congregated influence.

"We can anticipate many difficulties in the way of the General Assembly's efficient action, but we hope that the Assembly's wisdom and zeal will triumph over all obstacles. When a subject of such importance is presented for consideration, difficulties in the way of its attainment should but incite to more determined action.

"Our desire is that a good weekly religious paper shall be furnished on such terms of cheapness, as will place it within the means of every family. It is a very general complaint that our religious papers are put at too high a price. For this reason many are unable to obtain them. And many more, though able, are not willing to give the amount asked.

"We would not diminish the cost of the paper by making it less readable. We would have the quality of the material used and the fairness of the mechanical execution, equal to the best, Nor would we reduce the price by diminishing the intrinsic value of the matter. Let the editorial department embrace the very first talent in the church; and talent concentrated with undivided attention to the one business.

"The cheapness of some of the miscellaneous weeklies, and of some of the organs of our societies, may not be considered as proper criteria by which to fix the price of our paper. We then refer to the American Spectator as an approximating example. That paper is intended to sustain itself. Its material and execution are of the best character. And it is mailed to ordinary

subscribers at one dollar and fifty cents, and to clergymen at a dollar. Now, if such a paper, independent of church communion, can be sustained at these rates, it seems to us that the General Assembly could elicit sufficient enterprise and talent, when stimulated by the patronage of the Presbyterian church, to establish and carry on just such a paper as is needed, and on terms which would be acceptable.

"Brethren, we would be importunate, for we plead the necessities and the spiritual interests of thousands, and tens of thousands. We urge the obligation which rests upon the church rightly to use this weapon of strength, and duly to furnish the needful aliment to myriads of inquiring minds. Surely every family should have a newspaper. And very many families think they must have one. But while they can have a large paper, in good style, with much and varied reading, for one dollar, they are not likely to give two and a half dollars. The papers being equally large, and their appearance equally good, the price decides the choice. Thus such papers issue their thirty thousand, or their fifty thousand, while our religious papers may not attain their three or their five thousand. Shall we not hence learn wisdom? And shall not our sympathies be awaked? And shall we not endeavour to fill an enlarging sphere of usefulness? The times impel us onward. To meet the necessities of our people and to spread the influence of the gospel, we must have a good paper at a low rate. This we must furnish, or our church fails in its duty, and will suffer exceedingly.

"And such a paper we must still think could be so furnished. The fact that large miscellaneous journals, and having but few advertisements, are supplied to clubs at seventy-five cents, is worthy of notice. Surely paper can be bought, and types set, and press work done for religious matter as readily and as cheaply as for any other. But suppose that for those journals the whole of the type were borrowed already set, as probably much of it is, still the publication proves that the materials, press-work, folding, house-rent, management, &c., must cost less, than one and a half cents for each paper, and thus leads to the idea that, with a very large subscription and prompt payment, the compositor and the editor could be fairly compensated, and the paper be published at two cents a number, or one dollar a

year. The case of the American Spectator before alluded to, strengthens the idea. And the case of the leading journal of the Methodist church, published at one and a fourth dollars, and issuing many thousand copies, still increases our confidence that the thing is practicable. And the necessity of such a paper, so furnished, is so imperative that we cannot but hope the Assembly will give it their serious consideration.

"The arrangement might possibly be made with the *Presbyterian* for a commencement; or with the *Treasury;* or with both. Their combined subscription would give an excellent beginning. Or some other of our Presbyterian papers might form the nucleus. If the price were put at $1.25 or even $1.50, we would have made a very important improvement. But we need a dollar paper, respectable in its appearance and ably edited, and hence a paper easily paid for, and of intrinsic value. And if such a paper could not possibly be so afforded by a subscription list, there should then be a fund raised for the permanent sustenance of an editor or of an editorial corps. Such would be one of the noblest charities which could receive the benefactions of the liberal; and such a paper containing, as it surely would, a judicious summary of Missionary intelligence, and breathing the spirit of piety, visiting weekly fifty thousand families, and instructing two hundred thousand readers, would do more for our Boards, and for all the interests of religion, than can now be estimated.

"With this brief and imperfect expression of our views, we submit the subject to the wisdom of the Assembly, and commend it to the divine favour.

"On behalf of Presbytery,

DAVID M'KINNEY,
G. W. THOMPSON,
J. B. RIDDLE. } Committee."

The memorial found the Assembly unprepared for immediate and definite action. The importance of the subject was acknowledged, but it was new to many. To have pressed it then would have been hasty, and might have endangered the enterprise. Its friends hence yielded to the suggestion that it be laid over for one year. This would allow time for investigation, and for a comparison of opinions; and the next Assembly, convening with the subject in view, would be prepared to express more

certainly the wishes of the church, and more wisely to adopt measures for carrying her will into execution. To this end the whole subject was entrusted to a committee to report thereon next year. This commitment however does not impose silence on the friends of the measure. It rather invites them to speak. They, as well as its opponents, have a right to be heard. Reasons and plans should be suggested and discussed. Thus only shall the attention of the church be duly awakened, and her wants and desires become properly known. Immense interests are involved in the proposition, and hence much and serious consideration is required. On such a question we can readily conceive that Christian men may, at least for a time, take different sides. It is so with regard to every new movement in the things of religion. It was so on the suggestion of a Theological Seminary. And also at the organization of some of our Boards. But these all, as the result of investigation, received favour sufficient to bring them into existence: and now, as the result of experience, they receive merited and almost universal approbation. Possibly such may be the result with the proposed application of the power of the periodical press. A serious and candid examination of the subject is certainly demanded. The expression of opinion is free and full, and especially on the part of its friends. These should speak, even in advance of others. They should communicate the results of their inquiries, and the foundations of their convictions. Hitherto they have been almost silent. Even their memorial has not been, till now, published. Thus far the existing religious press has generally spoken unfavourably toward the enterprise: and may have forestalled public opinion. It is hoped however, that the church has still a willing ear for what her friends may tender as connected with her best interests and urgent duties. She will examine with candour and decide in the light of truth. So far as we have yet ascertained the leadings of public sentiment, we have found that our brethren who occupy country charges are the most ardent friends of the undertaking. They see and feel the necessity of such a periodical, and the blessed influence it might exert. They have proved its practicability, and would make a serious effort to effect its accomplishment. Other brethren may see and feel as they do, when they shall have become properly acquainted with their facts and reasonings.

The importance of a religious periodical of the very first character, paying its weekly visits to forty thousand, or fifty thousand families, and giving the very instruction which is needed, to two hundred or three hundred thousand human beings, all on their way to immortality—some just sitting out on their journey, others already bearing the responsibilities of life's duties while they travel, and others just finishing their preparation for entering their eternal state—the importance of such a paper is not over-estimated in the memorial. The Presbytery might have dwelt much more largely on this part of their subject. The influence to be exerted by such a messenger is incalculable. So far as our own church and our own country are concerned, no one of our Theological Seminaries, and no one of our Ecclesiastical Boards is likely to go before it in efficiency. They who shall succeed in getting it up and in making it *what it should be*, will have accomplished a work at which myriads shall rejoice—shall rejoice as men, as parents, and as Christians—shall rejoice on earth, and rejoice in heaven. Its constant access, its punctual visits, its friendly address, the confidence it would inspire; its vivacity, its pious anecdote, its faithful admonitions, its solemn warnings, its kind calls, its sweet persuasion, its varied instruction, its heavenly spirit, its affectionate importunity—its whole adaptation to the wants of human souls, would give it an influence for good which would be inexpressible.

But the very power of the paper is a thought which startles many a sober minded Christian. We may well startle at it; but we must not hence reject its use. It is the very instrument which Providence tenders us, to be by us used in our own Master's service. It is the very weapon needed in the times in which we live, and in the field of action which we occupy. Men of the world do not decline an instrument because of its great power. For this reason they the rather seize it. It will the more effectually subserve their purpose. The power of steam, and of electricity, and of the daily press, and of the floods of cheap literature, is immense. But men do not decline these things. These are all applied to human purposes: and they are sometimes used against religion. And if the church would maintain her position and advance her destiny, she must use weapons of strength. Let her not shrink

from her responsibilities. Let her use the instrumentalities of power. She needs them. Her work is worthy of them. But let her use them with wisdom, and skill, and prudence. Let her sanctify them by the word of God and prayer, and they will be as safe as they are powerful.

The period in which we live is an age of progress. A decade now comprises the advancements of a century in former times. In such a period the church must not stand still. Nor yet go on crutches. She must not lag behind the times. It is not her prerogative in every thing to lead, it is at least her privilege to follow closely in the line of improvements, and to embrace and use every new thing which can subserve the end of her institution. She did so in the days of her reviving. She was among the first to use the art of printing. It was a power, immense, overwhelming, resistless. Christians did not war against it. The church did not reject its aid. She adopted it. She sanctified it. She promptly applied it to the word of God—to the multiplying and cheapening of Bibles. She was wise in this. Rejecting it she must have perished. Adopting and using it she lived and flourished. When afterwards infidel ingenuity and zeal discovered a new mode of applying the power of the press, and sent forth by thousands their poisonous missiles in the form of Tracts; Christian wakefulness and fidelity caught the idea, and issued their myriads of similar messengers, but freighted with priceless treasures. In these instances the church acted with wisdom and promptitude. So let her always act. She must so act if she would love and feel her mission to human kind. She must seize upon every improvement and sanctify it, and use it. Whatever can increase her influence is hers by the testament and benediction of her Lord. Whatever can edify her children, or attach her friends, or attract the perishing multitudes, or in any way promote her interests or extend her efficiency she may justly appropriate. Her increase and triumph is the manifestation of her master's glory; and he has given her as her right, every instrumentality which can be used to convey knowledge to the human mind, or to affect the heart and direct the conduct of men.

Cheap literature is one of those instrumentalities. It has been discovered by the worldly. It is used by the enemies of religion. It is applied by them with an influence overwhelm-

ingly destructive. In the forms of the book, the pamphlet, and the tract it was pernicious. In these forms we have met it with an antidote. Tract Societies, the Sunday School Union, and the Board of Publication issue and circulate a literature which is at once attractive, cheap, and wholesome, and which is so diffused as to be easily accessible. But, of late years, cheap literature has assumed the form of weeklies; and in this form has become tenfold more powerful for evil. Myriads of these sheets are circulated. They are put at a price extremely low; and yet the extent of their circulation and the promptitude of payments which they command, give their proprietors a sustenance. Yea they are sources of gain. They are large, of good material, tastefully got up, embellished, embracing a great variety of matter, lively, fascinating, containing some things very good, carrying news which every family should possess—but not pure, not healthful, injurious in their tendency; tainted with moral poison. Their tales, jests, and sneers, pollute the reader's mind.

Now this kind of cheap literature must be met. It must be supplanted, or an antidote must be provided. If the world has made the discovery, we must appropriate it to purposes of good. If the world has forged a weapon of power, we must wrest it from the hands of wickedness and sanctify it to the use of our Lord. Such is our duty. We then must have a weekly; equally large, cheap, excellent. Yea, it should be superior, in quality of material, in taste, in vivacity, and in supplying the ordinary wants of a family; and with the addition of purity and excellence.

Such a paper is thought to be practicable; but it is yet a desideratum. True, we have weekly religious papers, numerous and good, but none precisely adapted to the general wants of our church. They are all entirely too expensive. Hence they are not extensively patronized. The cost excludes them effectually from many families. We may agree that the cost should not exclude them—they are really worth the money: better deprive yourself of a meal a day than of your religious reading—we may pile reason upon reason. But the fact will still remain; the cost does exclude them. Some cannot pay because they are poor; and others will not pay because they are opposed to giving more for a thing than the proper cost of production. They think the high price an imposition. Hence the fact

is that the high price does, very extensively, exclude the paper. It is folly to war against this fact. It will be a fact still after all our arguments. Let us then at once adapt ourselves to its existence.

Those pernicious papers must be removed from our families. But how remove them? Not by authority, nor by declamation, not yet by reasoning. We must supplant them. And how can we supplant them? Only by offering a good paper in their stead—a paper having prima facie attractions, equally cheap and at the same time possessing real excellencies. With such a paper our pastors, elders, and colporteurs could speedily supplant thousands of bad papers; and when they could not supplant, they might furnish the antidote.

