THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1855.

VOL. XXVII.

PHILADELPHIA:

OFFICE OF THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY, 265 CHESTNUT ST.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXVII.

No. I.

	Page.
Art. I.—Remarks on the Studies and Discipline of the Preacher..	1
Art. II.—The Plan and Purpose of the Patriarchal History.....	24
Art. III.—Exegesis of Heb. vi. 4–8.....	39
Art. IV.—The World in the Middle Ages.....	62
Art. V.—Recent Works on Mental Philosophy.....	69
Art. VI.—Nahum's Prophecy concerning Nineveh.....	102
Art. VII.—Memoir of Dr. Archibald Alexander.....	133
Short Notices.....	160
Literary Intelligence.....	171

No. II.

	Page.
Art. I.—Ethnographic View of Western Africa.....	193
Art. II.—Schools and Systems of Interpretation.....	226
Art. III.—Congregationalism.....	239
Art. IV.—Faber on the Locality of Heaven.....	269
Art. V.—Christianity in India.....	283
Art. VI.—Jewish Expositions of Malachi.....	308
Art. VII.—Mrs. Sherwood and Henry Martyn.....	327
Art. VIII.—Bishop McIlvaine on the Church.....	350
Short Notices.....	359
Literary Intelligence.....	367

No. III.

PAGE.
ART. I.—The Zurich Letters 377
ART. II.—The Coptic Language 388
ART. III.—The Logic of Religion 395
ART. IV.—Dr. Spencer's Sketches and Sermons 422
ART. V.—Presbyterian Liturgies 445
ART. VI.—The General Assembly 467
SHORT NOTICES 542
LITERARY INTELLIGENCE 549

No. IV.

PAGE.
ART. I.—Sir William Hamilton and his Philosophy 553
ART. II.—Idolatrous practices of Northern Guinea 600
ART. III.—Monuments of the Umbrian Language 620
ART. IV.—Church Architecture 625
ART. V.—Demotic Grammar 649
ART. VI.—Lepsius and Brugsch's Travels in Egypt 655
ART. VII.—Comparative Accentual System of the Sanscrit and Greek 680
ART. VIII.—Huc's Journey through China 687
SHORT NOTICES 699
LITERARY INTELLIGENCE 717

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1855.

No. I.

ART. I.—*Remarks on the Studies and Discipline of the Preacher.*

THE habits of a young minister, in respect to mental culture, are very early formed, and hence no one can begin too soon to regulate his closet-practice by maxims derived from the true philosophy of mind, and the experience of successful scholars. Early introduction to active labour, in an extended field, partaking of a missionary and itinerant character, may, amidst much usefulness, spoil a man for life, in all that regards progress of erudition, and productiveness of the reasoning powers. Such a person may accomplish much in the way of direct and proximate good; but his fruit often dies with him, and he does little in stimulating, forming, and enriching the minds of others. On the other hand, a zealous young scholar, captivated with the intellectual or literary side of ministerial work, may addict himself to books in such a manner as to sink the preacher in the man of learning, and spend his days without any real sympathy with the affectionate duties of the working clergy. The due admixture of the contemplative with the active, of learning with labour, of private cultivation with public spirit, is a *juste milieu* which few attain, but which cannot be too earnestly recommended.

We assume it, without the trouble of proof, that every young minister, whose manner of life is in any degree submitted to his own choice, will strive after the highest Christian learning. But here there are diversities in the conduct of studies and the regulation of thought, which demand the most serious discrimination. We are persuaded that grave errors prevail in respect to what should be the aim of the pastor, in his parochial studies and discipline. For this cause, we would venture a few suggestions, not altogether without previous experiment and careful observation.

Let us suppose a settled minister, after the usual career of academic and theological training, to be seated in his quiet parsonage, with a sufficient and increasing apparatus of books around him. His tastes and predilections dispose him to account the hours blessed which he can devote to reading; and many a man, under this early impulse, makes his greatest attainments during the first ten years. Yet hundreds go astray from the outset. It is not enough to turn an inquisitive mind loose among an array of great authors. The error against which we would guard such a one, is that of mistaking a large and various erudition for wise and thorough culture of the faculties.

