THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1853.

No. IV.

Article I.—*Religious Endowments.*

The legal term *mortmain* is frequently used, especially in common discourse, and sometimes in books, in a mistaken sense. It is sometimes confounded by well informed men, and even by lawyers, with another and distinct subject. Mortmain, in strict propriety, means the acquisition or holding of real estate by a corporation or body politic, having perpetual succession. The popular meaning of the word is the vesting of land or other property, either in a corporation or in individuals, in such form as that the produce or beneficial interest may become permanently applicable to religious or charitable purposes. The proper legal term descriptive of property thus situated, is Charities or Charitable Uses.

It may be useful to deduce succinctly the history of these two subjects. In so doing, perhaps, the best explanation can be given of the general principles upon which religious and charitable endowments are based in the jurisprudence of England and this country.

The prohibition to alienate in mortmain, or, in other words, to give or grant to a corporation, existed in the Roman law. Diocletian gave this rescript: Collegium, si nullo speciali pri-

vilegio subnixum est, hæreditatem capere non posse, dubium non est. This special privilege was obtained from the senate or emperor. According to Mr. Gibbon, however, the progress of Christianity and the civil confusion of the empire contributed to relax the severity of the law upon this subject, and before the close of the third century many considerable estates were bestowed on the opulent churches of Rome, Milan, Carthage, Antioch, Alexandria, and the other great cities of Italy and the provinces.—*Gibbon*, vol. 2, chap. xv. An edict of Constantine eventually gave validity to legacies to the Christian Church, and broke down the Roman statute of mortmain.

In the Scotch law the terms *mortification* and *mortmain* are nearly synonymous. Feudal subjects granted in donation to churches, monasteries, and other corporations, are said to be given in mortmain, or to be mortified; either because all casualties must necessarily be lost to the grantor or feudal proprietor when the grantee or vassal is a corporation which never dies, or because the property of their subjects is made over to a dead hand, which cannot, contrary to the donor's intention, transfer it to another. The grant of lands to religious houses was prohibited in Scotland at a remote period.—*Shelford on Mortmain*, p. 3. It will be remarked, that the origin of mortmain in the law of Scotland is traced to the feudal system. The better opinion undoubtedly is, that it sprung from the same source in England—that it did not originate in enmity or opposition to the Church, though it waged a long warfare with monks and churchmen, who sought to enlarge the wealth and influence of their orders and establishments, but found these laws to be in their way.

It seems very certain that at common law, it was incident to every corporation to have a capacity to purchase lands for themselves and their successors. The monastery at Glastonbury is said by William of Malmesbury to have existed in the time of the ancient Britons, ages before the invasion of the Saxons, A. D. 450. The king of the West Saxons erected a church there which he and the succeeding kings enriched to such a degree, that the abbot lived like a prince, had the title of *lord*, and sat among the barons and in parliament, and no person, not even a bishop or prince, durst set foot on the isle

of Avalon, in which the abbey stood, without his leave. The revenue of this establishment at the time of the Reformation was said to have been above £4000 per annum, besides seven parks well stocked with deer. Richard Whiting, the last abbot, who was hanged in his pontificals for refusing to surrender the abbey and take the oath of supremacy to Henry VIII., had one hundred monks and three hundred domestics.—*Encycl. Brit. ad verbum.* If such accounts are to be relied on, it does not appear improbable that within two hundred years after the Conquest, near one-half of the most valuable landed property in the kingdom, had been acquired by religious houses and ecclesiastical persons. Lord Hardwicke is reported to have wondered that they had not got the whole. At a period of unrestrained violence, mixed with abject superstition, the doctrine that a man could make atonement for a life of lust, rapine, and blood, by grants or devises to the Church, was zealously inculcated by the monks and clergy. It is worthy of observation, that even at the present day it has been calmly laid down by a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate (Cardinal Wiseman) in his testimony before a committee of the House of Commons, that "if a person has, through the whole of his life, disregarded the duty of charity and giving alms in proportion to his means, I think he is bound to make up for that neglect of a serious Christian duty when he comes to die; and in that case it would not be undue influence on the part of the priest to advise him to leave what was a proper proportion of his property for charitable purposes." The soft words with which this sentiment is sugared can hardly cover the bitterness of the potion beneath, to any reflecting and discriminating mind. What an engine of extortion in the hands of unscrupulous men, acting upon such a principle, is the confessional! What has thus been gently intimated in England in 1852 was boldly claimed and roughly exercised by the churchmen and monks who wielded unbounded power and influence during the ages of superstition and darkness. It will be seen that the Papal dominion, from the time it first reared its crest in the Christian Church to the present hour, has maintained its claim to unbroken unity, at least in the one great purpose of acquiring temporal wealth and power.

The first statutes of mortmain in England were aimed at the religious houses particularly. Magna Charta (9 Henry III. c. 36, re-enacted 25 Edward I. c. 36) provides "that it shall not be lawful from henceforth to any to give his lands to any religious house, and to take the same land again to hold of the same house. Nor shall it be lawful for any house of religion to take the lands of any and to lease the same to him of whom he received it. If any from henceforth give his land to any religious house, and thereupon be convict, the gift shall be utterly void, and the land shall accrue to the lord of the fee."

At this period and long subsequently, personal estate formed a very small part of individual wealth when compared with landed property. Plate, armour and the richest valuables were frequently attached as heir-looms to the castle of the proprietor, and thus were made to partake of the incidents of realty. It was not lawful, except in certain parts of England, where the old Saxon laws had been retained after the Conquest and allowed to remain as particular local customs, to devise lands by last will and testament. Hence it appears by the terms of this earliest statute, which remains on the subject, that the first shift resorted to by ecclesiastical subtlety was to evade this prohibition of devises, by inducing men to make grants to the monasteries, with the assurance or understanding that the grantors should nevertheless enjoy the lands by a loan as long as they lived. This was even better than a will, for the gift was irrevocable, which a will never is. Lord Coke has observed, that the religious houses and regular clergy were to be commended for always having of their counsel the most learned men in the law. It is certain that means were soon invented by them to evade this statute, by purchasing lands holden of themselves, and by taking leases for a long term of years.

As to the first named evasion, the statute gave no interest to avoid the grant in mortmain, except to the lord of the fee. Of course, where the religious house held the position of lords of the fee, which they did in many instances, land owners during those periods of insecurity having resorted to them for protection, and acknowledged themselves to hold of them as their vassals, they could buy in the tenancy, and become absolute proprietors without hazard. There was no one to take advantage

of the forfeiture. As to the second evasion, the statute spoke only of a gift or grant of the land itself—which could mean at the least a freehold or interest for life. In the case of a corporation which never dies, that is the same as a grant in fee simple. A loan even for a thousand years is not a freehold—it is but a personal estate: and hence such a term of years was held not to be within the letter, however clearly it was within the spirit of the statute. The courts were at that time occupied for the most part by ecclesiastics, acute and fertile at all times in coining plausible grounds for any decision which might tend to fill the coffers of the Church.

Hence the next statute, (7 Edward I. st. 2) called the statute De viris religiosis, was passed in order to meet these evasions. "It is provided that no person, religious or other, whatsoever he be, that will buy or sell any lands or tenements, or under the colour of gift or lease, or that will receive by reason of any other title whatsoever it be, lands or tenements, or by any other craft or engine, will presume to appropriate to himself, under pain of forfeiture of the same, whereby such lands or tenements may any wise come into mortmain." It then proceeds to add, as the penalty for such alienation, forfeiture to the immediate lord, or on his default to the king, to whom a right of entry was given.

Driven from these contrivances, the counsel learned in the law of the abbeys and religious houses, proceeded still further to confirm the justice of Lord Coke's eulogy, by new devices of legal ingenuity. The next process was to set up a fictitious title to the lands intended to be acquired. An action was brought against the tenant to recover them. The tenant, by collusion, made no defence, whereupon judgment was given for the religious house, which thus recovered possession of the lands by sentence of law upon a supposed prior title. The tenant himself, being a party to the suit, and all claiming under him, were for ever precluded from setting up any title to the premises. The judgment was conclusive—res judicata—and thus the title is effectually passed as if it had been aliened by grant or feoffment: for as recoveries were prosecuted in a course of law, they were presumed to be just. It was held that titles thus acquired were not within the words of the statute. Thus

originated common recoveries, which for many hundred years were the principal assurances by which a tenant in tail could dock the tail and enlarge his estate to a fee simple, and which have been superseded for this purpose in this country, and latterly in England, by a more simple mode of conveyance, though there are still cases in which they may be used.

This occasioned another statute, (13 Edward I. c. 32) which provided that in such cases, notwithstanding the tenant made default, a jury should be impannelled to inquire whether the demandant really had right to the thing or not, and if there was no such right, the land should be forfeited in like manner as upon an ordinary alienation in mortmain.

Some smaller shifts of clerical cunning, such as setting up crosses upon lands to indicate that they claimed privileges as belonging to the orders of Knights Templars and Knights Hospitallers, and such as entering upon and consecrating as church yards large tracts of land adjoining churches, were repressed by statutes 13 Edward I. c. 33, and 15 Richard II. c. 5.

The next most signal device of the ecclesiastics and their lawyers to elude the statute of mortmain was the adoption from the Roman law of the doctrine of uses. Where land is granted to A. on the confidence that he will allow B. to take the profits, the interest of B. was called an *use*. The clerical chancellors assumed the jurisdiction in such a case, of compelling A. to observe the confidence thus reposed in him by the grantor. At law this use or confidence was not recognized. Of course feoffments made to natural persons to the use of religious houses did not fall within the words of the mortmain laws. Hence the churchmen had the honour of introducing and naturalizing in England the subject of uses, to which trusts succeeded: a head of jurisprudence so fruitful of consequences, that wherever the common law has penetrated, it has followed and been found the most pliable instrument to effect the varied purposes of increasing wealth and luxury. The statute 15 Richard II. c. 5. however fixed the character of mortmain upon uses.

Sir Francis Palgrave has expressed the opinion that these various statutes were not passed with the special view of hindering the growth and wealth of the monastic orders, much less with a view to prevent the exercise of undue influence by the

clergy to the disherison of lawful heirs, but mainly, if not altogether, for political and feudal reasons. It is evident that when all possessors of real estate were heavily burdened with feudal services, the vesting of land in dead hands, *in mortua manu*, which could render no feudal service, increased the burthen of those not exempt. As corporations never die, there could be no descents with the feudal incidents of relief, primer seisin, marriage, and wardship, nor escheats for want of known heirs, nor escheats in cases of attainder, because the corporation, as such, could commit no crime as it had no soul. These were large sources of revenue to the feudal lords. But the policy did not take its rise merely in consequence of these pecuniary incidents of tenures. There was the obligation of the vassal to accompany his lord to the field in time of war. It rested not of course upon the man of religion. At that period there were also a great many civil obligations connected with land, which could not be discharged unless the freehold was in possession of laymen. If religious persons held an undue proportion of land, there would be a deficiency of persons to attend the view of frank pledge, by which the peace and order of the district were attempted to be secured; a deficiency of persons to put in assize as jurors. Attendance upon assizes in early days was exceedingly burdensome; it was so burdensome that it was a very common thing for persons to obtain a remission of that service. These duties were very onerous, and if there were but few freeholders, it became a great hardship upon them. Thus, one of the objects, though not expressed in the statutes, preventing alienations of land to persons of religion or to religious houses, was to prevent a diminution in the number of persons in the county or hundred able to perform those services to the community. (Evidence of Committee of the House of Commons, 1844.) Mr. Burge, the distinguished author of an elaborate and learned work on the Conflict of Laws, was also of the opinion that the statutes of mortmain originated not in any design to prevent religious or charitable institutions from receiving gifts, but in the desire to preserve to the Crown and to the mesne lord those feudal rights of which they would unquestionably be deprived, if property were permitted to be given to a body incompetent to part with

it. The law would not allow the Church to part with property it had acquired: it became, therefore, inalienable, and the crown and the mesne lords lost all the incidents of escheat relief and other feudal profits, which were of considerable value. (Ibid.) It is to be noted, that ecclesiastical persons were not expressly prohibited by law from alimony until the reign of Elizabeth; but it in no way weakens the force of Mr. Burge's opinion, since it is well known that a policy of the Church much more effectual than any mere parchment prohibition, opposed the alienation of any property upon which her iron sinews were once laid.

During the whole period to which our attention has been directed, alienation in mortmain was lawful where a license for that purpose had been obtained, at first from the immediate lord of the fee, and afterwards from the Crown. These licenses were usually granted after an inquest returned upon a writ of *ad quod damnum*, finding if any and what damage would accrue from the grant of the license. Thereupon if it appeared fit, the license was granted with a *non obstante* of the statutes of mortmain. When at the Revolution the whole doctrine of the royal prerogative to dispense with acts of Parliament by a clause of *non obstante* was exploded, this right to grant license to alien in mortmain was specially reserved to the Crown by the statute 7 and 8 William III. c. 37.

We have already had occasion to remark the fact, that lands in England after the Conquest were not devisable by last will and testament, except in certain localities. One of the means by which this power was at first indirectly acquired was through the medium of uses. Uses generally were held to be devisable. A man desirous of possessing the power of disposing of his land by will, made a feoffment or grant to the use of his last will, as it was termed, for brevity's sake: that is, he made a conveyance to some friend in confidence, to allow him, the grantor, to enjoy the profits as long as he lived, and after his death to convey to such person or persons as he might nominate and appoint by his last will. Thus he would be able to have by him a disposition of his estate in the event of sudden death, yet retaining at all times the power to revoke and alter it—a power which seems now to us so indispensable. The Par-

liament of 28 Henry VIII., in the vain hope of entirely rooting out and destroying this subtlety of uses, passed a statute declaring that the person entitled to the use should be in law the owner of the land—a statute which it has been said had only the effect of adding three words to a conveyance: for it was held that though when a deed was made to A. to the use of B. the possession and legal title was transferred to B. by the statute, yet if the deed was expressed to be to A. to the use of B. *to the use of C.*, the operation of the statute stopped at B. who was the legal, while C. was the beneficial owner. This new kind of use—a use upon a use—was recognized in the Courts of Chancery by the name of a trust, and enforced as fully as its progenitor had been. The effect of the statute, however, was to render uses no longer devisable, and therefore as the power of devising lands was found to have worked well, the statute of wills, 32 Henry VIII., was enacted, which gave the power, but expressly excepted devises to corporations or bodies politic.

Such is the law of England. We have not in this country re-enacted the statutes of mortmain, or generally assumed them to be in force; and the only legal check to the acquisition of lands by corporations, consists in those special restrictions contained in the acts by which they are incorporated, and which usually confine the capacity to purchase real estate to specified and necessary objects; and in the force to be given to the exception of corporations out of the statute of wills. 2 *Kent Com.* 282.

There are, indeed, very few cases in which corporations in this country are not prohibited from acquiring or holding lands or other property beyond a certain amount. As to the construction of such restrictive clauses, every thing depends naturally upon the particular phraseology employed. If the proviso be limited to the purchase of lands of a specified yearly value, then it is quite clear that if the value be within the prescribed limits at the time the purchase is made, and the lands afterwards rise in value for any reason, the title of the corporation is not thereby affected. *Bogardus* v. *Trinity Church*, 4 Sandford: Chancery Rep. 684. If at the time of the grant the income exceed the prescribed limit, it is a question between the corporation and the sovereign power, of which third persons

cannot avail themselves. The question is a different one where the terms of the proviso expressly restrict the corporation, as they do in some cases, to the *holding* of property beyond a certain value, or still more commonly, yielding more than a certain net income. In such cases the corporation would seem bound to dispose of its invested funds, or real estate, so as to keep its income from such sources within the prescribed limit, under the penalty of forfeiting any surplus to the sovereign power: for here too, it may be equally affirmed that strangers have no power to intermeddle. It is a question exclusively between the commonwealth and the corporation which holds its franchise from the sovereign by its charter, and is responsible to that sovereign alone for the infringement of any of its prescriptions, or the usurpation of any powers not therein contained.

When the ecclesiastics had introduced the general doctrine of *uses* from the Roman law—separating the beneficial from the nominal ownership of property—the dedication of property to indefinite charitable uses soon followed. Although the Roman law is indeed a fruitful source which has supplied copious streams to the jurisprudence of all nations, it may be questioned whether the feudal tenures of frankalmoign and divine service do not exhibit the same end, accomplished practically in another way before that period. It is true the distribution of the free alms of the donor was the feudal service annexed as a condition to the tenure—the non-performance inducing a forfeiture of the feud. The essential and fundamental principle of the use or trust, however, is that it shall never fail or cease for the want of a trustee, or the neglect of his duties, but Chancery will remove the trustee and appoint another, and see the object of the donor carried out. It is the indefinite character of the trust—the uncertainty of the particular objects to which the benefaction is to be applied—that constitutes what in law is termed a *charity*. A legacy in trust for A. B. and C., however poor and deserving objects of charity, is a simple trust; and property cannot thus be tied up as to particular persons, either actually ascertained and named, and capable of such precise ascertainment, beyond a life or lives in being, and twenty-one years afterwards, that being what is called the rule against perpetuities. But a legacy in trust for a man's poor relations, or

in trust for the poor of such a parish, is a charity not within the rule against perpetuities, and may last for ever—that is, as long as the fund remains to be distributed and objects exist within the scope of the intention which founded the charity. It is immaterial whether the persons to be benefitted be *in esse* or not, or how uncertain the objects may be, provided there be a *discretionary power vested any where* over the application of the property to those objects.

In England, when the particular objects named have failed or cannot take, when the testator's or donor's intention cannot be carried out for some reason in the mode he has himself prescribed, or when the fund is more than sufficient for the objects specified, the rule is to execute the charitable purpose as nearly as possible. This is the famous rule of *Cy Pres*, which was at one time carried to most extravagant lengths, but is now very much limited and restrained. In America it has never had a foothold. Undoubtedly there may be unimportant, immaterial particulars, in which a charity may depart from the direction of the donor when it becomes impracticable from a change of circumstances; but if what the donor has made a fundamental condition cannot be observed, the charitable use must fail, and the property revert to his heirs. Rather this, than the monstrous power to be vested any where, of saying to what other charitable use the fund shall be devoted. That would depend too much upon the opinions, it may be the prejudices, of the person occupying the seat of judgment.

During the times of Popery in England, lands were frequently given to superstitious uses, though not to any corporate bodies, so as to be within the statute of mortmain. At the Reformation all future grants for such purposes were declared void by the statute 23 Henry VIII. c. 10. It has exercised to a very considerable extent the ingenuity of the English courts to determine what is or is not a superstitious use within the prohibition of this statute. It seems in general, that whatever religious doctrine or practice is not recognized as lawful by the Established Church, or as tolerable by act of Parliament, is considered to be a superstitious use. Thus, masses for the dead—burning tapers in honour of saints—Unitarianism—Judaism—have been decided to be superstitious uses.

Next follows the statute 43 Elizabeth, c. 4, which was at one time considered as the foundation of the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery over charitable uses. That opinion is now, however, universally abandoned—the publications of the British record commission in 1827, having shown above fifty cases of bills and answers in Chancery relating to charitable uses, from the reign of Richard II. to that of Elizabeth. The main object of the statute was to facilitate the exercise of that jurisdiction, and for this purpose it vested in the chancellor the power of issuing a commission, to inquire into and redress the abuses which might be found to exist in the administration of the numerous charities then existing in England. The commissioners to be appointed by him were clothed with very extensive powers. Although not the source of jurisdiction, this statute has always been and still is resorted to as a legislative exposition of what is a good charity—if not from the express mention, at least by analogy to the cases enumerated in the preamble. These are, "relief of aged, impotent, and poor people—maintenance of sick and maimed soldiers and mariners—schools of learning—free schools and scholars in universities—repairs of bridges, posts, havens, causeways, churches, sea-banks, and highways—education and preferment of orphans—relief, stock, or maintenance for houses of correction—marriages of poor maids—supportation, aid, and help of young tradesmen, handicraftsmen, and persons decayed—relief or redemption of prisoners or captives—for aid or ease of any poor inhabitants concerning payment of taxes."

The most important English statute upon this subject is 9 George II. c. 36. It is often, though improperly, called a statute of mortmain. It will be at once seen, however, upon the recital of its provisions, to be a law in restraint of devises and bequests to charitable uses. It enacts that no land, nor money to be laid out in the purchase of land, nor charged or secured in any way upon land, shall be conveyed or given in trust or for the benefit of any charitable uses whatsoever, unless such conveyance or gift be by deed, in the presence of two witnesses, executed twelve calendar months before the death of the donor, and enrolled in the Court of Chancery within six calendar months next after the execution thereof—such deed to be

without any power of revocation or reservation for the donor, or any claiming under him.

This statute is said by Mr. Shelford to have been made to prevent the mischief arising from improvident alienations or dispositions to charitable uses by dying or languishing persons, and it has been declared by several judges to be founded in good sense and sound policy. For a long series of years, devises to charitable uses in England had not only been wholly unrestrained, but had received a more liberal construction than other gifts, and had become so excessive in their amount, that the legislature deemed it expedient, as there was so much land already in mortmain, to lessen the facility of placing more in that situation. The very liberal construction adopted by the courts in favour of charitable gifts, was perhaps another reason which occasioned the statute. The particular views of the legislature were first (as expressed in the title of the act) to restrain the disposition of lands, whereby the same became inalienable, it being considered of great importance in a trading country to allow the free alienation of lands; and second, to prevent testators in their last moments from being imposed on by mistaken notions of religion, in giving away their estates from their heirs or families. *Shelford*, 120.

This law, however, has not given general satisfaction in England. It will be noticed that it is confined to real estate. Personal property to any extent may be bequeathed to charitable uses—and landed estate may be devoted to like purposes, provided it be by a present absolute gift, and the donor lives a twelve month after he has made the disposition. It has been strongly urged that the difference between real and personal estate has now become very unimportant: the vast increase of the amount of personal property in the progress of improvement and accumulation, has completely overshadowed the power which at one time was supposed to reside in land alone. The evil of withdrawing land from commerce is no more than that of withdrawing money; nor need either be locked up, if care be taken that while the product of the fund is sacredly appropriated to the objects of the charity, the trustee, with or without the direction or approbation of the court, shall at all times be at liberty to change the investment of the principal from

realty to personalty, and *vice versa*, as circumstances may render advisable. It is insisted also, that undue influence exercised over death-bed dispositions, and the unreasonable disherison of near relations, may demand that such bequests should be watched with a jealous eye; but that these evils can be restrained otherwise than by a sweeping provision which trenches upon one of the natural rights of a man over his own property, and which prevents him who has no claim of kindred upon him, and who is in the full exercise of a sound and disposing mind, from dedicating his property, whether real or personal, to the cause of God and humanity.

This question seems in England to have become very much imbued with the feeling which the attempted strides of the Papacy there have excited in the Protestant mind. It is not to be denied that there are considerations connected with the subject well calculated to make a serious though liberal Protestant hesitate about supporting a repeal most loudly called for by those who are evidently aiming, with the assistance of Puseyism, to establish a strong foot-hold for Popery in that kingdom.

In 1844, a select committee was raised by the House of Commons, on the motion of Lord John Manners, "to inquire into the operation of the laws of mortmain, and of the restrictions which limit the power of making gifts and bequests for charitable and religious uses." The committee, as usual, heard the testimony of several eminent lawyers and divines, and came to the conclusion, that although they did not feel authorized by the terms of the reference to report in favour of any specific alterations of the laws of mortmain, they felt bound to state, "from an attentive consideration of the evidence submitted to them by witnesses, whose means of information and authority must be held to be great, that the operation of the laws is most unsatisfactory, leads to doubt, expense, uncertainty, and litigation, and frequently defeats good and pious purposes, which the present aspect of the country would induce all men to wish fulfilled; while from the existing facilities for evasion, they cannot be regarded as serving the main purpose for which they are supposed to be maintained, by securing the heir from the unexpected alienation of property to which he might reason-

ably have hoped to succeed." Emboldened by the report of the committee, Lord Manners, in 1846, brought in a bill to relax the law against pious and charitable bequests. It led to an animated and spicy debate, but was opposed by the Ministry, and was lost on a division—a show of only seventeen votes, probably its whole strength in the House, having been made in its favour.

In 1851, a movement with an opposite aspect was made by Mr. J. E. Headlam. On his motion a committee was appointed "to consider the propriety of *extending* the law of mortmain, so as to include personal estate, and generally to consider whether any alteration should be made in the law as it affects testamentary or other dispositions in favour of religious, charitable, or permanent objects." This was at a period of high feeling against what was deemed Papal aggression in the erection of an Archbishopric of Westminster, and several Bishoprics by the See of Rome, and the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was then pending. It is not improbable that the inquiry grew out of this excitement. It was conducted in the usual manner, and the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster was himself examined before the Committee. The investigation, and the manner in which it was conducted, have drawn down upon the Committee the indignation of the Papal party. One of them, a Mr. Finlason, a barrister of the Inner Temple, who had before made his bow to the public as a legal and political writer, has written quite a book on the subject, which he entitles "An Essay on the history and effects of the laws of mortmain, and the laws against testamentary dispositions for pious purposes." He affirms that "it is perfectly plain, that the overwhelming preponderance of the evidence before these Committees was against the law as it stands; and it is equally clear that the secret object of both Committees, especially the last, was to discover some pretence for depriving the Catholic community of any advantage that might arise from an anticipated alteration of the law by means of some exceptional legislation, imposing additional restrictions intended to operate especially against them." The report of neither Committee however, bears out this assertion. The last report contained

recommendations "that the same law should be enacted with respect to all dispositions of personal estate given for charitable purposes, whether it be directed to be laid out in land or not," and "that it should be incumbent upon all persons to whom *real* or *personal property* is given or bequeathed upon any permanent charitable or religious object, to make a return either to Commissioners or some public Board, of the nature of the gift, and the particular purposes to which it is to be applied." With respect to the main subject of the law, devises of land, the Committee said: "They do not recommend any alteration in the law which prohibits devises of land for the purpose of raising a revenue to be devoted to charitable purposes; but that there should be an exemption from all restraints upon alienation in favour of sites of land to be used for religious edifices, (for any religious community,) or to be used for hospitals, cemeteries, nunneries, or places of education." No action having been had on this report in Parliament, the law in England remains unchanged.

In this country the law of charities has been settled upon the broadest and most liberal footing. In some of the States, indeed, the statute of Elizabeth has been held not to be in force, but the principles of the English Court of Chancery prior to, and under it, in exercising their jurisdiction, have been fully adopted. The statute of 9 George II. is believed to be in force nowhere in this country.

The principles upon which trusts for religious and charitable purposes are administered by the Courts of justice both of this country and of England, are sound and conservative. The great object is to ascertain and carry out the intention of the donor or testator from whose charity the property has proceeded. It would require a treatise to show in how many varying cases this great principle has been sought to be applied, and to deduce from them all the rules which stand for the government of future cases. The leading rules may be thus given:

1. Where the founder or donor has clearly expressed his intention that a particular set of doctrines shall be taught, or a particular form of worship and government maintained, it is

not in the power of individuals, having the management of the institution, at any time to alter the purpose for which it was founded.

2. If a charity be created for a religious purpose, in a Christian congregation designated by the name of a sect, without any specification of the particular worship or tenets intended, the intent of the founder will be deduced from the tenets, doctrine, and discipline of the congregation, avowed and practised by its professors and worshippers at the time of the donation, and the charity will be held appropriated to such church and none other.

3. Where an institution exists for the purpose of religious worship, and it cannot be discovered either by the name of the sect or otherwise, what form or species of religious doctrine or worship was intended, the only means of deciding the question is through the medium of an inquiry into what has been the usage of the congregation, considering such usage as the best evidence of what was the original contract upon which it was founded.

4. Where a congregation has been organized in connection with no particular ecclesiastical form of government or sect of Christians, it is competent for such congregation by a majority to form such connection, provided there be no change of doctrines or fundamental principles involved; and having formed such connection it may afterwards withdraw and resume its independent position.

5. Where a church has been organized, and been endowed whether by donation or subscription, as belonging to any particular sect, or in subordination to any particular form of church government, it cannot break off from that connection and government. Property may be given to the support of tenets without subjection to any ecclesiastical power which upholds those tenets: but it may be shown also that it was given for promulgation of the one in subordination to the other.

6. Over the acts and doings of ecclesiastical bodies within the sphere of their legitimate jurisdiction, the judicial power of the State can take no cognizance. If such a body repudiates and disavows its essential fundamental doctrines and distinctive principles, it will forfeit the administration of all trust

property acquired by donation, before such act of disavowal. It will be dealt with as a trustee abusing the confidence reposed in him, and diverting the funds from the objects contemplated by the donors. But upon all merely administrative questions, the judgments of the ecclesiastical tribunals are final and conclusive. Their acts and decisions cannot be revised in the civil courts. Ministers deposed, whether for scandal or heresy, cannot claim the assistance of the civil power to restore them. As trustees they determine who are or are not the beneficiaries of their funds, and they cannot be called to account, unless for the perversion of these funds to objects or tenets not within the terms or intention of the original donation. Any other than those courts must be incompetent judges of matters of faith, discipline, and doctrine; and civil courts, if they should be so unwise as to attempt to supervise their judgments on matters which come within their jurisdiction, would involve themselves in a sea of uncertainty and doubt, which would do anything but improve either religion or good morals.

These are the leading principles upon which rests the security of religious endowments. However applicable these principles may be to all kinds of charitable trusts, it must at once occur to every one, that they cannot operate in practice with the same vigour in the case of voluntary benevolent societies—independent colleges and seminaries—and eleemosynary corporations, as they do in the case of institutions in connection with, and subordination to, ecclesiastical organization. The administration of trusts committed to such institutions can be more regularly and thoroughly supervised, and though equally liable to experience losses as all others, from unwise investment or the peculation of officers, they cannot be perverted to purposes wholly foreign, without the perversion also of the entire body. The minority who maintain the original principles of the sect, become the trustees of its funds. Even the entire perversion of the body would not lead to the perversion of its trust funds, if there were any in the community still honest and faithful enough to invoke the interposition of justice. It is not so with the institutions of a different character, unconnected with any ecclesiastical organization. They have no distinctive prin-

ciples or doctrines. Even should formulas be required to be subscribed by those who teach or are entrusted with the active management of them, there can be no civil judgment pronounced on those who subscribe with mental reservations, or on any other footing than *in sensu imponentis.* It has been the want of ecclesiastical subordination to the doctrines, government, and discipline of some efficient ecclesiastical organization, which has resulted in carrying so many churches, colleges, and seminaries, so far from the original views and intentions of their donors and founders, that if they would awake from their tombs, their first work would be to demolish their own foundation; or, if that could not be done, to endow another to oppose the first. Thus has the money of orthodox and zealous Calvinists, invested in churches, colleges, and seminaries, been often perverted to the teaching and promulgation of very different and opposite views, even to the denial of the divinity of the Lord.

Let us not be misunderstood. In their best—their ecclesiastical form—all permanent religious endowments are surrounded with perils. Colleges and seminaries, however, we must have, and they must be permanently endowed. There are cases of Christian men, possessing no surplus beyond a comfortable maintenance while they live, and having no moral claims upon them from children, kindred, or those who stand in their place, who do right to bequeath a portion or the whole of their estates, according to circumstances, to objects of piety and benevolence. If they favour a permanent endowment for their property, instead of giving the principal to be at once used, let them weigh well the superior security of an ecclesiastical organization. But, as a general rule, a man had better be his own executor. The Church, in all her benevolent enterprises, should be sustained by the stated contributions of her living members. Her societies and boards should depend upon their confidence, and should not be ruined by permanent endowments above the need of that confidence.

The danger of the perversion of endowments is to be apprehended principally, if not exclusively, in the case of close corporations. Where the institution endowed is under the control of the Church, the whole body must become corrupt before

such perversion can arise. This is one great reason for preferring the plan of having our Theological Seminaries under the control of the supreme judicatory of the Church, or of Synodical bodies deriving their life immediately from the religious community, to that of placing them in the hands of a self-perpetuating board of trustees.

ART. II.—*Education in the High Schools of Germany.*

1. *Zur Gymnasialreform, Theoretisches und Praktisches*, von Dr. H. Koechly. Dresden und Leipzig, 1846.
2. *Die genetische Methode des schulmässigen Unterrichts.* Von Dr. Mager. Dritte Bearbeitung. Zürich, 1846.
3. *Das Privatstudium in seiner pædagogischen Bedeutung. Eine Skizze als Beitrag zur Kritik unsrer heutigen Gymnasien.* Von Dr. M. Seyffert. Brandenburg, 1852.
4. *Das Schulwesen im protestantischen Staate.* Von Dr. F. J. Günther. Elberfeld, 1852.
5. *Alte und neue Bildung mit Bezug auf das höhere Schulwesen.* Von Wilhelm Scheele. Elbing, 1852.