Shall then the church adopt this form of cheap literature? She promptly adopted the art of printing on its discovery, and applied it to the circulation of the Bible. She took up the plan of issuing Tracts, and spread them by millions. She met the floods of cheap books by the action of her Societies and Boards. Shall the novelist, and the writer of tales, and the witling, and the jester, and the actor pay their weekly visits to our families while the messages of wisdom, and love, and mercy are excluded? And shall the assessment of a few extra dollars upon our religious papers be the influence which bars the door against their entrance? It must not be so. The enemies of religion, and the men of the world must not retain the sole use of the cheap weekly. The church surely has quickness of perception sufficient to see that it is to her an indispensable; and she has an energy to seize it, and skill to conduct it. She is awaking from her slumbers, and she has yet faithful sons. Her Board of Publication has taught her that she can buy paper, and print it, and do all other work as elegantly and as cheaply as the same can be done by any other agency.

It was said by one who possessed much knowledge of human nature, "Let me make all the ballads for a nation, and I care not who make the laws." At that time ballads were the popular literature—the cheap literature of a nation. But the day of ballads has given place to the day of newspapers. Now every family must have its paper. Children, servants, labourers must read, as well as politicians and men of science. Hence they derive the subjects of their conversation—the very elements of

their thought. They find here their amusement. They consult for their interests. The newspaper is their daily reading, their evening joy, and their Sabbath occupation. One might now well say, let me furnish all the papers, and I care not who occupy our legislative and our judgment halls. These must all bow to popular sentiment—must subserve public feeling. I care not who shall issue the ponderous tomes. They must be adapted to the common appetite, or they will occupy a dusty shelf. I care not who shall fill our pulpits. They must minister to the public taste, or they will preach to empty seats. Even the little Tract must conform to the sentiment instilled by the periodicals, or it will, for the most part, be a silent messenger; unread, neglected, its precious truths unexamined and unappreciated.

Our periodicals are now the media of influence. They form and mould the community. Who then shall control this plastic power? Shall it be the infidel? or the worldling? or the Christian? Happily the press is free to all. Whosoever will may use it. Energy, and enterprise, and zeal will here distinguish their possessors. Shall then the church decline this means of power? Or, while other branches of the church use it, shall Presbyterians decline it? We would thereby prove recreant to the trust committed to us. We would neglect one of the most important means of usefulness with which our hands are furnished. We must use it, or we shall become feeble and perish. We must use it, or we fail to propagate the religion which we profess. We must use it in its most effective forms, or we come short of the full measure of our duty.

But, it is said, we do use the press: we publish many and good papers: our ministers edit them and our church courts recommend them. All true. But who read them? This is the point. Are they in a single family beyond those of our steady members? Are they in one third of the families belonging to our church? Do we then furnish the *ballads* even for our own people? Is public sentiment formed by the Presbyterian press? Or do we contribute our share to the forming of public sentiment? The thing must be impossible, while we fail to reach the fountain head—the family circle, the fire side, the mass of the community. To exert our proper influence we must so use the press as effectually to reach the common mind. We must not, by an impracticable price fixed upon our journals,

bar the door of access against the myriads who would naturally look to us for the light of knowledge; and receive at our hands the elements of their character. The day was when evangelical Christians had the lead, not only in religion and in moral sentiment, but also in schools and colleges, and in most literary enterprises. And Presbyterians then stood pre-eminent among their fellow labourers. But now, evangelism has lost immensely in all those departments; and Presbyterians are rapidly declining from the station they then occupied. True, we have been growing, but our growth has been too slow. We have not grown with our country's growth. Others have advanced more rapidly. Thus we occupy a lower grade than we once did, in the scale of influence. If the advancing influences around us were all evangelical, we might still console ourselves with the reflection that the gospel was gaining. But, as intimated, while other Christians are outstripping us, there are influences not Christian, but inimical to Christianity, gaining upon them. And why should Christians be outdone? They should be immeasurably in the advance when the human mind is to be influenced. And why should Presbyterians yield to any in the paths of usefulness? If others travel with rail-road speed, must we still cling to the stage-coach? If they speak by electricity, must we await the tardy progress of the mail? Have we not the Lord's truth in charge, and shall we fail to spread it? And have we not human souls in charge, and shall we fail to reach them? Is not the truth mighty? Why then, possessing this weapon, and having the whole land before us, are we declining in the scale of influence? It must certainly be because we fail duly to use the means of progress. We do not cause our light to shine with sufficient brilliancy, nor to a sufficient extent. It should penetrate every cabin. It should reach every mind. It should illumine every dark spot throughout the land. We have yet schools, colleges, seminaries, Boards, presses, and periodicals. Why then do we not grow—grow as rapidly as others—grow by natural increase, and by accretion? It must be because we fail duly to reach the common mind. Our churches have but few accessions from the world, and we do not retain all our own. Some of our members every year go off to other churches, and many of them return to the world. And then our children—born in the church—nurtured in our families—where are they?

Not found, one and all, in the church's bosom, her youthful members and devoted labourers! But gone and going, thousands of them, to other communions, or apostatizing to the world! Alas! there is fault somewhere. There is evidently a remissness on our part. Divine truth is not duly brought in contact with the mind; for truth is mighty, and God's promise is good. If the desired result is not attained it must be because either the means are not duly used, or there are countervailing influences. We must then arouse. This is no time for lethargic quietude.

"In former times the Bible was mainly the reading book in schools and families. Associated with it in schools, were the catechism and a few books of moral sentiments; and in families a few books of sermons and practical religion. Our weekly sheets were then but few, and they were newspapers. What we now call literary papers—that is, tales, novels, fancy sketches, &c., in the form of newspapers, were then scarcely known in common life. Our people then were generally shut up to the necessity of reading something which was really good. But now how different! The land is flooded with light reading. The Bible is mostly a neglected book, both in schools and in families. Sermons and thoughtful treatises on religion occupy the shelf. The newspaper is now the resort; and here, in immense sheets, embellished and made attractive, the mind is amused with things imaginative, frivolous, fascinating, with things extravagant, mixed, drugged, tainted with licentiousness. When such periodicals furnish the aliment for the common mind, society must become polluted, and children must grow up corrupted. It is hard for the tract, the Sabbath school, and the pulpit when all combined, to resist such influences. But few of those who grow in such circumstances, will embrace evangelical religion: and very few of them will become Presbyterians. The purity of Christianity is repulsive to hearts so tainted. The system of truth which we teach requires too much of thought, of industry, self-denial, cultivation of intellect, and government of feelings, to be embraced by minds so trained. Those corrupting influences must then be removed. And to remove them we must go to the fountain head. The family reading must be changed. This is indispensable. But how shall this be done? We are attempting it by books, cheap, ex-

cellent, attractive. This is all well. But it is not enough. We have tried it. It is good, but it has not cured the evil; and cannot cure it. Families will have a newspaper. And they will read it, and many of them have leisure to read not much else. They should have a paper, and it should be of the right kind. Our readers will not here suppose that we urge a cheap paper, though of the very best kind, as the panacea for all the ills to which we have alluded. We speak of it as one of the remedies. It will not be a substitute for preaching, nor for books, nor for parental government. But to all these it will be a powerful auxiliary. And it is a power within our reach. Our Church can have it if she will.

The question then is, shall we furnish the needed paper? At least shall we furnish it so far as those are concerned who look to us for moral and religious aliment? We say, yes, without hesitation. And we trust that the church also will respond with energy. Necessity is laid upon her. She would as wisely blot out her Board of Education, and trust to private enterprise for her supply of ministers, as refuse to establish the paper of which we speak; still trusting to individual efforts to furnish the weekly reading for all her members. We must then supplant the present teeming weeklies by one immensely better: or we must place a better by their side. And this throughout our wide domain. We strive to educate for the ministry every young man of piety and talents who will give himself to our Master's work. Wherever there is a highway in our extended empire, we endeavour to have it trodden by the domestic missionary. In these things we do well. But there is a door of usefulness still open, and inviting our entrance. Let us then resolve to furnish a journal of such a character and at such a rate, that wherever there is a mail transported, it shall carry a weekly message of precious, formative, nourishing, and perpetuating truth to every Presbyterian family.

### The Right Kind of Paper.

The better paper which we shall offer must be one possessing not only superior intrinsic excellence, but, as has been noticed, it must be attractive. It must have an excellence which shall be visible. The casket must prepare the way and gain access for the jewel. Those who know the jewel's worth would

search for it, though it were in the mire. But even they do not choose to keep it there. They will enshrine it, and show it with becoming decorations. But those who are ignorant of its worth will neither wade nor dig for it. Its encasements must allure them to its acquaintance and possession. Hence, as stated, we must have regard to the size of our paper, quality of material, embellishments, style of execution, &c. These excellencies are manifest on first inspection; and thus, with cheapness, will give it access. And when it has access, it must be found to be a real treasure. Its intrinsic worth must then make it a favourite. Thus it will keep its place, and accomplish the good for which it was intended.

Many things in reference to our journal must of necessity be left to the editor's own judgment and taste. He, agreeing with the Assembly in general sentiment, would conduct it in his own way, throwing into it his whole soul. Interest awakens interest. Feeling begets feeling. The editor must be a freeman; and a freeman of right sentiment and of full capability. The paper should possess the common form and features of our weekly sheets. It must be truly a religious paper; and really a newspaper. It should embrace a lively sketch of secular news, foreign and domestic; sufficient to keep its readers acquainted with their country's and the world's passing history. Without this it would not supply family wants, and could not have an extensive circulation; and especially it could not find its place in the thousands of families we wish to reach. It should also have something of incident and anecdote; of science, art, and agriculture. The third and fourth pages of the *Presbyterian* present something of an example of what a page or two might be; and the *Treasury* and the *American Messenger* might be referred to as specimens of another large portion of its contents. Missionary intelligence and the doings of our Boards would appropriately occupy one or two columns. And three or four columns of advertisements of general interest would aid in sustaining it, and would not render it unacceptable. The type also should be large and fair. There should be no effort to crowd into it a very large amount of reading matter; because often the more you present in a paper, the less of it is read.

The paper should contain just the information and instruction which is adapted to the wants, feelings, and interests of

families in common life; because it must be to common minds almost the main vehicle of knowledge and influence. Very many families take but one paper. Let this then be the very paper which they need. Many other families take their county paper for local news, and a weekly of more pretensions for general reading. Let this be the paper which will supply their wants. When the paper shall be thus adapted to families in common life, containing just what every one should know; it will then be adapted to all the youth and all the labourers in the land; and to females in every station; and to the ordinary necessities of men in every sphere. Politicians, theologians, and men of science will then find it to contain things of which they should not be ignorant; and they can add from other sources whatever they may desire. Our paper then would furnish the wholesome aliment which all need, served up with attractive variety and with sufficient taste. Men of wealth, and leisure and learning would increase the supply according to their wants and appetites.

While then our paper will be adapted to Christians, and to all who are to be made Christians, the adaptation must be such as to give it access and favour. It must have variety, sprightliness and vivacity. It must make itself a welcome visiter, and become a denizen. Such it cannot be made by ecclesiastical and ministerial recommendations. These will be an introduction. They will afford a favourable commencement to an acquaintance, but its own character must domiciliate it. What this character shall be, we must ascertain, not by abstract reasoning on what man should be, but by examining into the fact and ascertaining what man is. Then may we make our approaches so as to reach his mind, elicit interest, gain confidence, secure affection, and influence him to his good.

### THE PRICE.

The charge for our paper should by no means exceed a dollar. This is the money unit. It will defray the expense of a paper in every way respectable. What we need is enterprise. The principal paper of the Methodist Church is published at $1.25, but here there is a considerable margin left for delays and losses. Some of the large and elegant weeklies are furnished to clubs at a dollar, with a gratuity to the agent; and some at a price still less. We would go to the same market for both ma-

terials and labour, to which others go; and we will be furnished as cheaply: and men will rejoice in the opportunity to supply us. Prompt payment will make us welcome in the market. And prompt payment must be our undeviating rule. And to enable us to observe this rule we must keep ourselves in funds. Hence pre-payment to us must be a sine qua non. It must be entirely a cash transaction. We make no allowances for delays; nor for bad debts; for there must be no debts contracted. It is a fraud upon honest and prompt men to make them pay two prices for a thing, because others are dilatory or dishonest. Pre-payment puts men on an equality, and enables a publisher to supply his subscribers at the cost of production.

An estimate for a seven column paper (the size of the Episcopal Recorder, but of superior material) would be as follows, for an issue of forty thousand copies.

| | Weekly. | Yearly. |
|---|---|---|
| Paper, 88 reams, at $4 50, | $399 00 | $20 502 00 |
| Composition, 100,000 ems, at 37½, | 37 50 | 1,950 00 |
| Press-work, 320 tokens, at 45, | 144 00 | 7,488 00 |
| | $577 50 | $30,030 00 |
| Editor, | | 1,800 00 |
| Envelopes and mailing, | | 900 00 |
| Office rent, | | 300 00 |
| Postages, (These should be paid), | | 200 00 |
| Discount, (There should be none), | | 300 00 |
| Fuel, light, stationery, &c., | | 500 00 |
| Editorial aid, | | 500 00 |
| Book-keeper, | | 500 00 |
| | | $35,030 00 |

The composition would vary with the size of the type, notices retained, &c. The incidentals would vary with the economy of the management. If but 10,000 copies were issued, the cost would be about $1.32. If 20,000, it would be $1.03. If 30,000, it would be 93 cents. If 40,000, as above, it would be 88 cents. If paper worth $5 a ream were used, and an additional $500 appropriated for editorial aid, the paper would still be within the dollar, and it would rank among the most excellent. If it

were thought expedient to have an eight column paper (such as the Presbyterian) and if the increased space were appropriated to advertisements; these would reduce the expense. And so of any increase of size. And if the Boards would drop their periodicals, and each occupy its column or two, once a month, they would find it vastly to their benefit. They would address then the whole church; and their addresses would be read. The people would be much better informed, and hence their contribution would be larger. And the expense of the present periodicals of the Boards would be saved; and, if needful, might be appropriated as aid in sustaining the weekly which we now advocate. Those who conduct the Boards would however be the proper judges of all this. But the item of editorial aid we would commend to favourable notice. No one man, with all his time and talents, and devotedness of soul could supply such messages weekly, as should occupy so much of the attention of the myriads whom the paper would visit, and in whom it would be so much the formative and guiding influence. All such matters, however, as before intimated, we would leave with the editor, under a few general directions, and responsible to the Assembly. On this part of our subject the main ideas are, a superior paper and a limited price; and, to accomplish these, a large subscription and pre-payment.

The ability of the Church to conduct the enterprise cannot be doubted. Her wealth, her talent, her numbers, her organization are such that whatever she wills, in this line, she can execute. The paper, as we have shown, can be published at a price greatly reduced from what is customary, and yet sustain itself. Or if we should think it desirable to have a periodical whose size, materials, and style of execution would exceed the price suggested, the excess of cost might be provided against by general collections, or by the establishment of a fund. Only convince the Church that the enterprise is one of real value and she will furnish the means to carry it into operation. Individuals might see it to be their duty and their privilege to be as liberal toward the paper as they have been toward the other schemes of the Church. It is highly probable that we have benevolent and wealthy members, who would at once supply a fund adequate to the sustenance of the ablest editorial corps; provided only that they had full confidence in the zeal and

energy of all our ministers and church sessions. Let but this confidence be inspired, that all our officers in their parochial capacity will duly attend to the multiplying of subscriptions, and the collecting and forwarding the money with promptitude, and the enterprise will advance. The paper will speedily start into being, and it will flourish. What we need to inspire this confidence is a new zeal—a zeal, pure, unquenchable, sustained by principle, fanned by love, and directed by wisdom. Let our parochial officers, one and all, become fully possessed of the idea that the great business for which they live and breathe, is to save men and serve their Lord, and things will at once assume a new aspect. There will be mutual confidence; harmonious action in great measures; and co-operation where associated energy is needed. Means then will flow in from myriads of rills, and gush forth from numerous overflowing fountains. No overpowering instrumentality of human salvation will then be withheld from the Master's use. As for our present enterprise, its practicability will then be at once apparent, and the execution will not be tardy.

### Plan.

Let the Assembly vote the establishment of the paper, and elect an editor of approved capabilities. Let his salary be liberal, that his whole time and energies may be devoted to the duties of his office. Let the instructions be general, and give him the aid which may be needful.

Let the Assembly appoint the pastor and session of each particular church in our connexion, an agency for the paper; with instructions to obtain subscribers, and forward the money with the names, always, and promptly in advance; assured that for every dollar sent, a paper shall be regularly mailed to the name and office as requested. There are twenty-five hundred churches in our connexion. These at the low average of twenty subscribers each, would raise a list of fifty thousand. This average, by an effort adequate to the importance of the object, would be readily attained. Surely we may depend upon our pastors, and elders, and deacons for a ready service in this labour of love. It is zeal, union, and promptitude which are to accomplish our work. A cheap paper is to be had in the same way in which a wise community have cheap preaching. They

will have none but the best; and they will well sustain the labourer. And to effect this they will congregate in sufficient numbers to prevent the burden from being oppressive. A hundred or a thousand can hear the same message with equal ease and equal profit. And a burden which would crush one man is easily borne by ten. They know also that every new helper they obtain, will himself receive the greatest benefit from his contribution.

As a beginning, and to make up for a deficiency of subscribers during the first year, and for any other contingency, let the Assembly direct that a special collection shall be made in all the churches for this object. Some would probably decline or neglect, but enough would act. This collection might be repeated the second year if needful.

If the Assembly should think that the dollar is not likely to furnish and sustain so good a paper as we need, let measures be instituted to raise a permanent fund.

The treasurer of the Trustees of the Assembly might be the depository of all moneys raised. Or there might be a Committee, or a Board. Or the paper might be connected with one of the existing Boards, as to its fiscal concerns. We do not present our plan as faultless. All plans and calculations in this incipient stage of our investigation must almost necessarily be imperfect. Our intention has been, in these things, to show that the enterprise is practicable. We make a commencement of suggestions and figures upon which our friends may improve.

### OBJECTIONS.

The leading objection to the journal we would establish is its immense power—a "fourth estate" in the empire. This we have already noticed in part. The immense power resident in the press, when uttering cheap literature, is the very reason why we should use it, and why the church should enjoy its benefits. We wish to accomplish good: and the very greatest good; and to the utmost extent. Our Theological Seminaries wield an immense power; and our Boards of Missions, and of Publication, and of Education. But we do not wish hence to ostracize any of them. We need them all. We could not do without them. And we do not find them uncontrollable. They are not *alien* powers. They are of the church—a part of ourselves;

and we would increase their influence. So the paper will be of ourselves—an arm—and if it should prove to be a *right-arm* so much the better. We need such a member. The times demand it; and all the existing members will rejoice with it. The paper will be just what the church shall make it. It will be more immediately under her control than any Seminary, Board, or Agency which she has instituted. The editor will hold his station under the Assembly. Pastors and sessions will be the paper's agents. All its sayings, its character, its whole soul will be weekly exhibited to the church. Our Seminaries, Boards, quarterlies, and local weeklies (for such would still be needed in some localities, and wherever they are needed they would spring up;) all these would be on their watch towers. There would be no concealment, no duplicity, no stealing of hearts. It would be a severe reflection upon the intelligence and discrimination, the fidelity and piety of our officers and members, to intimate that in the interval of the Assembly's meetings, any editor could so gain upon them as to secure his continuance in the trust while he was in the abuse of its power. Such an idea is not to be entertained. Presbyterians are too familiar with the Bible, and have too much independence of thought and feeling for any man, however great, to undermine their principles or steal their heart from their Master's truth. The editor would be installed in his seat of influence only to abide the church's will, and the first indication of corrupt intentions would cause his displacement.

Another objection, urged with some degree of feeling, is that the contemplated paper would operate injuriously to existing interests. We have publishers who have laboured long and been highly useful, and who have property invested in their papers. We honour such brethren, and would gladly transfer them to a more extensive field of usefulness, and to higher rewards. But we cannot consent that our gratitude to them shall retard the church's progress. They, with others, helped her onward in the day of her need; but that is no reason why they should hold her back now in the day of her increasing need. They are her servants. They live for her. Their sustenance at the hands of our common employer, has been equal to that of other labourers. And they suffer no strange thing. It is a law of providence, that in all improvements, old things must go

into disuse and their proprietor must endure the loss. The individual suffers, but the public is a gainer. The use of railroads has almost ruined turnpike stock. Cotton-mills have almost annihilated spinning-wheels and hand-looms. The printing of the Bible, destroyed the business of the transcribers. Our Board of Publication took profitable trade out of the hands of many a bookseller. And if, under the enterprise we now advocate, some of our publishers should be obliged to change their employments, they would but come under the operations of a common law. As they have laboured for Zion's welfare, they will rejoice to see her extending glory, even though times and circumstances require her to modify or change the instrumentalities of her advancement. A change is now demanded, and we must urge it, though it may, in a few cases, affect individual interests. We urge it, because we believe it to be intimately connected with human salvation, and indispensable to the full measure of our church's glory. And if it should operate to the requiring of additional labours from any; or to the diminution of their means, let them remember that the church is entitled to sacrifices from all her sons.

The failure of some papers which have attempted a reduction of price, is urged as a reason why we should not attempt a cheap paper. We might however, assign reasons for failure, independent of cheapness. High priced papers also have failed. To sustain a paper it must have patronage. To this end it must have merit; and there must be payments. We hope to secure all these things on the plan we suggest. Individual enterprise could not secure them to the extent needed. We would as soon think of an individual getting up a Theological Seminary or a Missionary Board. And no individual nor combination of individuals should be permitted to control such a paper. Then truly it would be an instrument of power to be dreaded. We might well tremble at the thought of an irresponsible association reaching our families weekly, moulding their religious sentiment, and furnishing to them the very aliment of thought. But, while private enterprise could supply it; and while no irresponsible association should be entrusted with the power it would give, that power belongs to the church as her prerogative, and she should use it to her Master's glory. If our General Assembly then, will take hold of the matter in earnest; and if

our ministers, elders, and brethren will give it their hearts and their hands, we need entertain no apprehensions of failure.

It is urged by some that the church should not establish a paper. They would leave this matter entirely to individuals. The force of this objection we have not been able to appreciate. It seems like saying the church should not publish the gospel; for truly, as we hope, our paper would proclaim the glad tidings, proclaim them as purely as we hold Bible truth, and as extensively as our utmost limits, and in a manner most efficient. The church establishes schools, colleges, theological seminaries; she educates her sons, licenses them, and ordains them ministers of the word; she sends out missionaries; she publishes books; and why she should be restricted from preaching by a weekly press, it is not easy to conjecture.

We might notice other objections, and try to remove other difficulties; but it is time to close our remarks. The piety and wisdom, with the enterprise and liberality of our church, can remove every obstacle. Our people need only to have their attention duly directed. The importance of the object, its necessity, its capability of putting forth such an immense influence for good, must awaken feeling and lead to unity of counsel and promptitude in action. Then may the commencement of another year record it as a blissful fact, that the Presbyterian church is sending the glad tidings of salvation in weekly messages of love to tens of myriads who look to her for the knowledge of a Redeemer, and for guidance in the way of life.

---

Art. VII.—*Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome. Being Notes of Conversations held with certain Jesuits, on the subject of Religion in the city of Rome.* By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M. A. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff street. 1849. 12mo. pp. 237.

This small but entertaining volume is a record, as its title imports, of a series of conversations or discussions on the prominent articles of faith and practice in the Church of Rome. The time when they were held is studiously concealed, but in the

absence of all dates, we may approximate it with sufficient precision, from a comparison of several intimations scattered through the volume. We gather that they occurred during the pontificate of Gregory XVI. (by a most absurd typographical error printed "Gregory XII.," who died in 1417;) subsequent to the cholera in Rome, the publication of Tract No. 90, and Mr. Ward's Ideal of a Church, before the apostasy of Ward and Newman, and the Novena for the conversion of England; and at the commencement of the Ronge Schism. We are, therefore, authorized to determine the period in question as the latter part of the year 1844.