IN placing the titles of these works at the head of our article, we do not intend to review them, nor even to give an analysis of their contents. They are to serve as an index of the nature of our remarks; they are to tell the eye as it glances over these pages—Here is something on education—*education in the German gymnasia;* and then they are to invite or deter the reader, as his interest may dictate. At the same time, they have a right to their place as being among the most important of recent publications on this subject, which is considerably agitated in Germany. Never, perhaps, at any previous period of the history of German civilization and religion, were the minds of its most earnest men in such a ferment in regard to the all-important question of the best means of educating the young, as at present. The storm of their late revolutionary and reactionary periods has just passed away; the shattered

fragments of some parts of their social and political fabric have either been removed out of sight, or they have once more, with great pains, been skewered in their old positions; the smoke and dust have dispersed, the earth has ceased to rock beneath men's feet, and they look wondering about. Foremost among the bewildered faces we recognize those of the educators of the age, almost at their wit's end from fright and disappointment; they at first look at each other significantly, then they whisper —they murmur something—and finally you distinguish their louder voices. "Those were our pupils," they say, "those were our pupils, that stirred up all this noise; those were our pupils that carried on these regicide proceedings; those were our pupils that made the sky ring with the hated terms of Socialism, Communism, and Red Republic;—and those were our pupils, too, that made such fools of themselves and such a laughing stock of their country at St. Paul's, in Frankfort."

The late events have opened their eyes to some enormous defects, either in their methods of teaching, or in their political institutions, or else in both, which, it is true, had been pointed out to them before, but which never assumed that distinct and actual nature which tangible effects now press upon their attention. They feel that something is wanting in their national existence, to which none of their previously applied means, meant to be preventives, had sufficient reference. Any one but a German perceives at a glance what this is. When he sees a man of brilliant parts lecture for six weeks on the accentuation of a Greek noun of the first declension, his thoughts are, "However great the learning this may require, however much research and ingenuity it may manifest, what is the accentuation of a Greek noun to the great interests and the loud calls of the race of mankind? Must the brightest talents of one of the noblest nations thus evaporate in artificial, self-created regions of inquiry?"

But what is the German to do? His is not the frivolity and facile vivacity of the Gaul, nor the "common-sense" utilitarianism and bread-and-butter philosophy of the Briton, nor the *dolce far niente* worship and Madonna-devotion of his Southern neighbour; but his is a mind bequeathed to him from ancestors who routed Varus' legions, who were proud to give their

vote in the *Witenagemot*, or who—conceived grotesque gods for their Walhalla. These are the characteristics of his mind still: a genuine love of liberty, a meddling, active, bustling spirit, and a fancy doting on the obscure and lonely, the wild and weird, delighting to roam in a region out of space and out of time. Take away from him his public life, forbid him to cherish patriotic (not merely *loyal*) emotions, repress his feelings of true manliness, the Roman *virtus*, so that he should feel that

> "There is a bondage worse, far worse, to bear
> Than his who breathes, by roof and floor and wall
> Pent in, a tyrant's solitary thrall:
> 'Tis his who walks about in the open air,
> One of a nation, who, henceforth, must wear
> Their fetters in their *souls*;"

and he will, nay, he must turn to the realms of mere thought, and construct wild philosophies, build fanciful theories, and invent impracticable systems. What if the arts, what if learning flourish? "When the æsthetic element represses other and that essential interests, when its cultivation is carried so far that it tends to alienate man from these interests, then it is always connected with much insipidity and sloth, with much self-complacency, with an aimless craving for diversion, and a morbid desire for mere pleasure. Ever to look and to listen, to enjoy and to criticise, becomes ultimately a hollow, effeminate, sybaritic life, which tends to destroy even the noblest powers."* And as to learning, it is undeniable that the Germans have done much for it; "but it is not good when a nation which possesses *every* element of progress and advancement, is confined to an exclusively literary existence."† It is not good for philosophy, as without practical application it must run into mere theorizing; it is not good for practical life, for the πράττειν does not belong to the man who can exert the native powers of his understanding only on nature as distinct

* Rosenkranz, Leben Hegels, p. 349.

† This is the motto which a wonderfully clearsighted German theologian (Hundeshagen,) places on the titlepage of a work which, although it appeared before the late German commotions, said some very true things on this subject. Its title is: Der deutsche Protestantismus, seine Vergangenheit und seine heutigen Lebensfragen beleuchtet von einem deutschen Theologen. Frankfurt am Main. 1847. 8vo. pp. 539.

from man, or only on the dead life of the past, and who can look at the acting men of the present age only from a distance, and know them only from hearsay. Where the ideal and the real are thus divorced, there the development and advancement of life cannot go on in a healthful manner.

It is not strange, therefore, that the Germans should have partitioned off the subject of education also into so and so many categories, vacant shelves, which are there, whether any thing is to be placed on them or not; and it is owing to this among other reasons that their books on this subject are so little readable. We can often neither appreciate nor understand them, first, because we are not sufficiently conversant with the spirit that dictated them, the circumstances that called them forth, and the necessities they are intended to supply; and secondly, because they are so immeasurably in advance of us in the mere theoretical development of their system. Terms that seem to be to them the veriest household words, are to us as unintelligible as the terms Holoptychius, Cricodus, Schilfglaserz, or the opecculated species of the dioptea and raphoneis oregonica would be to some geognostic Epimenides, who should awake on one of these days.

If we open any one of the books mentioned at the beginning of this article, we shall find such systems as Basedow's, Pestalozzi's, Jacotot's, Hamilton's, Rudhardt's, and such methods as the deictic, the acroamatic, the mnemonic, the heuristic, the socratic, the catechetic, the eclectic, the genetic,* the calculating, and others, bandied about with a freedom that convinces us at once that what is Greek to us, is their vernacular. An endless refining of the *theory*, not of the *art*, of teaching, has produced all these designations: they are afraid, it seems, to let

* The *genetic* method requires perhaps a more serious word. It is advocated by some of the ablest teachers of Germany. Dr. Mager, the editor of an excellent educational journal, *Die Paedagogische Revue*, has been labouring for its ascendency for many years. Herbart has been trying to introduce it in metaphysical investigations. In its application to education it is defined by one of its advocates in the following language: Geneticam methodum eam dicimus instituendi aut docendi rationem, qua res naturali suo ordine et ita exponuntur, ut a simplicioribus ad composita; a causa ad effectum, a minori ad majus, a faciliori ad difficilius pergatur, singulorum tamen momentorum apte inter se conjungendorum diligentissima habita ratione. (Lindner De finibus et praesidiis artis pœdagogicæ secundum principia doctrinæ christianæ, p. 29.)

nature do her work; all is artificial, and their motto appears to be the German poet's epigram:

> "Nature hide from childhood's eyes and ears,
> Methodless, confusing it appears."*

The mind of every reader, probably, who considers all these methods, or, at least, the fact of their existence, will at once start both a philosophical and a practical query. The first is, that this German way seems to be quite an improvement on good old Bacon, who, following Aristotle, said that only *Duæ viæ sunt atque esse possunt, ad inquirendam et inveniendam veritatem. Altera a sensu et particularibus advolat ad axiomata maxime generalia, atque ex iis principiis eorumque immota veritate judicat et invenit axiomata media: atque hæc via in usu est. Altera a sensu et particularibus excitat axiomata, aseendendo continenter et gradatim, ut ultimo loco perveniatur ad maxime generalia: quæ via vera est, sed intentata.*† On closer inspection, however, we shall find those methods with their uncouth names to be but subdivisions, or, at best, modifications of what we have been in the habit of calling analysis and synthesis, observation and induction. "Is there anything whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us."

And this may aid us in disposing of the second point, the practical query: Is it true that, with our vast educational interest, our almost infinitely diversified machinery of instruction, and every kind and grade of teaching, we should have nothing similar to the many methods which the Germans draw up in rank and file before us? We may answer in the words of Macaulay, who shows that a *government* may be strong and efficient without its being reared by line and plummet, and that it is only a refined and *speculative* phase of national existence which is inclined to systemization. "In rude‡ societies the progress of government resembles the progress of language

* Vor der Natur verbind dem Kinde Aug' und Ohr,
Verwirrend stellt sie sich ihm immethodisch vor."

† Novum Organum, Lib. I. Aph. 19.

‡ The kind reader will probably remember the adage: *Omne simile claudicat.* Moreover, the term may not be thought too harsh if we consider the age, the experience, and the intellectual speed and momentum which Germany has attained, as compared with this country of only seven decades.

and of versification. Rude societies have language, and often copious and energetic language, but they have no scientific grammar, no definitions of nouns and verbs, no *names* for declensions, moods, tenses, and voices. Rude societies have versification, and often versification of great power and sweetness, but they have no metrical canons: and the minstrel whose numbers, regulated solely by his ear, are the delight of his audience, would himself be unable to say of how many dactyls and trochees each of his lines consists. As eloquence exists before syntax, and song before prosody, so government may exist in a high degree of excellence long before the limits of legislative, executive, and judicial power have been traced with precision." It is thus with teaching in this country. There being but few attempts made to centralize the powers exerted, the energies expended, and the experiences gathered, uncounted methods may arise, and are actually arising, some doubtless extensively practised, all pursued with more or less success, or accompanied by failure, perhaps dying with the individual teacher, and affording no man a chance to give them "a local habitation and a name."

To become more intimately acquainted with ourselves, "to see ourselves as others see us," to be objective to ourselves, as it were, there is no better means than to compare ourselves with others, to look at others, their attainments, and their state. The sweep which intellectual activity in Germany has taken is so extensive, that whatever direction our national development may take, we shall certainly come into near proximity to some of the shoals and banks, of so few of which the Germans have steered clear. If we refuse to profit by the experience of others, we shall be obliged to experience the same mishaps, which will be so much the greater disasters in our case, as we are so much nearer the ultimate stage of the development of the race, as our progress, in any direction whatsoever, is, without exaggeration, a hundredfold more rapid than that of any nation of the old world has been, and as, by the accelerated flow of our nation's blood, any injury received must so much the more swiftly communicate itself to all parts.

If we are told that our system of education (if the singular number can at all be used) is the offspring of our character, re-

lations, condition, and circumstances; that it is what a German would call *naturwüchsig*, and that we ought not, we cannot imitate that of any other nation, our reply is twofold. The same objection is made by the Hindu to the Christian religion; he gives the same reason for refusing to examine its claims; and moreover we are not asked either to adopt or to imitate the German system; on the contrary, as a whole, we should most earnestly hope never to see it introduced into this country. That it is perfect not even a German would dare to affirm; but that it has some admirable, some excellent features which it would be well to "naturalize," there will be few, we presume, to deny. We will not tire the reader, and only ask him to consider Nestor's sage advice:

κάλλιόν ἐστι μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἔρεσθαι
ξείνους,

or to cite higher authority: Πάντα δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.*

Of most general interest among the works above mentioned, is the last one on the list, *Scheele's Alte und neue Bildung.* In a lively and pleasing style, with a thorough acquaintance with the subject, and a close logical coherence, the author pictures modern education, and evolves the historical necessity by which it has sprung from that of previous ages. He then criticises this modern system, and suggests the changes which the spirit of the age requires, and presents the necessity of other institutions of a high order besides those that mainly prepare for the study of one of the learned professions. The manner in which he shows the great importance of the Latin language, and how like Napoleon it still rules the nations, now from the grave as formerly from the throne, is well worthy of attention. *He* reasons mostly *ex concessis*. *We* should have to resort to fundamental truths to meet the doubts that are so often raised among *us* respecting the "utility" of the study of ancient languages; for the grounds on which their importance is maintained, are impregnable.

* We do not believe that this is an illegitimate extension of the principle. Nihil enim periculosius quam ea morositas, qua fit ut nobis insipida sit quævis doctrina, dum probare, quæ recta sit, non sustinemus. (*Calvin.*)—Pauli doctrina intelligenda est de hisce rebus, quæ adhuc incertæ hærent, et in ambiguo stant, et dum lis adhuc sub judice pendet. (*Zwingle.*)

A dead language must ever retain the place assigned to it by the experience of many centuries, as long as it furnishes the means of education; as long as it presents a rich literature, the real treasures of which can never be disclosed by mere translations; as long as its grammar is exact and endowed with a variety of forms; as long as it furnishes materials for history; as long as it has an important bearing on the science of language, the complement of history; and as long as it contains the root of modern languages. Most of these requirements are found in the Greek language, all in the Latin. Drop the study of Latin, and you have removed the whole basis on which the literature of every modern nation rests. None of the languages of the present day contain the source of the history of the nation by which it is spoken; so that the history of the race from its remotest recollections, and their original oneness and mutual connection depend upon the record contained in some ancient language; we lose ourselves, if we drop this thread. Let us relinquish the study of Latin and Greek, and we have exploded that vast storehouse from which, almost exclusively, modern science draws its terms, its words, the very instruments by which a science or a discovery becomes the property of the world, from being the property of an individual. Moreover, what can we substitute for that which now is the germ of *the* science of the age—*the comparative study of language?* This claim is not arrogance. For neither astronomy with its unceasing discoveries, nor geology with its startling disclosures, has any reference to *man.* They may teach us the wonderful laws which regulate God's great universe; they may permit us to dimly trace a few facts in the history of the little planet we tread on, we live and die on; but what is it that draws the curtain from the inmost recesses of the past, opening to us a view upon the *nations* migrating from a common centre; that proclaims, in unmistakable speech, what pyramids and mummies, mounds and graves, skulls and buried arms fail to intimate clearly, namely, that men are a family of brethren; that confirms without hesitancy, that God "hath made of *one blood* all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," and that, however great the diversity of the tongues and dialects of men now is, there was a time when "the whole earth was of one language

and of one speech;"—what science is it but the science of language?—and the languages misnamed dead are at once its foundation, its material, and the field of its culture.

> "The tree of language branches the wide, wide world around,
> Its wondrous roots are hidden in deep and solid ground.
> Far in primeval ages wells up that source of power,
> Creating SPEECH's great wonders, e'en to this present hour.
> * * * * * *
> The knowledge of these wonders 'tis we bring to the light,
> The course which language taketh reveals its fountain's site;
> Its billows murmur stories of deep significance,
> Though neophytes discern but confused noise and chance."*

"There is in fact no sure way of tracing the history and migrations of the early inhabitants of the world except by means of their languages; any other mode of inquiry must rest on the merest conjecture and hypothesis. It may seem strange that anything so vague and arbitrary as language should survive all other testimonies, and speak with more definiteness, even in its changed and modern state, than all other monuments, however grand and durable. Yet so it is; we have the proof before us every hour. Though we had lost all other history of our country, we should be able to tell, from our language, composed as it is of a substratum of Low German with deposits of Norman-French and Latin—the terms of war and government pertaining to the former of the superinduced elements, the terms of Ecclesiastical and Legal use to both of them—that the bulk of our population was Saxon, and that they were overcome and permanently subjected to a body of Norman invaders; while the Latin element would show us how much that language had been used by the lawyers and churchmen."†

Language, then, being the storehouse of tradition, living on from nation to nation;—the clue of material and spiritual con-

* "Und so dehnt seine Zweige rings um den Erdenrund
Der Wunderbaum der Sprache und wurzelt tief im Grund;
Tief in der Vorwelt sprudelt der reiche Quell der Kraft,
Die, heut noch nicht versieget, des Wortes Wunder schafft.
Und dieser Wunder Kunde, die bringen wir herauf,
Den Weg zum Quelle zeigt uns der Sprachenströme Lauf,
Und ihre Wogen rauschen uns tief verstanden an,
Wo dumpfen Schall nur hören der Ungeweihte kann.
(*Lorenz Diefenbach*, Sprachforschung.)

† Donaldson, New Cratylus.

nection, which joins century to century—*the common memory of the human race;*—the study of its noblest representatives has little to fear from those opposed to it, though they be giants. Vandalism and a low utilitarianism cannot triumph. But those friendly to it—its professed friends and promoters—aye, there lies the danger. If at this moment thorough classical training is in jeopardy in this country through the encroachments of twenty subjects, which may all belong to what is called useful information, and may all tend to impart a knowledge of things (*realia*), but which have nothing to do with education proper, let us be candid and confess that the advocates of classical instruction themselves have left the door open for this host of harpies. If we, at any time, have had no well-defined conception of the real aim and object of education, if we have become formal, and lukewarm in our attachment to it, if the cry of the vulgar has been allowed to undermine our honest convictions, if our indifference has shaken men's faith in our sincerity, if we have set half-taught men and youths to wield that chisel which requires the steady hand of an artist like Arnold, if we have substituted the fact of having read so many pages for the ability to read them, if we have given Virgil and Homer to *children* to read, if we have let smattering take the place of grammatical firmness, if we have made boys learn by rote like parrots, instead of learning by reflection like men,—then we need not wonder if our sin has found us out, and of all our harvest-hope we have

"Nought reaped but a weedie crop of care."

In a previous number* we gave an imperfect sketch of the method of instruction in the ancient languages, pursued in the German gymnasia. We proceed now to some other branches, and first to the Hebrew.

As a branch of instruction, the Hebrew language has a history of its own. It cannot be surprising that a new interest in the study of the Scriptures should be coincident in point of time with the Reformation; in fact, the advances which have been made in the grammatical study of the Hebrew language, have been due almost wholly to Protestants. That wonderful

* Princeton Review, October, 1852, p. 564, sq.

youth, the Franciscan Conrad Pellican, published his Hebrew grammar (*de modo legendi et intelligendi Hebræa*) in 1503, having compiled it without any aid except the Hebrew Bible and a Latin translation.* However, John Reuchlin is generally considered the father of Hebrew learning in Germany, for by his *Libri tres de rudimentis Hebraicis* (published in 1506) which contained both grammar and dictionary, he transplanted David Kimchi's learning into Christendom, and became the author of those technical terms which are still retained in the books treating of the Hebrew language. Thus aided, the Hebrew was soon introduced into the schools, and accordingly, we find that about the middle of the sixteenth century it was taught in the Saxon princes' schools, and in the year 1580 it was established by law as a regular branch of instruction; the same was the case in the schools attached to the monasteries in Würtemberg. It retained its place undisputed in the gymnasia, which sprung from these institutions, at least for such pupils as intended to study theology, until very recently, when voices began to be raised against it. It was said that it was favouring that one class of pupils, the future theologians, whilst nothing was offered in compensation to those who designed to devote themselves to law or medicine; that it was overburdening the student who had enough to do with his ordinary branches, that there was no reason why it should not or could not be studied with equal advantage, at least, during the first year of the University course, that the number of students of theology was so small in the gymnasia that it was unreasonable to waste the time of a teacher on a few, which could with greater advantage be employed in the instruction of a large class. Besides, the University must furnish the means to study the elements of the language, at any rate, since the students came there very unequally prepared, and since many do not resolve to study theology until they have entered the University.

Nevertheless, whilst the objections to the removal of Hebrew were so many and so great, these charges against its remaining were considered too slight and trifling. No student, it was

* Not long after the bolder monk of Erfurt had lifted up his voice, Pellican joined the Protestants.

said, ever complains that by adding Hebrew to his other studies in the gymnasium the burden became too great for him, since the study is voluntary; the language itself is much easier than Latin or Greek; it is not partiality to theological students to afford them the means of acquiring the Hebrew in the gymnasium, as other students may enter upon the study of law or medicine immediately upon leaving the gymnasium, whilst theology cannot be studied without an acquaintance with the Hebrew. As a language, moreover, it well deserves a place in the gymnasium, without at all encroaching upon its immediate object. For in the combination of sublimity of spirit, and simplicity of form, neither the Greek nor the Latin could bear a comparison with it. Besides, modern civilization rests after all as much, nay, by far more, upon the religion of the Old Testament, than upon Greek and Roman culture. If the latter, then, receives so much attention that the educated man may know the historical foundation on which he stands, does not the Hebrew language deserve at least an equal share of attention? On the other hand, if Hebrew should be dropped as a branch of instruction in the gymnasium, the theological course in the University would require to be lengthened by at least one year.* And would not thus the general standing of Hebrew learning be considerably lowered, since, at present, the student who comes to the University, has studied Hebrew for four, five, and even six years beforehand? Thus, too, the memorizing of paradigms which is so unpalatable to adults, falls in years when committing to memory is an ordinary, every-day affair.

This subject is worthy of special attention, as the question has been raised here and there in this country, whether our colleges ought not to afford the opportunity of acquiring the Hebrew. If we consider the age at which most of our theological students enter the seminary, the almost general repugnance to learning the rudiments of a new language so different in cha-

* Præterea vix est, cur moneam, eum, qui theologiæ studere cogitet, non posse accedere ad academiam, nisi etiam linguæ Hebraicæ elementa et vocabulorum aliquam copiam memoria teneat. Nam qui in academia demum ad litterarum Hebraicarum elementa se applicent, eos partim cetera studia tardare vel omnino rerum suarum successum incredibiliter impedire, usus affatim docet." (*Nobbe* De maturitate studiorum scholasticorum temporis Melanchthoniani et nostri, p. 28.)

racter from all which they may have learned before, the multiplicity of studies that devolve upon them during their theological course, short at best as it is, the value of the time and labours of a theological professor, a scholar, who must devote perhaps ten lessons a week, and even more, to the thankless drudgery of hearing recitations in grammar and mere translation—we may well wonder that our colleges do not supply this great want. Two or three hours a week during the Junior and Senior years devoted to Hebrew would be an invaluable benefit to our Biblical scholarship, and, may we not say, to our Church? And it seems as if colleges, with a very small amount of self-denial on the part of professors, could much more readily afford the means to study Hebrew, than French or German, which all of our colleges do. We are amazed sometimes at the amount of Hebrew learning apparent in some of the books from Germany; but we should probably be still more astonished to see boys of fourteen years of age translate sections of modern history or of Greek and Roman antiquities into Hebrew, as fast as the original is dictated to them; or to see theological students, in taking walks with their teacher, translate newspapers into Hebrew for pastime.*

Of the method usually pursued in the instruction of Hebrew the following is an outline. As soon as the student can read the text, he commits to memory the pronouns and the paradigm of the regular verb, the formation of which the teacher explains at the same time; that is, he points out the preformatives and afformatives, and their significations; then comes the doctrine of the suffixes, with the necessary paradigms of nouns and verbs. At this stage of his progress, the pupil commences to translate some easy passage of Scripture, the teacher frequently giving beforehand the meaning of the words contained in the subsequent lesson, to supersede the necessity of the student's hunting for the words, which would take too much time from him at this early period of his advancement. Reading and translating are henceforth continued, whilst some portion of the grammar forms at the same time a part of every lesson. Now he learns the

* This has actually been the custom, until recently, in some of the institutions of Würtemberg. The decline of religion went hand in hand with a decline in this part of their scholarship!

doctrine of the letters, their changes, etc. As soon as he is acquainted with the gutturals and their powers, he commits the verbs with their gutturals; as soon as he has learned the nature and changes of the quiescent letters, he learns the paradigms of the irregular verbs. The paradigm given in the book is seldom conjugated in the class, but generally some verb like it. During the reading lessons the teacher constantly causes the student to repeat what he has learned before, and explains what he has not yet learned, so that he becomes acquainted with some rules of the syntax, such as the uses of the construct state, of the tenses, the article, the particles, etc., long before he learns them in the grammar; or the teacher explains one of these phenomena, and requires the student to learn the rules concerning them for the subsequent lesson from the book. Reading the text correctly, and also writing the Hebrew character, are constantly kept in view; the latter is practised by written grammatical exercises, such as the conjugation of verbs, first after the model of the paradigm in the book and with its aid, afterwards from memory. In preparing his reading lessons the pupil is also required to write out the words, which he must look for in the lexicon, and commit them perfectly to memory. Translations from the German into Hebrew are also in use, mostly, however, in such a manner that, the books being closed, the teacher gives the German of some passages read shortly before, or even at any previous time, and requires them to be turned into Hebrew, *ex tempore*. The more advanced student is also required to turn parts of the New Testament, or of the Apocrypha, into Hebrew; German-Hebrew dictionaries are hardly ever used. There are also frequent exercises in the reading of the unpointed text.

The study of the Hebrew, which generally occupies part of the last four years of the course in the gymnasium, is generally distributed, so that in the first year the pupil learns the accidence and practises it both orally and by writing; in the second, he translates parts of the historical books of the Old Testament, continuing the study of the grammar; in the third, he reads select portions of the Psalms and Proverbs, still retaining the study of the grammar; and in the fourth year, select portions from the prophets are read.

German grammar is taught in all the gymnasia; the methods are numerous, and differ very considerably. Although they arose successively, most of them are still followed in different parts of Germany. Shortly after the Thirty Years' War, when the study of the ancient classics was considered the Alpha and Omega of an education, it was thought that native authors and speakers could only succeed by imitating the ancients. Translation and imitation were consequently the only means used to impart the art of writing; hence German grammar was Latinized, or at least cast in the mould of the Latin grammar. To this period belong all those "fabulous" German grammars, from Gottsched to Heinsius and Heyne. But when German genius broke loose from the fetters of such an artificial and unnatural system, and German literature became of age, grammar, stiff from long repose, limped after it; it commenced to be practical; in order to adapt it to the necessities of the middle classes, technical and theoretical instruction were completely submerged under dictation, composition, and all sorts of exercises in style, so that the living, correcting teacher, was the supreme arbiter of all doubtful questions. This system insensibly fell back again into the imitating method, only that native writers were now set up as the models, instead of the Greeks and Romans. This method was still further improved by the appearance of such writings as those of Goethe and Schiller, which were now made the subjects of regular study and analysis. But when the modern science of comparative philology arose, and the *Germanists* raked up the almost forgotten ancestors of the German language, the Old High German, the Middle High German, and various other German dialects, the "historical grammar," with its method, made its appearance, which ascends to the highest sources of the language, traces the history of single sounds, of individual words, and of entire idioms, goes into the minutest details of syntax and diction, brings to its aid, for the purpose of elucidation, every available light from collateral languages and dialects, endeavours to remove all that is foreign, and to evolve the real substance of the language in the greatest possible purity. This method produced a complete revolution, and every method that has arisen subsequently, has not been intended to supersede, but to complete it. Jacob Grimm is its father. The next in order is Becker, with the logical method.

He supplied the theoretical sub-structure of system to the materials gathered before, and educed the most complicated forms and phrases, logically and naturally, from some one fundamental principle. The latest method is the "psychological," which, based on William von Humboldt's popularized ideas concerning language, endeavours to exhibit the relations of the human mind to the phenomena of universal grammar, and especially of the German mind to the German language.

Connected with this is the subject of composition, which receives particular attention in most of the gymnasia. System is pursued in this as well as in everything else. The progress is gradual from the lowest class to the highest. The first exercises in this department are copying extracts; this is intended as a practice of the rules of orthography and punctuation, and as a means for producing accuracy. Next comes dictation where the same ends are had in view. Then the teacher reads or narrates historical incidents, fables, tales, or descriptions, which the pupil afterwards writes down from memory. This affords the first practice in what may properly be called composing, that is, constructing sentences and periods. These exercises are followed by amplifications: a few of the principal features of a narrative, description, dissertation, (these, too, in systematic succession,) are given, which the pupil is required to carry out more fully and to complete. This is sometimes varied in such a manner that merely words are given which are required to be formed into a narrative, etc. This, of course, exercises the imagination. Hereupon follow exercises in changing the form, *e. g.* narratives are to be cast into the form of letters; the subject of the same letter is to be addressed to different persons; poetry is to be turned into prose; fables, parables, etc., into moral disquisitions; a figurative style is to be stripped of its metaphors, and *vice versa*, etc. etc. Then *Commentaries*, poems (generally) are to be explained, unusual phrases and expressions to be rendered clear, the connection of the parts to be pointed out, etc. This is a very extensive subject, commencing with the mere paraphrase of a fable, and reaching to the æsthetical development of a tragedy. Next imitations: the form of a greater or less production is retained by a change of its contents; or, in higher classes, a

description of an object, a person, a place, is given as a model to be imitated by the application of its principles, arrangement, etc., in the description of another object of a similar nature. The same is done with dissertations and the like. After this comes analysis; then its opposite. After that is required the treatment of a given historical material from a given point of view. Then description: of minor objects, phenomena, localities, edifices, machines, costumes, paintings, statues, travels, real or fictitious, festivities, spectacles, etc.* Descriptions of character occupy the next place; not only of the character of individuals, but also of nations, parties, societies, orders, periods; nor are they of a historical character alone, but also of heroes, of tales, poems, and dramas, or of imaginary characters, etc. After this are generally placed parallels and comparisons of objects in nature, historical or poetical characters, works of art, etc. Then investigations or criticisms; hereupon dissertations, and finally speeches and orations.

It will be readily seen that many of these divisions as here enumerated, admit again of such subdivisions that they afford matter for exercises in all classes, perhaps; that is, three, four, or more of these species may be practised during the same year, not successively, but by the side of one another; but here again, the principle of proceeding from what is easy to what is more difficult, is carefully observed.

The subject is always assigned by the teacher; the same subject for the whole class; it is generally one which does not go beyond the range of the pupil's knowledge or private reading, it gives the pupil generally an opportunity to show his improvement in the acquisition of certain matters that have been recently treated of in the class; the form of the composition, also, is always definitely given, whether it is to be an essay, or a speech, or a letter, etc., if it is to be a metrical composition, whether it is to be an ode, or a ballad, or a sonnet, etc. The minimum length also is prescribed. Such compositions are generally written once a fortnight. The teacher, on returning the corrected exercises to the pupils, tells them

* The Germans here make a distinction between *Beschreibung* and *Schilderung*, the latter being more elevated in style than the former.

how the class generally have succeeded in their work, reads and criticises some of the best and some of the worst, having previously classified and arranged all the compositions according to their comparative merits. Sometimes he reads a composition on the same subject written by himself, to show the class how the work should have been performed to be entirely satisfactory. Sometimes an hour will be spent by the teacher in narrating interesting stories, true or fictitious, or he will ask one and another of the pupils to do so; or some rare book will be read aloud. At other times the teacher will spend an hour in asking enigmas and riddles, which are frequently of a grammatical or etymological nature.

Arithmetic is taught in the lowest two classes of the gymnasium; text books are hardly ever used; very little, if any, cyphering is done in school hours; problems are dictated to be worked out at home, and written out, result as well as the work itself, in a copy-book, which is handed to the teacher in the next recitation, who, in the recitation after, returns it, with his marks noting the correctness or incorrectness of the several sums. The schoolhours are taken up partly with the explanation of new rules, etc., and partly with mental arithmetic; in this some scholars attain to great proficiency.

In Algebra the method is very much the same as that followed in this country, only that a text-book is hardly ever used, and the course is consequently slower but more thorough.

In Geometry the method is somewhat different. A text-book, again, is something the pupils in a majority of the gymnasia never hear of. The whole of the first year is spent in what are called the definitions and axioms, which with us are generally despatched in one or two lessons. The method followed subsequently is this: The teacher dictates a proposition, explains all the terms, and ascertains by questioning whether it is understood. Some one of the pupils is now required to draw the figure on the black-board which seems to be demanded by the proposition. If auxiliary lines are necessary, he is either led, by questioning, to find them himself, or other members of the class find them for him, or, if they are of a more complicated nature, the teacher draws them himself. The hypothesis is then stated, as well as the thesis (the thing to be

proved,) by some formula (if possible) resembling an algebraic one; then the demonstration is found by the pupil, aided by the teacher, in the same heuristic or zetetic manner to which we have had occasion to allude before. The pupils are allowed to take notes of the demonstration, provided their attention is not distracted by the operation, as they are constantly liable to have questions addressed to them just as much as the one who is engaged at the black-board. This demonstration is then fully worked out at home, when care must be taken to have as few words as possible, but represent everything by algebraic signs and by the position of the equations. All the propositions then gone through with in one lesson are repeated in the next without the aid of the teacher, when the pupils have an opportunity of supplying defects in their demonstration, and of correcting errors. For the lesson after this these propositions with their demonstrations are entered into a separate copy-book, which is handed to the teacher, at certain stated periods, for inspection and revision. The deduction of corollaries, the solution of problems, and the demonstration of minor propositions not treated of in class, constitute the remainder of the pupil's industry at home.

An important constituent part of an education is *the culture of the physical powers*. A number of melancholy experiences united to press this truth upon the attention of the Germans. But, as is usual with them, they discussed long and learnedly before they took hold of the idea, and introduced gymnastic exercises into their schools. The pedagogic difficulty with them was to determine whether these exercises were to be performed as play or as work. If they were to be considered as play, then it was contended they did not belong to the school as a school exercise, but considered as work they would seem altogether to concern only acrobats, jugglers, and so forth, or at best to constitute a part of the regular training of soldiers merely. After much had been spoken and written on the subject, a general assent appears to have been produced to the view which maintains that the aim of these exercises was to bring the youths of a school together in greater numbers, for the purpose of physical and corporeal development, so that, at the same time, they should not be left without supervision.

This was effected by the general establishment of *turnplätze*, gymnasia in the English sense of the word, where gymnastics were made a regular branch of instruction.