Mr. Seymour appears to have been a match for the Jesuits. In fact they were the most frank, unreserved and communicative of the two parties, while the astuteness and tactics were principally on the side of the Englishman. Not that we would accuse him of Jesuitry, but certainly, if his own notes may be depended on, he fairly outwitted his antagonists. In some quarters he has been accused of duplicity, but, we think, without reason. We must bear in mind the objects he had in view, the hazard he ran, and the unnatural and involuntary ambiguity of his position.

Mr. Seymour was a clergyman of the Anglican church, and naturally of an inquisitive and polemical turn. Having exhausted all the resources to which he had access at home upon the Romish question, he determined to repair to the fountain-head itself for more complete information. There are some of us who might deem this a very superfluous labour, as there is a judge of controversies always near at hand; but due allowances must be made for the prejudices of education and the influence of a hierarchical system, even among the evangelical party in the Church of England. Mr. Seymour was in easy circumstances, and had held preferment in the establishment. He spent some time in the city of Rome, diligently attending all the churches, and *assisting*, as the French have it, at every ordination, funeral, novitiate, festival and ceremony of consequence, to which he could gain access, and for which unusual facilities were afforded him by his Roman Catholic friends. The result of his observations he has published in a work entitled "A Pilgrimage to Rome."

The extraordinary assiduity in this occupation, with the

Pontifical in hand, attracted the attention of the ecclesiastics; and, after being sounded on the subject, he was visited at various times by distinguished individuals of the Order of Jesus, some of whom were deputed for the special purpose by no less a personage than the General of the Order. They easily fell into the error of supposing him to belong to that increasing party under the banners of Pusey and Newman, who were hankering after the vanities of Rome, and were already far advanced upon the Appian way, the *Via Media*, but who, for appearance sake, would not yield without some show of argument. To his disclaimers they evidently attached no more importance than to the complimentary courtesies of a tournament. Mr. Seymour was thus placed under a necessity of discussion, at the same time that he felt fully aware of the danger which might ensue from the free expression of his sentiments at the Papal Court. One of his visiters was a dignitary of great power and influence, a word from whom could procure his passports to be sent him with an order from the police to quit Rome. The Anglican Amos might have found in him another Amaziah, priest of Bethel, to counsel him, "O thou seer, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and prophesy there; but prophesy not again any more at Bethel; for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court." The fate of poor Dr. Achilli sufficiently evinces that the meridian of the Eternal City is not the safest for the promulgation of the truth.

Such are the circumstances under which these conversations are introduced to our notice; and we can easily understand the necessity which compelled Mr. Seymour to adopt a systematic wariness and caution, that furnish no unapt illustration of the wisdom of the serpent combined with the gentleness of the dove. We must do him the justice to say, that so far from practising any unworthy concealment, he made at the very opening the most distinct and unequivocal avowal of his cordial attachment to his own communion, and repelled the idea of his desiring a change.

"I dealt with all frankness with these several gentlemen, as to the object of their visit. . . . I was very careful to undeceive them, stating that I should be most happy to confer with them on the differences between the two churches, but that I could not do so under a false colour; that I was devotedly

attached in judgment and in feeling to the Church of England; that I looked on her as the Church of God in England, and the most pure, most apostolic, most scriptural of all the churches of Christendom; that, without unchurching other churches, she was still the church of my judgment and of my affections; and that I had never for a moment harboured the thought of abandoning her for any other church, and especially for the Church of Rome." P. 7.

"I said at once that there must be some mistake; that some one must have misinformed him; for that I was an attached member of the Church of England; that I had, as one of her clergy, held preferment in her, but had resigned my appointment; that I was perfectly independent in my circumstances and my feelings; that I had always been warmly opposed to the Church of Rome, as well as sincerely attached to the Church of England; and that I had now visited Rome with a desire to see and judge all things for myself, to change, modify, or confirm my former opinions, after a free and fair examination of everything to which I might be so fortunate as to obtain access." P. 15.

These declarations must be regarded as sufficiently explicit, to defend the author from the charge of deception and duplicity. The nearest approach to any thing like it is to be found on P. 113. "I could not expect that anything that I could offer, especially under the peculiar circumstances and manner in which I was obliged to state my views, could have any lasting effect on his mind, especially as I could so seldom give expression to my argument as if it were my own deep feeling, but only as a suggestion as to what might possibly be the impression on the minds of others." But let it be remembered that the individual with whom he was thus obliged to be on his guard, was the dignitary, a word from whom would suffice at a moment's notice to send him from Rome with his cherished purposes unaccomplished. P. 97. For it would appear that besides his design of obtaining information on the general question of the Papacy without committing himself, he was desirous to decide on the propriety of his receiving the communion from the hands of the Romish priests, (p. 65) and to discover the mode of reasoning by which they contrived to work on the minds of the English. P. 78.

He appears to have been remarkably skillful in conducting an argument; his mind is strictly logical, and his style so clear and limpid that it is impossible to misunderstand his meaning. His reading was extensive. He was not only acquainted with the common routine of controversial writers, but was intimate with the early fathers, and ready to cite passage for passage. Whether the matter in dispute was the decrees of councils, or the inscriptions in the catacombs, he showed himself equally at home. His antagonists were men of eminence and ability: sometimes picked men; learned, courteous and agreeable. If there were any individuals whose opinions might be deemed weighty and authoritative, these seem to have been the persons. We may therefore feel that we have presented to us the very best face which can be put upon that side of the question. We may also repose reasonable confidence in the accuracy of the report, as Mr. Seymour states that he was in the habit of taking notes during the conversations, and of committing the whole to writing the moment his visiters had withdrawn.

There are two things that have struck us very forcibly upon perusing this work. One is the rooted hold which superstition has taken on all minds, even the most enlightened, that are subject to the deathly grasp of the Papacy.

> "Lethale vomebat
> Suffuso virus cælo, Stygiaque per urbes
> Religione sacer, sævum retinebat honorem."

It is indeed a curious psychological phenomenon that we are invited to witness—the extent to which credulity and superstition are compatible with learning and intellectual ability (of a certain sort at least). Here we see men expert in science, philosophy, belles lettres, and the classics, whose minds are quite contracted on theological topics, and reduced within the narrowest limits of bigotry. Habitually courteous and affable, we find them unhesitatingly affirming the conviction, "that every one must be damned in the flames of hell who did not believe in the supremacy and infallibility of the pope." P. 132. As Mr. Seymour remarks, this averment derives considerable importance from the position of the person who uttered it. The speaker was the chief teacher of theology in the order of the Jesuits, and in the Collegio Romano.

These learned men did not blush to avow their belief in

miraculous pictures, even to the length of assenting to the preference which the Virgin Mary would give to one picture of her over another, if they were placed side by side; hearing the prayers addressed to the miraculous pictures, and refusing to hear those addressed to the picture that had not the reputation of being miraculous. Well might the author say, "I must frankly confess that I was wholly unprepared for this. In all my former experience of controversy in Ireland and England, I had been told that all those were the mere abuses of the superstitious, and not sanctioned by the learned, if, indeed, such things were believed or practised anywhere. I had often heard them denounced as mere fabrications, pure inventions to injure the character of the Church of Rome, and I felt much surprise to find them not only believed and practised, but defended. I felt that it was opening out to me a new state of things, a new phase of mind, and a totally new system of faith or credulity which I had never anticipated. A mind must be in a peculiar state to believe in the miraculous powers of a picture or image." P. 10. "This was a degree of credulity, not to say superstition, for which I was wholly unprepared; and I felt that there must be something in the atmosphere of Italy, or something in the training of the mind of Italy, that could lead an intelligent, a travelled, and educated man to such a state of credulity." P. 11.

A ludicrous story was gravely narrated by one of the Collegio Romano, of a whole tribe of American Indians marched down to a river by a Roman Catholic missionary; there, without any preaching, instruction, or profession of faith, sprinkled with water and decorated with little crosses; and claimed as worthy converts. At the expiration of two years, the missionary returned, in the course of which time the Indians had had no instruction whatever. When he summoned them to confession, he was overjoyed to find that not one of them had any sins to confess! So far from imagining the possibility of this unconsciousness of sin arising from their deplorable ignorance of the nature of sin, he seriously insisted on the explanation "that there was no matter for the Sacrament of penance, as during these two years the Indians lived such converted lives, such holy and Christian lives, that there was not one among them who had committed a single sin, and therefore had no sins to confess, and the missionary priest was unable to confer absolu-

tion, inasmuch as there was no matter for the sacrament!" P. 182. But this is nothing to the story of a devout Indian, immediately subjoined, who was too far from the missionary to admit of the host being conveyed to him; whereupon the host flew out of his fingers over to the poor Indian, and into his mouth! "Oh," he added, in a tone of the most reverential devotion, "the blessed Lord Jesus so loved that poor savage, that he longed to enter into his heart, and thus miraculously flew into his mouth! How anxious he was to get into him!" P. 183. The fervour and earnestness of this priest forbade all doubt of his entire sincerity in crediting the miracle. He had a wide esophagus!

The growth of Mariolatry is painfully brought to view in these pages. The subject is of sufficient importance to quote the passage at length:

"My clerical friend, after a pause, which I was unwilling to break, lest I should express myself as strongly as I felt, resumed the conversation, and said, that the worship of the Virgin Mary was a growing worship in Rome; that it was increasing in depth and intenseness of devotion; and that there were now many of their divines, and he spoke of himself as agreeing with them in sentiment, who were teaching that as a woman brought in death, so a woman was to bring in life; that as a woman brought in sin, so a woman was to bring in holiness: that as Eve brought in damnation, so Mary was to bring in salvation: and that the effect of this opinion was largely to increase the reverence and worship given to the Virgin Mary." P. 41. "The whole devotional system of the Church of Rome, the prayers unceasingly offered to the Virgin, the innumerable pictures of the Virgin, the countless images of the Virgin, the many churches dedicated to the Virgin, the universal devotion rendered to the Virgin, the manner in which all the services and prayers of the Church and people are impregnated with thoughts of the Virgin, the extent to which, in conversation, all classes went in speaking of the Virgin, all had impressed me with the feeling that the religion of Italy ought to be called the religion of the Virgin Mary, and not the religion of Jesus Christ." P. 106.

This is perfectly in keeping with the notorious facts that in 1799, the Tuscans appointed the Virgin Mary their Generalis-

simo; and in 1836, the king of Spain made her the Commander-in-chief of his forces, their banner being a consecrated petticoat embroidered by his royal hands. In 1816, an association was formed with the pope's sanction, called the Children of Mary, and May was the month especially set apart for her worship. To these follies, and the graver blasphemy of "Our Lady's Psalter," we may add the infatuation of the present pope, Pius IX.; whose whole soul seems to be much more taken up with having the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin formally established as the doctrine of the Church, than with the personal administration of his dominions. Surely it would hardly be a misnomer to call the Romish communion a Marian, rather than a Christian church.

Among the reasons adduced in favour of the worship of Mary, we find one which at least has the merit of novelty. "Their" (the Jesuits') "devotion to the blessed Virgin is known through the whole world; and as for their holiness, they have been accused of ambition, of intrigue, of politics, with opposing sovereigns and disturbing the peace of kingdoms, but no one has ever charged them with impurity or immorality." p. 121.

But the grand and crowning reason to which they perpetually recur, with never-wearied and grateful unction, is the superior tenderness of Mary.

We cannot enlarge further on this point, but for additional particulars, particularly the vindication of the recital of "Hail Mary!" and nothing else, in the ears of a dying man; and the droll mistake of the priest who took the cry of a little child in danger, "O mamma! mamma mia!" as an invocation to the Virgin, instead of its mother; we must refer the reader to the book itself. We feel strongly inclined to the opinion, that for this prevailing preference of Mary to Christ, the Fine Arts are in a great degree responsible. "Picturæ ecclesiarum sunt quasi libri laicorum," said Comester, in the twelfth century. Among the paintings which adorn the walls of Roman Catholic churches, there is no subject which is a greater favourite than the Madonna and Child. The greatest masters of all countries have tried their skill upon it. The mother of course occupies the most prominent and patronizing position. There are even pictures of the Virgin and Child in Heaven, although it was in the maturity of manhood Jesus entered into heaven, and of course

the child in her arms can be employed merely as a convenient mode of designating the Virgin Mother. But the most revolting length to which the practice has been carried, is the representation of Mary administering chastisement to her child, by way of illustrating his subjection to his parents. How is it possible for people whose only books are such pictures as these, to take up any other idea than that of the permanent inferiority of Jesus?

Another thing which we had forcibly impressed upon us by the perusal of Mr. Seymour's work, is the imbecility of reasoning exhibited by the learned men of Rome. His antagonists were not obscure individuals encountered by accident, but personages, (in one case selected by the Padre Generale), whose station qualified them to be considered as authoritative exponents of the doctrines of their church; the professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Collegio Romano, or University of Rome; the professor of Canon Law; the professor of Archæology; the Librarian; a tutor in the College of Nobles; a dignitary of no small note and influence whose title is not given, besides other priests and Jesuits. Yet highly educated and shrewd as these men were, they were sometimes exceedingly at a loss for a reply, when, too, a reply naturally suggested itself to our own minds, heretics as we were.

We are not unaware of the fable of the lion and the painter. We know the partiality of men to their own offspring, and how easy it is for a reporter to colour here, and embellish there, and suppress in another place, so as to make the published account more favourable to himself or his party than the real argument was. Cicero's oration in defence of Milo is an example in point. Another is furnished by Mr. Kennedy in his life of Mr. Wirt. In the great steamboat case of Gibbons against Ogden, Mr. Emmett was counsel for the defendant in opposition to Mr. Wirt, and in allusion to New York enterprise, quotes from the Æneid an exclamation of the hero, "Quæ regio in terris, nostri non plena laboris!" and applies it in a triumphant strain. Mr. Wirt, who was a thorough Virgilian, very happily took up the quotation, and completed it, and showed from the context that so far from being the language of triumph, it was that of lamentation. This turn of thought he pursued in glowing descant on the horrors of disunion which

were threatened by the then aspect and position of the State of New York. In the published report of Mr. Emmett's speech, as revised, these words are interpolated, "She may turn the mournful exclamation of Æneas into an expression of triumph," &c., thus anticipating the eloquent passage in Mr. Wirt's felicitous reply, and taking away all its point and bearing.

But, making all due allowance for self-partiality in the case, still, if any thing like a faithful report is given, we are able to draw our own conclusions. There is the argument itself, its naked bones and sinews, in the plainest, most unpretending, but clearest, of styles. Of this pellucid style the admirable expositions of justification, sanctification, and the merit of good works, pp. 198, 200, may be referred to as specimens. Mr. Seymour represents himself as a man of prayer, a devout and conscientious man; and such is the logical structure of his mind, that we can hardly conceive the discussions to have borne any altering or tampering of consequence. In short, we feel that the account before us is altogether trustworthy.

In almost every encounter the Jesuits made a failure. Mr. Seymour professes himself amazed beyond expression at the weak and inconclusive arguments and hasty retreats of men whom he had been led to regard as most subtle, practised, and formidable controversialists. Whether the leaden pressure of authority, the early submission to that mockery of reason, transubstantiation, or the habit of dwelling on peculiarities of dress and ceremony had emasculated their intellects, the facts stand forth prominent, and the defeat is not to be concealed. We are disposed to ascribe the perversion and prostration of their faculties on points of theology, to the wretched system under which they had been trained. They had been bred implicitly to venerate the canons of the church and its dogmas as of equal authority with the scriptures; and it never entered into their heads to doubt. Their reason had been permitted to fall into entire disuse as far as the investigation of religious truth is concerned. It was a case of complete *non-user*, and entailed the natural consequences of neglect. The Yogee who extends his arm for a series of years, at last loses its muscular power, and is disabled from retracting it. Of the sincerity of his Jesuit friends Mr. Seymour became perfectly satisfied. He once had been of the common opinion that the Romish priesthood were all infidels;

but this opinion, further acquaintance induced him to abandon. "I am satisfied that multitudes among them believe, with the fullest and most implicit faith, the dogmas of their church; and therefore, instead of regarding them as hypocrites and monsters of deception and wickedness which such a supposition implies, I regard them as melancholy evidences of the fall of the human nature, and sad monuments of the shipwreck of the human judgment, evidencing to the world that no reach of human intellect, and no grasp of mental genius, and no range of this world's learning, can bring the true and saving knowledge of God to the mind or heart of man." P. 185. He gives a melancholy example of a man of talents, an English proselyte, who offered up blindly the sacrifice of his intellect to the ecclesiastical Moloch. P. 82.

The reader will find about a dozen occasions on which Mr. Seymour got the better of his opponents, either sorely gravelling them, or reducing them to silence. He will notice the adroitness with which he met the reproach of the Puseyite divisions in England, with the counter movements of the Rongites in Germany; the dilemma in which he placed the defender of judicial absolution; the confounding of Latria, Dulia, and Hyperdulia, which he proved in the prayer of Jesus, Joseph, and Mary in one breath; the total withdrawal of the argument for an infallible tribunal, to which he drove one adversary; the similar hesitation which he caused in another, when defending the omniscience of the Virgin Mary; the vexation of a third, when he turned against himself his seven essentials of Bulls *ex cathedrâ;* the inability of a fourth to reconcile the contradiction of the *flesh and blood* in the sacrament being styled "an *unbloody* sacrifice;" the lowering of the tone of the gentlemen of Collegio Romano, when they found that they could not impose upon his superior knowledge in regard to the inscriptions found in the catacombs; the ridiculous figure which he made them cut upon the subject of the scriptures in Rome; and the scarcely less ridiculous figure which the two Jesuits presented when unable to verify the claims of the Roman Church to infallibility. The last two are such rich scenes, that we shall obtain ready pardon for transcribing them at length.

The professor of Dogmatic Theology and the professor of Canon Law conveyed to Mr. Seymour a formal challenge; and the conversation was opened with the subject of the opposition

of the Church of Rome to the circulation of the sacred volume.

"The professor of Dogmatic Theology replied by saying that although it was very true that the people were wholly unacquainted with the nature of the holy scriptures, yet it was very incorrect to suppose that the Catholic Church was opposed to their reading them; that the Church set a great value on the sacred volume, and venerated it too highly to let it be used commonly or indiscriminately; that, so far from forbidding its circulation and perusal, the church permitted it to all whom she thought likely to profit by it, and forbade it only to those who, being ignorant, would be likely to pervert and misapply it; but that it was a great mistake, and indeed a calumny against the Catholic Church, to say that she was opposed to the full and unrestricted use and circulation of the Scriptures.

"The answer that I made to this was, that, having resided many years among a Roman Catholic population in Ireland, I had always found that the sacred volume was forbidden to them; and that, since I came to Italy, and especially to Rome, I observed the most complete ignorance of the Holy Scriptures, and that it was ascribed by themselves to a prohibition on the part of the Church.

"He at once stated that there must be some mistake, as the book was permitted to all who could understand it, and was in fact, in very general circulation in Rome.

"I said that I had heard the contrary, and that it was impossible to procure a copy of the Holy Scriptures in the Italian tongue, in the city of Rome: that I had so heard from an English gentleman who had resided there for ten years; that I looked upon the statement as scarcely credible; that I wished much to ascertain the matter for my own information; that I had one day resolved to test this by visiting every bookselling establishment in the city of Rome; that I had gone to the book-shop belonging to the Propaganda Fide—to that patronized by his holiness the Pope—to that which was connected with the Collegio Romano, and was patronized by the order of the Jesuits—to that which was established for the supply of English and other foreigners—to those which sold old and second-hand books, and that in every establishment, without exception, I found that the Holy Scriptures were not for sale. I could not procure a single copy in the Roman language and of a portable size in the whole

city of Rome; and that, when I asked each bookseller the reason of his not having so important a volume, I was answered in every instance, *é prohibito* or *non é permisso*, that the whole volume was prohibited, or that it was not permitted to be sold. I added that Martini's edition was offered to me in two places, but it was in twenty-four volumes and at a cost of one hundred and five francs, (that is, four pounds sterling,) and that under such circumstances, I could nót but regard the Holy Scriptures as a prohibited book, at least in the city of Rome.

"He replied by acknowledging that it was very probable that I could not find the volume in Rome, especially as the population was very poor, and not able to purchase the sacred volume; and that the real reason the scriptures were not at the booksellers, and also were not in circulation, was not that they were forbidden or prohibited by the Church, but that the people of Rome were too poor to buy them.

"I replied that they probably were too poor, whether in Rome or in England, to give one hundred and five francs for the book, but that the clergy of Rome, so numerous and wealthy, should do as in England, namely, form an association for cheapening the copies of the scriptures.

"He said, in reply, that the priests were too poor to cheapen the volume, and that the people were too poor to purchase it.

"I then stated that if this was really the case—that if there was no prohibition against the sacred volume—that if they would be willing to circulate it, and that really and sincerely, there was no other objection than the difficulties arising from the price of the book, that difficulty should at once be obviated. I would myself undertake to obtain from England, through the Bible Society, any number of Bibles that could be circulated, and they should be sold at the lowest possible price, or given freely and gratuitously to the inhabitants of Rome. I stated that the people of England loved the scriptures beyond all else in the world, and that it would be to them a source of delight and thanksgiving to give for gratuitous circulation any number of copies of the sacred volume that the inhabitants of Rome could require.

"He immediately answered that he thanked me for the generous offer, but that there would be no use in accepting it, as the people of Rome were very ignorant; were in a state of brutal

ignorance; were unable to read any thing, and therefore could not profit by reading the scriptures, even if we supplied them gratuitously.

"I could not conceal from myself that he was prevaricating with me: that his former excuse of poverty, and his latter excuse of ignorance, were mere evasions; so I asked him whose fault it was that the people remained in such universal and unaccountable ignorance. There were above five thousand priests, monks, and nuns, besides cardinals and prelates, in the city of Rome; that the whole population was only thirty thousand families; that thus there was a priest, or a monk, or a nun for every six families in Rome; that thus there was ample means for the education of the people; and I asked therefore, whether the Church was not to blame for this ignorance of the people.

"He immediately turned from the subject, saying that the Church held the infallibility of the Pope, to whom it therefore belonged to give the only infallible interpretation of the scriptures.

"This led the conversation in another direction." Pp 125–129.

The only other instance we shall quote at length, showing the Jesuits at fault for a reply, is that relating to the claim of infallibility of the Church of Rome. The ground taken by Mr. Seymour is novel and ingenious, and sets in fine relief his scholarship and perspicacity. The professor, above alluded to, continued the discussion by proposing to argue the question of salvability in the Church of England, involving the question whether the Church of England was the Church of Christ. They agreed to urge nothing without producing for it a written canon or article.

The professor laid down the syllogism: "The Church is infallible; the Church of England confesses herself fallible; therefore the Church of England is not the Church of Christ." On Mr. Seymour's pointing out the fallacy, and showing that the Church of England did not pretend to be *the Church*, but only a part of it, he altered the syllogism as follows: "The Church of Christ, in all her parts, is infallible; the Protestant Church of England confesses herself fallible; therefore the Church of England is not a part of the Church of Christ." Mr. Seymour denied the minor.

"He laughed at me good-humouredly, and with a look of triumph, and said that the Church of England had confessed it, and he could produce the article. He referred me to the Article XIX. I produced the article and read the words, 'As the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.' I said that this Article of the Church of England asserted that other churches, and that the Church of Rome in particular, had erred, and were fallible, but that she had said nothing of herself; and certainly had not, as his argument supposed and required, confessed herself fallible. He frankly acknowledged this to be a sufficient answer, and that his argument had failed, but said he would arrange his syllogism in another form, so as to obviate this. He seemed, however, slightly—very slightly annoyed at finding himself so easily foiled in his first two attempts. He proceeded with great quickness to arrange his argument again. The Church of Christ, in all her parts, claims to be infallible: the Protestant Church of England does not claim to be infallible: therefore, the Church of England is not the Church of Christ.'