The principal methods followed are three in number, which bear severally the names of Jahn's, Spiess', and Ling's. That of which *Jahn* was the most prominent advocate, is the oldest. In 1793, Gutsmuth published his *Science of Gymnastics*, which is founded, to a great extent, on the ancient Greek art, and which was designed to awaken the attention of parents and teachers to the necessity of giving the body a healthful development, whilst the intellect received its due share of training and exercise. The means which he employed to effect this development was a union of vigorous effort with unrestrained sport. Though his endeavours did not fail to turn the thoughts of multitudes to this subject, yet the convulsed state of Europe at that time, the wars of Napoleon, and the general calamities in the train of contending nations impeded its full development and its progress. But during the time that Germany, and especially proud Prussia, felt the yoke of the Corsican oppressor, Jahn had given to the ancient and yet novel art a new impulse among the descendants of the Teutons. The general armament against France, which almost emptied the universities and gymnasia—(these youths were not pressed into the service, they were volunteers)—only stirred up a greater desire, among the remainder, for personal prowess, and bodily strength and vigour, all of which were greatly advanced by those gymnastic exercises. Jahn's system—if such it can be called, for it is merely a natural development and regular arrangement of play—is by far the most prevalent. To look at one of these places where youths are assembled for gymnastic exercises, one would think each one did just as he pleased, without rule or order; and, in many cases, his supposition would be correct. In fact, this system has no special reference to respiration or muscular action, and teaches only the use of limbs. All it produces appears to be agility, and perhaps boldness. Generally all the pupils of the gymnasium are divided and arranged, not in classes corresponding to those in the school, but in sections according to size and strength, and each of these sections is committed to the special instruction of a προγυμναστής (*Vorturner*); this latter is either one

of the older pupils, or one of the teachers of the gymnasium; and many of us would perhaps be surprised to see some of those learned professors, with whose names and books we have become familiar, and whom we represent to ourselves somewhat like the figure on the cover of Klotz's lexicon, lank, worn out, in gown and slippers, almost buried among musty tomes—to see one of these in the gymnast's linen roundabout, going through some break-neck motions and perilous ventures, or playing leap-frog *con amore*. A practised teacher of gymnastics superintends and directs the whole. These exercises take place in the open air, twice a week, for two hours each time, and generally only during the summer months.

But these gymnastics had their evils; they were found, in many instances, to engender a certain degree of bluntness, which soon became rudeness, a pride in personal vigour and strength, a spirit of defiance, and negligence of external forms and appearances, so that when it was found that the various societies of gymnasts (they existed to a very great extent among the people at large*) cherished a spirit of liberty by (at least during the time of their gatherings) obliterating distinctions derived from birth, by engendering a spirit of equality, and a democratic turn of mind, they were considered in those monarchies, as politically dangerous, radical, and revolutionary, and the public places for gymnastic exercises were closed.

Thus this beautiful art languished, at least in the northern parts of Germany, until Prussia, in 1842, again endeavoured to revive it; that is, in connection with the gymnasia. But, in the mean time, a new system had arisen in the south, that of *Spiess*, who, failing to find thoroughness, order, and method in the old system, wished to make the whole subject much more one of the real and recognized branches of an education. This system makes the attendance of the pupils obligatory, as at any other branch of instruction; the different classes of the gymnasium are taught by different teachers as classes, and not together with other classes, daily at least for one hour; in summer in the open air, in winter in a building; the order of sequence in the exercises, as laid down in the books on the subject, must be

* The *Turner* societies among the Germans in America are their offspring.

strictly attended to, and not deviated from any more than the rules of Latin syntax. There are, however, occasional pedestrian excursions of the whole gymnasium (including the teachers) for amusement, and partly for the exhibition of gymnastic exercises learnt before, and the practice of those for which there is no opportunity in a more or less confined gymnasium.

The third and most artificial system is that introduced by the Central Gymnastic Institute, established at Berlin, which is to educate teachers of gymnastics, in as much as it is for want of these that gymnastic exercises have not been introduced yet into all the gymnasia, though the government ordered it about ten years ago. The difficulty was not that of obtaining men qualified to teach gymnastics, but men scientifically educated for the office of instructor, who should act as professors, and, at the same time, discharge the duty of teachers of gymnastics. The government attaches great importance to this office, because these teachers, with their pupils freed from the ordinary restraints of the schoolroom, are found to possess much more direct influence upon them than other teachers. It is also considered of the greatest importance that such teachers should be thoroughly acquainted with anatomy and physiology. The system pursued in that institution, and prospectively to be introduced into all the gymnasia, is that of *Ling*, a Swede, who divides the whole practice into four parts:

1. *Pedagogical gymnastics*, (subjective-active) which teaches us how to subject our own body to our will.

2. *Military gymnastics*, (objective-active) which teaches us to subject the will of another person to our own, (wrestling, boxing, fencing, etc.)

3. *Remedial gymnastics*, (subjective-passive) by which man endeavours to overcome those anomalies and diseases of the body which have arisen from some abnormal state or condition.

4. *Aesthetical gymnastics*, (objective-passive) which teaches us to manifest our thoughts and feelings by attitude and posture, or to express the idea of the beautiful by the movements of the muscles.

In some gymnasia, swimming, riding, and even dancing, are also taught.

Desultory and imperfect as this sketch is, it would be still

more so, should we pretermit every allusion to the religious position and influence of these gymnasia, the relation of classical studies to the Christian spirit in Germany, and the manner in which they are regarded by the earnest Christians there.

A quarter of a century ago, when F. Thiersch wrote his able work *Ueber gelehrte Schulen*, he believed he saw no greater foe to Christianity and to its spirit than the materialistic and utilitarian tendencies of the age, which endeavoured to banish the classics from the German gymnasia, or at least to greatly circumscribe their sphere. Nor was he alone of this opinion. Voices most worthy to be heard were raised in defence of a thorough and almost exclusive study of the classics as one of the chief pillars of a truly Christian education and sentiment. So much the more astonishing is it to see at the present time men of equal zeal for Christianity, charge the same branch of instruction with being the cause of a great part of the mischief in Church and State, recently experienced there. The fact is, thinking men had always followed with their sorrowing eyes the fearful inroads which Rationalism, infidelity, and hostility to Christ were making in their country: and proverbially slow as they are in perceiving the practical bearings of a subject, they met the enemy at impracticable points, and with inefficient weapons. At first the preaching of the word from Sabbath to Sabbath, faithfully and fervently, was believed to be sufficient to counteract the evil among the people at large; but by degrees they perceived that irreligion was on the increase, and that they would not succeed in sweetening the bitter waters without ascending to their fountain. At this point of time the field of theory became the arena of the combat, and the consequence was that Rationalism as far as its theoretic and literary pretences were concerned, yielded up the ghost. Nevertheless, its advocates continued to parade about the dead carcass, incredulous of its demise, and the people at large were as much exposed as ever to its deleterious influences. Believing scholars felt that their reasonings and arguments fell utterly powerless on the minds of those whose whole mode of thinking, whose *Anschauungsweise*, was *toto cœlo* different from their own. To their schools of logic, then, to the Universities, they directed their view and their efforts, and much indeed was

written on University education and on the state of morals and discipline among the students. But all their discussions and investigations only convinced them more and more that they had not yet found the root of the evil. Now they turned to the gymnasia; and it is certainly true that it is from these that really proceeds the spirit that pervades and rules the life of society in Germany; for from these proceed all the ministers of Church and State, the royal officers as well as the representatives of the people, their judges as well as their teachers. And in what hands were these gymnasia?

In 1848, when Radicalism, leaning on the "glorious March-days," raised its head with unprecedented boldness, there was held at Berlin a large convention of teachers of gymnasia, in which it was moved to banish the Bible from the school, to cease teaching that the moral law is represented by the decalogue, to discontinue, thenceforth, requiring pupils to commit the Creed, and to prevent clergymen from giving religious instruction in the gymnasia.

But we are too hasty. How, it may be asked, came such a spirit of antichrist into institutions established by the Church, and required by the law of the State to instruct in the doctrines of the Christian religion? It cannot be denied that it had been engendered, fostered, and promoted, not by the classics, but by the mode pursued in studying and teaching them. When Grecian taste and refinement, Roman patriotism and heroism, the solemn dignity and wisdom of a Socrates, the self-denial and sobriety of a Stoic, the patience and perseverance of a Demosthenes, not to speak of the splendid images of epic and dramatic poetry, and of mythology; when all these were placed before the eyes of pleasure-loving youth in all their attractiveness, when the teacher studiously concealed their dark sides, or exhibited them only as necessary and pardonable evils, when the light of the word of God was never placed in contrast with the delusive, lurid fires of pagan poesy, the religious feelings were stifled, the sense of sin blunted, and the need of redemption was hardly ever experienced.

And such was the treatment of the classics for years and years. The whole race of modern philologists who constitute

the most important portion of the teachers in the gymnasia, proceed from a school in which the different elements of antipathy to Christianity, as they appeared respectively in Rousseau, Lessing, and F. A. Wolf are mixed. The *Darstellung der Alterthumswissenschaft* of the latter became the foundation of the classical philology of the present day. In this book Wolf utters the sentiment that the study of antiquity "constitutes the basis of the character of a perfect man; in the dedication (to Gœthe) he calls it a "serious thought to enter into the whole worship of the inspired gods." Another coryphæus of the same school, Heyne, says: "With sorrow I must confess that if I have not become altogether abandoned, I owe it more to the heathens than to the Christians." G. Hermann warns his readers against "the impious piety of those bats that talk as if man was wicked and could only obtain divine grace by believing."*

The disciples of such masters, of course, carried their own coldness and repugnance to the gospel into the gymnasium; they could not show to their pupils, that the law written in the hearts of the heathen was *also* a schoolmaster to lead them to Christ, and that with all their jocund view of life, with all their manly vigour, the very essence of their existence was a melancholy longing, a bitter resignation, a need of salvation without a power to save. Their visible efforts in groping after the truth, if haply they might find it, which, when pointed out by the Christian teacher, might themselves fill the soul with the preciousness of a Saviour, were never mentioned by those philologists. Even Epicurus had said, *Initium est salutis notitia peccati;* and if it was Anselm's dictum, *Credo ut intelligam*, Aristotle had said before him, δεῖ πιστεύειν τὸν μαινθάνοντα. Plato says, that real goodness is neither natural to man, nor acquired, but that it is a gift of God, (εἰ δὲ νῦν ἡμεῖς ἐν παντὶ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ καλῶς ἐζητήσαμέν τε καὶ ἐλέγομεν, ἀρετὴ ἂν εἴη οὔτε φύσει οὔτε διδακτόν, ἀλλὰ θείᾳ μοίρᾳ παραγιγνομένη ἄνευ νοῦ οἷς ἂν παραγίγνηται.—Meno, § 42.)†

* *Impia pietas tenebrionum, hominem malum esse nec nisi credendo impetrare gratiam divinam dictantium.*

† What a contrast between this sublime humility of the truth-seeking spirit of the Greek, and the loathsome pride of the Roman: *Propter virtutem enim jure lauda-*

In the *Republic* (I. 5,) he describes a Grecian death-bed. "After a man," says he, "begins to think that he is soon to die, he becomes inspired with a fear and concern about things that had not entered his head before, for those *so-called myths* about a future state, which tell us that a man who has been wicked here must be punished hereafter, though he laughed at them formerly, then torment his soul with apprehensions that *they may be true.*" In another remarkable passage, he speaks of the two classes of men—the godly as most blessed, and the ungodly as most miserable, (τοῦ μὲν θείου εὐδαιμονεστάτου, τοῦ δὲ ἀθέου ἀθλιωτάτου;* a former generation he believed to have been better and in closer community with the Deity, (οἱ μὲν παλαιοὶ κρείττονες ἡμῶν καὶ ἐγγυτέρω θεῶν οἰκοῦντες);† the knowledge of a just and benevolent God he taught to be wisdom and true virtue, the want of it folly and unmistakable depravity.‡ Sometimes the ancients are quite "orthodox." Cicero says, *In libidine esse, peccatum est, etiam sine effectu.*§ Plato teaches eternal punishment: Gorg. p. 525. Phæd. p. 113. But such, and an hundred like instances, never *occurred* in the teaching of those learned men.

It is true, the law requires religious instruction to be given in every class of the gymnasium at least twice a week, and the course pursued (with considerable variations) is that the lower classes are made acquainted with Biblical history, whilst the chief articles of faith are explained, and portions of Scripture and hymns are committed to memory. In the middle classes the life of Christ and the history of the Church under the Apostles form the subject of instruction. The highest classes read the New Testament in the original, in connection with Exegesis, Introduction, an Exposition of the principal doctrines, or Church history. Catholics and Jews are neither required nor expected to attend these recitations; the former are taught separately by some priest of the Catholic Church, who is compensated by the gymnasium, and where the Jews are numerous,

mur, et in ea recte gloriamur; quod non contingeret, si id donum a deo, non a nobis haberemus. (Cic. Nat. Deor. III. 36.)

* Theætetus, § 86.

† Phil. 16. Cf. Polit. 271.

‡ Theæt. § 85.

§ De finibus, III. 9.

a Jewish rabbi is generally employed by the gymnasium to teach these.*

But it needs no demonstration to affirm that the character of such religious instruction depends, after all, upon the person of the teacher, or else it would be inconceivable how these gymnasia could have acquired their antichristian tendencies. If we look at some of their text-books and catechisms, the case will be very plain to us. A change of heart is not even spoken of in some of the catechisms in use among them. The doctrine of a Redeemer is treated for the most part historically, and only so that he is shown to be the Messiah of the Jews. The Holy Spirit is a spirit engendered by enlightenment and instruction, a sort of mental development and a communication of clear ideas. A knowledge of self is insisted on, but not in the Christian sense, not a knowledge of one's sinfulness and dependence, but rather in the sense of Plato, a knowledge of how great our intellectuul wants and capacities are.

And how is it with religious exercises? These vary indefinitely, as everything else connected with these institutions, not only in the different gymnasia, but also in the same one at different periods, under different directors. In most of them the teacher who teaches the first lesson in the morning, reads a hymn, more rarely a short prayer in prose; sometimes he repeats it from memory. The pupils nearly always consist of a mixture of Lutherans, Reformed, Roman Catholics, "German Catholics," Jews, (in some institutions the latter form nearly one-half of the pupils,) here and there a stray Baptist or Methodist also. But there is seldom a word heard in these prayers that could offend any one of them: the name of Christ is rarely mentioned. Sometimes, in a Protestant gymnasium, it happens that the teacher who instructs during the first hour of the day in a certain class, is a Roman Catholic. Under such circumstances we have known instances where the teacher would bring some Protestant prayer-book with him, and hand it to one of the pupils to read a prayer. The variety of prayer-books, also, is very great; every shade, from sound doctrine to

* In the Catholic gymnasia, the remarks made in regard to Catholics, will, of course, apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Protestant pupils.

the merest moralism, may frequently be found in the same gymnasium.

At the beginning of a term, the exercises of the gymnasium are introduced by all the pupils assembling in the "Hall," and singing one of those celebrated German hymns, after which the Director delivers a short hortatory address. In a few gymnasia it is customary for the teachers and all the pupils of their denomination, to unite in the celebration of the Lord's Supper once or twice a year. In some the morning worship is common, that is, all the pupils assemble daily, or at least on certain days of the week in the "Hall," and sing a hymn, after which one of the teachers pronounces a prayer. In addition to these exercises a very few have a religious address at the beginning of every week.

The only other religious influence which some may expect to find, is that of the singing lessons, where those great German *Choräle* and Oratorios are practised and performed. But in these the whole attention of the pupil is so much absorbed by the music and the mere mechanical execution, that the words make no impression upon him. We can really assert that in a number of gymnasia the name of Christ is not heard so as to make any impression or awaken any thought, except, perhaps, in the two hours specially devoted to religious instruction. Even in history, when the enormous change is to be spoken of, which marks its page shortly after the commencement of the Christian era, the professor will endeavour to show the cause to have been the migration of nations, or the downfall of the Roman empire, anything rather than the true cause, so that one who should not attend the hours of religious instruction, might be a pupil of a gymnasium for years, and remain utterly ignorant (for all that the gymnasium does to the contrary) of the great motive power of the civilized world, and the only true hope for a blessed hereafter. In fact, we could mention the case of a Jewish boy not below ordinary capacity, and rather fond of reading, who had been in a Protestant gymnasium for five years, and being once prevented by a cold from singing in the usual singing lesson, was sitting still whilst the class were singing Paul Gerhardt's glorious hymn, *O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden.* He followed the words as they were

sung, and the long drawn notes gave him time for reflection. But he soon found that he understood nothing of the hymn. The

> . . . "Haupt, zum Spott gebunden
> Mit einer Dornenkron!"

suggested to him many a painting and engraving he had seen; but the next lines,

> "O Haupt sonst schön gezieret
> Mit höchster Ehr und Zier,"

were utterly unintelligible to him. He would doubtless have fallen upon a train of thinking which might have proved highly profitable, had not the last word of the next line, "*schimpfiret*," which is obsolete, and seems to present an anomalous formation, given his thoughts a different direction.

As an index of the religious influence of the gymnasia, and its estimation among Christians in Germany, we would refer to the establishment of the *Christian Gymnasium at Gütersloh*, in 1851, in consequence of an action of the Convention of German Evangelical churches (*Kirchentag*,) which met in Stuttgart, in 1850. Such a convention is a voluntary meeting of men from all parts of Germany, who are interested in the Church, and are endeavouring to find ways and means to stop the decrease of evangelical religion and true piety among them, and to further and aid schemes for the extension of Christ's kingdom. The School, as being the nursery of the Church, and entrusted with the intellectual and spiritual interests of the rising generation, her hope, could not fail to claim and receive a considerable share of their attention. It was generally conceded that the School was not doing its duty, that so far from being an ally to the Church, it was to be feared that in many instances the latter was injured by the School. Especially was this charged upon the gymnasia; and this feeling called forth the establishment of the above named institution, and of a similar one in Stuttgart, in both of which the prime consideration is the education of their pupils for the Church and true Christianity.

According to the Prospectus, the Christian Gymnasium at Gütersloh considers an education for the kingdom of God the highest aim and the ultimate object of all efforts at education.

It intends, therefore, to instruct youths carefully in the Holy Scriptures, to introduce them into the history of the kingdom of God, and of the Christian Church particularly, and to endeavour to convince them of the truth and the divine origin of Christianity—all on the basis of the Confession of Faith of the Evangelical Church. This end is also kept in view in the instruction in History and the Natural Sciences. Classical antiquity must be stripped of its "divinity," the delusive halo with which it has been surrounded by an apostate, heathenish philology. But nevertheless, the classics will be taught with greater thoroughness and earnestness than has been done by the method which has sprung from the Pantheistic philosophy.

The action of the Convention awakened a general interest in the subject throughout the Protestant church of Germany, and at the Convention held in Elberfeld on the 15th of September 1851, it was found necessary to make the question as to the influence of the education of the gymnasia upon Christianity, one of the regular topics of discussion. In vindication of the gymnasia it was urged that too much was required of them; that their influence was over estimated; whilst, in fact, their tendency was towards a Christian education; that even the law required this of them. The speakers on this side endeavoured to show that even the various branches of instruction taken singly had a religious tendency. It was not *Protestantism* which excommunicated science. Those that designated the study of the heathen classics as unchristian, could not claim the example of Paul, and Basil the Great, and Augustine. It was Julian the apostate who wished to deprive the Christian schools of the study of the classics; but Luther, Melancthon, Spener, Francke, Neander, and others of this class knew how to esteem it. Even in the arrangement of their studies, the gymnasia recognized the Christian faith as a distinct element. If, therefore, the state of religion was low and deplorable, it was not the *gymnasia* which could be accused on account of it, but the whole Church, and parents, preachers, and teachers. *He that is without sin among you in this matter, let him first cast a stone*, exclaimed the chief speaker for the gymnasia.

The principal speaker on the other side of the question was

Dr. Rumpel, the Director of the new Institution at Gütersloh. He said that the very question showed that the necessity was recognized of the gymnasium's giving Christian instruction, but that it was not doing it. It was therefore not incumbent on him to demonstrate that the gymnasia were not Christian, but the burden of proof lay with the opposite side. He endeavoured to show, not that classical studies were of a dangerous tendency, but that the great philologists from whose schools the present generation of teachers had proceeded, had been alienated from the gospel. In their minds the spirit of antiquity had taken the place of the Spirit of God. Yet the treatment produced by this alienation was not confined to the instruction in the languages, but existed also in the other branches, such as History, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics. This whole current must be stemmed. Some *Christian* Wolf was needed for the classics. Some changes were undeniably needed; but as these were not, and could not be made instantaneously in the existing gymnasia, these *Christian* gymnasia had been established for Christian parents to have their children rightly instructed.

In the subsequent debate, various ways and means were proposed to bring the gymnasia back to Christianity. Professor Müller, of Halle, recommended chiefly the employment of theologians as teachers in the gymnasia. To this it was replied, that the attempt had been made to obtain such, but that the office of teacher was too toilsome a one, and offered too little compensation, to hold out sufficient inducement for theologians to enter it. Another minister thought that students of divinity ought to consider it a self-denying sacrifice required of them by their very profession, to offer their services as teachers. Some objected to the name *Christian* gymnasia, for the new Institution, and wanted the term *Church* gymnasia substituted for it. Others recommended the reading of Latin and Greek Christian writers in preference to the classics. Dr. Krummacher, of Berlin, closed the discussion with a characteristic speech, in which he said that the fault could not be justly charged upon any single agency; that it lay in the atmosphere, and that the religious teacher, as he was needed at this period, must be a very exorcist. The resolutions finally passed

were to the intent that as the existing (State) gymnasia were Christian institutions, in their fundamental arrangement, as well as by the requisition of the law, it was the duty of the Evangelical Church, and of every Evangelical Christian, to contribute by every possible means towards making them what they ought to be; that, however, private gymnasia were useful as supplying a want felt in some sections of the country, and as serving for models to the State gymnasia, which needed such a stimulus; and that the Convention was glad to see such an institution founded at Gütersloh.

At the charges implied in this, the teachers of the gymnasia raised a loud clamour, and numerous and ingenious defences were constructed; nevertheless, the general absence of the true Christian spirit in a large portion of the teachers, of a cordial faith in the Son of God, and of a hearty zeal for his cause, so evident to all, could not be supplied by the most ingenious apologies; besides, as they had conceded in the course of the debate that they left it to "the facts of history" to teach the pupil that the heathen were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel," their position needed no further interpretation.

Yet it would be incorrect to suppose that all the gymnasia present this gloomy and cheerless aspect; that all the teachers had become apostate, and heathen or infidels at heart; or that corruption went on uninterruptedly, without a corresponding remedial power developing itself. The observer cannot have failed to mark that a better day is beginning to dawn in the conception and representation of antiquity. There are already pens busy showing that classical antiquity is of great importance in a *Christian* education; for its life and development are nothing but the unimpeded natural growth of the heart of man when left to itself. Both negatively and positively it points to Christianity. To exhibit this aspect of the bygone ages, and to lead the pupil to a perception of it, is the duty of the Christian philologist. Nor is this a mere ideal appellation; there are those that in all truth deserve it. To name only such as are somewhat better known on this side of the Atlantic, we would mention Lassaulx, a teacher in Bavaria, who has written a whole series of dissertations for the purpose of showing that all the mythology and religious rites of the Gentiles

were but a σκία τῶν μελλόντων, the types and prophetic annunciations of what was to follow. In his *Commentatio de mortis dominatu in veteres*, Lassaulx has collected a number of passages from the classics, which give us a vivid image of the gloomy despondency and despair which forms the background of the bright surface described in Schiller's *Gods of Greece* as unbeclouded gaiety, youthful pleasure in this life, imperishable beauty, a paradise full of peace, a heaven on earth. Lassaulx presses from the ancients a confession which shows us their dread, their horror in view of the vanity and perishable nature of all earthly blessings, and in view of the losses they meet with on the one hand and on the other, their forced indifference, and spiteful, defiant resignation.* Dr. J. F. Kurtz, in Russia, who is well known in the theological world, has written several books of a similar bearing; in his History of the Old Covenant he has some pertinent remarks on the pedagogical design of Paganism.

Nägelsbach of Nürnberg, a scholar and linguist as accomplished as he is modest, says, that in his investigations on this subject he could not but perceive the longing and striving of the human mind after the possession of the one, the living, personal God, without which the soul could not be at rest or peace, and for which no pantheism could compensate. "This seeking after God is the life-pulse of the whole religious development of Antiquity." All their attempts failed, and the life of the ancients would exhibit before us motion and progress without a guiding star and without a centre, were it not that we knew that God has a constant witness of himself in the conscience of man, which being itself the moral law of good and evil, affords foundation and security to the existence of man. It was this law "written in their hearts," which sustained the life of the world until the time when the mind of man, exhausted and weary from its unsuccessful search after the living God, received that as a gift of grace from above, which it had been constantly seeking after.†

In chronological order Creuzer should have been named sooner, but his theory is exceedingly liable to abuse, and has

* Some of Lassaulx's dissertations have been translated into English.

† Homeric Theology, p. xii, sq.

been abused by some of his English exponents. Still, in the preface to the third edition of his *Symbolik und Mythologie*, speaking of the unfavourable criticism the Rationalists had passed upon his work, he says: "They had begun to perceive that my investigations concerning the ancient religious systems led to a result which was diametrically opposed to their teachings. They start with the proposition that man is very good by nature, and needs only to perfect his reason to arrive at the highest felicity. But these investigations had shown that among almost all nations of antiquity there prevailed a vivid consciousness of spiritual corruption, and a desire after reconciliation with God." "Nor did my book please those who seek the utmost perfection of man in the element of beauty and in æsthetical manners." "Such æsthetic and poetic souls are loth to be reminded how deep the feeling of ruin and helplessness is, from which the sublimest poesies and the profoundest allegories of the ancients have proceeded."*

We have been somewhat more minute, in showing that there is a difference between the Classics as they ought to be taught, and the Classics as they have been taught, that the reader may not confound some of the admirable features of the German system of education with the evils resulting from that system as handled by godless teachers. We may rest assured that the Christian need not turn away entirely from those "ages dark, obtuse, and steeped in sense," but that he may still derive great lessons from the wanton childhood of our world, when matter "stole the style of gods," for though *Pride made the virtues of the Pagan world*, yet

> "The Stagirite, and Plato, he who drank
> The poisoned bowl, and he of Tusculum,"

who led an Augustine† and a Neander to the fountain of salvation, still point to Him who died to save lost man, and raised him from his moral grave.

* See in the *Studien und Kritiken* (1847, p. 211.) an account, how Ullman, the theologian, was influenced by Creuzer, the philologist, and how Creuzer's profound interpretation of the religious symbols of the Ancients cured Ullmann of religious scepticism.

† *Ille vero liber* (he speaks of Cicero's Hortensius, a philosophical treatise, only a few fragments of which are extant) *mutavit adfectum meum, et ad te ipsum, Domine, mutavit preces meas, et vota ac desideria mea fecit alia.* (August. Conf. III. 4.)

ART. III.—*Recent Doctrinal and Ecclesiastical Conflicts in Connecticut.*

1. *God in Christ;* by Horace Bushnell, 1849.
2. *Christ in Theology;* by Horace Bushnell, 1851.
3. *Remonstrance and Complaint of the Association of Fairfield West to the Hartford Central Association*, 1850.
4. *Appeal of the Association of Fairfield West to the Associated Ministers connected with the General Association of the State of Connecticut*, 1852.
5. *Complaint against the Hartford Central Association*, signed by fifty-two Ministers, and presented to the General Association of Connecticut at its meeting in Waterbury, June, 1853.
6. *Memorial of the Hartford Central Association*, presented to the same body.
7. *Answer to said Memorial with Rejoinder to the same*, published in the Religious Herald, Hartford, July 21, 1853.
8. *Minutes of the General Association of Connecticut* from 1848 to 1853.

BETWEEN New England Congregationalists and the principal Presbyterian bodies of this country, the most intimate relations have always subsisted. This mutual affinity has shown itself in all the forms in which it is possible for the "communion of saints" to display itself between bodies of Christians organized under different modes of Church polity. This essential unity has long been formally recognized by the mutual interchange of delegates in their annual ecclesiastical assemblies. Nor has this been a mere empty ceremony. In ways the most decisive, it has proved itself to be the token of a real fellowship. Ministers have been called and translated from one of these denominations to posts in the other, as if they were to all intents one communion. Candidates for the ministry, too, have resorted to the colleges and theological seminaries on either side of their own denominational lines, with great freedom, as convenience or other supposed advantages might incline them. Members of Congregational churches going to reside where there was a

Presbyterian, but no Congregational church, have, as a matter of course, united with the Presbyterian, in preference to any Baptist, Methodist, or Episcopal church. Presbyterians, in like manner, *mutatis mutandis*, have, of course, become members of Congregational churches.

For a long time the circumstances of these two great Christian bodies in the country were such, that their substantial unity in Christian doctrine and life was mostly in the foreground, while their differences in Church polity were kept more in the background, in their consciousness, their mutual relations, and intercourse. They felt all the comforts and attractions of the former. The occasions were rare in which they suffered chafing and alienation from the latter. As the Western territories began to be settled by emigration from the old Eastern States, these two great Calvinistic communities, true to their historic life and instincts, contributed a large quota of these enterprising and adventurous pioneers. The result was great numbers of small settlements, the germs of future towns and cities, in which was a mixture of Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Professing one faith, they had been accustomed to different forms of Church government. But this difference had not been made to assume any marked prominence or importance, because no experience had yet proved it irreconcilable, or an insuperable obstacle to union. On the other hand, the all-preponderating motive to union was, that, in many cases, neither class separately could sustain Christian institutions, while united, they could, at best, even with missionary aid, form but a weak, struggling congregation. Hence arose the celebrated Plan of Union, in which these differences as to polity were so accommodated that Congregationalists and Presbyterians could be united in one church or ecclesiastical organization, *each retaining his own peculiarities in the actual administration of Church government.* Congregational committee-men became members of the highest judicatories of the Presbyterian Church, and took part in deciding the most fundamental questions relating to her faith and order. This, however, caused little practical difficulty, so long as all parts of this extended but anomalous organization were true to the doctrinal standards, which had been the only publicly avowed creed of both the Congregational and Presbyterian

communions. But when a powerful party arose, determined to legalize in the Church a latitudinarian system repugnant to the distinctive features of this creed, the Plan of Union at once excited uneasiness and jealousy. The question, who had a constitutional right to vote in the assemblies of the Church, became a vital one of self-preservation. It was speedily arraigned and annulled as unconstitutional. On this issue, in form, but on the graver issue of serious doctrinal differences underlying it, in fact, as is well known, a formidable secession left the Presbyterian Church. This issue has proved to be singularly unfortunate for our New-school brethren. The Congregationalists, whose supposed wrongs inflicted by these summary proceedings they sought to redress, by rallying a a new organization, have deserted them upon this question, and quite outdo Old-school Presbyterians in their dislike and denunciations of the Plan of Union. Almost any system of church government will work well enough, as long as there is doctrinal unity and mutual confidence and love. But when serious division in opinion and feeling arises, then men must know under what regimen they are living, and any vague, hybrid system, which has no certain powers, and confers no certain rights, is intolerable. Whether constitutional or not, it is not necessary here to decide; one thing is certain, the Plan of Union is outgrown, by general consent of Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Whatever may be the relative merits of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism, experience has sufficiently proved, that in those exigencies which put any system of polity to the test, their amalgamation is not endurable. In the language of Judge Gibson they are as "immiscible as water and oil." But, while this has been found impracticable, yet its adoption for so long a period, is a striking proof of the degree of substantial unity and recognized fellowship that have obtained between these Christian bodies. It is only in illustration of this fact that we have dwelt upon it. As to all other forms of manifesting this fellowship, they still remain, except so far as innovations and corruptions in doctrine or order in various quarters, or the heat of recent controversy or rivalry may have abridged their operation. And so far as this last cause is concerned, the breach seems to have be-

come wider between the Congregationalists and the New-school Presbyterians than the Old. May the great Head of the Church so order things, that without infringing truth and righteousness, it grow narrower and not wider!

This intimate communion between Presbyterians and Congregationalists has arisen from various causes. First and most fundamental is their agreement as to the system of doctrine taught in the Bible, and underlying all genuine piety. This was the system set forth in all the Reformed and Puritan symbols, the only system which, until a recent period, friends thought to honour, or foes to reproach, with the name of Calvinism: the system drawn out more minutely in the Westminster and Savoy Confessions of Faith, and more summarily in the Assembly's Shorter Catechism. The former is the doctrinal standard in the Presbyterian Church, explicitly professed by all her ministers and officers.

The Westminster or Savoy, which on all doctrinal points is identical with it, not only in matter, but with scarcely a variation in language, is the only creed ever adopted by any Synod of the New England churches representing the entire communion, and authorized to declare its faith. The first Synod held at Cambridge in 1648, voted unanimously: "This Synod having perused and considered, with much gladness of heart, and thankfulness to God, the Confession of Faith, published of late by the reverend Assembly in England, do judge it to be very holy, orthodox, and judicious in all matters of faith." They then proceed to say, that they except to it only in matters of church government and discipline. Again, in their second and last Synod at Boston, in 1680, they say: "It is well known that as to matters of doctrine we agree with other reformed churches." "We have (for the main) chosen to express ourselves in the words of those reverend assemblies, (the Westminster and Savoy,) that so we might not only with one heart, but with one mouth, glorify God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." At a later period, the churches of Connecticut, by their representatives assembled at Saybrook, in 1708, for the purpose of fixing a Confession of Faith and platform of government for the churches of the colony, unanimously adopted the Savoy Confession, which had been previously adopted by

the Synod of all the New England churches, together with that system of Church government which has been peculiar to that State, and to which we may hereafter advert. They declare it "to have been the constant faith of the churches in this colony from the foundation of them." That this was true, not only of the Connecticut, but all the New England churches till this date and long afterwards, appears not only from these public confessions, but from the catechisms, sermons, theological treatises, and every other manifestation of their faith during that era.

Athough more recently innovations upon the doctrines of these confessions have appeared in a descending series, labelled after the names of their inventors, with the uncouth titles of Hopkinsianism, Emmonism, Taylorism, (shall we yet be obliged to add Bushnellism?) still, these have never commanded such a number of open adherents, as to induce any rejection or alteration of these ancient standards. They are still the only formal confessions of faith ever made by the New England churches as a whole, the only avowed and unretracted faith of the congregational communion in New England. The only qualification to this remark is, that the Saybrook Platform says that it is sufficient if a man acknowledge either the Westminster or Savoy Confessions, the Assembly's Catechism, Shorter or Longer, or the doctrinal articles of the Church of England. So far from disowning, they have in various ways reaffirmed their adherence to these formularies. Thus the General Association of Connecticut, as appears from their Minutes for 1849, voted in that year that "we do, (and can hardly too often) reaffirm our faith in the great doctrines of the gospel *as embodied in our Confession of Faith.*" Hence it has been well said, by one who is not obnoxious to the imputation of narrowness or bigotry; "This is the authorized faith of the Congregational churches, the only faith which has ever been professed by the churches assembled by their pastors and representatives in synod or council. And this has been not only the publicly professed faith of our churches, but it has been the real or implied faith of every church calling itself Congregational.*

* Budington's History of the First Church in Charlestown, p. 151.

Another index of unity in doctrine between the two denominations, and which tended more powerfully than all else to make them substantially one in feeling and in fact, was the universal use of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism in the religious instruction of children. Until a comparatively recent period, all pious parents in both communions taught this admirable summary of Christian doctrine to their children. Much was also done by pastors and in schools, in teaching and explaining it to youth. It is still the only recognized manual for instructing youth in Christian doctrine among Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Their ecclesiastical bodies often commend it, and urge to greater fidelity in the use of it. And wherever faith in its doctrines and zeal for God have not died out, much is still done in both communions by parents, pastors, teachers, and Sabbath schools, to make the rising generation familiar with it. So far as this influence extends, it must promote unity in doctrine, and in the whole development of Christian life and experience.

Closely connected with all this, is an agreement as to the true doctrine of the Church, (notwithstanding differences as to its external organization) as against the fundamental principle of Popery and Prelacy. They agree that the Church is the communion of saints: that the matter of the Church is men considered as already regenerate and believing, and deny that the Church exists before believers as a divine corporation and repository of saving power, from which, and by union to which, men first derive the new-creating grace of life.

Aside then from questions of ecclesiastical order, this identity of principle in regard to all that directly moulds the Christian character, produced such a similarity of Christian life, that the ministers and people of these two Christian communities readily coalesced, wherever convenience favoured their union. Nor did their differences as to government loom up into prominence, until the upspring of lax doctrines raised the question, which system best guarded its own creeds, or offered the largest license to latitudinarians.

Besides this, a considerable portion of the first ministers of New England were Presbyterians in principle. They had been so in England. Even Congregationalists themselves, as not

only their leading writers, but the Cambridge Platform itself shows, made ruling elders an essential requisite to a duly organized church. Their powers were not only co-ordinate with, but superior to those of the body of communicants, inasmuch as it devolved on them to initiate and direct all acts of discipline and government.*

That great Congregational luminary, Thomas Hooker, first pastor of Hartford, is said to have described their prerogatives by calling them "a speaking aristocracy in the face of a silent democracy." He also laboured incessantly for some union of the churches under one organization. One of his last solemn sayings was, "we must agree upon constant meetings of ministers, and settle the consociation of churches, or we are undone." The Saybrook Platform provides for this. Trumbull pronounces it a compromise between those who were "*nearly Presbyterian*," on the one side, and those who were "verging towards independency" on the other. Till within a recent period the common appellation of Congregationalists in New England was *Presbyterian*. Nor has it yet become obsolete. The consequence has been, that as all portions of our country have been largely peopled by emigrants from New England, they have generally found, until the recent growth of congregational propagandism, and notwithstanding this, do even now, to a great extent, find, not only a welcome, but a congenial religious home in the Presbyterian Church. They have contributed a large constituent part of her ministry and members, while, *vice versa*, many of her own members and ministers have formed happy and edifying connections with the Congregational churches of New England.

We have, at the risk of wearying our readers, thus particularly explained the close connection between the Congregational and Presbyterian bodies, by way of introduction to the principal topic of our article, because it shows the deep stake we have in the matter. Whatever transpires in any branch of the Church is a legitimate subject of interest and consideration to every other branch. For they are all members of one body, and partake of a common life. If one member suffer, all suffer, and

* Cambridge Platform, Chap. x.

if one rejoice, all rejoice. No one part can be independent of any other, or unaffected by, or, if right, indifferent to its fortunes. But this is pre-eminently true of all doctrinal developments in either of the Congregational or Presbyterian bodies. Their affinities and their intercourse are so close that, whether they will or no, they exercise a strong reciprocal influence. Doctrinal principles have seldom appeared in one, without speedily contending for a foothold in the other. This has been true of the metaphysical solutions of the high points of doctrine attempted successively by Hopkins, Emmons, and Taylor. Then again, the "new measures" in which some of these diluted schemes sought to work themselves out in New York were speedily transported to New England. And we already see one great principle on which Congregationalists and New-school Presbyterians made issue with the Old-school, viz: *that the Church as such* should conduct her own Missions, and that each *branch of it as such* should provide publications for the due exposition and enforcement of its own system, working like a mighty leaven in each of those bodies.

All branches of the great Presbyterian and Congregational families have the deepest interest in the final disposition of that great question which has agitated the Congregational ministry of Connecticut for some years past; which has made them a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men; and which, so far as action through existing ecclesiastical organizations there is concerned, is understood to have reached a finality. That question has been no other than this: "Shall the peculiar opinions upon the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, and Justification, advanced by Dr. Bushnell in his book entitled 'God in Christ,' and re-asserted and vindicated by him in another book entitled 'Christ in Theology,' be legalized or outlawed among them?" This is very far from being the question whether, if a minister, in his private speculations, gets bewildered into some crude theory on the Trinity, or incarnation, by attempting to fly without wings above the proper level of the human intellect, he is therefore to be disowned. It is the question, whether a systematic speculating away of the whole series of doctrines specified above, carried to the scornful rejection of even the lowest form of the doctrine of vicarious atonement,

and the use of the most contemptuous epithets in regard to the accepted forms of all these and other fundamental Christian truths, and this, too, in *the form of open propagandism* through the press, shall be consistent with good standing in the ministry. Moreover, it is not the question whether these things shall be ground of discipline in a private church-member, but whether he who propagates them shall be countenanced and upheld in their ranks, by the Congregational ministry of Connecticut, as a safe Christian teacher. After an amount of effort and sacrifice on the part of faithful men, rarely possible in any similar case, to exclude these heresies from their connection, what is the practical result? While we trust that their faithful testimony will be blessed of God to check the evil, we fear that, so far as this precise point is concerned, their labours have been in vain.

In order to understand the import of all the ecclesiastical movements on this subject, it will be necessary to explain such peculiarities of the Saybrook Platform as are implicated in them. That instrument, besides providing for associations which consist exclusively of ministers, and are the only permanent ecclesiastical bodies beyond single churches generally known among Congregationalists, provides also for consociations conterminous with these associations. These consociations are confederations of the churches in a given district, each church being represented by its pastor, and a lay-delegate, at their meetings. These consociations are charged with the duty of acting on "all occasions ecclesiastical"* within their limits, that cannot properly be met by a single church. They are, in short, permanent councils, doing for their churches what is done for Congregational churches elsewhere by councils either mutual or *ex parte*, chosen by one or both the parties for the occasion, and expiring with it. The only powers committed to the associations are the licensing of ministers, advising vacant churches, forming a General Association, composed of delegates sent by them, together with the following:

"ART. XIII. The said associate pastors shall take notice of any among themselves that may be accused of heresy unto, or cognizable by them, examine the matter carefully, and *if they*

* Saybrook Platform, Art. 2.

find just occasion, shall direct to the calling of the council, (*i. e.* consociation,) where such offenders shall be duly proceeded against."

This makes the association a grand jury of inquest, to determine whether there is such *prima facie* evidence of guilt in the case of an accused consociated pastor, as to warrant putting him on trial before his consociation.

Soon after the publication of Dr. Bushnell's *God in Christ*, as our readers doubtless recollect, it was condemned, as subverting some of the first principles of the gospel already mentioned, by the accredited organs of doctrinal opinion in nearly every evangelical denomination in the country. This unanimity cannot be explained unless there was such *prima facie* evidence of heresy as to demand a trial.

Under these circumstances, the Hartford Central Association, to which Dr. Bushnell belonged, examined the case for the purpose of ascertaining if there was justifiable cause for putting him on trial.

After having thus examined the case, and heard Dr. Bushnell's "Vindication of himself from the charge of heresy brought against him from various quarters," they adopted and published to the world the following decision in the premises:

"We are satisfied that whatever errors the book may contain, it furnishes no sufficient ground for instituting a judicial process with him.

"We regret his departure in some of his statements from the formulas of the Church. We adhere to those formulas; but we regard him, notwithstanding the exceptions he has taken to them, as holding whatever is essential to the scheme of doctrine which they embody.

"He could not, in our view, be properly or justly subjected to the charge of heresy and a consequent trial, or be denied the confidence of his brethren in the ministry."

This decision, as might be expected, created wide-spread distress and alarm. It was not so much that the man, Dr. Bushnell, was cleared, who personally was of small consequence in the matter: but the *principles* on which he was acquitted, which had the nature and effect of law, applicable to all similar cases. While this decision stood, that Association could not

consistently refuse licensure, ordination, or confidence, to any man on account of his holding the opinions advanced by Dr. Bushnell. And so long as the decision was assented to by tacit acquiescence on the part of other associations, it was presumptively in accordance with the standard of orthodoxy recognized in the State. What then was to be done by that class of ministers, who would no sooner countenance such teachings, than (as Dr. Hall said at Danbury) "poison the wells out of which their children drink?" What could they do? The General Association is not a judicial body—nor is there any body having appellate jurisdiction over the doings of a district association. But one remedy remained. 1. Fraternal argument and remonstrance with the Hartford Central Association by sister associations. 2. If this proved unavailing, to bring the case before the General Association, on the ground that every society, and especially every Christian association, must, in the nature of things, be the judge of its membership, and have the power to deal with and exclude from its privileges those persons or constituencies that subvert the very basis of the union and compact. Few would pretend that the General Association could not exclude an association of avowed deists or infidels from its connection, although not an appellate, or, in form, a judicial body. In conformity to these principles, measures have been pursued with a constancy, fidelity, and sacrifice, seldom equalled, to procure by these circuitous, and therefore laborious, processes, the removal of the heresy from connection with that body. These, at length, ended in a formal complaint against the Hartford Central Association before the General Association, at its last meeting, signed by fifty-two ministers, among whom were, Drs. Day, Woolsey, Hewit, Calhoun, Tyler, Thompson, Cleveland, Hall, Atwater, and others. As this narrates in the most concise form the whole history of the case, and shows the real issues presented to the General Association, while the names attached to it are a sufficient guaranty for the truth of its statements, we shall lay before our readers the whole of it, following its statement of the decision of Hartford Central, already quoted, both as in itself deserving of permanent record, and as the shortest way of putting the principal facts in the case in their possession. They represent,

"That the Fairfield West Association being in common with vast numbers in and out of our State, dissatisfied with this decision, addressed to the Hartford Central Association a remonstrance and complaint, in which they undertook to show, and in our opinion did show, by copious extracts from the book in question, that its author had plainly denied several of the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, and entreated their brethren to reconsider their doings and redress the injury which their decision had done to the cause of Christ, a copy of which is herewith submitted.

"That the Hartford Central Association made a brief reply, in which they declined to reconsider their decision until new evidence of a decisive character should be presented, while they offered no proofs or arguments to overthrow or invalidate the allegations and reasonings of the remonstrance from Fairfield West Association, a copy of which reply is herewith submitted.

"That hereupon the Fairfield West Association published said remonstrance and answer, and sent them to all the ministers of the State, with a circular letter to each of the District Associations, requesting them to meet and consider the subject, and let them know the conclusion to which they came.

"That the Fairfield West Association received answers from these bodies, some of which expressed entire concurrence with them, and all, as far as they expressed any positive opinion, sustained their position, that this was a case in regard to which judicial proceedings ought to be instituted.

"That as the question had been raised by the apologists of Dr. Bushnell, what doctrines are fundamental in respect to the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, and Justification, the Fairfield West Association, by their memorial, brought the whole subject before the General Association, at its meeting in Litchfield, in June, 1850, and asked that body to declare what are deemed and treated as fundamental doctrines on the points in question, among the ministers and churches of this State: and that thereupon the General Association, with great unanimity, declared the doctrines of the Westminster Catechism on these points fundamental, and the denial of them heresy; they also said, 'we regard it as the right of any of our District Associations to remonstrate with any other Association in respect to

any proceedings which are thought to involve the faith and purity of our churches, or to bring reproach on the associated clergy of the State.'

'We regard it as the duty of any Association receiving such a remonstrance, to reconsider the case in question; and if they do not reverse their former action, to use their best endeavours to satisfy the complaining Association in respect to the proceedings so complained of.'

"That after waiting a sufficient time for the Hartford Central, of their own motion, if they saw cause, to adjust their doings to this standard so set forth by the General Association, and finding that they neglected to do so, the Fairfield West Association, in October, 1850, addressed to them a second letter, requesting them to compare the teachings of Dr. Bushnell with the declaration of the General Association, and either reverse their decision aforesaid, or use their best endeavours to satisfy them (the Fairfield West Association,) that their allegations were unfounded.

"That in May 1851, the Hartford Central sent back a reply to this letter. In this they utterly declined to reverse or even reconsider their proceedings, or to discuss the allegations made. They further said, 'the question is not, as to what doctrines are fundamental to the Christian religion, for on that point there is no controversy, but as to what are the essential elements of the doctrines conceded to be fundamental, and how far these are retained in Dr. Bushnell's book.' Thus the real issue, as stated by themselves, is, what is essential in the great doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement and Justification? and are those things which Dr. Bushnell has denied on these subjects, essential gospel truths? and are they, or are they not longer to be deemed and treated as such amongst us? In other words, the question is, whether the declaration as to fundamental doctrines made at Litchfield, is to be so interpreted amongst us, that they are to be considered as conforming to it in good faith, who avow the teachings complained of in Dr. Bushnell's book? And this is the real question at the bottom of all others, now agitating the ministry and churches in connection with this painful subject.

"That, at about the same time, Dr. Bushnell published

another volume, entitled 'Christ in Theology,' containing the substance of 'his vindication of himself' before the Hartford Central Association, from the charges of heresy brought against him from various quarters. That, on examination, this book appeared to reaffirm in an offensive manner, the heresies complained of in the first—particularly that it appears to us to teach,

"1. That the orthodox are not justified in maintaining that there are Three Persons or even distinctions in the Divine Nature, or essence, and that this doctrine as commonly held among us is 'plain tritheism.'

"2. That there is no evidence that Christ had a human soul, and no warrant for believing it.

"3. That if God could accept the sufferings of the just for the unjust, it would 'indicate in him the confusion or loss of all moral distinctions;' and that the 'whole scheme of suffering in Christ substituted directly for penal suffering in us, is a bare assumption, justified by no scriptural authority whatever.'

"4. That although in the author's judgment the doctrine of vicarious atonement is thus absurd, and would indicate in God, if it were true, 'the confusion or loss of all moral distinctions,' yet God has set forth the work of Christ under this form, and as such, calls upon ministers to preach it, and men to receive it.

"5. That our accepted systems of religious doctrine give us not the gospel, but a 'dull mechanical contrivance of theology,' in which the gospel is 'reduced to two dry factors,' to a 'speculative figment, cold and dry,' to 'petty formulas,' 'specks,' 'fragments,' 'minima' of truth; and that there is reason to suspect that 'what we call our Christianity is the product of the organizing force of human dogmatism.'

"6. Accordingly, in March, 1852, the Fairfield West Association issued an 'Appeal to the Associated Ministers of this State connected with the General Association,' in which, after a full narrative of the proceedings aforesaid, they undertook to prove, and in our opinion, did prove, by copious extracts from the volume in question, that it contains not only the above mentioned, but numerous other false and dangerous sentiments,

and announced their intention to bring the whole subject before the General Association.

"That accordingly, the whole matter was so submitted by Fairfield West Association to the General Association, at its last meeting in Danbury, June, 1852.—That hereupon, the General Association with great unanimity adopted the following minute:

'That it is the opinion of this General Association, that, in the present state of public feeling in regard to the publications referred to in the memorial from the Association of Fairfield West, all the parties concerned should, in the exercise of Christian charity, remove, so far as possible, every obstacle whether real or supposed, to a full and fair investigation, according to our ecclesiastical rules, and we do hereby advise to such a course.'

"That before it was practicable to bring charges against Dr. Bushnell, with a view to his trial before his (the Hartford North) Consociation, in accordance with this vote, the North Church in Hartford, withdrew from that Consociation, thus taking their pastor from its jurisdiction.

"That the Hartford North Consociation, at its annual meeting on the 4th Tuesday in September, 1852, passed the following resolutions:

'*Resolved*, 1. That we have received with surprise and regret, the communication from the North Church in Hartford, notifying us, that they have withdrawn from Consociation.

'*Resolved*, 2. That the action of said church, especially if, as it seems to us, it was taken for the purpose of screening its pastor from an expected trial before this body, is in our view irregular, uncourteous, and eminently unhappy in its tendency.

'*Resolved*, 3. That these resolutions be sent by the Register to the Clerk of the North Church in Hartford.'

"That said church has not retraced its steps, but still remains, with its pastor, out of the jurisdiction of Consociation.

"That Dr. Bushnell has not retracted the offensive doctrines complained of, while he yet continues a member of the Hartford Central Association in good standing; and that this body

still adheres to the votes complained of in the foregoing Memorial of Fairfield West, viz: that the sentiments he has taught in his books aforementioned, 'furnish no sufficient ground for instituting a judicial process with him:' that 'he could not justly be subjected to the charge of heresy and a consequent trial, or denied the confidence of his brethren in the ministry;' that he 'holds whatever is essential to the scheme of doctrine' embodied in 'the formulas of the Church.' That while these votes stand, the idea of bringing charges with a view to his trial before his Association, is preposterous.

"That all due labour has been used to induce the Hartford Central Association to rescind the aforementioned votes, and no recourse remains for remedying the evil, but in the action of the General Association.

"That the General Association cannot decline to interpose in the case, without thus signifying to the world, either that it deems the errors of Dr. Bushnell non-essential, or that it has no power to deal with or exclude from its connection and fellowship, those who hold or propagate fundamental error, and persist therein.

"To take the former ground, is to deny that to be essential which we most solemnly believe to be such, and which has ever been the basis of fellowship in evangelical communions.

"To take the latter ground, is virtually to strip the General Association of all just claim to be regarded and treated as a Christian body; to render its certificates of membership and good standing worthless; its delegations to other Christian bodies an imposture, and its bond of union a nullity. No such theory can endure the slightest examination. To avow it, would be to forfeit the confidence and respect of other Christian bodies and of the world, and would contradict the whole past history of your body.

"We therefore COMPLAIN against the Hartford Central Association, that in the action aforesaid it has subverted the doctrinal basis of our union and fellowship as a General Association. We ask for a suitable redress of this grievance at your hands; and insist, that without such redress, membership and certificates of membership in this body are not even *prima facie* evidence of soundness in the faith."

Let us stop a moment, and see how the parties thus far appear, in this statement of facts, unquestioned in any quarter. 1. The complainants are manifestly open, bold, straight-forward. There is no disguise, no shrinking from the fullest discovery and exposure. They demand a thorough sifting and righteous disposal of the whole case. They, with extraordinary pains-taking, collate the proofs that the fundamental doctrines of the gospel have been cast away. They once and again call upon the Hartford Central either to retrace their steps, or to explain to them how they can shield such principles in the ministry, without sacrificing fundamental truth. The Hartford Central will not do the first. They "utterly decline" to do the last. But would they have thus declined under the pressure laid upon them, if they were conscious of the strength of their cause? Their first plea, and, until the last occasion on which they were arraigned before the General Association at Waterbury, their only plea, has been want of jurisdiction. Dr. Porter even claimed at Danbury, in 1852, in defence of his body, that if an Association should declare themselves Deists or Universalists, the General Association had no right to exclude their delegates! This idea was never, however, advanced but once. It in reality operated as a *reductio ad absurdum*, to prove to the satisfaction of all, the existence of the jurisdiction which he denied. Finally, when through these persevering exertions, a trial of Dr. Bushnell was impending before his Consociation, he and his church fled from its jurisdiction. These things speak for themselves.

But when formal complaint was made against the Hartford Central, at the last meeting of the General Association at Waterbury, that body adopted a new course. It sent up a memorial, not only denying jurisdiction, but also endeavouring to meet the charges of heresy laid against Dr. Bushnell in the complaint. But here again, although they had printed copies for distribution, they, we are credibly informed, refused to circulate it, when publicly requested, or to give a single copy to the complainants, when privately requested, even the night before, or until it was publicly read on the last day of the session, when there was no opportunity for a close and accurate examination of it. We do not wonder. The very show

of a defence, and of invalidating the charges of heresy, without allowing time to sift it, doubtless produced some confusion of mind in all that dubious portion of the body who had not thoroughly mastered the subject. Had there been opportunity to expose its true character, it seems to us that it would have been looked upon as furnishing the strongest confirmation of the truth of those charges. It fully explains why its authors had before been so shy of facing the merits of the case. We suppose this to be the best defence that can be given, as it is the only one that has appeared, and comes from accused parties capable of doing full justice to their cause. And as the whole case turns upon it, we shall inquire what proof they have adduced of Dr. Bushnell's soundness, or to weaken the vast amount of evidence that he holds the heresies imputed to him, arrayed in the documents of Fairfield West Association?

1. With regard to the Trinity, they do not deny that he teaches in manner and form as the complainants allege he has taught in regard to it. They could not. The proofs are too manifold and unambiguous. They quote a passage in which Dr. Bushnell says that as the persons of the Trinity are "incidental to the process of revelation," and since God has "an eternally self-revealing nature, we may well enough assume on that ground, if on no other, that he is always to be known as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."—(*Christ in Theology*, p. 168.) But what of all this, after his manifold denials of any Trinity in the divine nature, and his open avowal of doubt (p. 167) "whether the distinct personality of the word, when regarded as the Son, is referable to the incarnation?" We think it would have looked more like a serious attempt to do the subject justice, had they at least noticed the following answer to this plea, in the "Appeal of Fairfield West," pp. 29, 30.

"Nor does he (Dr. Bushnell) elevate his dogma above Sabellianism, by telling us that God has an eternally self-revealing nature, while he contends that we can KNOW nothing of any Trinity not 'generated in time' by the process of actual revelation. What we know nothing about cannot be an article of faith. Did Sabellius or any theist ever deny that God has eternally that nature whereby he not only reveals himself, but creates, upholds, and governs all things? Withal, a trinity

made by revelation can be eternal only by virtue of an eternal revelation. This is possible only on the supposition, that the creatures to whom God reveals himself, have themselves eternally existed. Thus we have the Pantheistic doctrine of an eternal creation, which makes God and the creation one. We know not that Dr. Bushnell is prepared to take these consequences of his doctrines. Yet the following passages from his first book, '*God in Christ*,' look strongly that way. 'Conceive of him (God) as creating the world, or creating worlds, if you please, *from eternity*. In so doing he only represents, *produces, or outwardly expresses himself*,' p. 146. Also, p. 177, 'If God has been *eternally revealed or revealing himself to created minds*, it is likely always to have been, and always to be, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' This may satisfy Pantheists. To all others, it looks worse than the Sabellianism it is offered to screen."

2. They in no manner invalidate the second of the foregoing charges, in regard to Dr. Bushnell's denials respecting Christ's human soul.

3. With a single, and, as we shall show, perfectly immaterial exception, they do not deny that he teaches the horrid sentiments ascribed to him in the third specification relative to the Atonement. That exception is this. The complainants charge, that they understand him to teach that *the* "whole scheme of suffering in Christ, substituted directly for penal suffering in us, is a bare assumption," &c. The Hartford Central say, instead of "*the* whole scheme," Dr. Bushnell said "*this* whole scheme," &c. They then try to divert attention from the real issue, by expatiating upon this as a painful instance of injurious misquotation. It will be observed, that the word "the," in reference to which this accusation is made, is not put by the complainants within their quotation marks; the whole charge of Hartford Central, therefore, is baseless. Moreover, whether true or false, nothing material depends upon it. Whether he says "*the*" or "*this* whole scheme," &c. the word "whole" makes it manifestly include *all forms of the scheme of doctrine, according to which Christ's sufferings are "substituted directly for penal suffering in us.*" They allege that Dr. Bushnell's language in the sentence preceding the

passage in question, (Christ in Theology, p. 234) shows that he was speaking only of "penal" suffering in Christ. The sentence referred to, *as quoted by them, indeed,* adverts to the sufferings of Christ being viewed as a "penal substitute" for ours. But in looking into the book itself, we find that the words are not "penal substitute," but "direct substitute." They themselves have put the word "penal" for the word "direct." Thus they falsely charged the complainants with making a misquotation, which, if they had made it, was both accidental and immaterial. And in order to give it any show of importance, they misquote the hinge-word of a preceding sentence, which, as it stands in the book, fully sustains the charge of the complainants.

And all the writings of Dr. Bushnell on the subject, fairly interpreted, fully sustain it, the Hartford Central themselves being judges. Expunge this part of the third specification, and the previous part remains intact, which they have not even attempted to call in question. It is as follows:

"That if God could accept the sufferings of the just for the unjust, it would indicate in him the loss or confusion of all moral distinctions."

To preclude all doubt or cavil, we here put in full the original language of Dr. Bushnell, thus condensed. (Christ in Theology, p. 272.)

"The *willingness* of God to accept the woes of innocence instead of the woes of guilt, would only indicate the confusion or loss of all moral distinctions, a readiness to let justice perish by a double sacrifice, first by releasing the pains of guilt, and again by receiving the pains of holiness."

How could language more explicitly assert the impossibility of the *direct substitution, in any form,* of Christ's sufferings for the punishment of the guilty?

Not only so, but the Hartford Central say,

"Yet he (Dr. Bushnell) denies that the sufferings were 'penal' (p. 273) and also that they are to be regarded as a laying on upon Christ of the direct abhorrence of God for sin."

They thus admit that he rejects both of the received forms, and the only possible forms, of the doctrine of vicarious atone-

ment, "strict" and "mitigated," whether called by the name of New England or Old-school. As to their plea that Dr. Bushnell holds that Christ by his death *indirectly* expresses the abhorrence of God to sin, does not every martyr do as much, and could any Unitarian say less?

They further quote Dr. Bushnell as saying,

"It is often alleged as a fatal heresy that I reject the opinion that 'Christ suffered evil in direct substitution for evil or penal suffering that was due from us.' Doubtless this may well enough be taken for heresy by those who believe that Christ was literally punished for our sins, or suffered penalty on account of them. But this is a doctrine openly discarded by most of the teachers of New England."

That he here denies without qualification that Christ's sufferings were in any form directly substituted for the punishment of sinners, is indisputable. But he also herein claims agreement with many New England theologians, on the alleged ground, that they denied that Christ's sufferings were "penal." As it is just here that the tactics of Dr. Bushnell, and the Hartford Central and their defenders, have been successful in misleading ministers and Christians, we shall dwell upon the matter long enough to clear up the truth on the subject, and show the true attitude of the parties thus implicated.

1. The so called New England theologians have never questioned, they have ever held as a principle confessedly not to be controverted, and fundamental among the orthodox, that Christ suffered evil in "direct substitution" for the punishment due to sinners. They have also held that his sufferings were thus "directly" laid upon him as the substitute of sinners, in vindication of God's law, as an expression of his justice or regard for righteousness, and of his abhorrence of sin; and that whoever denies that they are, to this extent, strictly vicarious, denies the faith. The point wherein some of them have differed from the old standards, has been, not in denying that his sufferings were of this character, but that, being confessedly such, they could properly be called "penal" or a "punishment." As the venerable names of Dwight and Griffin have been cited by by Dr. Bushnell and the Hartford Central, in support of his rejection of this fundamental Christian truth, we cite a single

passage from each on this point. Dr. Dwight says, (Theol. vol. II. p. 393,) after quoting several texts of Scripture:

"Language cannot more clearly or more strongly assert that Christ was a SUBSTITUTE for sinners, that he bore their sins and SUFFERED FOR THEIR INIQUITIES; or, in other words, that he became an atonement for them."

Says Dr. Griffin, (Atonement, p. 49,)

"I will now show you from the Scriptures, that the thing which was offered *for sin*, and which *came in the room of punishment*, and which *laid the foundation for pardon*, was no other than SUFFERING. It was this which was offered *for sin*. 'Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures.'" The italics are Dr. Griffin's.

We hesitate not to pronounce the attempt to represent these men and their associates, as patrons or abettors of the doctrine that Christ's sufferings were not directly substituted for the punishment of the sinner, a libel on the illustrious dead, and a fraud on the living. They would have sealed the doctrine they are thus charged with gainsaying, with their blood.

It is wholly immaterial to the present issue, whether they were right or wrong in denying that these vicarious sufferings of Christ could properly be called "penal." The one truth which they held fast as beyond all debate among evangelical men was, that these sufferings were vicarious. That which they held to be an open question alone, was whether they were literally penal. But had the issue been this, that they must acknowledge that Christ's sufferings were penal, because they were truly vicarious, or that they were not vicarious because not penal, they would have held fast the former view even unto death.

Now Dr. Bushnell, and, as we shall soon see, his defenders in Hartford Central, not only repudiate the penal view of Christ's sufferings as absurd; but they also affirm, that the so called more mitigated view of the New England divines alluded to, which represents Christ's sufferings as laid upon him "directly" in place of the sinner's punishment, "to express God's abhorrence of sin," is one form or branch of the penal scheme, and as such to be rejected as absurd.

Thus, in our view, they discard every possible form of the doctrine of vicarious atonement.

We adduce the following facts to prove this grave allegation.

1. So far as Dr. Bushnell himself is concerned, the last quotation we have made from him (first adduced by the Hartford Central to prove his soundness) shows it. It is unmeaning on any other supposition, as will be perfectly clear to those who will look back and examine it.

2. That he rejects, and considers himself as rejecting, all forms, high and low, of vicarious atonement, held by the orthodox, on the ground that they are penal, will appear conclusively from the following extracts from his book, *God in Christ.*

"It will probably be right, then, to distribute the views of those, who are now accepted as orthodox teachers, into two classes; one, who consider the death of Christ as availing by force of what it *is;* the other, by force of what it *expresses:* the former holding it as a literal substitution of evil endured for evil that was to be endured; the latter holding it as an expression of abhorrence to sin, made through the suffering of one, in place of the same expression that was to be made, by the suffering of many." p. 195.

"The objections I have to that more mitigated theory, are these:—First, it assumes that, *as punishment expresses the abhorrence of God to sin, or what is the same, his justice, he can sustain his law* and lay a ground of forgiveness without punishment, *only by some equivalent expression of abhorrence* —an assumption that is groundless and without consideration, as I may cause to appear in another place.

"Secondly, this latter seems to accord with the former view in supposing that Christ *suffers evil as evil,* or as *a* PENAL *visitation of God's justice,* only doing it in a less painful degree; that is, suffering *so much* of evil *as will suffice,* considering the dignity of his person, to express *the same amount of abhorrence to sin,* that would be expressed by the eternal punishment of all mankind. I confess my inability to see how an innocent being could ever be set, even for one moment, in an attitude of displeasure under God. *If he could lay his frown for one moment on the soul of innocence and virtue, he must be no such being as I have loved and worshipped. Much less can I ima-*

gine that he should lay it on the head of one whose nature is itself co-equal Deity. Does any one say that he will do it for public governmental reasons? *No governmental reasons, I answer, can justify even the admission of innocence into a participation of frowns and penal distributions. If consenting innocence says:—'Let the blow fall on me,' precisely there is it for a government to prove its justice, even to the point of sublimity: to reveal the essential, eternal, unmitigable distinction it holds between innocence and sin, by declaring that under law and its distributions, it is even* IMPOSSIBLE TO SUFFER ANY COMMUTATION, any the least confusion of places." pp. 198—9.

It follows, of course, that the Hartford Central deems and treats every form of the doctrine of vicarious atonement, which, according to Dr. Bushnell, and in fact, is recognized among the orthodox, as, at least, non-essential. But we are sorry to be obliged to say more.

As the Hartford Central had published their Memorial in the Religious Herald, a paper edited by one of their leading members, some of the complainants published a brief rejoinder in the same journal, which dwelt more especially upon the questions connected with the doctrine of atonement.

In this article, they observed that three schemes were contemplated by Dr. Bushnell in his books.

"1. The PENAL SCHEME; *i. e.* (as explained by Hartford Central) 'the scheme of penal suffering'—suffering 'merely as suffering,' 'APART from the consideration of *expression* and design *in relation to the ends of moral government.*'

"2. The GOVERNMENTAL SCHEME: in which suffering is laid directly upon Christ—'evil to pay the release of evil'—as a sacrifice, a propitiation by *direct vicarious sufferings*, to EXPRESS God's justice, or his abhorrence of sin.

"3. The AT-ONE-MENT SCHEME: which represents the sufferings of Christ as merely incidental, not laid upon him, nor inflicted on him in order that he may suffer 'evil as evil' for our release; but only the sufferings that he *incidentally* meets with from human malice, while on an errand of entirely another character.