Instead of taking the ordinary mode of denying the major, and opening up the question of the infallibility of the whole church, Mr. Seymour thought the time had come to turn the tables, and carry the war into the enemy's camp. His reading had suggested to him an argument which struck him forcibly, but which he had never lisped to a living soul. Like David with Saul's armour, he had never tried it. He resolved to take this opportunity of making the first experiment, and "fleshing his maiden sword." The syllogism having been reduced to writing, he drew the pen over the word "England," and substituted the word "Rome." It then read thus: "The Church of Christ, in all her parts, claims to be infallible; the Church of Rome does not claim to be infallible; therefore the Church of Rome is not part of the Church of Christ." The two Jesuits laughed heartily, and anticipated an easy triumph. They insisted that the Church of Rome had always asserted her infallibility. He demanded coolly the authoritative document, according to the preliminaries agreed on.

"After some moments' pause, he said he could produce several instances, and named the Council of Constance, the Council of

Basle, the Council of Florence, and several other lesser authorities. I knew each of the decrees to which he referred; and therefore, when he said that one asserted the supremacy of the Church of Rome as the mother and mistress of all churches; and that another held that every soul was subject to the Roman pontiff at the peril of his salvation; and that others still asserted that every man must be obedient, and owed obedience to the successor of St. Peter: and others, again, that it belonged to the Church of Rome to interpret Holy Scripture—when he said all this, I reminded him that all this was beside the real question—was nothing to the real point before us; that my assertion was that no received decree, or bull, or other authoritative document of the Church of Rome claimed infallibility, and that he answered me only by producing some which claimed supremacy and authority. He said that supremacy and authority implied infallibility. I answered by an emphatic No! . . . . . My opponent here did not deny the principle I had thus laid down; but he seemed puzzled and perplexed at finding that all his documents failed in the precise point of asserting infallibility. He referred to several others which he had not already named, but in a moment after he gave them up as inadequate; all, when examined, were disposed of by my preceding answer.

"I shall never forget, while I live, the spectacle of these two Jesuits, able, learned, and subtle as they were, and long habituated to controversy, yet so completely perplexed at this turn of the argument as to be looking at one another, and consulting and endeavouring to find an answer sufficiently plausible. My opponent, the reverend professor of Theology, seemed a little cast down at first, but soon rallied, and laughed at the perplexity and singularity of his position. He laughed good-naturedly, no longer at me, but at himself, and honestly said he had never seen the difficulty before; that he had thought the point clearly settled, but that it certainly was not so; and that he could not see how to answer me.

"His companion, however, the reverend professor of Canon Law, was not so good-humoured on the occasion. He was excited and annoyed at the failure, and asked confidently and warmly why it was that Protestants were always charging the Church of Rome with arrogance, and presumption, and blasphemy for claiming infallibility, if, as would now appear

from the argument, she has never claimed it. . . . . .

"I was unwilling to reply to this in the warm spirit in which it was spoken, and I merely said that I had never objected to the Church of Rome that she had been arrogant, or presumptuous, or blasphemous in claiming infallibility, or even that she ever claimed it or pretended to it at all. I believed that, as a Church, she never, on any occasion whatever, had advanced such a claim; I knew, indeed, that her advocates usually claimed it for her, and that her controversialists generally asserted it for her, and that the multitudes imagined she both claimed and possessed that divine prerogative; but I also knew that they were not THE CHURCH; that a few learned advocates were not the Church; that a few subtle controversialists were not the Church; that the multitude of an ignorant people were not the Church, and I knew, also, that THE CHURCH herself had never claimed or asserted it. If I was wrong in this broad statement, I was in presence of those who could easily correct me. They could tell me when and where THE CHURCH had claimed or asserted it. They could name the council and point to the decree. They could designate the pope and point to the bull. There never was an assertion more easily confuted if indeed it was capable of being confuted at all.

"They still asserted that the Church was infallible, and claimed to be infallible, though they seemed in a quiet way to acknowledge that they could not further prove their position." Pp. 134–143.

We here take leave of Mr. Seymour and his book, recommending it as likely to prove highly interesting to any one who is fond of intellectual gladiatorship, or who, like the author, is curious to ascertain the state of things at head-quarters.

---

## SHORT NOTICES; AND QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Life, Health and Disease. By Edward Johnson, M. D. New York: John Wiley, 161 Broadway, and 13 Paternoster Row, London. 1850.

This is one, and not the least remarkable, of the countless efforts to

popularize science, so characteristic of this age. There seems to be no department of knowledge held sacred against this democratic and equalizing tendency. The most recondite mysteries of life, health and disease must be revealed and explained to the curious eye of every tolerably educated person. Even boarding school girls are not considered educated, without a familiar acquaintance with scientific discoveries, of which Hippocrates or Galen never dreamed.

The work before us is no superficial catch-penny affair; and still less is it a piece of professional clap-trap. The author is a thoroughly educated and clear-headed physiologist and physician. For the benefit of an invalid lay brother, who was tormented with a desire to know the real nature of his protean malaise, he undertakes to translate into exacid yet popular language, the mystic phraseology, with which his brother's medical attendant had supposed himself to be satisfying the patient's curiosity, about "impaired digestion, "depraved secretions," "depreciation of the vis vitæ—the tone, the energy, the "nisus formativus of the organism," and other such like classical names for human ignorance, in which physicians are wont to indulge.

From some of his psychological doctrines as well as his extravagance and blunders in moral and theological reasonings, we utterly dissent: but his expositions of the structure and functions of the animal system, and the nature and causes of life, and health, disease and death, although they may not in all cases command absolute acceptance, are always the result of a penetrating and rational analysis, and are set forth in terms as lucid as sun light. The peculiar value of the work, as distinguished from the clear and able productions on the kindred topics of popular anatomy and phisyology, which we have previously noticed in our pages, lies in its clear philosophic expose of the causes and conditions productive of health or disease, in the human economy. For this, we know of nothing comparable to this little treatise, for the purposes of non professional readers. The style is one of its most remarkable characteristics. It is never dull or dry, even in the descriptive details. It is always sprightly and graphic, and often highly amusing, as well as entertaining and instructive. The aptness and beauty of illustration hold the reader fascinated from page to page, and sometimes the style rises to a level bordering the regions of poetry. If we had space we should be tempted to quote a passage or two, to show how genius can invest the description of details or the narration of facts, so commonly dry and even unsightly or repulsive, with a radiance of beauty. After a passage as remarkable for its truth as its power, descriptive of the office of the pyloric valve, and the fatal criminality of destroying, by artificial stimulants, the wonderful eclectic sensibility, which endows it for its office, he gives us one of those repeated non descript combinations where serious and appalling reality unites with a playful imagination, and the offspring of the union is such pictures as this: "When I contemplate this state of things, I think I see a whole army of diseases, marching in file out of the stomach, through the pyloric gateway into the citadel of the bowels. I see pale faced and bloated Dropsy with his swollen legs—livid Asthma struggling for breath—grotesque

and tottering Palsy—yellow-visaged Jaundice—red-eyed Delirium—Fever, with his baked lips and parched tongue, looking piteously around and crying 'water, water!'—limping Gout, grinning with pain—musing Melancholy—hideous insanity! But let us drop the curtain over a picture so horrible. My mind's eye aches with looking at it. Above all things, my dear John, take care of your pyloric valve."

We must in candour add, that with all that is eloquent, and beautiful, and good, and true, there is a vein of extravagance, running through the favourite ideas of the author; which is especially exceptionable, in his reasonings on the influence of the comforts of civilized life, upon health and longevity. He is certainly too well informed not to know, that the average of human life, as ascertained by the most accurate computations, has been steadily increasing with the advance of civilization for the last two hundred years; and notwithstanding the authoritative and exaggerated tone, in which he sets hard labour and exposure, (which he considers the natural and therefore the healthiest state of man,) above the condition of intellectual culture and the comforts and shelter of modern professional life, he ought to know that the average longevity of literary men, is materially greater than that of hard-working, out-door labourers. This at least is true, whether he knows it or not, and overthrows a large part of the reasoning and inferences of two or three of the letters. Hard work and exposure do unquestionably blunt the sensibilities which torment the non-working classes with multiform nervous disturbances, real and imaginary: but it is proverbial, that "nervous people never die," while the acute and destructive maladies which cut short the life of the exposed and exhausted labourer, reveal to us, against the ingenious reasonings of the author, where the real wear and tear lies.

There are also some of the minor physiological hypotheses, which we think could easily be shown to be untenable: as, for example, that which refers the diminished sensibility, (which by the way is set in antagonism, in the relation of cause and effect, with the contractibility of the tissues,) to the pressure made upon the nerves, by means of a vigorous circulation filling up and distending the circumjacent capillary vessels. A much more satisfactory, and we think obvious, solution, might have been suggested by the author's own clear and admirable exposition of the origin of the vital forces, in the transformation of the organized matter of the tissues, which is constantly going on in the animal body. The forces thus developed are thrown upon the nervous system, like the electricity collected by the receiver of a machine; and if allowed to accumulate unduly, instead of being worked off in the form of muscular contraction, the result inevitably is, a morbid increase of nervous restlessness or irritability, and if carried still further, the sensibility becomes painful, and so produces the disease, now so familiar to us by the name of neuralgia.

But we must not allow ourselves to be drawn into a discussion of any of the points handled by the author. We heartily recommend the book to those of our readers who wish to *know*, definitely, something about the

wonderful processes going on within them; and the conditions respectively favourable to health and disease.

Poems and Prose Writings. By Richard Henry Dana. New York: Baker & Scribner. 1850. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 440.

The respected and now venerable author presents to us in these two goodly volumes, a collection of such portions as he thinks most worthy of preservation, of the products of a long life, devoted chiefly to literature. The collection comprises all his poems before published—the imaginative tales, and two or three imaginative articles, originally given to the world in a serial work, under the title of The Idle Man,—and about a dozen Essays and Reviews first printed in various Quarterly or other Literary Journals.

As a poet, Mr. Dana has long been known and esteemed for the purity and delicacy of his taste, for his genuine love of nature, and for his profound penetration into the depths of poetic truth, revealed in her beautiful forms. The tales found in these volumes are remarkable for their exemption from every vestige of mawkish sentimentalism, and for the deep spirit of humanity which breathes through them.

The Reviews contained in this reprint are chiefly of Literary works, some of them taking the form of distinct disquisitions on the philosophy of poetry and other topics in literature; and others are critical discussions of the merits of the works reviewed. In regard to the former Mr. Dana displays great philosophical acumen, combined with pure and truthful poetic power. Of the reviews properly so called, we know not how better to express our appreciation, than by saying that we do not remember to have read an author, in whose critical judgments we so generally and fully accord. We do not remember a single case, in which we felt disposed to dissent materially, and still less to protest. The article on Hazlitt's Lectures, is perhaps a little too spicy; but the body of it, which is composed of a rapid critical examination of the most prominent English poets, is in our judgment, fully equal in beauty, vivacity, and power of style, to any of the well known articles on the same subject, from the old Nestor of the Critical world; and for just discrimination—by which we mean a true appreciation of general poetic merit, both absolute and comparative, and a delicate and discriminating analysis of the reasons of his judgments.—Mr. Dana's article, in our opinion, taken as a whole, is the very best we have ever read.

These remarks would be wholly incomplete, as well as unjust to the author, if we should omit to say that the religious spirit which breathes through his writings, and clothes itself in distinct theological form, in several of the reviews, especially those on Pollok's Course of Time, and Taylor's Natural History of Enthusiasm, is the true Evangelical spirit of the New England Church, at that critical period, when she was called to determine her views, and contend for them earnestly, against insidious Socinian heresy, in the form of a rational and almost deistical philosophy.

Aids to English Composition, Prepared for Students of all grades; embracing Specimens and Examples of School and College Exercises, and most of the higher branches of English Composition, both in Prose and Verse: By Richard Green Parker, A. M. Fifth Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1849.

Although this is the fifth edition of a stereotyped book, yet as some of our readers may not have seen it, and may desire a work on the subject, it may be worth while to say that it is really a useful book: although not one adapted to exalt our appreciation of the powers of its author, except perhaps the power of patient, persevering and accumulative research. In the multiplicity of its instructions, we find many things of which we can scarcely conceive it possible that any one, desiring, to compose at all, could be ignorant. The author sets out by undertaking to teach his reader how to obtain ideas, somewhat after the fashion of the old rhetorical writers, except that this portion of the work evidently contemplates the capabilities of the merest child. It would be more applicable in teaching the art of talking, than that of composing. Although our own experience has sometimes revealed to us an astounding degree of ignorance, on the part of young men far advanced in what is commonly called an education, yet we cannot think this an adequate justification for putting into a work on English Composition, (including specimens of the highest order, both in prose and poetry), the properties of glass, or the parts of which a pen is composed; or for filling an entire page with diagrams, showing how a letter should be folded. Something, surely, should be taken for granted; and although it might happen that some students would be ignorant of such elementary and every-day knowledge, yet the author might safely comfort himself with the thought, that it would be too late for them to learn.* The rhetoric of the volume is conformed to the arrangement of Blair, and partakes of all his defects.