"The first of these schemes, as stated by the Hartford Central, is a caricature of what they term the 'Views of the

Princeton Theologians,' and of the doctrine of the atonement set forth in our own Westminster Confession and Catechism.

"The second or Governmental scheme, is commonly styled the New England theory.

"The third is the theory of Socinians and of modern Universalists. It denies what is fundamental in the other two, viz., the *direct vicariousness* of the sufferings of Christ. It denies all vicarious sufferings, every thing properly involved in the idea of a propitiatory sacrifice. With Dr. Bushnell, it holds that the work of Christ was not to propitiate God, but man: and hence it has been styled 'At-one-ment,' in distinction from any and every proper doctrine of atonement."

After showing by extracts from Dr. Bushnell's books, that he rejects the first two, and adopts the third, the complainants ask,

"And now how stands the Hartford Central? They say '*We* have no hesitation in saying that the sufferings and death of Christ were *vicarious*.' But to the word 'vicarious' they append an explanation; 'vicarious *in the sense of*' &c. And in setting forth the sense which they assign to the word vicarious, they wholly omit to say whether Christ suffered directly in our stead, even to *express* the divine justice or abhorrence of sin, and so by his sufferings directly *substituted* for penal sufferings in us, to redeem us from the curse of the law—'Being made a curse for us;' or whether his sufferings were merely incidental, with no other design than of propitiating man.

"The explanation which Hartford Central appends to the word 'vicarious' in this connection, leaves it impossible to determine by the explanation itself whether they mean to adopt the evangelical atonement, or the at-one-ment of Dr. Bushnell and the Socinians. So far as their explanation goes, and on its own evidence simply, it is a paltering in a double sense between the two. Is this paltering designed? Did they mean, by annexing this explanation to the otherwise well understood word 'vicarious' to give it such a latitude as to embrace the heretical at-one-ment, as well as the evangelical atonement. Let them explain themselves. This is the more demanded, because in one of their answers to Fairfield West, they say that they came to their decision concerning Dr. Bush-

nell by 'analyzing the doctrines in question, *reducing them to their last elements*, throwing out what may be termed merely incidental, or at least not *essential*.' The results of that analysis they gave us before. Here we have the process. Whatever they may hold as their own theology, in their judgment concerning Dr. Bushnell, they throw away the sufferings of Christ in direct substitution for penal sufferings in us, even as an *expression* of God's justice, or of his abhorrence of sin. They retain the Socinian at-one-ment, as the only '*last element*' in the sacrifice and death of our Lord! So, by the late judgment and its recent vindication, so stands the rule of faith in Hartford Central. Is it now to be the rule of faith established among our ministers and churches, or does this judgment belie the New England faith, and subvert the doctrinal basis of our union?"

The * Editor of the paper, and reputed author of the Memorial of Hartford Central, and with Dr. Porter the most prominent of its chosen defenders in General Association, makes a reply in the same number of his paper, to this Rejoinder, which sufficiently answers these questions, so far as he is concerned, and, as we think, under the circumstances, for his Association, till they disavow such doctrine. He says:

"We consider the two first theories, as stated by them, to be nearly or quite identical, both being referable to the *legal* or *penal* scheme, of which they are but subdivisions, and to both of which the true New England view is opposed."

He then goes on and denounces the "legal or penal scheme" as a "*scheme of absurdity worthy of a mechanical theology.*"

And what is the doctrine thus denounced in such terms of derision and scorn? Not merely the doctrine that Christ was punished for the sins of men, but also the "governmental scheme; in which suffering is laid directly upon Christ; evil to pay the release of evil—as a sacrifice, a propitiation by *direct vicarious sufferings* to EXPRESS God's justice, or his abhorrence of sin!" Thus most clearly every vestige of the doctrine of vicarious atonement is cast away as an absurdity! With what truth and fairness the "New England view" is impressed into the service of such men we have already seen. Let it be remembered, too, that their own General Association has pro-

nounced the doctrine that Christ "offered up himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice," fundamental, and the denial of it heresy. And we feel compelled to add, that by whomsoever such heresies are avowed and persisted in, we can have no fellowship with them, be they Dr. Bushnell, the star Editor, the Hartford Central, New England, or even an apostle or angel from heaven. It is surely needless to labour the proof that Dr. Bushnell teaches this deadly heresy, or that his Association shield it, when their leading members, in a journal devoted to their cause, unblushingly avow, and defend, and propagate it. We have dwelt the longer on this point, because it involves the most vital and fundamental truth of the gospel.

The Memorial of Hartford Central complains of the fourth charge of complainants, as imputing to Dr. Bushnell a want of sincerity, but does not undertake to show it untrue. It is proved most undeniably in the documents of Fairfield West. They say, "we cannot speak of the sun's rising without being liable to the same kind of impeachment." A clear admission, as it seems to us, that Dr. Bushnell teaches that the form in which the Bible sets forth Christ, and calls on men to believe upon him, is, in fact, false and absurd.

With regard to the fifth charge, they say that Dr. Bushnell was speaking not of our "accepted systems of religious doctrine," but of our "treatises of theology." And do not these contain our "accepted systems of religious doctrine?"*

These charges, therefore, are in no manner invalidated by

* They commend the following as a "very serious and proper suggestion."

"*Christ in Theology.*" (p. 70.) "And it will be found, as a matter of fact, that all the strong bodies of Protestant believers—the Lutheran, the Reformed Church, the Scotch, the Methodist, and, in fact, the Independent connection—have been organized in and by the strong ligaments of formulas, taken as being the very essence and literal being of the truth. In their formulas, these bodies or churches have all their distinct characteristics, and, as it would almost seem, a vital force equally distinctive and peculiar to themselves. They seem, in fact, to be different organizations, and many will even praise the stern, uncomplying rigour of their doctrine, for the very reason that it is seen to have an organizing power so efficiently and broadly characteristic.

"Now if there be something agreeable in this, which I will not deny, it does not seem to me to be any thing that is properly Christian. On the contrary, though we love to see organic vigour and lively characteristics, it is not pleasant to see Christian bodies animated by distinct *varieties of life.* Such appearances awaken the painful suspicion that *what we call our Christianity, is a product only of the organizing force of human dogmatism.*"

the Memorial of Hartford Central, but are rather (especially the worst of them) confirmed by it, and aggravated by the developments since made. These show that one, at least, of the leading members in that body—even one who voted in the General Association, that he could have no fellowship with the opinions imputed by the complainants to Dr. Bushnell—not only countenances but adopts the worst of his heresies.

What action was taken by the General Association on this showing of facts? After a hurried discussion of a little over half a day, at about 10 o'clock, P. M., they passed the following minute unanimously:

"That the opinions imputed to Dr. Bushnell by the complainants, and the imputation of which is no doubt warranted, if the construction which they conscientiously give to certain quotations from his published books is just, are opinions with which the ministers and churches of Connecticut as represented in this General Association have no fellowship, and the profession of which on the part of candidates for the ministry, ought to prevent their receiving license or approbation of any of our Associations; and further, that when a minister is reasonably chargeable with holding those opinions, definite charges and specifications should be preferred against him before the proper body, which body should make arrangements to secure for the charges an impartial hearing and decision."

"Rev. Dr. Hall said, that on reflection he was not satisfied with this resolution. Though good as far as it went, it was insufficient without something more. He thought the General Association ought to advise the Hartford Central that they should bring Dr. Bushnell to trial. Accordingly he offered the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the matters alleged both by the Fairfield West Association and by the complainants, Rev. G. A. Calhoun, D. D., and others, are of so grave a nature as to demand judicial investigation, and that those who make these allegations are so numerous, so earnest, and, in our opinion, so intelligent and conscientious, as to render such matters of complaint duly presented by them, or any of them, reasonable ground for such investigation. Therefore

"*Resolved*, That this body advise the Hartford Central As-

sociation, that if such a complaint be presented in due order and form, they cannot refuse or neglect to secure a just trial of Dr. Bushnell before an impartial mutual council, with the approbation of the associated ministers of the State."

"On motion of Rev. Dr. Bacon, it was voted to lay this resolution upon the table; whereupon Dr. Hall presented the following protest:

"Against the decision of the General Association, in laying upon the table, and so refusing to consider the foregoing resolutions, designed to secure an impartial trial of Dr. Bushnell in case any shall duly present charges, the undersigned respectfully and solemnly *protest*—because, though the action already passed is good so far as it goes, and they voted for it, it does not go far enough to redress the evil complained of. It declares the matters alleged, if alleged justly, a sufficient ground for demanding trial and condemnation. Now Dr. Bushnell and his church have withdrawn from the Council of Hartford North, for the purpose of avoiding the trial advised by the General Association at Danbury; and the Hartford Central Association have already declared, and persisted in declaring, that to subject Dr. Bushnell to the charge of heresy for the matters alleged, is not merely unreasonable, but unjust. How much soever any may desire it, a trial under the circumstances is impossible. The General Association, by refusing to advise the Hartford Central, that on due charges being made, they cannot refuse to secure a just trial before an impartial mutual council, with the approbation of the associated ministry of this State, have refused the suitable and necessary redress to the complainants, and, in so doing, have refused to vindicate and maintain the standards of doctrine upon which our union and fellowship are based. They still retain and admit to all the fellowship, privileges, and immunities of our confederation, and that without securing the opportunity for an impartial trial, one who is fully and unequivocally charged with having denied the great fundamental doctrines of Christ, and with having set forth a scheme which the Fairfield West Association and others, have solemnly —publicly declared to be another gospel.

EDWIN HALL,
LYMAN H. ATWATER.

Waterbury, June 24th, 1853."

"The following answer to the above protest was presented and adopted:

"In admitting the protest of Drs. Hall and Atwater to a place in the minutes of this Association, we deem a denial of the reasonings and conclusions of that protest a sufficient answer; in particular, we deny,

"1. That there is any necessity for any further action on the part of this General Association, by way of advice, to secure a hearing in the proper quarter for such charges as may be preferred by responsible complainants against any man in our fellowship. We also deny,

"2. That it would be proper for this General Association to decide beforehand that certain charges against a member of a particular Association shall be tried, and in that way to encroach upon the power and liberty of a particular Association."

On a careful review of all the facts thus far presented, the following seems to be a true exposition of the present attitude of the case.

1. The Memorial of Hartford Central, the only defence of themselves or Dr. Bushnell's books which has yet appeared, so far from showing that "the opinions imputed to Dr. Bushnell by the complainants" are not avowed by him, furnishes additional evidence that, as to all material points, they are the real opinions undeniably taught in his books, and never yet retracted by him. At all events, the proofs of the truth of these charges, collated by Fairfield West, and laid before the General Association by that body, and by the complainants, which have so generally satisfied the Christian people of this country on this subject, have not been rebutted. No attempt has been made fairly to rebut any important part of them, nor, in our opinion, can they be rebutted.

2. The General Association being judge, such opinions ought to debar from the ministry and from Christian fellowship those who hold them. When the charge of holding them is reasonably, (*i. e.* with a strong appearance of probability,) brought against any minister, he ought to be put on trial for his standing in the ministry.

3. Yet, although charges of holding such opinions have been so widely and earnestly made against Dr. Bushnell, supported,

too, by such an amount of unanswered and unanswerable evidence, the Hartford Central Association persist in saying that he is sound in the faith, and cannot justly be subject to the charge of heresy and a consequent trial—and this, after an amount of labour to induce them to retreat from this position, seldom if ever paralleled, or likely, in future, to be paralleled in any similar case.

4. To evade the trial advised by the General Association at Danbury, Dr. Bushnell with his church withdrew from the jurisdiction of Consociation. Dr. Bushnell and the Hartford Central Association retain their standing, privileges, and immunities in the General Association entire and intact. Without further action, either dealing with, or advising the Hartford Central, the General Association suffers its own former advice to be defeated. Ministers that avow, and Associations that protect the heresies alleged, are suffered to remain in the General Association without censure, without expostulation, without a trial.

5. The General Association, having refused in any manner to call to account the Hartford Central, was then moved to advise that body, that if charges should be properly preferred before it against Dr. Bushnell, it could not properly refuse to secure a trial before an impartial tribunal. But it refused this only remaining measure of redress, having any tendency to exclude the heresies complained of from its connection. It has refused the slightest redress of which the case admits. It denies that such "further action" is either "necessary" or "proper." But without such action, manifestly, no fair trial is possible. They thus deny that it is "necessary" or "proper" for them to secure a trial of, or provide any other remedy for, the case of a member who has been repeatedly charged before them, by the Fairfield West Association, and again by fifty-two ministers, with teaching opinions which they themselves say, if justly charged, ought to exclude from the ministry. They refuse to touch one of their Associations, which persists in saying that the charge against one of their members of holding such opinions, thus extensively, persistently, and responsibly made, and supported by such overwhelming *prima facie* evidence, furnishes no just ground for a trial: nay, that

one who has in manifold forms avowed the identical opinions which the General Association says ought to debar from the ministry, "cannot justly be subjected to the charge of heresy and a consequent trial, or be denied the confidence of his brethren in the ministry."

6. It is thus virtually decided that the General Association cannot properly take any measures to purge itself from any heresy, when avowed by any minister in its connection, and shielded by his Association. It can scarcely be conceived that any minister expecting to remain in the Congregational communion, should avow opinions more grossly heretical, or in forms more palpable, manifold, unambiguous, than Dr. Bushnell has done. No case can be conceived in which a larger number of ministers would combine and persevere, with a greater amount of labour and sacrifice, to secure the removal of such heresy from their fellowship. The disposal of this case therefore, in our opinion settles it, that it is impracticable to remove heresy from the General Association of Connecticut, as that body is now constituted, when once it is sheltered or espoused by a district Association. Whether this results from the nature of Congregationalism, or the unfaithfulness of those who administer it, in this case, is of no importance, so far as the great fact is concerned. The practical issue has come, which the complainants insisted would come, if "suitable redress" of their grievances were denied. "Membership and certificates of membership in this body are not even *prima facie* evidence of soundness in the faith;" they are no evidence that those who have them do not hold the heresies of Dr. Bushnell; or of his brother of the Religious Herald, who scouts the doctrine of vicarious atonement, held by evangelical Christians, as a "SCHEME OF ABSURDITY WORTHY OF A MECHANICAL THEOLOGY." This is undeniable. For it now has such members, and refuses to take any steps for reforming or excluding them. And has not the further alternative, set forth by the complainants therefore come, in which "its delegations to other Christian bodies become an imposture, and its bond of union a nullity?" So it seems to us. Foreign bodies who exchange delegates with the General Association of Connecticut, are plainly liable to receive those

to their fellowship who repudiate the first principles of Christian doctrine as set forth in their Confessions of Faith. Their "bond of union" too, by including those who deny and subvert the doctrinal basis of that union, is utterly broken, or made a rope of sand.

In such a state of things those who love the truth as it is in Jesus, will of course take no vague or indecisive position. Fidelity to the Head of the Church, to the truth of the gospel, to the souls committed to their care, to the ministers and people connected with them, to other Christian bodies in correspondence with them, to the whole Christian world, and to posterity, require that they utter no uncertain sound, and take a position which shall be known and read of all men. This seems the more requisite, as the worst of the heresies charged, begins to be avowed and propagated with increasing boldness since this final disposal of the subject by the General Association.

What it becomes them to do in this emergency is not for us to say. We understand that many among them begin to feel that they can scarcely do less than signify to the world, that whatever relations they may continue to sustain to the existing ecclesiastical bodies of the State, they can be in no manner sponsors for the orthodoxy of those bodies, or of their members, or for the validity of their certificates, or other ecclesiastical acts. For such membership and certificates are no evidence that they who possess them do not hold and teach the heresies we have been considering, or what has loudly and justly been denounced by the evangelical world as "another gospel."

But how are we to explain the connivance and protection thus given to such sentiments by the major part of the Connecticut ministry? The ready answer to this with many will be, that so far from conniving at or protecting, they have by repeated declarations, first at Litchfield, and then at Waterbury, repudiated and condemned these sentiments, and disavowed all fellowship with them. Such declarations are indeed well, as far as they go. But they are of little account, so long as those who boldly avow the heresies so condemned, are retained in fellowship, and every measure is obstinately refused, *which can have any tendency to exclude such heresies from the General Association, or to bring their authors under Christian discip-*

line. There is no answering Fairfield West, when they say, (Appeal, p. 91,)

"In such circumstances, if the General Association does nothing more than declare that the ministers and churches regard the denial of these doctrines as heresy, if it does not go forward and take effectual measures for removing such heresy from its connection, all such declarations are proved to be false and insincere. They are masks, which if they hide our shame from ourselves, do but attract the attention of others to it."

1. There are those who, as we have already seen, are represented in the only weekly religious journal of the denomination in the State by the chosen champion of Dr. Bushnell and his Association, and who tread so far in the footsteps of their master as to stigmatize the doctrine of vicarious atonement, in every form of it recognized in the Christian church, as "A SCHEME OF ABSURDITY WORTHY OF A MECHANICAL THEOLOGY." We shall wait for evidence before we can believe that this class extends beyond the precincts of Hartford Central.

2. A larger class have been imposed upon by the disingenuous tactics of Dr. Bushnell and his apologists. They have been made to believe that Dr. Bushnell opposed only the "penal" scheme of atonement, while he substantially embraced what has been called the New England scheme. The grossness of this pretence we have already exposed.

3. In aid of this delusion has come the weak and confused position of those, who, holding that Christ's sufferings are strictly vicarious, nevertheless deny that they are truly penal in their nature. So far as they are truly vicarious, they are laid on Christ for the sins of men, in satisfaction of justice and in vindication of law. What is this but punishment? So Christ bore our sins. How, unless in bearing their penalty? We have always resisted those who deny that Christ's sufferings are penal, because we not only believe that herein they deny precious truth, but because we also believe that they thus put a sword into the hands of the opposers of vicarious atonement, and disarm its friends. While these good brethren cling to the vicarious, but deny the penal quality of Christ's sufferings, they are embarrassed, as these artful dodgers skulk under their own theories for a shelter: and ask them, "if you deny that Christ's

death was penal, and assert that it was symbolical or demonstrative merely, what if we affirm also that it was simply didactic or expressive only in another way?" Of course the same reasoning, if good for any thing, is good for the rankest Socinianism. The star Editor is abundant in insisting that New-school men would see that they could not consistently oppose Dr. Bushnell, if they had run out their own theories to their legitimate results. It is not incumbent on us to show that this claim is unjust. But we will say,

1. That the bold urging of it has apparently unmanned many New-school men on this subject, and paralyzed their opposition to Dr. Bushnell's heresies on the Atonement.

2. It is altogether unfair to assume, as Dr. Bushnell and his defenders have done, that these men admit the logical consequences of their denial that Christ's sufferings were penal, or waver at all in the faith that these sufferings are directly substituted for the sinner's punishment, and that this doctrine is fundamental.

3. This controversy has afforded a new and conclusive proof, that we gain nothing and hazard everything, by tampering with the old doctrine of the Scriptures and the Church, *that Christ's sufferings were truly penal and so truly vicarious.*

4. We imagine that uncertainty of mind as to jurisdiction had much to do with the result. This jurisdiction was sturdily denied by the Hartford Central Association to the last. No similar case had ever been known among Congregationalists. It was admitted too, on all hands, that the General Association was not a judicial body, and yet that it had control over its own membership. Still the feeling among many was, that the General Association could not look into the judicial acts of district Associations, for the purpose of calling them to account, and thus indirectly reversing proceedings which they could not directly overrule. The development of opinion in the body on this subject is somewhat remarkable. Dr. Bacon offered the following resolutions:

"1. *Resolved*, That inasmuch as the General Association is not a judicial body for the trial of appeals from subordinate judicatories, whether Churches, Councils, or Associations, the decision of a particular Association in regard to the standing of

one of its members is not to be examined by the General Association, with a view to its being confirmed, or reversed.

"2. *Resolved*, That to arraign a particular Association for trial before the General Association, simply on the charge that it has made an erroneous decision in a single case concerning the character and standing of one of its members, especially when it professes its cordial and undiminished attachment to the system of Christian doctrine, which is the bond of our union, would be to do indirectly what the General Association has no right to do directly; and would be to usurp the power and jurisdiction belonging to a court of appeal."

The following resolutions adopted by the General Association in 1848, without any intimation from any quarter that the body was therein usurping judicial powers, were then read by a member.

"*Whereas*, this association is in the dark respecting the *discipline* exercised by certain ecclesiastical bodies in correspondence with us, in regard to the sin of slavery, therefore,

"*Resolved*, that a committee of three be appointed by this body, to collect facts and make inquiries respecting this subject, and report to the next General Association.

"Rev. Dr. Bacon, &c., were appointed a committee, &c."

No sooner was this read, than the second of the above proposed resolutions was modified with the assent of the mover, by the following addendum: "Unless the case be of such a nature that said judgment and decision indicates a fatal disregard of our faith and order."

It was somewhat too glaring to have had no misgivings about the warrant to inspect the discipline of distant Presbyteries remotely connected with the body, and to become all at once morbidly scrupulous about the right to look into a case of discipline in which it was solemnly alleged that one of their own associations had subverted the fundamentals of the gospel! Still we doubt not that a certain haziness of view on this subject concurred with a similar indeterminateness of mind on the doctrinal matters involved, to bring about the final indecisive result. As many viewed it, who had not thoroughly examined the subject, it was possible after all, that Dr. Bushnell might have been misunderstood. And it was possible that the offence

of the Hartford Central was not grave enough to subject it justly to the charge of a "fatal disregard of our faith or order." Of course all such were prepared to do nothing but to give the accused the benefit of their doubts.

But we should fail to detect the deepest ground of the sympathy or favour felt towards Dr. Bushnell's books by some of the younger clergy, if we did not advert to the state of mind in which a great part of those educated in the system called New Divinity find themselves, after being a few years in actual pastoral service. They soon feel it to be a dry, lifeless, starveling system; and that they must find something broader and richer to satisfy their longing souls. Many of them are directed to the standard, catholic, and Calvinistic authors, and above all, to their Bibles. They find themselves thus refreshed and invigorated with the truth as it is in Jesus, "ever new and ever young," and which the metaphysical figments that had famished their souls, had so long supplanted. Many such are even among the champions of old Calvinism.

But another class, in this unsettled state of mind, fall in with Schleiermacher, or Morell, or Dr. Bushnell. Here, too, they find large pretensions to spiritual light, inspiration, the life of God in the soul, which not only quite eclipse the dead metaphysics they have learned to mistake for orthodoxy, but the standard of Paul and John, Augustin, Luther, Calvin, Edwards, the saints of all generations. Not a few who are, as we verily believe, in search of the true light, are unhappily dazzled just now, by these glaring, stained lights, that happened to fall upon their track. We believe that many of these, if they can be shown, or can find the truth, will embrace it. When such a man as Dr. Bacon speaks in the terms following, as he did in the Bushnell debate at Waterbury, he certainly indicates a state of theological training, or opinion among the clergy antecedent to the late discussions, which, if not reformed into something better, must quickly ripen into something worse. It goes far to account for all the phenomena under review. We quote without note or comment.

"Let me say further—for I am now defining my position—that I think I can see the wisdom of God in permitting that book (*God in Christ*) to be published. Much as there is in it

at variance with our feelings, it has had a good effect upon our theology—at least it has upon mine. It has led me to a re-examination of what we were holding in New England as the doctrine of the Trinity. I was astounded when I found what was held by some of our divines on this subject. I did hear *flat tritheism* in my own pulpit from one of the most venerable and honoured men in the ministry of this country—in a sermon aimed against the teachings of this very book. I found that in some of our theological seminaries the doctrine of the Trinity was propounded in a form truly heretical—that of 'one substance with three sets of attributes.' This theory is in face and eyes of the Athanasian creed. Not only myself, but others, I am persuaded, have been led to more definite views on this subject, in consequence of the publications of Dr. Bushnell, and of the discussions that have grown out of them. In former years I was in the habit of speaking somewhat unbelievingly, to say the least, of the doctrine of eternal generation, as held by our benighted brethren of the Old-school Presbyterian Church. But I take all that back. I believe that doctrine as it is contained in the Nicene creed. I have been led to hold the doctrines of our faith more in accordance with the ancient formulas, by Dr. Bushnell's books; and I have heard of other men who have been led by them to preach the doctrine of eternal generation. I suspect, indeed, that they have been of benefit to our theology, even in the most orthodox quarters of our ecclesiastical commonwealth. Dr. Bushnell's book has been useful to me because of the force with which it impresses upon us all the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It seems to me—I do not know but I shall give offence in saying it—but it seems to me, that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit among us was becoming a very dry kind of doctrine—was regarded as almost an *incumbrance* in our system of faith; and it is my impression that as the result of these recent discussions, we have become more orthodox on this point. I am weary, and have been for a long time, of this metaphysical hair-splitting in theology; of this attempt to define the psychological relations of the Holy Spirit to the human mind. We have had an erroneous tradition, that the power of Edwards as a preacher lay in his peculiar notions of the philosophy of the will. It did not lie there;

it lay in the doctrine which, as I think, constituted the life and power of his book on the Affections—namely, that gracious affections are accompanied with new spiritual light."

There is another important fact in this connection, which doubtless had great influence in preventing any decisive action in the premises. Those who had themselves been forward in introducing or promoting doctrinal innovations, and in obliterating whatever old landmarks and barriers would dyke out their novelties, however much they detested Dr. Bushnell's views, felt the awkwardness of assuming to be champions of orthodoxy—and especially of appearing intolerant or exclusive towards fresh innovators, to whom they could not deny with a good grace the same license which they had already claimed for themselves. For the most part, therefore, New-school men were abundant in decisive declarations, but unwilling to carry out those declarations in the exercise of corresponding discipline.

The last General Association of Connecticut signalized itself by an act of fundamental importance in its bearings upon the ecclesiastical constitution of the churches of the State. They admitted an Association formed avowedly upon the basis of elective affinity, instead of territorial contiguity. Against this procedure, driven through with little discussion under the screw of the previous question, Dr. Hewit protested, as revolutionary and subversive of the Saybrook Platform. To this it was rejoined by Dr. Bacon, that the Saybrook Platform had already become obsolete and been superseded in various particulars. This is very true. But it is also true that these particulars did not involve the fundamental principle of the Platform, but only the incidental details and arrangements for carrying it out. That principle was this: that ecclesiastical bodies should *be formed upon the basis of territorial contiguity, and not of the likes or dislikes of parties or individuals, setting at defiance that principle.* The great principle of the Platform is, that "churches which are neighbouring shall consociate." The formation of bodies by elective affinity lays the axe at the root of this principle, and gives the Platform its death-blow. Compared with this, all prior infractions were of that minor sort,

which did not touch the vitals; and to which Dr. Hewit justly applies the maxim, *de minimis lex non curat.*

We will only add, that some constitution, platform, or manual, which shall be recognized by the Congregational body as a just representation of their principles, seems to us a desideratum. As to the Saybrook Platform, even the fragments of it which yet survive, are of no force out of Connecticut. The Cambridge Platform is largely obsolete. Each Congregationalist may adopt as much or as little of it as he pleases. None adopt it as a whole. There is no manual or treatise on the subject known to us, which does not contain much that would be extensively repudiated by the most respectable men of the denomination. If one wishes to know his rights, duties, and immunities, as a member or officer of a Congregational church, where is the constitution that shows them? Does one say, the Bible? All claim to abide by that. Is it usage? But this is diverse in different quarters. Besides, where is the authentic evidence what this usage is? We think the permanent unity and prosperity of the denomination will require some united declaration of its fundamental principles, to which all can be directed, when they wish to know, on authority, what Congregationalism is.

Art. IV.—*History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Vol. Fifth. The Reformation in England.* By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D. D., &c., &c. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1853.

In the preface to the *fourth* volume of this history, Dr. Merle states that it was his desire "to narrate also the beginnings of the English Reformation, but my volume is filled, and I am compelled to defer this subject to the next." After giving some reasons for the omission, he proceeds to say: "It is not without some portion of fear that I approach the History of the Reformation in England; it is perhaps more difficult than elsewhere. I have received communications from some of the most respectable men of the different ecclesiastical parties, who, each feeling convinced that their own point of view

is the true one, desire me to present the history in this light. I hope to execute my task with impartiality and truth. But I thought it would be advantageous to study for some time longer the principles and facts."

We need scarcely say that the public were prepared to give this long-looked-for volume a cordial welcome, for any work from the pen of D'Aubigné is sure to command readers. But, for the reasons indicated in the preceding extract, the appearance of the present volume was waited for with an unusual degree of interest by various religious parties in England and America; each being curious to see how the author would handle a subject confessedly more difficult than any other in the entire compass of the history of the Reformation. The mass of ordinary readers, we have no doubt, will find this volume not less attractive than those which have preceded it, for it is pervaded by the same kindly spirit, and has the same evangelical unction, which give such a charm to its predecessors. No one who begins its perusal will stop until he has reached the end of the book. Still, we are inclined to think, that, among those who have waited so anxiously for the publication of the work, there are some who will lay it aside, with the feeling that their expectations have not been fully answered. Considering that more than seven years have elapsed since the issue of the previous volume, and the statement made by Dr. Merle in the Preface to it, that the history of the English Reformation prior to 1530 is of comparatively little moment, we must confess that we were somewhat disappointed when we found that the narrative terminated with the fall and the death of Cardinal Wolsey. Nor are we exactly able to reconcile the large space he allows to certain political transactions, in which that remarkable man was a prominent actor, with the reasons he assigns for considering the year 1530 as the proper terminating point of the Reformation in Germany, viz: that "the work of faith then attained its apogee; that of conferences, of interims, of diplomacy, begins." Be this, however, as it may, the end of the volume leaves us at the outskirt of the field over which the author proposes to carry us; and when we think of its extent, and of the difficulties of the way, we cannot resist the fear that, at the present rate of progress, we may lose our

accomplished guide before we can reach those spots which we are especially desirous to investigate with the aid of his genius, piety, and learning.

With regard to the merits of Dr. Merle D'Aubigné as a historian, there is, we apprehend, little difference of opinion, at least among the thousands of evangelical Christians who have derived both pleasure and instruction from his fascinating pages. His first volume, published in Paris, obtained—as, indeed, might have been anticipated—a very limited circulation in France; so limited that the author was strongly tempted to abandon the enterprise on which he had entered, and was only induced to proceed with it through the earnest expostulation of Guizot. But the moment that the British and American public were made acquainted with the work, it gained immense success. Three distinct translations appeared almost simultaneously in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, while its author at once took rank among the first historical writers of the age. His History of the Reformation may be said to be not merely his *opus magnum*, but his only work, for he seems to concentrate upon it the studies and labours of many years; and while in the earlier portions of it he has drawn largely from Marheineke, yet all his volumes contain ample evidence of independent and pains-taking research. Among living historians—and our age can boast of not a few whose renown will long endure—who, in point of popularity can be compared with Dr. Merle, with the single exception of Macaulay? Both of them are perfect masters of the art of historical composition, yet their works are cast in very different moulds. The pages of Macaulay abound with pictures drawn with the most elaborate care, and with exquisite art; those of D'Aubigné, if less pictorial, are far more dramatic; they are instinct with life and action. The latter, too, like his English contemporary, possesses the rare power of producing his personages in all their individuality before the reader; his men and women move before us in the costume and mode of their day, and their features are imprinted on our mind with the distinctness of the daguerreotype.

But while Dr. Merle's dramatic power lends such a vivid interest to his historical writings, we are somewhat doubtful whether he does not occasionally carry it to an unwarrantable

excess. For example, he often brings forward the Reformers and others, conversing upon the topics of their day. We have, or seem to have, the very words, as well as the sentiments they uttered. In their case, it is a comparatively easy task for the historian to get up a dialogue such as may have occurred between the persons introduced, since the necessary materials are abundant and accessible, in the shape of letters, table-talk, examinations, and conferences. But when the men who lived a thousand or fifteen hundred years ago are presented before us occupied with the same sort of familiar discourse, though the sentiments put into their mouths may be quite consistent with the character of the speakers, we still cannot help feeling suspicious of the exact historical truthfulness of the narrative. Yet such dialogues we do find in the account of the early British churches.

These volumes abound with a class of sentences somewhat analogous to the gem-like notes with which good Matthew Henry has adorned his matchless Exposition—sentences in which the author aims to embody some grand truth of universal application in a few well chosen words, or to gather up the teachings of history on a specific subject, and to compress them into a form fitted to please the taste, and to fix itself in the reader's memory. Many of these sentences are exceedingly beautiful and striking; but in this last volume we occasionally encounter one which contains a good deal more fancy than force. Thus, in speaking of the fall of Wolsey, Dr. Merle observes: "England, by sacrificing a churchman, gave a memorable example of her inflexible opposition to the encroachments of the Papacy."—V. 489. Surely Dr. Merle must have penned these words while under the influence of that prodigious excitement into which Britain was recently thrown by the erection of the Popish bishoprics in England. Wolsey was undoubtedly a proud, ambitious, "churchman;" he was "sacrificed," and his fall was the occasion of great delight to one of the parties into which Henry's court was divided; but to speak of his overthrow as a "sacrifice" on the part of "England," by which she evinced her "inflexible opposition to the encroachments of the Papacy," is to use language more suited to the flights of poetry than the sober realities of history. Wolsey was the

victim of his own unprincipled ambition. As the historian observes, when summing up his character, "power had been his idol, and to obtain it in the State, he had sacrificed the liberties of England." For a time he was prime minister of the kingdom, with the whole power of the government in his hands, and while his conduct in the affair of the divorce no doubt helped materially to alienate Henry, yet he fell not as cardinal or churchman, but as the politician. Even his impeachment by the House of Lords did not partake of the nature of a protest against papal encroachments, for the particular acts of treason with which he was charged, were such as any prime minister might have perpetrated. Then, again, the House of Commons, to the great annoyance of the Cardinal's enemies, refused to concur with the Peers in impeaching him of high treason. In no proper sense of the words, therefore, can it be affirmed that in the overthrow of Wolsey, "England sacrificed a churchman," and manifested her "inflexible opposition to papal encroachments."