But still it is a very useful book. It contains a vast amount of information on all manner of subjects connected with Composition, in all its kinds and varieties, and also with the printing and publishing of Composition, not even excepting the names and sizes of types, and the art and mysteries of proof-reading. Scarcely any one—we had almost said not even the author—can go to the volume without finding in it something that he did not know before.

A Universal Pronouncing Gazetteer; containing Statistical and other Information, of all the more important places in the known world, from the most recent and authentic sources. By Thomas Baldwin, assisted by several other gentlemen. To which is added an appendix, containing more than ten

* We once carried a letter to the post, from a friend who was just completing his professional training, addressed to a young lady; on the back of which the superfluous appendage was fully spelled out, Younited States!

thousand additional names, chiefly of the small towns and villages, &c., of the United States and of Mexico. Eighth edition. With a Supplement, giving the pronunciation of near two thousand names, besides those pronounced in the original work: forming in itself a complete vocabulary of geographical pronunciation. Published by E. H. Butler & Co. 1849.

This is the same work which we had occasion to notice four years ago, in terms of very high praise, now enlarged and improved, as the voluminous title page above quoted states, in the most important and substantial way. Every one, except those who are too ignorant to care about such matters, knows how embarrassing it is to be called upon to read or tell the stirring news which fills the columns of our daily newspapers, in regard to places of which he knows neither the locality, nor the name, although the latter may be spelled out before his eyes. Almost every one has felt the mortification of being compelled to pronounce combinations of letters, with the inward certainty that he was pronouncing them wrong; and that, too, while knowing that few blunders are more ludicrous to those who know better; and we might add, more damaging to the literary reputation of those who blunder. We have seen the most respectable people in the streets of London, completely bewildered, by a stranger inquiring the way to Pall Mall; and we doubt not whether an Englishman could be found, who would understand at first, what was intended by the pronunciation which any stranger would certainly give to such names as Youghall, or Cirencester. We take for granted, therefore, that every body wants a pronouncing Gazetteer: and we are happy to be able to assure our readers, that the one before us is worthy of their fullest confidence. The author or authors have in all cases gone to the best living authorities; and as these authorities are for the most part given in the preface, we can judge for ourselves of their trust-worthiness. Wherever they could not ascertain the true pronunciation of a name, they have wisely left it unpronounced, instead of resorting to conjecture, or relying on insufficient authority. Besides the authoritative pronunciation of so many names, we have learned and scholarlike dissertations, in the several prefaces and introductions, in regard to the general principles of pronunciation, as applied to all the more important of the modern, and especially the European, languages. These alone would be worth the price of the entire volume, to any ordinary reader who values accuracy.

We cannot refrain from saying in this connexion, that an extension of this work, or the execution of another on the same plan, so as to embrace the proper names in history and literature, would, we think, prove a most acceptable addition to our literary apparatus. This, indeed, is a want which ordinary scholars and more especially students, feel quite as keenly in its measure, as that which our authors have so well begun to supply. The names of persons are just as arbitrary and unpronounceable, without instruction, as those of places. We have noticed this want expressing itself of late, in numerous queries in the newspapers, about the proper pronuncia-

tion of the noble Hungarian and Polish heroes, who have been battling for human freedom. Many of the leading French, Italian and Spanish names in modern history, as well as in Literature and Science, are involved in great uncertainty, and very often, no doubt, even highly respectable scholars err egregiously in their pronunciation. Nor is the difficulty entirely wanting in the case of English names, about which ignorance is felt to be more embarrassing and scandalous. This is especially true, in regard to the names and titles of the old English Norman aristocracy. Who would ever think of pronouncing Cholmondely, Chumley. Nor is it only in extreme cases like this, that the difficulty is felt. We once knew a well educated and prominent gentleman, in a public lecture, resort to a long and cumbrous circumlocution, because he was not certain in which of three or four ways to pronounce the name Iago, in Shakespear's Othello.

Uncertainty, and still more error, on such matters, is a great evil; and sometimes damages a man's standing for scholarship most seriously and often unjustly. The evil can be cured only by some such means, as Mr. Baldwin has shown us how to use. And we know of no one else, capable of doing the work we have pointed out, so readily, so accurately, and so authoritatively. The same authorities with which he is already in communication, could settle the pronunciation of the names of persons, as well as places: and he is so familiar with the general principles on which it must be done, that he could accomplish the task, and give it to the public, with far less labour and perplexity, than a new hand at the business. We think we may venture to assure him, if he will undertake it, of a hearty welcome and a grateful and we hope substantial acknowledgment, from those whose favour he has won by the admirable work before us.

We find that we have been carried away by the peculiar feature of the Pronouncing Gazetteer, from saying in the proper place, that the author not only gives the pronunciation of the places cited, but has compacted into his small volume, a vast amount of topographical, statistical and other information, about the places mentioned, taken from the best geographical authorities

Analecta Anglo Saxonica. Selections in prose and verse, from the Anglo-Saxon Literature: with an Introductry Ethnological Essay, and notes, critical and explanatory. Two Volumes; 12mo. pp. 430, 444. 1849.

Tha Halgan Godspel on Englisc. Anglo-Saxon version of the Holy Gospels; edited by Benjamin Thorpe, F. S. A., from the original MSS. Reprinted by Dr. Klipstein. Second Edition. 1848. pp. 240.

Natale Sancti Gregorii Papae. Aelfric's Anglo-Saxon Homily on the Birth-day of St. Gregory, &c., with a full rendering into English, Notes, &c. 1849. 12mo. pp. 96.

A Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language. Revised and en-

larged edition. 1849. 12mo. pp. 276. All by Louis F. Klipstein, A.A. L.L.M. & P.H. D. of the University of Giessen; and published by G. P. Putnam. N. Y.

It is no small honour to be the first to furnish literary apparatus for Anglo-Saxon studies in America. Dr. Klipstein, in a very quiet way, and with little sympathy of the public, has here provided all that beginners need, except a lexicon, and this we presume will soon appear. The University of Virginia has had an Anglo-Saxon chair from its foundation: several colleges have followed with tardy pace; but the majority of our scholars are still indifferent. Gentlemen who are pursuing these studies, such as Professors Gibbs, Schele, and Fowler, Mr. Marsh and others, have given little through the press, except in periodicals. Anglo-Saxon books are very costly, even in England. Up to a recent date, Bosworth's complete work was absolutely out of the market. Madden's edition of the Brut would alone absorb a month's pay of some poor clergymen. To such, Mr. Putnam's neat and cheap editions come as a benefaction.

Dr. Klipstein sets about his work with that enthusiasm which is all-important in a pioneer, and spares no pains in clearing the way. In regard to orthography he has rejected all the peculiar characters, and represented the *th* by dotted letters: we like the ancient signs, yet reluctantly accede to this as convenient and perfectly intelligible. The Grammar has some advantages not offered by those now in use. Not to mention Rask, which is very dear, and exceedingly uncouth, Vernon's Guide, though admirable in many respects, adheres so closely to the continental arrangements, as to be odd and puzzling to beginners. Few persons ever overcome the mental inversion produced by learning nouns after a method which places the Accusative next to the Nominative, and the Genitive last of all: however legitimate this may be, on principles of Germanic etymology. For practical purposes, the three declensions are likewise all-sufficient. The version of the Gospels, besides being a venerable relic, is an admirable reading-book for beginners; and more advanced scholars may collate it with Ulfilas. The tract of Aelfric is an agreeable study, with the editor's translation and analysis. But the Analecta, for such as have not the works of Thorpe, will serve as a magazine of Anglo-Saxon lessons, for all the early months of study. In giving this sincere tribute to Dr. Klipstein's labours, we do not by any means wish to be considered as subscribing to his particular judgments, especially in regard to his estimate of authorities, and his proposed emendations of English orthography. We entertain no doubt, that, five years hence, the study of Anglo-Saxon will be thought as indispensable for a young gentleman as that of French now is for a young lady; and this result will be due in no small degree to the works named above.

Sketches of Virginia. By the Rev. William H. Foote, D.D. author of Sketches of North Carolina.

In expectation of the time when we may more fully express our judg-

ment, in regard to this most promising historical work, of which some chapters are before us, we heartily commend it to the notice of all Presbyterian readers, as from the hand of a laborious, competent, and faithful son of our church.

An Address on the Importance and Advantages of Classical Study. Delivered before the Graham Philanthropic and Washington Literary Societies, of Washington College, June 1849. By B. M. Smith, Pastor of the Staunton Presbyterian Congregation. Published at the request of the Societies. Lexington, Va. 1849.

We are accustomed to look to the author for conservative truth, strong reasons, and forcible language; nor are we disappointed in the present instance. He argues irresistibly in favour of thorough classical training; and gives the thong, as he passes, with right good will, to a method of which we know nothing by direct observation, but which is said to exist in some colleges, of affording what is called an irregular course, out of which the ancient discipline is excluded.

The Swedish Church in America. A Discourse delivered before the Historical Society of the American Lutheran Church, May 18th, 1848. By William M. Reynolds, A. M., Professor in Pennsylvania College. Gettysburg. 1849. pp. 40.

Professor Reynolds has given us a valuable chapter in American Church History, and one which will acquire new value, with the new accessions to our people from the Scandinavian nations. Few signs in our literature are more encouraging, than the increase of historical monographs; these are researches which we would cheer on, with all our strength. The work seems well done, and shows intimacy with the best German authorities, and American sources. Some of the best people in the middle states have Swedish blood in their veins. Well do we remember old Doctor Collin, and his quaint little church; now turned over, as we learn, to the Episcopalian denomination. Some will be surprised to find almost thirty ministers named, as having laboured in America. There is something attractive to us in the protestantism of northern Europe. Why does not Mr. Abbot, who sends forth so many biographies, give us a life of Gustavus Adolphus?

Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society. Memoir of John Fenwicke, chief proprietor of Salem Tenth, New Jersey. By Robert G. Johnson. Read before the Society, July 23, 1846. Printed 1849.

A venerable Jerseyman, much addicted to the delightful research of ancient annals, here gives us the fruit of his labours, in regard to a case of

much interest, especially to West Jersey. Two centuries ago, Fenwicke was acting as Major in the forces of Cromwell. He was first an Independent in John Goodwin's church, and then became a Quaker. Of his history in this state, we have our only sufficient record in this memoir.

A Lecture on African Colonization, delivered in the Hall of the House of Representatives of Ohio. By David Christy, Agent of the American Colonization Society. Cincinnati, 1849.

This pamphlet is on one of the most important enterprises of modern times, which will one day be looked back upon, with such historical interest as we now look back on the founding of Rome, or the Norman Conquest. Mr. Christy presents some politico-economical aspects of African Colonization, which claim the serious attention of both friends and foes.

Apostolic Baptism. Facts and evidences on the subjects and mode of Christian Baptism. By C. Taylor, editor of Calmet's Dictionary. New York. M. W. Dodd.

This is a new and stereotype edition of a work which has given no little trouble to immersionists. The facts of Mr. Taylor have never been denied, to our knowledge; nor have his evidences ever been disproved. Whilst Baptists assert that baptism as administered in the whole church of God, save by themselves, is a relic of Popery, Mr. Taylor, by facts and arguments, that are yet unmet, proves, that, both as to mode and subject, we administer it in the way and manner which are both scriptural and apostolical. The offensive ground which our Baptist friends are taking, the feeble arguments by which they maintain it, and the bad temper which they manifest from Dr. Carson down to Dr. Cote, unless abandoned and corrected, must induce other Christian denominations to treat them with less fraternal regard than formerly, and to place their views and their conduct as to baptism on the same shelf with the absurdities of Puseyism.

The work before us has acquired a reputation which our endorsement cannot materially increase.