Another dictum of like character occurs as a pendicle to the account of Sir Thomas More's elevation to the chancellorship. "The less cause kings and their subjects have to fear the intrusion of clerical power into the affairs of the world, the more will they yield themselves to the vivifying influence of faith." It will be remembered that the judicial office to which More was raised upon the fall of Wolsey, was one which had been held, for a long period, chiefly by ecclesiastics, for the reason that there were few laymen capable of properly discharging its functions. That such a position is utterly incompatible with the appropriate work of a Christian minister, will be readily admitted by all who have a just conception of what that work is, and it may be that Dr. Merle in the sentence above quoted, simply intended to give expression to this sentiment. But he would find it a very difficult matter to substantiate his statement as it stands. Kings and their subjects may be and have been exempted from all fear of the intrusion of clerical power, without exhibiting the least readiness to yield to the influence of the faith. Priestly intrusion into secular affairs, unquestionably, has been productive of most disastrous results to church and state, but history teaches us that the very kings

and statesmen who were foremost in resisting priestly usurpation have been themselves equally ready to intrude into the spiritual things of the church, and to rule with a rod of iron the heritage of the Lord.

In the descriptive portions of this last volume, though they are on the whole very admirably executed, we occasionally meet with statements, which, to say the least, wear an appearance of exaggeration that may be pardoned in a tale claiming only to be "founded on fact," but which is certainly out of place in a formal history of the past. Thus in the account of Erasmus's edition of the New Testament, the publication of the work in England is represented to have produced an almost unparalleled excitement. "Never had any book produced such a sensation. It was in every hand; men struggled to procure it, read it eagerly, and would even kiss it. In every place of public resort, at fairs, and markets, at the dinner-table, and in the council chambers, in shops, and taverns, and houses of ill-fame, in churches, in the universities, in cottages, and palaces," Erasmus and the Greek Testament was the subject of discussion. From the terms employed, one might naturally conclude that this highly excited state of feeling, instead of being confined to particular localities and classes, had spread itself over the entire kingdom, so that all England was in a blaze. That the publication of a volume, which not one person in ten thousand could read, produced such an immense sensation, not only in schools and palaces, but in shops, taverns, and houses of ill-fame, is an event too improbable to be credited on the simple testimony of Erasmus, and the historian refers to no other authority in support of his statement. We do not like this tone of exaggeration, which Dr. Merle sometimes adopts, we dare say unconsciously. It is inconsistent with that rigid truthfulness at which the historian is bound to aim, and when once detected, it is apt to beget a suspicion in the mind of the thoughtful reader that the glowing pages which he at first peruses with the deepest interest, would be much less charming if they had not been so highly coloured.

The present volume contains four books, which are numbered as belonging to the general history of the Reformation. In the first we get a summary account of the introduction of

Christianity into the British Isles while under the dominion of Pagan Rome, and of the early struggles between the churches of Britain and Rome.

The early annals of the British churches, *i. e.* from the introduction of the gospel down to the period when the Papal dominion was established over the whole island, constitute a portion of church history that possesses great interest, especially for Presbyterians. Dr. Munter, a Danish divine, has written a very valuable book on this subject, our only regret being that he has not entered more fully into it. Very valuable materials were collected by Usher, Stillingfleet, and Lloyd, to which considerable additions have been made by Smith, Jamieson, Bost, and other historical students of the present day, but a full and fair history of these churches yet remains to be written. Long after the southern parts of Britain had yielded to the arts and had adopted the heresies of Rome, a vigorous struggle for the true faith was maintained in the northern division of the Island. Amid the rugged mountains of Scotland, and the green hills of the sister isle, there were multitudes of Christians who held fast their integrity. Here the light of the gospel continued to shine, in a high degree of purity, while the dark clouds of Romish superstition were rapidly spreading over the remainder of Western Europe; and here, too, the simple worship and discipline of an earlier age were observed, and, in spite of the fierce assaults of the Papacy, held their ground, until within less than two centuries of the Reformation. Dr. McCrie, the biographer of Knox, was of opinion that the early and firm hold which the Reformed doctrine obtained in the west of Scotland, was partly owing to the memory and influence of the ancient Culdees—as these early Scottish Christians were called—an influence which, like hidden leaven, continued to operate upon the minds of certain classes, long after Romanism had become the recognized religion of the kingdom. That there was a wide difference between the Culdees and the Romanizers of England in the seventh and eighth century, is put beyond dispute by the testimony of Bede. It was a difference that extended not only to articles of faith, but also to forms of government and modes of worship, and on each of these points, though they were not entirely

exempt from the errors prevalent in that age, the principles they avowed and defended with uncompromising fidelity, were essentially the same with those embodied in the symbolic books of the Reformed Church. Bede expressly declares that prelacy was totally unknown among them, and that while some ministers were styled bishops, these last neither claimed to be nor were regarded as superior in any respect to presbyters. So far were they from affecting to be lords over God's heritage, or, under Christ, supreme rulers of his Church, that they cheerfully received the directions, and obeyed the commands, of the college of presbyters, or, in other words, of the Presbytery, as their proper and divinely appointed ecclesiastical superior. Their pastors proclaimed that fundamental doctrine of the gospel—salvation by grace—and they attested their apostolic descent not only by their vigorous defence of apostolic truth and order, but also by their zealous and self-denying efforts to spread the glad tidings of salvation among the pagan tribes of their own land, and of continental Europe. Columban (who must not be confounded with Columba,) the apostle of Germany, was a Scot, and was sent forth upon his perilous, and at that day, far-distant mission, by the Presbyters of Iona—Iona! "*clarum et venerabile nomen*," one that richly merits to be held in affectionate remembrance by Christians of whatever name, but especially by those who derive their origin, natural or ecclesiastical, from Presbyterian Scotland. It indeed seems so strange, that a rocky islet on one of the wildest parts of the coast of a country at the farthest verge of the then known world, and which had not yet emerged from barbarism, should become a favoured seat of science and religion, the centre of influences literary, ecclesiastical, and missionary, reaching even to distant nations, that many who have heard the name of the sacred spot, and possibly have made a pilgrimage to it, are disposed, it may be, to regard its story as one of the lying legends of the dark ages. But the well known and noble passage in which the great lexicographer of England, forgetting for a moment his bigoted and sturdy hatred of Scotland and the Scots, gives utterance to the feelings awakened in his soul as he gazed upon the ruins of Iona, describes facts as indubitable as any that history records.

The survey of the Saxon period is followed by a more extended notice of Wickliff and his times. "Wickliff," says Dr. Merle, "is the greatest English reformer; he was, in truth, the first reformer of Christendom. The work of the Waldenses, excellent as it was, cannot be compared to his." p. 104. The name of Wickliff, "the morning star of the Reformation," will ever be regarded as one of the most glorious in the catalogue of witnesses for Christ; but we are scarcely prepared to assent to the judgment of the historian as to his comparative merits. Unquestionably his piety and abilities were of a very high order; and by his translation of the Bible, his polemic writings, and his academic lectures, he was the means of diffusing a light in which many rejoiced for a season. The publication of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue was virtually a blow aimed at the very foundation of Popery, as the Papists of that age were not slow to perceive; but, in general, his attacks were directed against the outworks of the citadel of superstition, rather than against the citadel itself. The historian himself admits as much, for in speaking of the character of Wickliff's followers, he says:—"Of the Lollards there were many who had been redeemed by Jesus Christ, but, in general, they knew not to the same extent as the Christians of the sixteenth century the quickening and justifying power of faith." The views of the Waldenses on most of the points in the gospel scheme, were clearer and more distinct, than those which obtained among the disciples of the English reformer. The protest of the former against the corruptions of Rome was pronounced with no less emphasis than that of the latter, and we therefore cannot go along with the historian in the strong statement that the work of the Waldenses "cannot be compared with that of Wickliff." Confined within the narrow limits of their Alpine valleys, by foes who would gladly have exterminated them, destitute of all political power, and with no John of Gaunt to stand between them and their bloody persecutors, it was impossible for them to make upon Italy the impression which Wickliff made upon England. And yet we know that in spite of all obstacles, they were accustomed to send forth their missionaries, two by two, who, travelling amid perpetual perils, and thus obliged to act with extreme caution,

kindled the light of life in many a family. While Wickliff lived, he enjoyed the countenance and support of powerful friends, who were allied with him, not so much from religious convictions, as for political reasons, and hence his cause, for a time, had something like fair play; but the moment that these princely patrons left the cause to stand on its own merits, it rapidly declined. Here and there a few humble, timid believers were found, who fondly cherished the memory and the teachings of the departed reformer, and who in secret places fed their faith by the perusal of that precious volume of inspiration which he had rendered accessible to them. We have no doubt that the labours of Wickliff were not without their influence in preparing the way for that triumph which the gospel, after the lapse of many long years, was destined to gain in England; but it must be owned that there was no apparent bond of connection between the reformer of the fourteenth and those of the sixteenth century.

The remainder of the volume is occupied with the history of the Reformation proper, which, as we have already mentioned, is carried down no further than to the death of Wolsey. It includes many exceedingly interesting details respecting Tyndale, Frith, and their fellow-labourers, in the work of translating the New Testament, and of spreading the knowledge of the gospel in England; but the personages who fill the largest space are Henry VIII. and the more prominent statesmen of the period. The history of Henry's divorce from Catherine of Arragon is given with great minuteness, and is one of the most readable portions of the book. The varying phases of this affair, as it dragged its slow length along, one while at Rome, and again at London, are depicted with elaborate care. While thus adding to the dramatic interest, and the popularity of the book, the excellent author, it seems to us, has been a little forgetful of his theory respecting the origin and character of the English Reformation.

"The English Reformation," says Dr. Merle, "has been, and still is calumniated by writers of different parties, who look upon it as nothing more than an external political transformation, and who thus ignore its spiritual nature."—*Pref.* iv. "If the Reformation in England happened necessarily to be

mixed up with the State, with the world even, it originated neither in the State nor in the world. There was much worldliness in the age of Henry VIII., passions, violence, festivities, a trial, a divorce, and some historians call that *the history of the Reformation in England.* To say that Henry VIII. was the reformer of his people, is to betray our ignorance of history. This great transformation was begun and extended by its own strength." Such is Dr. Merle's theory with regard to the causes in which the English Reformation originated, and one chief object of this volume, as he expressly declares, is to vindicate the work from the aspersions cast upon it by Romish and Protestant writers, by proving that it was pre-eminently spiritual and scriptural. We might adduce numerous other passages of precisely similar import with those already quoted. Notwithstanding these repeated and earnest protests against those who ignore the spiritual element in the English Reformation, he himself deals with a "trial and a divorce," in much the same way as that in which they would be handled by the class of writers from whom he so widely differs; that is to say, by the large space he allows to Henry's divorce, and by the elaborate minuteness with which the details of the affair are given, he virtually recognizes it as something more than a subordinate and unimportant incident in the history of the Reformation.

But without dwelling on this point, we proceed to observe that it would have been more satisfactory if the excellent author had described with greater precision the views of the English Reformation which he regards as partial, or as totally unfounded; and if he had done so, it is quite probable that our judgment respecting the nature of the work, and of the various agencies concerned in its production, would be found to be nearly or even exactly in accordance with his own. It does not, however, distinctly appear to what class of Protestant writers he refers as having calumniated the English Reformation, and as he affirms in several places, that it was more immediately and purely scriptural in its origin than that of any other country, his readers might infer that even the Nonconformists of England were among those who have done injustice to the history of the Reformation in their native land. We are

very confident that Dr. Merle himself would most earnestly disclaim such a conclusion, yet there are sentences which appear to warrant it; and we regret that he has not taken more pains to guard against the danger of misapprehension by explaining the sense in which he employs the term *Reformation*. That the Reformation in England was a mere political affair, that this great event was effected solely through the influence of a wanton and capricious tyrant, is a position which none beside papists and infidels have ever pretended to maintain. Romanism was assailed by men clothed in the panoply of God; the right of the people to possess and study the sacred volume was boldly asserted, copies of it were circulated, the revived gospel was preached in church and school, and many souls were turned from darkness to light, the sincerity of whose conversion was proved by the readiness with which they laid down their lives for the faith. These are facts beyond dispute; but the same things occurred in countries noted for their Popish bigotry, in Italy and Spain, and the question arises, Might not England's fate have been similar to theirs, if Henry VIII. had been a man of different character, or if his divorce from Catherine had never taken place?

Until Elizabeth ascended the throne, it cannot be said that the mass of the English people sympathized with the cause of Protestantism; on the contrary, there are strong reasons for believing that up to that time, if the popular mind could have found free utterance on the subject, the major part of the nation would have expressed a preference for the old religion. With some restraints upon the power of the priesthood, and some improvement in their morals, they would have been content to let things remain as they were. We argue this from the fact that no serious opposition was made to the monstrous system which Henry established, when he resolved to be the Pope in his own dominions, and to regulate the faith and worship of his people. Nor can we explain on any other supposition the readiness with which the nation submitted to Mary, notwithstanding her well-known bigoted attachment to the old faith, and the ease with which she set up the papal authority in her kingdom. We cannot believe that she would have been permitted to mount the throne so easily, and to shed

so much of the best blood of her kingdom, if the majority of her subjects had been decided Protestants. The most decided of them, as if conscious of their feebleness, fled to the continent the instant the crown was placed upon her head; while those who remained behind sought the shelter of obscurity, or became the unresisting victims of the bloody queen. Happily her reign was a short one, but if it had extended through as many years as that of her sister and successor, England might have continued until this day a faithful subject of the Apostolic See.

The little sympathy felt by the mass of the English people for the Reformation, appears in a striking light, when we compare the progress of that cause in England with its progress in Scotland, Holland, Switzerland, and even in France. In the countries last named the movement was pre-eminently a popular one. The revived gospel took such firm hold of the masses, that the Reformation triumphed in spite of the utmost efforts of kings and emperors to put it down. In each of those countries in which Romanism was supplanted by the reformed faith, the latter system of doctrine and order was received not at the dictation of the civil power, but because of the very general conviction that it was in accordance with the word of God. France, indeed, continued to be Romanist in sentiment; but up to the time of the horrible massacre which has covered the name of Charles IX. with undying infamy, papists themselves considered it doubtful on which side she would ultimately be found. Among the Protestants of France there were some of the highest nobles of the kingdom, and even princes of the blood royal; but none of these presumed to dictate to the Reformed Church what she should believe, or how she should worship God. The only recognized authority was that of Christ speaking in his word. How different the course of things in England! The light of salvation dawns upon her universities and her great metropolis. Some noble souls, illumined by its beams, seek to diffuse the word of life, and not without success, but they are few in number, they are obliged to act with extreme caution, they have no organization, while upon the higher powers in Church and State the only influence they exert is to provoke their vengeance. Meanwhile Henry, incensed at the duplicity of the Pope in the affair of his divorce,

and eager to consummate his marriage with Anne Boleyn, the beauty of his court, breaks with Rome, and assuming the powers previously exerted by his Holiness, as Supreme Head of the Church, he orders his people, under pains and penalties, to follow his example. Cranmer, Cromwell, and others, who were more or less Protestant at heart, taking advantage of Henry's indignation against Rome, and of his anxiety to get rid of Katherine, try to induce him to move a little in the direction of the gospel. The old religion of the State is slightly modified, but everything depends upon the will of the king. As Henry goes, the Church goes, and when he stops, she stops. He is succeeded by his son Edward, than whom a lovelier character never sat upon the throne of Britain. The heads of the Church, emboldened by the sincere piety of the youthful monarch, and his pliant temper, venture to take farther steps in the right direction.* But Edward's sun goes down before it was yet noon. The bloody Mary obtains the throne, and in a moment all that had been done for the reformation of the Church is undone. Cranmer, Hooper, Ridley, and others, are sent to the stake. Popery is once more dominant in England, and such it might have remained until this day, if Mary had lived to give an heir to the throne, and to superintend his education. Her sceptre passes into the hands of Elizabeth, "that bright occidental star," as she is styled in the preface to our authorized version of the Bible; the daughter of Anne Boleyn, half Protestant, half Papist, and for some time after her accession to the throne, doubtful with which side to identify herself; but the instant she decides the question, the Church of England puts on a new type—one which has proved to be, in the main, permanent, and is as distinctive as the architecture of the age which gave it birth.

Now with these facts before us we cannot concur with the historian when he says that, "this great transformation was begun and carried on in its own strength, by the Spirit from on high," certainly in that sense of his words which they

* There is a document preserved by Strype, drawn up by Edward himself, which at once proves his cordial sympathy with the Reformation, and warrants the inference, that if he had lived he would have laboured to bring the Church of England into a conformity with the Reformed churches abroad, in point of discipline as well as of doctrine.

seem intended to convey. If by the transformation be simply meant the spiritual renovation experienced by such men as Tyndale, Frith, and Bilney, and which they were instrumental in producing in others; or in other words, that there was a real revival of pure religion begun and carried on by the Spirit of God, through the medium of his own word, the statement is indisputably true. With that work kingly power had no concern, unless to thwart and persecute it. But most readers will be apt to understand the term as having reference to the change which passed upon the Church of England, when she threw off the papal authority, and assumed the form in which we now find her. Now, the first great decisive blow given to the Pope's power in England, was the work, not of the Church, but of Henry, and no one pretends that he was prompted to do what he did by regard for Scripture truth. In other countries, the reforming fathers refused to be satisfied with a mere modification of the old system. They sat down to discover by prayer and study, what was the mind of Christ as revealed in his word, respecting the constitution of his Church, in doctrine, polity, and worship. Whether they in all things found what they sought for, is a point which we need not decide; but this much is certain, that the voice of Christ speaking in his word was alone recognized by them as authoritative. They struggled long and hard to get their scriptural idea realized in the actual constitution of the Church. With the English Reformers in the days of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, it was notoriously different. As the process of reforming their Church went forward, they were compelled in many matters of importance, to stifle their own convictions of what was right and proper. In framing the ritual, the polity, and to a certain extent, even the doctrinal symbols of the Church, they were not permitted to follow Scripture alone, but were forced to content themselves with the monarch's notions of what was expedient. Hence that strange compound of opposite elements which we find in the constitution of the Church of England, and which for two centuries or more has rendered her relations to her reformed sisters so equivocal. In the lapse of years the monstrous evils to which Cranmer, Hooper, Latimer, and their contemporaries submitted, as the

only way of escaping still greater ones, have come to be looked upon as positive blessings; and Anglican divines of later times have been accustomed to describe the framework of their establishment, as the perfection of beauty, and worthy to be admired by all Christendom. We are very confident that the estimable author has not the slightest sympathy with Anglicanism of this sort; but his statements, already quoted, respecting the scriptural and spiritual character of the English Reformation are so unqualified, that many of his readers may consider them as intended to apply to the whole state and condition of things, as they existed in the Church of England, after she became decidedly Protestant.

The story of Henry's divorce is told in the historian's very best style. The various incidents more or less intimately connected with it—the domestic life of Catherine, Ann Boleyn's appearance at court, the relations of Henry with Charles V. and Francis I.; Wolsey's schemes to secure for himself the Papal throne, the dealings with Rome, Cranmer's entrance into public life, the trial, fall, and death of the great cardinal—all these topics are managed with such consummate art, that this portion of the volume has all the interest of the most attractive novel. The subject merits the large space which it fills, for if we may not say that the divorce of Henry from Catherine was one of the chief causes of the English Reformation, we certainly may say that the event was productive of the most important consequences, ecclesiastical and civil. If the lawfulness of that marriage had never been questioned, it is quite improbable—speaking after the manner of men—that the relations in which England had so long stood to Rome would have been disturbed. Or, if the Pope had acted promptly when the case was brought before him, and especially if he had decided it in accordance with the known wishes of Henry, there is reason to believe that the whole power of the government would have been exerted in support of the old religion, and to put down with a strong hand the friends of reformation. It is now a well established fact, that the question of the invalidity of the marriage was first started by Wolsey, as a means of revenging himself upon Charles V. the nephew of Catherine, who had twice prevented his election to the Popedom. But after the doubt

whether Catherine was his lawful wife, or the desire for a new and younger one had taken hold of Henry's mind, the cardinal bitterly regretted what he had done. He clearly foresaw the fatal consequences of the Pope's shuffling policy, not only to himself, but to the cause of the papacy in England, and he would gladly have paid any price, if he could have induced Henry to forego his scruples, or if death had come to his help, and had conveniently carried Catherine off. But he had gone too far to go back. It was now too late for him to repair the mischief he had done to his own Church through his eager thirst for vengeance. It was a striking instance of the wicked man taken in his own snare. Looking at the event from our stand point, one cannot help being amazed that a man so able and so sagacious as Wolsey, holding as he did the highest ecclesiastical position in the kingdom, should have committed himself to a scheme so full of peril to the Papal authority in his native land. But it should not be forgotten, that the Pope had annulled many a royal marriage, without stopping to inquire with over-much scrupulosity, whether the reasons of separation were legitimate or not. Henry's own brother-in-law, Louis XII. of France, had obtained a divorce from his wife Joan—a woman of spotless reputation—simply because he had never loved her, while she, meekly submitting to her fate, retired to a convent, and at last died in the odour of sanctity. Wolsey might therefore persuade himself, with some show of reason, that the affair, however difficult, could not involve serious danger. He knew neither the kind of man nor the kind of woman with whom he had to do, long as he had been acquainted with Henry and with Catherine; he did not understand, or at least did not take into account the lustful waywardness of the one, nor the conscientious obstinacy of the other. If the Pope had promptly decided the question when it was first raised, Henry might have acquiesced in the settlement of it, whether for or against the validity of the marriage, but at a later period his love for Anne Boleyn made it absolutely necessary for the Pope to declare the connection incestuous, if he wished to retain Henry in the communion of the Roman Church. If, at any period before the fall of Wolsey, Catherine had yielded so far as to enter a convent and assume monastic vows, Popery might

have escaped the overthrow which awaited it. We recognize in these events the overruling providence of Him who can cause the furious passions, and the deep laid policy of his enemies to subserve his own glorious purposes, who taketh the wise in their own craftiness, and maketh the wrath of man to praise him.

The subject of Henry's divorce merits consideration for its moral as well as its historical bearings. Henry VII. projected the marriage in order to retain Catherine's unusually large dowry, but in his last moments the piety of the old king seems to have got the better of his avarice, and he is reported to have urged his son not to consummate it, as being contrary to the divine law. But other counsels prevailed, and for more than twenty years Henry and Catherine lived together in the most perfect harmony. The king declared, in the most solemn manner, that not a doubt had ever crossed his mind respecting the lawfulness of his marriage, until it was suggested by the French ambassador, during the negotiations for the marriage of the Princess Mary, that it might be against a law of God, from which the Pope himself could give no dispensation. Dr. Merle, we think, clearly proves that these doubts arose in the king's mind prior to his attachment to Anne Boleyn. But whatever Henry's motives may have been, whether he was actuated by scruples of conscience, or by the lusts of the flesh, the right answer to the inquiry, was his marriage incestuous or not, is no way affected by these considerations. Supposing Henry to have been perfectly sincere, and simply desirous to know what his duty was, the replies which he received from theological faculties, canonists, and other distinguished divines, Popish and Protestant, were certainly well fitted to awaken his deepest anxieties on his own account, and for the sake of his kingdom. What the judgment of the historian is on this point, does not distinctly appear. In one place he says—"Some evangelical Christians, who thought that Henry was troubled more by his passions than his conscience, asked how it happened that a prince who represented himself to be so disturbed by a *possible* transgression of a law of *doubtful* interpretation, could desire, after twenty years, to violate *the indisputable law which forbade the divorce.*" But when Cranmer is brought upon the stage as one of the actors in the affair, he

quotes, with apparent approval, the views of the Reformer, saying, "What says the word of God? If God says the marriage is bad, the Pope cannot make it good. When God has spoken, man must obey."

In the drama of the divorce, Anne Boleyn is of course one of the most prominent personages. Popish authors, for obvious reasons, have tried hard to blacken her character, by calumnies which her bitterest enemies did not venture to utter while she lived. That she had some sympathy with the new views, there can be no doubt, but the historian seems uncertain in what light to regard her. In some places he speaks of her as evincing the highest virtue; repelling with violence the approaches of the king; "deriving secret strength" to do this from the books she read while an inmate in the palace of Margaret of France; as the "only one who appeared calm" during the terrible sweating sickness; as praying much for Henry and for Wolsey. Elsewhere he says, "the world, with its pleasures and grandeur, were at bottom the idols of Anne Boleyn's heart." Up to the time when her misfortunes began, we can discover no decisive evidence in her conduct that she was a Christian, in the proper sense of the word. On the contrary, the eagerness with which she entered into the scheme for the divorce, before the question respecting the validity of the marriage had been decided, and the undisguised pleasure with which she received the news of the death of Catherine, of whose household she had been a member, and by whom she had been treated with much kindness, too clearly showed that her heart and life, during this part of her career, were not under the control of religious principle. Happy would it have been for her if she had steadily maintained the ground on which she stood, when, upon the first discovery of Henry's passion, she with a noble boldness said to him—"Sire, your wife I can never be, your mistress I never will be;" or if she had, at least, utterly refused to listen to his overtures until the sentence of divorce had been formally pronounced. Not a shade would then have rested upon her memory, and possibly she might have escaped her untimely end. The spirit in which she met her unhappy fate, leads us to hope that the clouds and darkness which gathered round her in the close of life, were

the means of teaching her not only the vanity of earth, but to seek the crown that fadeth not. Whatever may have been her foibles or her faults, they will be forgotten in the pity awakened by her cruel reverses, and the detestation which every generous mind will feel for all concerned in her judicial murder. No wonder that the remembrance of this murder was one of the sharpest and most galling thorns in the heart of the royal sensualist, when he himself was laid upon the bed of death.

ART. V.—*Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews. With an Introductory Essay on Civil Society and Government.* By E. C. Wines. New York: George P. Putnam & Co., 10 Park Place. 1853. Pp. 640, 8vo.

THIS work is a copious contribution to one of the most captivating and useful departments of sacred literature. It contains a large body of information connected with history, civil government, law, and divinity, gathered from various, and to some extent, remote sources, and presented in a manner suited to engage the interest of a large class of readers.

The history of the preparation of this large and handsome volume, affords encouraging promise of the extensive circulation of the work. That history was ten years long. It began with an invitation to the author to deliver one of the lectures of a course to the Mercantile Library Association of Philadelphia. That course of lectures embraced discourses from many of the most distinguished and popular writers and speakers of the different professions in the country. For a particular reason, mentioned in the Preface, the author "was led to choose, as the theme of his discourse, Moses and his Laws." Entering in such a way on the investigation of this attractive and prolific subject, he became enamoured of the theme. He was requested by many enlightened citizens who heard his lecture, to give a series of discourses on the same subject. He re-wrote and enlarged the discussion, until at length it became an extended course of lectures. These lectures, as many of our

readers know, were delivered, with distinguished acceptance, in several Theological Seminaries, and in some of the most enlightened cities of the United States.

A part only of the subject matter of this series of lectures has been taken as the basis of this volume. That part is the analysis of the civil constitution of the Hebrews. And this occupies only the latter half of the volume. The first half is taken up, in part, with an introductory essay on civil government, a discussion connected only remotely with the subject indicated by the title of the volume, yet an animated and extended view of the impressions of the author on the nature and design of the civil organization, including numerous references to writers whom he has consulted, and under whose influence his thoughts had been extended. Then follows the first book, preliminary to the main subject of the work, containing a statement of the nature and plan of the work, and the claims of the Hebrew law to our study and regard; an estimate of Moses as a man and a lawgiver; of the credibility of Moses as a historian, and his authority as a divine messenger; of the influence of his laws and writings on the world, and of the leading constitutions of the other ancient nations. All these matters, occupying so large a portion of the volume, though they give the book a more general aspect than the title promises, will still be welcome to readers who have not the author's sources at hand.

After these preliminary discussions, in great fulness and minute detail, extending through considerably more than half the volume, the author begins his second book, which treats of the organic law of the Hebrew State. In the first chapter he states what he conceives as the fundamental principles of the civil constitution of the Hebrews, seventeen in number, and embracing an exhausting enumeration of the principles strictly belonging to the basis of a civil organization of perfect order and perfect freedom; the two great leading objects of the Hebrew Theocracy, viz: to teach the science of civil government, and to maintain the true religion in the world; the general idea of the government, as to its officers, the mutual relations and the civil functions of the tribes, together with their union under a general government, and the Levitical and

prophetical orders; the constitution of the chief magistrate; the Senate; the Commons; the Priesthood; the Prophets. From this view of the number, nature, and order of the topics embraced in this second book, the reader will see how elaborate and extensive provision has been here made for his entertainment and profit, and may form his agreeable expectations of the additional volume, promised by the author, if this volume finds encouraging favour.

As we do not propose to discuss the topics presented so fully by our author, nor to examine and judge his positions and statements, we commend the volume to our readers, as containing a large amount of important and valuable information not brought together in any other book; as exhibiting the results of extensive and discriminating research, which has the further recommendation of having been pursued, not as drudgery, but with enthusiasm and delight; as offering the fruits of enlightened and patient thought, sound in its general principles, and lucid and instructive in its illustrations; elevated, and often eloquent, in its language, and presenting comparisons of great force and beauty, between the principles of the Hebrew constitution and those of our own.

The Hebrew institutions, political and religious, are matters of profound interest to all enlightened people. They were studied with great zeal by contemporary statesmen and philosophers. They have given exercise to the most active and powerful minds of all the civilized nations. They have been a fountain of knowledge on the nature of law and of right, and on the science of government, to all people who have sought wise laws and sound morals. There has never been in the world another example of statesmanship, of legislation, of social relations and duties, of religious precept and privilege, which would bear comparison with those of the Hebrew commonwealth, as a guide towards the chief ends of human society.

The cause of this wonder of history is one which makes the example as authoritative as it is sublime. God is in all history, and therefore all history is light—philosophy teaching by example. But God was in the history of the Hebrew nation as he was not in the history of any other. God was there in Christ the Redeemer. The Hebrew system, in both Church

and State, its fundamental laws of morality, its ritual and civil polity, were part and parcel of the scheme of redemption by Jesus Christ, and were a working out, for the time being, of the law of the spirit of life in him. There we see Christ. The laws of that economy were the utterance of his wisdom and love. The national sentiment was the breathing of his Spirit. The people were chosen instruments of his work. Their institutions and history are monuments of his glory. Over and over again will the spirit of those heavenly emanations be inhaled by the Christian nations, incorporated in the Christian forms of thought, feeling, and social organization, and formed into the spiritual symmetry, strength and complexion of those who, in successive generations, will appear as members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

The Hebrew system was the beginning of the true religion in the world on a national scale, and in connection with a civil polity. It was the first example of national regulations for the worship of the true God. It was the first application of the true principles of the social economy to a great and growing people. The nation was prepared for its destination by a memorable course of divine providence. When its great ancestor had been taken from an idolatrous family, it was not till the third generation that the divine call and promise were allowed to embrace all the sons of the father's family. The germ of the mighty nation was then planted in Egypt, that, in the house of bondage, it might grow in numbers, without growing in pride, and become ready to follow the mighty hand of its deliverer through the subsequent discipline of liberty. It was a costly process, but for a worthy end; a tedious preparation, but for a glorious destiny.

Forthwith the Hebrew nation comes out from its grievous slavery, and stands before the world a living and an only witness of the nature and ends of civil society. Here the social relations and duties of men are seen in their very origin, in the will and ordinance of God, set forth by example and by written law, and carried out to their chief end—the elevation of man to his true religious life, his destined privilege of communion with God. Here is an example of the provision in human nature for that kind of government which helps men

most towards the present virtue and the highest happiness. Here is a practical lesson on the connection between civil society and all the motions of the divine nature in the people of God towards conscious and joyful devotion. Here is a living witness to the human law of order and of progress, corresponding so admirably with the whole scriptural idea of the progressive development of God in human affairs. We have here an actual example of the power of God concerned in the universal scheme of providential control, regulating and balancing the human forces, and holding the revolving systems of disordered humanity in a steady course of slow but sure progress towards universal equilibrium and rest. And here, in fine, we have a professed example of the authority of God in human government; one sublime instance, known or to be known in all the world, of what the Scripture asserts, that "the powers that be are ordained of God."

Those seeds of popular freedom and of social order, which, in the Hebrew institutions, fell for the first time into the soil of society, have ever since shown that they belong to human nature, by their germination and growth in every field of cultivated humanity. What was thus bestowed, by a special divine interposition, on a chosen nation, and preserved by a dispensation of miracle, has been struggling ever since for its due ascendency in the social constitutions of the civilized world. And here we see the position of our own country in the history of true civilization. It presents a clear advance, beyond the position of any people of former times, the Hebrews alone excepted, in the full recognition of all human rights by our fundamental laws, and in that union of the sense of freedom with the acknowledgment of the true God and the true religion, on which the real progress of mankind must ever depend. The world is waiting to see whether, as all things seem now to promise, these great principles are here to yield their precious fruits in such an aggregate of knowledge and virtue as the world has never yet seen.