The Works of Leonard Woods, D. D., lately Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary, Andover. In four volumes. Vol. I. Andover. Printed by J. D. Flagg and W. H. Wardwell.

Few living men have for so long a time devoted themselves to theological studies, as the author of this work. The thoughts of a man of so clear a head, and so impartial in his pursuit of truth, must prove valuable to those who come after him. It is a pleasing reflection, that some hundreds now in the ministry have been instructed in theology by this distinguished professor. And it is a matter of congratulation to the friends of orthodoxy

that his life and health have been thus far continued: so that there is a prospect of his being able to revise, remodel, and superintend the publication of all his lectures; of which one volume is before the public. The greater number of lectures in this volume are preliminary to those on didactic theology: of which a considerable portion has, in substance, been published in former years. The only subjects of theology treated in this volume are. God and his Attributes—The Humanity and Divinity of Christ—the Mediator—The Trinity—and the Divine Purposes.

We were somewhat surprised to find so small a space devoted to a consideration of the Divine Attributes: but we presume the author proceeded on the principle stated in regard to the Evidences of Divine Revelation, that the subject had been amply treated by authors accessible to students. As, however, most important errors have their source in misconception of one or other of the attributes of God, it would have been well in a system of theology to discuss these points concerning which there exists a difference of opinion among theologians.

It is not our purpose, at present, to review the lectures published in this volume, particularly: when the whole system shall be before us, we may be inclined to prepare an extended review of the work. Our only object now is, to invite the attention of our readers, and to congratulate them on the prospect of so large a contribution to the theological literature of our country; a contribution which we trust will have the effect of counteracting the tendency to wild hypotheses and erratic speculations, and to promote the knowledge of sound scriptural doctrine, on the most important of all subjects.

The Four Gospels; arranged as a practical family commentary for every day of the year. By the Author of "The Peep of Day," &c. Edited with an Introductory Preface, by Stephen Tyng, D. D., Rector of St. George church, in the city of New York. Illustrated with twelve highly finished steel engravings. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: George S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850. 8vo. pp. 548.

As the Holy Scriptures are the foundation of our common Christianity, the source of all authentic divine truth, whatever promotes the study of the sacred volume is a good to the whole community of believers. And as the Four Gospels are the record of the personal history of our common Lord and Saviour, whatever tends to the devout and reverential contemplation of his word and works, is to be hailed as water poured on the very root of evangelical religion. The volume before us is not so properly a commentary, as a series of practical remarks on the chief incidents in the Redeemer's life. They are written, as far as we have had the opportunity of examination, in a devout and evangelical spirit. The book is

therefore to be recommended as an important contribution to our practical religious works: and is very attractive in its outward appearance.

Memoirs of the Rev. Walter M. Lowrie, Missionary to China. Edited by his Father. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Philadelphia: William S. Martien. 8vo. pp. 500.

The personal knowledge of the subject of this memoir; the record of his labours as spread in our Missionary Journals before the churches; the deep sympathy felt at his sudden death; the widespread acknowledgments from so many different sources of his uncommon attainments and abilities and worth, lead us to take up this record of his life and labours with feelings of very peculiar and solemn interest. The volume has come into our hands at too late a day to permit of our doing more than to insert its title in our present number. We hope soon to be able to call the attention of readers more fully to its contents.

The Practical German Grammar: or a natural method of learning to read, write, and speak the German language. By Charles Eichhorn. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Philadelphia Geo. S. Appleton. 1850. pp. 284.

The author remarks in his Preface that there are two principal methods of learning a language. The one begins by mastering the grammatical forms and applying them as they are acquired in analysis and translation. The other professes to begin with the words and phrases of the language and to gather a knowledge of the forms from their use. This latter is called the natural method, as being the one adopted in learning our native tongue. This is the method the author of the grammar has adopted. The former is the one to which adults will adhere. The latter is the method which may be best suited to the young.

The Importance of Religion to the Legal Profession: with some remarks on the Character of the late Charles Chauncey, Esq. A Discourse delivered on Sunday evening, September 30th, and repeated on Sunday evening, October 14th, 1849, in the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. By Henry A. Boardman, D.D. Philadelphia. W. S. Martien. 1849. pp. 40.

A great topic and a fit occasion. The publication of the discourse complies with a double request, from members of the congregation and from other hearers, many of whom are gentlemen of the legal profession. The memory of an excellent man receives a suitable tribute, while the cause of religion is pleaded with faithfulness, judgment, and scholar-like ease. We have reason to believe that few productions of the respected author have been more applauded; and we wish for it a wide circulation.

The Relations of Faith and Philosophy. An address before the Porter Rhetorical Society of Andover Theological Seminary, Sept. 4, 1849. By Henry B. Smith, Professor of Intellectual Philosophy in Amherst College.

If this discourse did not come to us at the very close of our quarterly labours, it would invite us to enlarged remark. The subject proposed is of great intrinsic importance, and is at this juncture forcing itself upon us from several sides at once. That which most interests us, is the prominence given to the Person and the Work of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the justice which is done to those views of theology which connect themselves with this central doctrine, but which find less and less sympathy in New England. We are not called upon to express a judgment on all the definitions and opinions which may be expressed in the Address. Some of them may have bearings on New England controversies unknown to us. Some of them, if more fully developed, might fail to command our assent. But we freely own, that there is in several parts, especially in the conclusion, a generous statement of several evangelical truths, which we have often missed from the religious philosophy of our Eastern neighbours. As a philosophical treatise we regard it with interest and respect. It has acumen, fairness and earnestness, and would be more impressive still, were it more plain and natural in its diction. We do not understand Professor Smith as by any means subscribing to any one of the German philosophies; but a stronger caveat against the errors of Schleiermacher seems to us to be demanded by the times.

Memoir of Charles Henry Porter, a Student in Theology. By E. Goodrich Smith. American Tract Society. 18mo. pp. 168.

This is the memoir of a young man engaged in mercantile pursuits in New York, who began studies for the ministry, but who was suddenly cut off, while at the New Haven Theological Seminary. It is a narrative not unlike the life of James Brainerd Taylor; the same warmth, and the same turn for active labour.

Ollendorff's New Method of learning to read, write, and speak the French language; or First Lessons in French: Introductory to Ollendorff's larger Grammar. By G. W. Greene, Instructor in Modern Languages in Brown University. New York. D. Appleton & Co. 1850. 18mo. pp. 138.

The title explains the intention of this little book. We suppose it may be used with advantage, in cases where the larger work is inconvenient.

The Missionary's Daughter: a Memoir of Lucy Goodale Thurston, of the Sandwich Islands. American Tract Society. 18mo. pp. 219.

The Rev. Mr. Thurston was one of the first of those beloved brethren who went to the Sandwich Islands. His daughter, aged about seventeen, came to America, but lived only three weeks after her arrival. No one who loves Christian missions or youthful piety can read the book without emotion.

The Young Disciple: or a Memoir of Anzonetta R. Peters. By the Rev. John A. Clarke, late Rector of St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia. Abridged from the fifth Edition. American Tract Society.

The Child's History of Rome. By E. M. Sewell, author of Amy Herbert, etc. New York. D. Appleton & Co. 1849. 18mo. pp. 254.

We profess no admiration for the fictions of Miss Sewell, which have seemed to us tediously sentimental. This history is far more pleasing. The story of Rome is well told; and parents may rest on the assurance that nothing is introduced, against which infantile modesty need be guarded: which is more than can be said of most ancient histories. No book of the kind is in this respect so well suited to young children.

Is Christianity from God? Or a Manual of Bible Evidence for the People. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scottish National Church, Crown Court, Little Russel Street, Covent Garden. With an Introduction by Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen. New York. M. W. Dodd. 1849. 18mo. pp. 276.

We earnestly recommend the circulation of this volume. Where scepticism exists, here is strong argument, freshly presented, to settle the belief: where general confidence in the scriptures exists, here are detailed proofs to give it corroboration. Dr. Cumming is a Presbyterian minister, of extraordinary reputation, in London.

The Mercy Seat. Thoughts suggested by the Lord's Prayer. By Gardiner Spring, D.D., Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the City of New York. New York. M. W. Dodd. 8vo. and 12mo. pp. 383.

This newest publication of the respected author is on a great and delightful subject, and is marked with all those characteristics which have long since become familiar to the Christian public. In this union of the pulpit and the press, Dr. Spring sets an example, worthy of being followed by his brethren, of diligence, zeal, and determination not to grow weary in well doing. The work is presented in a variety of forms, some of which the enterprising publisher has made unusually inviting and elegant.

Exercises in Greek Prose Composition, adapted to the First Book of Xenophon's Anabasis. By James R. Boise, Professor of Greek in Brown University. New York. Appleton. 12mo. 185.

The synthetical method of teaching language, which was long neglected in this country, has now not only gained its right place in our systems of instruction, but begun to threaten the more essential analytic method with exclusion. We are therefore glad to see school books so constructed as to secure the combination of both methods. Such a book is this one by Professor Boise of Providence, the plan of which is such, that the synthetical exercises cannot be performed without a previous analysis of the corresponding passages in the Anabasis. If the execution is at all worthy of the plan, the book must be a welcome addition to our means of elementary instruction.

Der Brief Pauli an die Philipper. In berichtigter Lutherscher Uebersetzung von K. F. Th. Schneider. Praktisch erläutert durch Dr. August Neander. Berlin. 1849. 12mo. pp. 110.

Der Brief Jacobi. In berichtigter Lutherscher Uebersetzung, von K. F. Th. Schneider. Praktisch erläutert durch Dr. August Neander. Berlin. 1850. 12mo. pp. 102.

The first two numbers of a highly interesting series, intended to exhibit, in a popular form, the results of Neander's exegetical labours. This eminent writer is known to the English and American public almost exclusively as a church-historian; but a large part of his celebrity at home, especially with those who have enjoyed his instructions, rests upon his expositions of the New Testament. The specimens here given are free, not only from all pedantry and vain parade of learning, but from the usual formalities of method. The exposition in both cases has the form of a continuous discourse, in which the words of the epistles are interwoven, but with more adherence in the second than the first to the exact order of the text. Prefixed to each interpretation is Luther's version of the epistle, corrected in conformity to Neander's views by his assistant and amanuensis.

An Examination of the Doctrine declared, and the powers claimed by the Right Reverend Bishop Ives, in a Pastoral Letter to the clergy and laity of his diocese. By a Lay Member of the Protestant Episcopal Church in N. C. Philadelphia. H. Hooker. 1850. 12mo. pp. 105.

We may infer the importance attached to the controversy now rending the Episcopalian body, from the fact that laymen of such standing as Mr. Senator Badger, find it necessary to enter their protest against Puseyitish and Romish errors and abuses. Need we add, that the modicum of argu-

ment employed by the Diocesan shrinks into nothing in the practised and vigorous grasp of the Lay Member?

A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. By Dr. John C. L. Gieseler. From the fourth edition, revised and amended. Translated from the German by Samuel Davidson, LL. D. Two volumes. 8vo. pp. 396, 397. Harper & Brothers. 1849.

These are truly beautiful volumes, and the type and paper strike us the more, from the incongruity of the New England spelling, which ever and anon catches the eye and leaves us for a moment in doubt whether any scholarship, except what is provincial, has meddled with the proofs. In its kind Gieseler's work is one of the greatest ever written; not in respect of entertainment, nor in respect of the author's doctrinal leanings, but in the almost matchless riches, erudition, and bibliographical and antiquarian completeness of the notes. The text is a sluggish Nile running through a margin of boundless verdure and fertility. It is a book rather for the professor than the student; yet even as a text-book it would be invaluable, if the pupil could be induced to master the Greek and Latin authorities in the notes.

We find much that is objectionable in the Prefatory Notice. The curt and disrespectful terms in which Mr. Cunningham, the American translator, is set aside, with a grave but unproved insinuation; the flippancy with which the learned professor discredits all the common histories, but two or three; the implications, that the witty but lax and sneering Hase has no fault but shortness, and that his Manual is superior to that of the pious Guericke; these are blemishes, which we deplore. The work however is indispensable, and the version though hastily is ably made. It is after all the best, and a little more care about uniformity in proper names, some of which are given in Latin and some in German guise, with a little more avoiding of German idioms, would render it admirable.