Our author presents an interesting view of the position of the Hebrew commonwealth in the history of free institutions. His whole representation of the non-conformity of heathen governments to the laws of human improvement and happiness

exhibits an instructive contrast with the history of the Mosaic institutions. How the germs of human right pressed upward against the rigid covering of ignorance and superstition; and how were they repressed and smothered under all the forms of social order that ever existed under the dark auspices of heathenism. The author's extended and spirited remarks on this subject are well adapted to inspire our countrymen with gratitude for the fulness of freedom attained by the government under which we live.

It is with great force and justice that the author bespeaks for the Mosaic legislation the study of the antiquary, who can find here one of the oldest forms of social structure preserved entire and in a living freshness, which has no parallel among like remains of so remote antiquity; of the theologian, who may read true divinity in every line of the Mosaic legislation, and discover many of those types of truth and virtue, which unfold their more spiritual forms under the Messianic dispensation; of the moralist, who may find here the seeds of true virtue expanding in their appropriate individual and social forms, and presenting that experimental basis on which alone a moral philosophy can stand; of the lawyer, who can find here the principles of universal justice, bringing forth, under a government of law, a body of legal practice not less instructive, in many respects, than that of Greece or Rome; of the statesman, who may see in Moses a sublime example of wisdom and efficiency in applying the great principles of a righteous government; and of the friend of constitutional liberty, who may here see all the fundamental principles of right in full vigour, amidst surrounding despotism, and flourishing in one of the brightest forms of social equality and freedom, which has ever appeared.

There is upon the legislation of Moses an aspect of authority for all people, which does not appear in the legislation of any other nation. Though the Hebrew laws do not, in their detail, bind other nations, yet the great principles of truth and right are such as no nation can disregard with impunity. The laws of Moses, moral, ceremonial, and civil, were the temporary and variable language of universal truth and duty. Hence the question concerning the authority of those laws, has some import. There would be no sense in the question, whether the

American people were bound to adopt the laws of Austria or France, or whether the people of Great Britain were bound to adopt the laws of the United States. But every intelligent reader of the Hebrew laws can make it a serious question whether, and how far, those laws are binding on all people. For in them the wisdom and righteousness of God must be confessed; and the presumption is natural, that laws which God would ordain for one people, would, in substance, be proper for all people. This presumption must hold in relation to the great principles of moral and religious duty, and of civil right, which form the basis of the system.

Undoubtedly, therefore, the Mosaic jurisprudence is destined to increasing authority as a precedent of social conformation. It is a great light in the history of the world. A higher civilization, a greater prevalence of true religion, and a livelier sense of order and right, will give the leading nations a deeper view of the groundwork and spirit of the Mosaic policy, and of its fitness for an advanced stage of human progress. It is more truly appreciated now, than it was by the contemporary nations, and in the coming times of knowledge and virtue, it will be more justly appreciated than it is now.

The character and endowments of Moses are matter of unceasing admiration to all intelligent readers of his history. The man was made for his office. It is remarkable how assiduously the natural endowments of that wonderful man are often distinguished from his gift of inspiration, in order to place his personal character in a more exalted light; as if the natural genius and the peculiar education of the man redounded more to the divine glory, or his own fame, than those miraculous gifts which raised his office and his acts into the supernatural sphere. But, in the life and character of Moses, it is not easy to distinguish the natural from the supernatural. It is not easy to tell what of his mental qualities came, in the course of nature, from his parents, his relation to the chosen people, and to the Egyptian royalty, and what came from the special work of the Spirit in him. Whatever of his uncommon qualities came by ordinary generation from a parentage commended by St. Paul for religious faith, and brilliant in the brief records of his infancy for heroic energy and decision, can hardly be con-

ceived, in his marvellous history, except in union with some extraordinary divine force diffused through the whole providential process of his birth, his preservation, and his training; and also with an inward spiritual operation corresponding to the wonderful outward conjunctures of his preparatory course. While the natural yearnings of his maternal nurse were breathing the inspirations of the Hebrew nationality into his infant soul, who can help perceiving, as well in the yearnings as in their consequences, a tincture of the supernatural? Who shall prove that unaided nature could so consolidate the Hebrew basis of his character, as to secure it from dissolution, amidst full exposure to an alien and seductive education, and insure his appearance in due time as a prodigy of patriotic jealousy for his brethren, and of legislative wisdom for the world? If God in ordinary nature produces no such *class* of Mosaic men, he makes nature extraordinary, so far as he uses it in producing one Moses. The Lord of heaven and earth was revealing himself to the world in Israel, as he did not reveal himself elsewhere in the established course of nature. For this purpose he sanctified the whole Israelitish apartment of nature to himself, and infused into it a fuller measure of his power. It was there, and not in any common field of nature, that Moses rose. Born and bred in miracle, the adopted heir apparent of the throne of Egypt, is trained by a hand of power known nowhere but in Israel, "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and comes out with heroic and unquenchable devotion to "the people of God," and an inbred disgust for "the pleasures of sin." "The inspiration of the Almighty, which giveth all men understanding," brought forth in Moses unexampled endowments, through a chain of causes, for aught we know, indefinitely antecedent, and, however like other natural causes in their outward form, still certainly unlike all others in their inward force, and, therefore, raising the whole mental conformation of Moses above the purely natural.

We do not endanger the miraculous by diffusion. Such long and broad intertexture of the supernatural with the natural meets no resistance from any reasonable jealousy for the moral influence of miraculous interventions. Let God work supernaturally through nature as he works naturally in it. *In*

nature, each event of to-day had its beginning in the beginning of the world, and thus *through* nature, if God so please, may his "mighty works" come into view through long and hidden paths of supereminent power. God shows himself above nature, to teach men that he is in it. He parts the waters for Israel at the motion of the rod of Moses, that Israel may see God in all the administration of their leader. And then when the people's eyes are open on the universal presence of God, what matter, as to either the reality of the miracle, or its moral effect, whether the quails which flew into the camp were produced at the moment, or grew and flocked together in a way to our eyes undistinguishable from the course of nature; and whether they came to the camp under an instant impulse against all their natural instincts, or by inward forces coming to them through innumerable antecedents, working out the hidden counsel by a hidden energy, and surprising the people by an outbreak of effects from causes long supernaturally pregnant, but unknown. The whole conjuncture is unexampled and alone. Men never saw the like before, and such are the conditions of the event, that men never look afterwards for the like from the constitution and course of nature.

Tracing thus the extraordinary in Moses to a supernatural enforcement of natural antecedents, we reach a vivid and adorable view of the divine administration on which the eye of true philosophy, as well as that of piety, delights to rest. With perfect justice to philosophy, we may trace the wonderful endowments and history of Moses, apart from impulses confessedly received from the Lord on special occasions, to an adequate supernatural agency, working slowly but surely, through long preparation, towards its marvellous result; an agency none the less special for beginning so far back, and none the less supernatural for its long concurrence with nature. And here we fall into company with the glorious incorporation of God with all the proceedings under the special covenant, from Abraham to Christ. Even that incipient, preparatory, typical economy, not to be compared with "the ministration of the Spirit," was charged throughout with the miraculous energy. The whole system was pervaded by the inspiration. Every phenomenon partook of the miracle. The power, still

chiefly, but not wholly latent, which was energizing towards the Messianic fulness of time, wrought in all the old covenant history. In the striking endowments of Moses, it came out in great glory. Through, beside, and athwart the course of nature, it wrought at pleasure to prepare the way for Moses; to bring him into being; to preserve, nurse, train, and inspire him for his work, and then to conduct and support him through his unparalleled career. The most natural of his qualities he could not have had, though born of the same parents, nursed on the same bosom, and schooled in the same learning, but not of the "chosen people, whose God was the Lord." He was of a people whose God had now developed his power in them almost to the wonderful deliverance; who was preparing the flint in Pharaoh, and the steel in Moses and Aaron, to kindle his promised blaze of glory in the earth; who took up Moses as his servant "in his house" of miracle, making him his organ of power for deliverance and defence, of wisdom for instruction, of authority for legislation, and of mercy for condescending communion, in behalf of the people chosen for his name. We adore God in the whole structure, office, and administration of the man. His powers, by whatever process conferred, made him a link in the chain of wonders—a legitimate antecedent of supernatural consequences. His laws are truly divine in their origin and nature, however apparently digested in his own understanding and heart. He received his doctrines and precepts from God, though he thought them—though they carry the image of his mind; as the fruits of the Spirit in Christians bear the natural image of the minds in which they arise.

Here, also, we fall in company with the glorious agency of God in the perpetual miracle of the Christian Church; his constant work of raising the supernatural out of the soil of the natural. What the natural could not do, in that it was weak in the principle of its constitution, God, sending his own Son into the system of the natural man, on account of its vital infirmity, exposed and removed the defect, that the rectifying of the natural may be accomplished in us, not by a natural process, but a spiritual and supernatural. Here God, in Christ, thus made under the law of the human nature, brings forth in

the thoughts and affections of his people, his own truth, and his own virtue. "In Christ Jesus, the law of the spirit of life" is let down into the natural sphere, and the result of the union is a new creation wrought by these two co-working forms of power—of which the one formed and upholds nature as it is, the other reforms it as it shall be—both equally divine, but neither without the other reaching the glorious effect. And now, in Christ, the whole administration takes an immense enlargement of the pervasive inspiration under which all men are to live. With this greater spiritual force comes also the louder warning. "Take heed that ye refuse not him that speaketh; for if they escaped not who refused him who spake on earth, much more shall not we escape if we refuse him who speaketh from heaven. He that transgressed Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and done despite unto the Spirit of grace? How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?"

If any please to consider the divine force which explains the phenomenon Moses as something analogous to the spirit of the nation and the age, they still cannot reduce the wonder to a merely natural effect, but must leave it yet fairly in the sphere of the miraculous, unless they beg the whole question relating to the existence of the miracle. For while the influence may be diffusive as they would have it, it must still embrace whatever of special inspiration it may please God to breathe into and throughout the nation and the age, for the ends which the course of unaided nature would never have produced. The question whether Moses was a creature of the spirit of his nation and his time, is of no consequence towards deciding whether he was merely a natural man or not. For we have to ascertain what that spirit was, and whether it be only the same, both in kind and degree, which is all abroad in the whole natural bosom of humanity. If God is found to appropriate nature to his supernatural ends at pleasure, interposing his directing or strengthening agency, and magnifying the product beyond the power of the natural causes, we still meet the

power of the new creation in the regions of the old, and rationalism runs aground in shallows of its own selection.

In these thoughts we would wage no controversy with any fellow-believer in miracles. We give them place as one form in which the faith in miracles may be expressed. If the history of Moses and his people is a history of divine operations in humanity, it will command our reverence the more, the fuller it seems to us of God. The Mosaic economy was a revelation not only *from* God, but *of* him; not only *to* his people, but *in* them. The God of Israel there began the redemption of Israel by a spiritual presence, and an inworking power, which show the type of his presence and power through Christ in his fuller revelations in the Christian Church. It is in this light that we foresee the wonders which are to be wrought in the earth by those early revelations, and anticipate for the whole spirit and many of the literal precepts of the Mosaic code, an ascendency among the nations, beyond what they have yet acquired.

The Hebrew institutions have exerted great power in the civilization of the world. But there is one section of their history which suggests the thought, that they owe more of their influence on the civil and religious affairs of the world, to the light they threw on contemporary minds, than to the study of the Hebrew records by the subsequent generations. This fact is strikingly evident in regard to religion. The Hebrew doctrine of one spiritual God fell into close connection with the philosophy of Greece. The ideas of Plato respecting the nature of God and his government in the world, are well known to have been derived from the Hebrew Scriptures. In his mind, the Hebrew conception of the spiritual God was digested into a form profoundly philosophical, and in that form, it passed into the speculations of those Christian fathers, whose philosophical education had been mainly pursued under the influence of Plato, and who cherished for him and his writings unbounded reverence and admiration. These platonizing fathers were the men who roused and guided the cultivated mind of the church, during those preparatory ages, while the leading doctrines of the gospel were taking their intellectual form. When the great fundamental doctrine of the Hebrew

revelations fell into the intellectual soil of Greece, it immediately took root and sprung up in a vigorous form of speculation, and has become a tree whose branches are filling the whole earth.

Thus heathenism had its John the Baptist, the voice of one crying in the pagan wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. While in the line of Jewish progress toward the fulness of time, prophets and saints were fixing their hopes with growing clearness and order on "Him that should come," while the old covenant was waxing old and ready to vanish away, and the want of something new from heaven was becoming the absorbing feeling of the religious world, the heaven-born conception of the living and true God passed over into the brightest region of philosophical culture in heathenism. We find there the doctrine of one infinite, supreme, spiritual God, who is viewed as the ultimate source and support of all created life; and in the broadest and highest sense the source and support of the rational and moral life of man. This was a great advance from those gross ideas which were strictly and properly pagan, which "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things," and which in the highest refinement it ever attained without the Hebrew element, still thought "the Godhead like unto gold or silver or stone, graven by art and man's device." Plato preached repentance, in his way, to his philosophic generation; and although his baptism, like that of John the Baptist, was of no account in Christ, yet his doctrines were a preparation for one who should come after him, and baptize his disciples with the Holy Ghost and with fire. And so intimate and decided was the affinity between the Christian doctrine and these higher conceptions of the Grecian schools, that the very words of the Greek and the thought and spirit of the Christian were joined together in Paul at Athens.

Plato rose far, far above the common mythology of his generation. In him, the highest and most refined spiritual ideas took the place of the popular religion. He took the hints of Judaism with amazing avidity and precision, and appeared extremely sensitive to all such approaches of truth, as if under

some mysterious influence from Him, whose coming was then so near. Those borrowed ideas he cast at once into the crucible of his lofty and severe speculation, and brought forth a philosophical view of morality, and a profound basis for speculative theology which enlightened Christianity can never totally reject. Though far beneath Christianity, he seemed rising, by unconscious speculative yearnings, towards it. What in John was the conscious inspiration of devout feeling, seems in him the unconscious inspiration of restless, unsatisfied thought. But neither in the highest nor the deepest regions of his philosophy could he discover any satisfaction for the spiritual wants of human nature, or any remedy for its deeply seated and mortal disease. By this heathen philosophy, as by the Jewish economy, came something of the "knowledge of sin," but nothing of its remedy. Both judaism and heathenism, therefore, though each at practical enmity with the other, and both at hearty enmity with Christ, unite first in preparing the way of the Lord, and then in rearing the doctrinal structure of his kingdom.

In due time these mutually alien systems amalgamate, and their blood flows together in the veins of a new race, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and quickened by his life. Heathen philosophy and Jewish theology become one in Christ! He breaks down the middle wall of partition between them, for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace. In this sublime and holy union, we find them continually blending their forms of thought, their motions of feeling, their lights and shades of religious character, their tastes, their habits, and whatever differences come from the history of different races of men; all to bring forth that unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, which will transform the heterogeneous and chaotic mass into the perfect man in Christ Jesus.

In all we have said we mean simply to enter a protest against the mechanical theory of the universe, which regards it as a machine, made, indeed, by God, but left to go of itself. The Bible teaches us that God is everywhere, working all things after the counsel of his will, and that his Spirit dwells in men, either in the form of "common or of efficacious grace;"

so that, according to the Scriptures, the Spirit is the author of all special mental endowments, as well as of holy affections. It was he who gave skill to Bezaleel to work in gold, and silver, and brass. It was he who gave strength to the warrior, and wisdom to the lawgiver, as well as inspiration to the prophet. This is the clear doctrine of the Scriptures, which teach an everywhere-present, sustaining, and controlling God, in whom we live, move, and have our being.

ART. VI.—*Visibility of the Church.*

OUR view of the attributes of the Church is of necessity determined by our view of its nature. There is no dispute between Romanists and Protestants, as to whether the Church is visible, perpetual, one, holy, catholic, and apostolical. This is universally conceded. The only question is as to the sense in which these attributes can be predicated of it. If the Church is, in its essential nature and external organization, analogous to an earthly kingdom, then its visibility, perpetuity, and all its other attributes, must be such as can pertain to such an organization. When we affirm that an earthly kingdom is visible and perpetual, we mean that its organization as a kingdom is conspicuous, notorious, seen of all men, and unchanging. The kingdoms of Babylon, Egypt, and of Rome, have passed away. They are no longer visible or extant. The Papacy has a visible existence of the same kind, and Romanists affirm it is to continue while the world lasts. The kingdom of England is the body of men professing allegiance to its laws, and subject to its sovereign. The Church, according to Romanists, is the body of men professing the true religion, and subject to the Pope. Bellarmin, therefore, says: "*Ecclesia est cœtus hominum ita visibilis et palpabilis, ut est cœtus Populi Romani, vel regnum Galliæ aut respublica Venetorum.*"* As

* Disputationes: de Ecclesia Militante, Lib. iii. c. 2.

these bodies are equally external organizations, the visibility of the one is analogous to that of the other.

But if the Church is the *cœtus sanctorum*, the company of believers; if it is the body of Christ, and if his body consists of those, and of those only, in whom he dwells by his Spirit, then the Church is visible only in the sense in which believers are visible. England stands out before the world as an earthly kingdom; the members of Christ's body in England are no less conspicuous. That believers are there, that the Church is there, is a fact which can no more be rationally disputed, than the existence of the monarchy. But it does not follow that because equally visible, they are equally external organizations, and that to deny that the Church, in its idea, is an external society, is to deny that it is visible. Protestants teach that the true Church, as existing on earth, is always visible:

1. As it consists of men and women, in distinction from disembodied spirits or angels. Its members are not impalpable and unseen, as those ministering spirits who, unrevealed to our senses, continually minister to the heirs of salvation. "Surely," exclaims Bellarmin, "the Church does not consist of ghosts!" Certainly not: and the suggestion of such an objection betrays an entire misconception of the doctrine he was opposing. Protestants admit that the Church on earth consists of visible men and women, and not of invisible spirits.

2. The Church is visible, because its members manifest their faith by their works. The fact that they are the members of Christ's body becomes notorious. Goodness is an inward quality, and yet it is outwardly manifested, so that the good are known and recognized as such; not with absolute certainty in all cases, but with sufficient clearness to determine all questions of duty respecting them. So, though faith is an inward principle, it so reveals itself in the confession of the truth, and in a holy life, that believers may be known as a tree is known by its fruit. In the general prevalence of Arianism, the true Church neither perished nor ceased to be visible. It continued to exist, and its existence was manifested in the confessors and martyrs of that age. "When," says Dr. Jackson, "the doctrine of antichrist was come to its full growth in the Council of Trent, although the whole body of Germany, besides

Chemnitz and others, and although the whole visible Church of France, besides Calvin and some such, had subscribed unto that Council, yet the true Church had been visible in those worthies."* Wherever there are true believers, there is the true Church; and wherever such believers confess their faith, and illustrate it by a holy life, there the Church is visible.

3. The Church is visible, because believers are, by their "effectual calling," separated from the world. Though in it, they are not of it. They have different objects, are animated by a different spirit, and are distinguished by a different life. They are visible, as a pure river is often seen flowing unmingled through the turbid waters of a broader stream. When the Holy Spirit enters into the heart, renewing it after the image of God, uniting the soul to Christ as a living member of his body, the man becomes a new creature. All men take knowledge of him. They see that he is a Christian. He renounces the ways of the world, separates himself from all false religions, becomes an open worshipper of Christ, a visible member of the Church, which is Christ's body. When the early Christians heard the words of eternal life, and received the gospel in faith, they at once renounced idolatry, withdrew from all corrupt associations, and manifested themselves as a new people, the followers of the Lord Jesus. They were visible members of his body. Even though there was but one such man in a city, still the fact that he was a Christian became notorious; and if a visible Christian, a visible member of the Church. The true Church is thus visible throughout the world, not as an organization, not as an external society, but as the living body of Christ; as a set of men distinguished from others as true Christians. They are the epistles of Jesus Christ, known and read of all men. This is a visibility which is real, and may be, and often has been, and will hereafter be, glorious. The Church, in this sense, is a city set on a hill. She is the light of the world. She is conspicuous in the beauty of holiness. This is not, indeed, the visibility of a hierarchy, gorgeous in apparel, pompous in ritual services—a kingdom which is of this world. But it is not the less real, and infinitely more glo-

* Treatise on the Church, p. 19, Philadelphia edition.

rious. How unfounded, then, is the objection that the Church, the body of Christ, is a chimera, a Platonic idea, unless it is, in its essential nature, a visible society, like the kingdom of England or Republic of Switzerland! Apart from any outward organization, and in the midst of all organizations, the true Church is now visible, and she has left a track of glory through all history, since the day of Pentecost, so that it can be traced and verified, in all ages and in all parts of the world.

4. The true Church is visible in the external Church, just as the soul is visible in the body. That is, as by the means of the body we know that the soul is there, so by means of the external Church, we know where the true Church is. There are, doubtless, among Mohammedans, many insincere and sceptical professors of the religion of the false prophet. No one can tell who they are, or how many there may be. But the institutions of Mohammedanism, its laws, its usages, its mosques, its worship, make it as apparent as the light of day, that sincere believers in Mahomet exist, and are the life of the external communities consisting of sincere and insincere followers of the prophet. So the external Church, as embracing all who profess the true religion—with their various organizations, their confessions of the truth, their temples, and their Christian worship—make it apparent that the true Church, the body of Christ, exists, and where it is. These are not the Church, any more than the body is the soul; but they are its manifestations, and its residence. This becomes intelligible by adverting to the origin of the Christian community. The admitted facts in reference to this subject are—1. That our Lord appeared on earth as the Son of God, and the Saviour of sinners. To all who received him he gave power to become the sons of God; they were justified and made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and thereby united to Christ as living members of his body. They were thus distinguished inwardly and outwardly from all other men. 2. He commissioned his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He enjoined upon them to require as the conditions of any man's being admitted into their communion as a member of his body, repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. 3. He commanded all who did thus repent and believe, to unite

together for his worship, for instruction, for the administration of the sacraments, and for mutual watch and care. For this purpose he provided for the appointment of certain officers, and gave, through his apostles, a body of laws for their government, and for the regulation of all things which those who believe were required to perform. Provision was thus made, by divine authority, for the Church assuming the form of an external visible society.

Let us now suppose that all those who, in every age, and in every part of the world, professed the true religion, and thereby united themselves to this society, were true believers, then there would be no room for the distinction, so far as this world is concerned, between the Church as visible and invisible. Then this external society would be Christ's body on earth. All that is predicated of the latter could be predicated of the former; all that is promised to the one would be promised to the other. Then this society would answer to the definition of the Church, as a company of believers. Then all within it would be saved, and all out of it would be lost. The above hypothesis, however, is undeniably false, and therefore the conclusions drawn from it must also be false. We know that even in the apostolic age, many who professed faith in Christ, and ranked themselves with his people, were not true believers. We know that in every subsequent age, the great majority of those who have been baptized in the name of Christ, and who call themselves Christians, and who are included in the external organization of his followers, are not true Christians. This external society, therefore, is not a company of believers; it is not the Church which is Christ's body; the attributes and promises of the Church do not belong to it. It is not that living temple built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets as an habitation of God, through the Spirit. It is not the bride of Christ, for which he died, and which he cleanses with the washing of regeneration. It is not the flock of the good Shepherd, composed of the sheep who hear his voice, and to whom it is his Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom. In short, the external society is not the Church. The two are not identical, commensurate, and conterminous, so that he who is a member of the one is a member of the other,

and he who is excommunicated from the one is cut off from the other. Yet the Church is in that society, or the aggregate body of professing Christians, as the soul is in the body, or as sincere believers are comprehended in the mass of the professors of the religion of Christ.

If, then, the Church is the body of Christ; if a man becomes a member of that body by faith; if multitudes of those who profess in baptism the true religion, are not believers, then it is just as certain that the external body consisting of the baptized is not the Church, as that a man's calling himself a Christian does not make him a Christian. Yet there would be no nominal Christians, if there were no sincere disciples of Christ. The name and form of his religion would long since have perished from the world. The existence of the external Church, its continuance, its influence for good, its spiritual power, its extension, its visible organizations, are all due to the living element which it embraces, and which in these various ways manifests its presence. It is thus that the true Church is visible in the outward, though the one is no more the other than the body is the soul.

That the Protestant doctrine as to the visibility of the Church, above stated, is true, is evident, in the first place, from what has already been established as to the nature of the Church. Every thing depends upon the answer to the question, What is the Church? If it is an external society of professors of the true religion, then it is visible as an earthly kingdom; if that society is destroyed, the Church is destroyed, and everything that is true of the Church is true of that society. Then, in short, Romanism must be admitted as a logical necessity. But if the Church is a company of believers, then its visibility is that which belongs to believers; and nothing is true of the Church which is not true of believers.

2. The Protestant distinction between the Church visible and invisible, nominal and real, is that which Paul makes between "Israel after the flesh," and "Israel after the Spirit." God had promised to Israel that he would be their God, and that they should be his people; that he would never forsake or cast them off; that he would send his Son for their redemption; dwell in them by his Spirit; write his laws in their

hearts; guide them into the knowledge of the truth; that he would give them the possession of the world, and the inheritance of heaven; that all who joined them should be saved, and all who forsook them should perish. The Jews claimed all these promises for the external organization, *i. e.* for the natural descendants of Abraham, united to him and to each other by the outward profession of the covenant, and by the sign of circumcision. They held, that external conformity to Judaism made a man a Jew, a member of that body to which all these promises and prerogatives belonged; and, consequently, that the apostacy or rejection of that external body would involve the destruction of the Church, and a failure of the promise of God. In like manner Ritualists teach that what is said and promised to the Church belongs to the external visible society of professing Christians, and that the destruction of that society would be the destruction of the Church.

In opposition to all this, Paul taught, 1. That he is not a Jew who is one outwardly. 2. Circumcision, which was outward, in the flesh, did not secure an interest in the divine promises. 3. That he only was a Jew, *i. e.* one of the true people of God, who was such in virtue of the state of his heart. 4. That the body to which the divine promises were made, was not the outward organization, but the inward, invisible body; not the Israel κατα σαρκα, but the Israel κατα πνευμα. This is the Protestant doctrine of the Church, which teaches that he is not a Christian who is such by mere profession, and that it is not water baptism which makes a man a member of that body to which the promises are made, and consequently that the visibility of the Church is not that which belongs to an external society, but to true believers, or the communion of saints.

The perversion and abuse of terms, and the false reasoning to which Romanists resort, when speaking of this subject, are so palpable, that they could not be tolerated in any ordinary discussion. The word *Christian* is just as ambiguous as the word *Church*. If called upon to define a Christian, they would not hesitate to say—He is a man who believes the doctrines and obeys the commands of Christ. The inevitable inference from this definition is, that the attributes, the promises, and prerogatives pertaining to Christians, belong to those only who

believe and obey the Lord Jesus. Instead, however, of admitting this unavoidable conclusion, which would overthrow their whole system, they insist that all these attributes, promises, and prerogatives, belong to the body of professing Christians, and that it is baptism and subjection to a prelate or the pope, and not faith and obedience towards Christ, which constitute membership in the true Church.

3. The same doctrine taught by the apostle Paul, is no less plainly taught by the apostle John. In his day many who had been baptized, and received into the communion of the external society of Christians, were not true believers. How were they regarded by the apostle? Did their external profession make them members of the true Church, to which the promises pertain? St. John answers this question by saying, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that it might be made manifest that they were not all of us. But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." 1 John ii. 19, 20. It is here taught, 1. That many are included in the pale of the external Church, who are not members of the true Church. 2. That those only who have an unction of the Holy One, leading them into the knowledge of the truth, constitute the Church. 3. And consequently the visibility of the Church is that which belongs to the body of true believers.

4. The Church must retain its essential attributes in every stage and state of its existence, in prosperity and in adversity. It is, however, undeniable, that the Church has existed in a state of dispersion. There have been periods when the whole external organization lapsed into idolatry or heresy. This was the case when there were but seven thousand in all Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal, when at the time of the advent the whole Jewish Church, as an organized body, rejected Christ, and the New Testament Church was not yet founded; and to a great extent, also, during the ascendency of Arianism. We must either admit that the Church perished during these periods, or that it was continued in the scattered, unorganized believers. If the latter, its visibility is not that of an external

society, but such as belongs to the true body of Christ, whose members are known by the fruits of the Spirit manifested in their lives.

5. The great argument, however, on this subject, is the utter incongruity between what the Bible teaches concerning the Church, and the Romish doctrine that the Church is visible as an external organization. If that is so, then such organization is the Church; then, as the Church is holy, the body and bride of Christ, the temple and family of God, all the members of that organization are holy, members of Christ's body, and partakers of his life. Then, too, as Christ has promised to guide his Church into the knowledge of the truth, that external organization can never err as to any essential doctrine. Then, also, as we are commanded to obey the Church, if we refuse submission to this external body, we are to be regarded as heathen men and publicans. Then, moreover, as Christ saves all the members of his body and none other, he saves all included in this external organization, and consigns to eternal death all out of it. And then, finally, ministers admit to heaven all whom they receive into this society, and cast into hell all whom they reject from it. These are not only the logical, but the avowed and admitted conclusions of the principle in question. It becomes those who call themselves Protestants, to look these consequences in the face, before they join the Papists and Puseyites in ridiculing the idea of a Church composed exclusively of believers, and insist that the body to which the attributes and promises of the Church belong, is the visible organization of professing Christians. Such Protestants may live to see men walking about with the keys of heaven at their girdle, armed with a power before which the bravest may well tremble.

The scriptural and Protestant doctrine of the visibility of the Church is, therefore, a corollary of the true doctrine of its nature. If the Church is a company of believers, its visibility is that which belongs to believers. They are visible as men; as holy men; as men separated from the world, as a peculiar people, by the indwelling of the Spirit of God; as the soul and sustaining element of all those external organizations, consist-

ing of professors of the true religion, united for the worship of Christ, the maintenance of the truth, and mutual watch and care.

The objections which Bellarmin, Bossuet, Palmer, and writers generally of the Romish and Ritual class, urge against this doctrine, are either founded on misconception, or resolve themselves into objections against the scriptural view of the nature of the Church as "the company of believers." Thus, in the first place, it is objected that in the Scriptures and in all ecclesiastical history, the Church is spoken of and addressed as a visible society of professing Christians. The churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, and Rome, were all such societies; and the whole body of such professors constituted THE CHURCH. History traces the origin, the extension, the trials, and the triumphs of that outward community. It is vain, therefore, to deny that body to be the Church, which the Bible and all Christendom unite in so designating. But was not the ancient Hebrew commonwealth called Israel, Jerusalem, Zion? Is not its history, as a visible society, recorded from Abraham to the destruction of Jerusalem? And yet does not Paul say expressly, that he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; that the external Israel is not the true Israel? In this objection the real point at issue is overlooked. The question is not, whether a man who professes to be a Christian, may properly be so addressed and so treated, but whether profession makes a man a true Christian. The question is not, whether a society of professing Christians may properly be called a Church, and be so regarded, but whether their being such a society constitutes them a competent part of the body of Christ. The whole question is, What is the subject of the attributes and prerogatives of the body of Christ? Is it the external body of professors, or the company of believers? If calling a man a Christian does not imply that he has the character and the inheritance of the disciples of Christ; if calling the Jewish commonwealth Israel did not imply that they were the true Israel, then calling the professors of the true religion the Church, does not imply that they are the body of Christ. When the designation given to any man or body of men, involves nothing more than what is external or official, its application implies they are what they

are called. To call a man an Englishman, is to recognize him as such. To address any one as emperor, king, or president, is to admit his claim to such title. But when the designation is expressive of some inward quality, and a state of mind, its application does not imply its actual possession, but simply that it is claimed. To call men saints, believers, the children of God, or a Church, supposes them to be true believers, or the true Church, only on the assumption that "no internal virtue" is necessary to union with the Church, or to make a man a believer and a child of God.

Scriptural and common usage, therefore, is perfectly consistent with the Protestant doctrine. That doctrine admits the propriety of calling any man a Christian who professes to be a worshipper of Christ, and of designating any company of such men a church. It only denies that he is a real Christian who is one only in name; or that that is a true Church, which is such only in profession. An external society, therefore, may properly be called a Church, without implying that the visibility of the true Church consists in outward organization.

2. It is objected that the possession of officers, of laws, of terms of communion, necessarily supposes the Church to have the visibility of an external society. How can a man be received into the Church, or excommunicated from it, if the Church is not an outward organization? Did the fact that the Hebrews had officers and laws, a temple, a ritual, terms of admission and exclusion, make the external Israel the true Israel, or prove that the visibility of the latter was that of a state or commonwealth? Protestants admit that true believers form themselves into a visible society, with officers, laws, and terms of communion—but they deny that such society is the true Church, any further than it consists of true believers. Everything comes back to the question, What is the Church? True believers constitute the true Church; professed believers constitute the outward Church. These two things are not to be confounded. The external body is not, as such, the body of Christ. Neither are they to be separated as two churches; the one true and the other false, the one real and the other nominal. They differ as the sincere and insincere differ in any community, or as the Israel κατα πνευμα differs from the Israel

κατα σαρκα. A man could be admitted to the outward Israel without being received into the number of God's true people, and he could be excluded from the former without being cut off from the latter. The true Israel was not the commonwealth, as such, and the outward organization, with its laws and officers, though intimately related with the spiritual body as the true Church, did not constitute it. The question, how far the outward Church is the true Church, is easily answered. Just so far as it is what it professes to be, and no further. So far as it is a company of faithful men, animated and controlled by the Holy Spirit, it is a true Church, a constituent member of the body of Christ. If it be asked further, how we are to know whether a given society is to be regarded as a Church; we answer, precisely as we know whether a given individual is to be regarded as a Christian, *i. e.* by their profession and conduct. As the Protestant doctrine, that true believers constitute the body of Christ, is perfectly consistent with the existence among them and others outwardly united with them, of officers and laws, no argument can be drawn from the existence of such outward institutions to prove that the Church is essentially an external organization.

Bossuet presents this objection in the light of a contradiction. He says, "Protestants insist that the Church consists exclusively of believers, and is therefore an invisible body. But when asked for the signs of a Church, they say, the word and sacraments: thus making it an external society with ordinances, a ministry, and public service. If so, how can it consist exclusively of the pious? And where was there any such society, answering to the Protestant definition, before the Reformation?"* This objection rests upon the misconception which Ritualists do not appear able to rid themselves of. When Protestants say the Church is invisible, they only mean that an inward and consequently invisible state of mind is the condition of membership, and not that those who have this internal qualification are invisible, or that they cannot be so known as to enable us to discharge the duties which we owe them. When asked, what makes a man a Christian? we

* Bossuet's Variations, Book xv. § 20, *et seqq.*

say, true faith. When asked, whom must we regard and treat as Christians? we answer, those who make a credible profession of their faith. Is there any contradiction in this? Is there any force in the objection, that if faith is an inward quality, it cannot be proved by outward evidence? Thus, when Protestants are asked, what is the true Church? they answer, the company of believers. When asked, what associations are to be regarded and treated as churches? they answer, those in which the gospel is preached. When asked further, where was the Church before the Reformation? they answer, just where it was in the days of Elias, when it consisted of a few thousand scattered believers.*

3. A third objection is very much of the same kind as the preceding. If the Church consists exclusively of believers, it is invisible. We are, however, required to obey the Church, to hear the Church, &c. But how can we hear and obey an invisible body? To this the answer is, the Church is no more invisible than believers are. We are commanded to love the brethren; to do good to all men, especially to the household of faith. As faith, however, is invisible, it may be asked, in the spirit of this objection, how can we tell who are believers? Christ says, by their fruits. There is no real difficulty in this matter. If we have a real heart for it, we shall be able to obey the command to love the brethren, though we cannot read the heart; and if disposed to hear the Church, we shall be able to recognize her voice. Because the true Church is always visible, and, therefore, can be obeyed, Ritualists infer that the visible Church is the true Church, though, as Dr. Jackson says, the two propositions differ as much as "to withstand a man" differs from "standing with a man."

4. Much the most plausible argument of Romanists is derived from the analogy of the old dispensation. That the Church is a visible society, consisting of the professors of the true religion, as distinguished from the body of true believers, known only to God, is plain, they say, because under the old dispen-

* The question which Romanists so confidently ask, Where was your Church before Luther? is well answered in the homely retort, Where was your face this morning before it was washed?

sation it was such a society, embracing all the descendants of Abraham who professed the true religion, and received the sign of circumcision. To this external society were given the oracles of God, the covenants, the promises, the means of grace. Out of its pale there was no salvation. Union with it was the necessary condition of acceptance with God. This was a divine institution. It was a visible Church, consisting of professors, and not exclusively of believers. If such a society existed then by divine appointment, what has become of it? Has it ceased to exist? Has removing its restriction to one people destroyed its nature? Does lopping certain branches from the tree destroy the tree itself? Far from it. The Church exists as an external society now as it did then; what once belonged to the commonwealth of Israel, now belongs to the visible Church. As union with the commonwealth of Israel was necessary to salvation then, so union with the visible Church is necessary to salvation now. And as subjection to the priesthood, and especially to the high-priest, was necessary to union with Israel then, so submission to the regular ministry, and especially to the Pope, is necessary to union with the Church now. Such is the favourite argument of Romanists; and such, (striking out illogically the last clause, which requires subjection to prelates, or the Pope,) we are sorry to say is the argument of some Protestants, and even of some Presbyterians.

The fallacy of this whole argument lies in the false assumption, that the external Israel was the true Church. It was not the body of Christ; it was not pervaded by his Spirit. Membership in it did not constitute membership in the body of Christ. The rejection or destruction of the external Israel was not the destruction of the Church. The apostacy of the former was not the apostacy of the latter. The attributes, promises, and prerogatives of the one, were not those of the other. In short, they were not the same, and, therefore, that the visibility of the one was that of an external organization, is no proof that the visibility of the Church is that of an external society. All this is included, not only in the express declaration of the Apostle, that the external Israel was not the true Israel, but is involved in his whole argument. It was, indeed, the main point of discussion between himself and the

Jews. The great question was, is a man made a member of the true Israel, and a partaker of the promise, by circumcision and subjection, or by faith in Christ? If the former, then the Jews were right, and Paul was wrong as to the whole issue. But if the latter, then Paul was right and the Jews wrong. And this is the precise question between us and Romanists, and Anglicans. If the external Israel was the true Israel, then Romanists are right and Protestants are wrong as to the method of salvation. Besides, if we admit that the external Israel was the true Church, then we must admit that the true Church apostatized; for it is undeniable that the whole external Israel, as an organized body, did repeatedly, and for long periods, lapse into idolatry. Nay more, we must admit that the true Church rejected and crucified Christ; for he was rejected by the external Israel, by the Sanhedrim, by the priesthood, by the elders, and by the people. All this is in direct opposition to the Scriptures, and would involve a breach of promise on the part of God. Paul avoids this fatal conclusion by denying that the external Church is, as such, the true Church, or that the promises made to the latter were made to the former.

It is to be remembered that there were two covenants made with Abraham. By the one, his natural descendants through Isaac were constituted a commonwealth, an external, visible community. By the other, his spiritual descendants were constituted a Church. The parties to the former covenant were God and the nation; to the other, God and his true people. The promises of the national covenant were national blessings; the promises of the spiritual covenant, (*i. e.* of the covenant of grace,) were spiritual blessings, reconciliation, holiness, and eternal life. The conditions of the one covenant were circumcision and obedience to the law; the condition of the latter was, is, and ever has been, faith in the Messiah as the seed of the woman, the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world. There cannot be a greater mistake than to confound the national covenant with the covenant of grace, and the commonwealth founded on the one with the Church founded on the other.

When Christ came "the commonwealth" was abolished, and there was nothing put in its place. The Church remained.

There was no external covenant, nor promises of external blessings, on condition of external rites and subjection. There was a spiritual society with spiritual promises, on the condition of faith in Christ. In no part of the New Testament is any other condition of membership in the Church prescribed than that contained in the answer of Philip to the eunuch who desired baptism: "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."—Acts viii. 37. The Church, therefore, is, in its essential nature, a company of believers, and not an external society, requiring merely external profession as the condition of membership. While this is true and vitally important, it is no less true that believers make themselves visible by the profession of the truth, by holiness of life, by separation from the world as a peculiar people, and by organizing themselves for the worship of Christ, and for mutual watch and care. The question, when any such organization is to be regarded as a portion of the true Church, is one to which the Protestant answer has already been given in a few words, but its fuller discussion must be reserved to some other occasion.

SHORT NOTICES.

A Commentary on the Song of Solomon. By the Rev. George Burrowes, Professor in Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 144 Chestnut street. 1853. Pp. 527.

By some mistake a notice of this interesting volume failed to appear in our last number. It is entitled to a much more extended notice than it is now in our power to give it. It is certainly somewhat remarkable, that the Song of Solomon seems to be attracting special attention in different parts of the Church. Hengstenberg, Hahn, and Delitzsch, have all recently published on the subject in Germany, and Professor Burrowes in our own country. We hope soon to devote a review to these works, and can now only say in general terms of the book before us, that it is imbued with a devout spirit, and evinces, in no small measure, skill and wisdom in the author. The Introduction, which occupies eighty-six pages, ably defends

the canonical authority of the book, vindicates its claims to the devout study of pious people, and proves that it is a religious allegory, and not an amatory eclogue.

One source of evil which has unquestionably, at times, arisen from the misinterpretation and misapplication of this book, is the neglect of the important fact, that the marriage relation is in Scripture used to illustrate the relation between Christ and the Church, and not that between Christ and the individual believer. A believer is no more the bride of Christ than he is Christ's body. The Church alone is the bride of the Lamb. And when this illustration is applied to the relation of the believer to Christ, it is very apt to lead to a false and pernicious form of religious feeling. The two essential characteristics of the conjugal affection are, that it is supreme and exclusive. But the love of Christ for the individual believer is neither supreme nor exclusive. He neither loves him more than others, nor to the exclusion of others. Whereas, his love to the Church is altogether peculiar; it passes knowledge, and has no other such object. If this statement should disappoint any one, and make him feel that his relation to Christ is not what he supposed it to be, it only shows the sickly and unscriptural character of his religion. It is enough that the believer is a member of Christ's body. He need not fancy himself the sole organ of his life. And it is enough that he is a member of that Church which is the Bride of the Lamb, without intoxicating himself with the idea that he is the supreme and exclusive object of the Saviour's love.

The Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah. An Exposition of Psalm xviii. and Isaiah lii. 13—liii. 12. By John Brown, D. D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in the United Presbyterian Church, &c., Edinburgh. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 285 Broadway. 1853. Pp. 352.

This is a laborious and thorough doctrinal exposition of an important portion of Scripture, in a series of lectures. The author states that thirty years ago he committed to writing the results of his examination of the passages which are the subject of these lectures. The notes prepared at that time, after frequent revision, were cast recently into their present form, and published. Such maturity of consideration promises well for the solid value of the book. The slight examination we have given it has made the impression that it is sound and scriptural. We are the more pleased to see those portions of Scripture which treat of fundamental doctrines, made the subject of special works, because the tendency is everywhere manifest to divorce theology from the Scriptures, and to present it in the

form of a science. The great security for truth is adherence to the scriptural mode of exhibiting it. The attempt to separate the substance from the form, seldom, if ever, fails to transmute the divine into the human.

The Law and the Testimony. By the author of "The Wide, Wide World." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853. Pp. 840.

In answer to the self-proposed question, "What is this big book?" the author says, "It is a gathering of facts for the purpose of induction. It is a setting together of the mass of Scripture testimony on each of the grand points of Scripture teaching; in the hope that when the whole light of the scattered rays is flung on the matter, the truth may be made manifest." The father of the author, in order to find Sunday-work for his youngest daughter, drew out a schedule of doctrines, and proposed that she and an older sister should examine the whole Scriptures, and arrange under the several heads the passages which serve to sustain or illustrate them. This large and handsome volume is the result. It is evident, from the spirit in which the Preface is written, that the young ladies found their task a labour of love, and that they prosecuted it in happy ignorance that it was a work from which a Buxtorf or an Edwards might have shrunk. That it is not a work of critical analysis and discrimination, will be taken for granted; but the collection is so copious that the Biblical student will find it a very convenient book of reference. In the preparation of sermons especially, the minister may save much time and labour by having such a work constantly at hand. It will be a far better help than metaphysical or theological discussions of the doctrine he may wish to exhibit.

The Conflict of Ages; or, The Great Debate on the Moral Relations of God and Man. By Edward Beecher, D. D. Boston: Phillips, Sansom & Co. 1853. Pp. 552.

This work came into our hands only a few days since. We have had time to do little more than to ascertain its character and design. The great conflict of which it treats, is the struggle between the Augustinian and Pelagian systems of doctrine. The author's object is to trace the history of this conflict of ages; to ascertain the cause, and to reconcile the contending parties, by proposing "a mode in which all true Christians can, without any sacrifice of principle, be at harmony among themselves." In doing this, he says:—"I shall attempt to redeem the first named system from just liability to such attacks as it has sustained, by showing that all of its fundamental elements may be so stated and held as not to be inconsistent with the highest principles of honour and right. I propose at

the same time to do full justice to the motives and principles of those who in different ages have opposed it, as has been stated. So far as their principles of honour and right have been correct, it is my purpose to vindicate and defend them; at the same time endeavouring to explain how it has happened that they have been brought into conflict with the system which they oppose. I shall endeavour to point out a needless misadjustment of the parts of the system by which these principles have been brought into collision with the fundamental facts on which it is based." p. 4. Both systems contain important distinctive truths. These truths are so misadjusted as to be in perpetual conflict. Augustinianism rightly teaches the innate and entire depravity of man; Pelagianism no less earnestly teaches that God is essentially benevolent and just, and cannot first ruin his creatures and then punish them for being ruined. How are these truths to be reconciled? Pelagianism cuts the knot, by denying that man has a sinful nature, or is morally depraved at birth. Those who teach that God is the author of sin, with equal violence get rid of the difficulty, by denying that it is unjust in God to create sin in man and then punish him for it. Neither of these methods has had any vitality in the Church. They are alike unscriptural and in conflict with the most obvious facts of consciousness and experience. Some have assumed the personality of the race, and regarded the sin of Adam as the personal sin of all mankind; so that original sin or innate depravity is to be regarded in its origin as the common act and common guilt of the race, (die Gesammsthat und Gesammtschuld des menschlichen geschlechts.) Others satisfy themselves by a reference to the law of propagation, like begets like. We inherit the depraved nature of Adam for the same reason and by the same law that the tiger of to-day has the ferocity of the first tiger. This is no solution. It is a mere statement of the fact to be solved. The question is, why do we inherit the corrupt nature of Adam? Where is the justice of spreading moral evil and spiritual death by the infection of one sin? Others, again, assuming the principle that with God, at least, the end sanctifies the means, maintain, if sin and the actual amount of sin are the necessary means to the greatest good, benevolence demands its existence and its propagation through the race, either by the direct efficiency of God, or by a law of nature. The great majority of the Church, as we believe, has in all ages, rested satisfied with the scriptural account of the fall of man. God created him upright. He was left to the freedom of his will in a state of probation. He sinned, and thereby lost the image of God, and incurred

his wrath and curse. The covenant having been made with him not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression. This has been regarded by the Latin, Greek, and Protestant churches as the scriptural solution of this great problem; and with this they have rested satisfied, the more easily because every other solution seemed only to enhance the difficulty.

Dissatisfied, however, with all these explanations, Origen proposed the doctrine of a preëxisting state of holiness, in which a free apostacy from God occurred, so that men come into this world with the pollution and guilt contracted in a prior state of existence. This doctrine was mixed up on this part, with other speculations connected with the origin of the world. Discarding these foreign elements, the same view has been reproduced by Professor Müller, of Halle, in his work, *Die Christliche Lehre von der Sünde.* He admits the innate sinful corruption of our nature, from which actual sins proceed in every one who arrives to the period of moral consciousness. But with sin guilt is inseparably connected; and guilt implies that sin had its origin in a free personal act. Here is a contradiction for which he finds no other solution than "die Idee einer ausserzeitlichen Existenzweise der geschaffenen Persönlichkeit, von der ihr Leben in der Zeit abhängig ist;" that is, the idea of a preëxisting state, on which our present life is dependent. Vol. II. p. 488. To the same conclusion Dr. Beecher has arrived, and he appears to have fought his own way through to this solution of the great problem, with an earnestness that has given it the force over his convictions of an inevitable truth. This, then, is the Irenicum. The conflicting parties are to meet and unite on the field of transcendental liberty. The fate and character of man have been determined by a personal act of freedom which transcends the limits of consciousness and time. The three obvious objections to this scheme, viz: the silence of Scripture as to any such preëxisting state; the impossibility of connecting our present character with a personal act of which we have no consciousness; and the fact that Scripture gives in the fall of Adam a different solution of the problem in question, besides others which must crowd on every reader's mind, will probably produce an *a priori* conviction that our author's hopes of putting an end to the "conflict of ages" are doomed to disappointment. This, however, does not destroy the value of his book. Much appears to be conceded which has hitherto been denied; deeper views of the nature of sin are here presented than have recent-

ly appeared from the class of theologians to which Dr. Beecher is understood to belong, and many points of interest are discussed with great discrimination and force. The work appears to carry with it the impress of an able, earnest, and devout mind, and will do much, we doubt not, to conciliate for its author the respect and kind feeling even of those who are most opposed to his conclusions.

On Miracles. By Ralph Wardlaw, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853. Pp. 298.

The venerable author of this volume informs his readers that the substance of it was delivered from his pulpit in a series of lectures. He was induced to publish them under the present form by "the abounding scepticism of the times." Dr. Wardlaw has an established and widely extended reputation, and any work bearing his name is sure to meet with general acceptance. This work will not prove an exception. It is written in his characteristic clear and flowing style, and in a popular form, adapted to general apprehension and impression. The defect of the work, we apprehend, is a want of due discrimination and accuracy. "In every argument, without doubt," he says, "it is a first and most essential requisite, that our conceptions be as distinct and definite as possible of what we are arguing about." He complains of the want of accuracy in others, in stating the nature of miracles, and yet his own definition is both defective and inaccurate. He says they are "works involving a temporary suspension of the known laws of nature, or a deviation from the established constitution and fixed order of the universe." This definition is inaccurate, because it requires that an event, to be miraculous, must be contrary to the *known* laws of nature. This he insists upon. "It is an indispensable requisite to a genuine miracle, that it be wrought both *on* materials, and *by* materials of which the properties are well and familiarly known." But the nature of an event does not depend upon its nature being known. It is what it is, whether known or not. It may be known to one man, and not to another. So far as this member of the definition is concerned, it is enough that the event be actually supernatural. It may be, and very often is difficult to determine whether an event is natural or supernatural. But its being the one or the other is entirely independent of our knowledge.

The above definition is not only inaccurate, but essentially defective. A miracle is not only a supernatural event, but one due to the immediate efficiency of God. Satan has, no doubt, power to produce supernatural effects; that is, effects which

involve a suspension of the laws of nature. If he showed Christ all the kingdoms of the earth in a moment of time, this involved a suspension of the known laws of nature. If God were to show to us such a sight, it would be a miracle; if done by Satan, it is no miracle. It is essential to miracles that they should be the works of God, *i. e.* works produced by his immediate agency. And it is also essential that they be contrary to the established laws of nature. Raising Lazarus from the dead was a miracle, because it was contrary to nature, and effected by the immediate power of God. Regeneration, though due to the direct agency of God, is not, in the theological sense of the word, a miracle, because it involves the suspension of no natural law.

History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. By the Rev. W. M. Hetherington. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1853. Pp. 311.

Few provincial councils of the Church have had greater influence or are entitled to greater respect than that of Westminster. Its Confession of Faith and Catechism are the formula of doctrine for a greater number of Protestants than probably any other symbol. Dr. Hetherington's History of this venerable Assembly has for ten years been before the public, and is already too well known to need any commendation. This reprint is in a very neat and compact form.

The Powers of the World to Come and the Church's Stewardship as invested with them. By George B. Cheever, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1853. Pp. 384.

This work is "a practical survey of what is termed in some quarters the Eschatology of the Scriptures; the realities which according to Divine revelation we are to meet beyond the grave." A very solemn subject, treated in a very solemn way. The book is marked by the strength of feeling and imagination which are the known characteristics of Dr. Cheever's writings.

The Family Bible, Volume I., Genesis to Job. With brief Notes and Instructions, by Rev. Justin Edwards, D. D. With maps, and the references and marginal readings of the Polyglott Bible—pp. 668, 8vo; price in fine paper, bound, 75 cents. American Tract Society.

The work is similar in character to the New Testament, of which sixty thousand copies have already been welcomed by the community. "It is designed to assist common readers to understand the meaning of the Holy Spirit in the Bible, and to draw from it such instructions as they may need;" giving, in a terse and striking form, the plain, practical *results* of investigation.

The Missionary of Kilmany: A Memoir of Alexander Paterson, with notices of Robert Edie. By Rev. John Baillie. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1853. Pp. 253.

The subject of this memoir was a young man whose education was of the most limited kind. He was brought to the knowledge of the truth, through the instrumentality of the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, who entertained for him the most affectionate regard to the end of life. Through the influence of his venerable friend, Mr. Paterson, was induced to go to Edinburgh and labour as a missionary among the neglected poor. In this work he was eminently successful; so that Dr. Chalmers said of him, "that his labours had been more blest than any man I know." The memoir of such a man is at once a witness, a reproof, an encouragement, and a guide. We pray it may widely answer all these ends, to the glory of God, and to the consolation of the poor of his people, who may here see how much may be done by one of their own number.

Water from the Well-Spring, for the Sabbath hours of afflicted Believers; being a complete course of Morning and Evening Meditations for every Sunday in the year. By Edward Henry Bickersteth, M. A., Rector of Hinton Martell, Dorset. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1853. Pp. 254.

In opening this volume, our eye fell on the sentence, "The sight of Jesus by faith is the beginning of spiritual life." A truth so characteristic as to be, as it were, a divine signet. With such a mark on it, it will find its way to the hands and hearts of many who know that Jesus is their life.

Abeokuta: or Sunrise within the Tropics: an Outline of the Origin and Progress of the Yoruba Mission. By Miss Tucker. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853. Pp. 278.

Christian Progress: a Sequel to the Anxious Inquirer after Salvation. By the Rev. John Angell James. American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York.

The Life of William Tuttle, the Self-made Man and Consistent Christian. Rev. Joseph F. Tuttle, Rockaway, New Jersey. Second Edition, abridged by the author. American Tract Society.

The Lamp and the Lantern: or Light for the Tent and the Traveller. By James Hamilton, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

C. Scribner & Co., New York, will issue in the latter part of October, Dr. Schaf's History of the Apostolic Church. Translated from a revised and enlarged copy of the German, by Edward D. Yeomans. A work of extensive and accurate learning, of great philosophical ability, and literary merit, already known to our theologians acquainted with the German language, and worthy of very high esteem with the theological public.

An elegant edition of the Gospel of John in Syriac, in the Harclensian version, has been published by Prof. G. H. Bernstein, (xxx pp. advertisement, 30 pp. critical remarks, and 67 pp. Syriac text.) 2 thalers 20 sgr. It is reprinted from a MS. formerly in the possession of Joseph Asseman, and now in the Vatican library at Rome, numbered 279, and dating from A. D. 1483. Its text agrees throughout with that in White's edition of the Philoxenian version of the Gospels, Oxford 1778, though it is in many passages more correct. It possesses a peculiar value from being provided throughout not merely with the vowels, but with the points Kushoè and Rucoch, (corresponding to Dagesh and Raphe in Hebrew,) the employment of which is still involved in some obscurity. Bernstein has compared throughout two older MSS. in the Estrangelo character, the Florentine A. D. 757, and the Vatican 268, thought by Stephen Asseman to be the original MS. of Thomas of Harclea, A. D. 616, but regarded by Bernstein as less ancient than the preceding. He also compared in the first five chapters the Codex Angelicus, preserved in the Augustinian convent at Rome, written probably in the eleventh century, and which he supposes to represent the text of the Philoxenian version, prior to the emendations of Thomas of Harclea. The result of these comparisons is given in the critical remarks. The typography is of rare beauty. The work is from the press of Teubner, Leipsic.

Apostolus e codice monasterii Sisatovac palæo-slovenice, ed. F. Miklosisch. 8vo. pp. xxiv. and 267. 2 th.

F. Delitzsch, New Investigations into the origin and plan of the Canonical Gospels. Part I. The Gospel of Matthew. 8vo. pp. 112. 16 ngr. The first half of this treatise consists of an article which appeared in Guerike's Zeitschrift for 1850,

with some modifications: the rest is taken up with an exhibition of his peculiar views as to the form of Matthew, which he supposes to have been modelled after the Pentateuch. Its Genesis extends from i. 1—ii. 15; its Exodus from ii. 16—vii. 29; Leviticus viii. 1—ix. 38; Numbers x. 1—xviii. 35; Deuteronomy from xix. 1—xxviii. 20.

Jul. Müller, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. With a preface by Dr. Nitzsch. 12mo. pp. 392. ¾ th.

C. E. Luthardt, The Gospel of John in its peculiarity represented and explained. Part II. 8vo. pp. 491. 2 th. Both parts 3 th. 24 ngr.

J. G. Reich, Critical Commentary to the New Testament, in which the most important and difficult passages of doubtful reading are accurately reviewed and explained. Vol. I. contains Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. 4to. pp. 409. 2⅔ th. This work, as its name implies, is an elaborate examination of the critical authorities for the determination of the true text. It is written in Latin.

A second edition of Delitzsch on Genesis is announced, which appears from its title to be revised and enlarged.

The God-man, the Fundamental idea of Revelation in its unity and historical development, by C. W. E. Nägelsbach. Vol. I. The Man of Nature, or the idea of the God-man in the first stage of its realization in the life of natural humanity, from Adam to Noah. 8vo. pp. 452. 1 th. 24 ngr.

E. W. Kolthoff, Life of Jesus Christ delineated by the Apostle Paul, Commentatio. 8vo. pp. 55. ⅔ th.

H. K. Lipsius, Paul's Doctrine of Justification. 8vo. pp. 220.

The Psalms Explained, by J. Olshausen, 14th part of the Condensed Exegetical Manual to the Old Testament. 8vo. pp. 504.

W. F. Rinck, Apocalyptic Inquiries or Outline of the Revelation of John, and Guide to its understanding. 8vo. pp. 77. 12 ngr.

History of Rabbi Jeshua ben Joseph hanootzri (the Nazarene) called Jesus Christ. Vol. I. Critical investigation of the sources. No. 1. 8vo. pp. 1—112. ½ th.

Kurtz on the Bible and Astronomy, has reached the third edition. 12mo. pp. 570. 1 th. 22 ngr.

A. Sartori, On the Epistle to the Laodiceans. An exegetico-critical treatise. 8vo. pp. 55. ¼ th.

C. A. Wahl, Clavis philologica librorum V. T. Apocryphorum, has been completed by the publication of the second part. 4to. pp. 321—509. Cost of whole work 5 th.

The second part of Reuss' History of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament, second edition, has been published. 8vo. pp. 265—586. Containing what commonly passes under the name of General Introduction, viz., History of the canon, of the text, of the versions, and of the exposition.

The second volume has appeared, of Ewald's History of the People of Israel until Christ. 2d Ed. This edition of the work is to be divided into four volumes, instead of three. The present issue is occupied with the period of Moses, Joshua, and the Judges. 8vo. pp. 566. 2½ th.

E. Meier, The Form of Hebrew Poetry. 8vo. pp. 119. 21 ngr.

J. P. Trusen, The Manners, Customs, and Diseases of the Ancient Hebrews, according to the Holy Scriptures, historically and critically presented. 2d edition. 8vo. pp. 289. 1⅓ th. The whole book is written from the medical point of view; and the author would appear, from the length of title appended to his name, to be a physician of some distinction.

H. Grætz, History of the Jews from the fall of the Jewish State to the close of the Talmud. 8vo. pp. 564.

J. Alsleben, Life of Ephraim the Syrian, as an Introduction to a German and Syriac edition of the works of Ephraim, translated from the Syriac, and furnished with explanatory remarks. With a treatise, "Investigations on the Chronology of Ephraim," and an Appendix, containing a list of the Syriac works of Ephraim. 8vo. pp. 60. 10 sgr.

The Confession of the Evangelical Church in its relation to the Romish and the Greek: a critical exhibition of the distinctive doctrines of the contending Churches, by Dr. A. Hahn. 8vo. pp. 192. 1 th. After the opening sections on the true Church, and the Apostolic and Catholic Church, this treatise is divided into four articles, respectively relating to the objects of religious worship, the scheme of salvation, the means of grace, and the hopes of the Church. It was called out by the arrogant pretensions of the Romish bishop of Silesia, of which province Hahn is general superintendent.

H. Wimmer, The Church and School in North America. 8vo. pp. 368. The author, who, we infer from the preface, has visited this country, gives a brief account of each of the various sects that prevail here, and of the various grades of schools—the district, city, and normal schools, academies, colleges, and universities, professional schools, and benevolent institutions. It is interspersed with abundant statistics, and citations of American authorities.

J. Scheinert, The Christian Religion. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 479. 2 th. 8 ngr.

Corpus Reformatorum. Phil. Melanchthonis opera quæ supersunt omnia. Vol. XIX. 4to. pp. 787. 4 th.

L. Noack, Christianity and Humanity, or the religious consciousness of Jesus, and the redemption fact of Christianity. 12mo. pp. 105. 12 ngr.

M. Deutinger, Ground-lines of a Positive Philosophy, as a preliminary essay toward a reduction of all parts of philosophy to Christian principles. Part 7. With the additional title History of Philosophy. Vol. I. History of the Greek Philosophy. Section 2. The Greek Philosophy from Socrates to its close. 8vo. pp. 582. 2 th. 11¼ ngr.

H. Ritter, Essay toward an understanding upon the most recent German Philosophy since Kant. 8vo. pp. 136. ¾ th. Reprinted from the Allgemeine Monatschrift für Wissenschaft und Literatur.

Second editions have been published of the Religion of Judaism, and the Task of Judaism, by S. Stern.

A. Tholuck, Heathenism according to Holy Scripture. A discourse delivered before the Evangelical Union for Ecclesiastical purposes, April 4th, 1853. 8vo. pp. 16. 4 ngr.

A. Wuttke, History of Heathenism in reference to Religion, Science, Art, Morality, and Civilization. The 2d Vol. 8vo. pp. 597, is devoted to the Chinese, Japanese, and Hindoos. 2⅚ th.

Hindoo Studies, Contributions to the Knowledge of Hindoo Antiquity, by Dr. A. Weber. Vol. II.

L. Ross, the Pnyx and the Pelasgikon in Athens. 8vo. pp. 36. ½ th.

J. Bayer, Of Sinai, Olympus, and Tabor. Studies in the Philosophy of History, Religion, and Art. 8vo. pp. 160.

L. L. Dicke, Zeus. The Gods of the Greeks and Romans. 8vo. pp. 388.

L. Friedländer, The Criticism of Homer, from Wolf to Grote. 8vo. pp. 84.

T. Tobler, Plan of Jerusalem after Catherwood and Robinson. 2d ed. improved. 24 ngr.

O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth, Sanscrit Dictionary, published by the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg. No. 1. 4to. pp. 160. 1 th.

F. A. Arnold, Arabic Chrestomathy, from Manuscripts and rare printed works. 2 Parts, Text and Glossary. 8vo. pp. 438. 5 th.

Ibn-el-Athiri, Chronicon quod perfectissimum inscribitur. Vol. XII. and last, containing years of the Hejira 584—628. Edited by C. J. Tornberg. 8vo. pp. 330. 4⅔ th.

Libri Arabici: Fructus imperatorum et jocatio ingeniosorum, auctore Ahmede Ebn-Arabshah. ed. G. G. Freytag.

J. A. Vullers, Lexicon Persico-Latinum Etymologicum. Fasc. I. 8vo. pp. 208. The work is to be completed in six parts.

J. J. Tschudi, The Kechua Language, containing a Grammar, Specimens of the Language, and a Dictionary. 8vo. pp. 890. 6 th.

A Coptic Grammar is promised shortly, by M. A. Uhlemann.

F. Spiegel, To the Interpretation of the Vendidad. 8vo. pp. 54. 10 sgr. This is a justification of his translation of the Vendidad, part of which has been published, in reply to the strictures of Benfey.

F. W. Ghillany, City Librarian in Nuremberg, History of the navigator Martin Behaim, from the oldest existing documents. With a preliminary treatise, On the oldest Charts of the New Continent, and the name America, by Alex. von Humboldt. With an exact copy of Behaim's globe of the year 1492, in two planispheres of its natural size, and three of the oldest maps of America. Fol. pp. 122. 10 th. The resources of the Nuremberg library have here been adduced to throw light upon many points in the life of this early navigator, which were previously obscure. Behaim was born about 1459, in Nuremberg, and was, perhaps, a pupil of Regiomontanus. It has been claimed for him that he discovered America before Columbus, and that he preceded Magellan in the discovery of the straits which bear his name. These questions and others of interest in regard to the discoveries of that period, are here discussed. In the opinion of Humboldt, Amerigo Vespucci is not to blame that his name was given to this continent, to the prejudice of the great discoverer. He had as little idea as Columbus had, that a new part of the world had been discovered. One year after the death of Columbus, in 1506, there appeared the first proposal to call the new world "in honour of its discoverer, Vespucci," Americi terra or America. This was contained in a work entitled Cosmographiæ Introductio, first published anonymously, then in 1509 a second edition, under the name of Martinus Ilacomylus. The first map upon which this name appears is that of Petrus Apianus, in 1520. The map of Juan de la Cosa, one of the companions of Columbus, found by Humboldt in Paris in 1832, also accompanies

the work. The portrait of Behaim which it contains is from an old copy in possession of his family.

Rudelbach und Guericke's Zeitschrift. 1853. No. 3. Stip. Liturgical Questions. Biarowsky, On the new draught of a Hymn book for the Lutheran Church in Bavaria. Delitzsch, The Neptunian and Vulcanian Theories. Wetzel, The distinction between the Lutheran and Reformed system of doctrine. Ströbel's defence of the truth against Latzel. Critical Bibliography of the most recent theological Literature.

CONTENTS OF No. IV.

OCTOBER, 1853.