The knowledge of authors, however great and good, is an instrument, not an end; and an instrument which may be misdirected and abused. There is much to be attained from other sources than books; and all that is gained from these, must, in order to the highest advantage, be made to pass through a process of inward digestion, which may be disturbed or even precluded by indiscriminate reading. The attainment of truth demands more than what is termed erudition. One may have vast knowledge of the repositories of human opinion, of what other men, many men, have thought upon all subjects, what in modern phrase is known as the *literature* of science; one may have a bibliographical accuracy about the authors who have treated this or that topic in every age, about systems, and schools, and controversies; and yet be vacillating and undecided as to the positive truth in question. We meet with men—and they are not the least agreeable of literary companions—who never fail, whatever topic may be started,

to display familiarity with all the great minds who have treated it, to cite author after author, and to pour out reminiscences the most curious concerning the history of opinion in the Church, but who seldom strike us by the utterance of a single original conclusion, and never evince a rooted firmness of private judgment. Such are they who amass libraries of their own, and flutter among great public collections; who dazzle by quotation after quotation in sermons and treatises; who deck the margin of their publications with a catena of references to volume, page, and edition of works often inaccessible to ordinary scholars; but who discover or settle no great principle. They are felicitous conversers, walking indexes to treasured lore, and sprightly essayists, but not investigators, in the true sense, not producers, not solid thinkers. Indeed it would seem as if in the very proportion of such encyclopædic knowledge, there was an incapacity for the mental forces to work up the enormous mass of superincumbent information. All this we believe to be true, while we scorn the paltry self-conceit of those who would denounce learning as injurious to originality, or would contrast readers and thinkers as incompatible classes. Our position is only that care must be taken that the great reader be also a great thinker.

The clerical student will of course add to his knowledge of books every day; but these accumulations of knowledge must be governed by some law; must be directed, nay, must be limited. There is surely some point beyond which the acquisition of other men's thoughts must not be carried. This we say for the sake of those *helluones librorum*, who read for ever and without stint; browzing as diligently as oxen in the green herbage of rich meads, but, unlike these, never lying down to ruminate. Life is too short, Art is too long, for a human mind to make perpetual accretion of book-learning, without halt. *Sufflaminandum est.* There must be some circumscription of the range; for if a hundred volumes, in a given science, may be read, why not a thousand; and why not, supposing so many extant, ten thousand? At this rate, no scholar could ever find his goal. And as uninterrupted research shuts out continuous reflection, it is observed that those who go astray in this road become the prey of never-ending

doubts, even if they do not fall into latitudinarian comprehension and indifference to truth. The faults of some truly great men appear to have had this origin; we might adduce as instances, Grotius, Priestley, and Parr.

The mind must be allowed some periods of calm, uninterrupted reflection, in order to librate freely, and find the resting-point between conflicting views. That time is sometimes expended in learning, examining, and collating arguments of all kinds, on different sides of a given question, which might, by a much more compendious method, have served to discern and embrace positive truth, or to make deduction from acknowledged truth. No wise counsellor would proscribe the perusal of controversies. Yet he who reads on different sides, must necessarily read much that is erroneous; and all tampering with falsehood, however necessary, is, like dealing with poisons, full of danger. If we might have our choice, it is better to converse with truth than with error; with the rudest, homeliest truth, than with the most ingenious, decorated error; with the humblest truth, than with the most soaring, original, and striking error. The sedulous perusal of great controversies, is often a duty, and it may tend to acuminate the dialectical faculty; but none can deny that it keeps the thoughts long in contact with divers falsities, and their specious reasons. Now these same hours would be employed far more healthfully in contemplating truths which in their own nature are nourishing and fruitful. To confirm this, let it be remembered, that truth is one, while error is manifold, if not infinite; hence the true economy of the faculties is, wherever it is possible, to commune with truth. Again, while error leads to error, truth leads to truth. Each truth is germinal and pregnant, containing other truths. Only upon this principle can we vindicate the productiveness of solitary meditation. Link follows link in the chain, which we draw from unknown mysterious recesses. A few elementary truths are the bases of the universal system.

If it should be urged, that defenders of sound doctrine must be acquainted with all diversities of opposition, we admit it, with certain limitations. But we must be allowed to add, that he who thoroughly knows a truth, knows also, and knows thereby, the opposite errors. Let any one be deeply imbued

with the Newtonian system of the material universe, and he will be little staggered by denials of particular points, however novel and however shrewdly maintained. But the converse is not true. There may be the widest acquaintance with forms of false opinion, while after all the true doctrine may elude the most laborious search. And therefore we believe that the reading of error, known to be such, for whatever cause, just or unjust, never fails, at least for a time, to have bad effects; producing pain and dubiety, collecting rubbish in order that it may be removed, and inflicting wounds which it is necessary to heal. Without rushing, then, to any extremes, we may employ these incontestable principles in the regulation of our studies.

There is a sort of independence and adventure which leads inquiring and sanguine minds to contemn the thought of using any special precautions in the handling of error. They feel strong in their own convictions, and fully exempt from all danger of being seduced. But they neglect the important principle that the very contact of what is false tends to impair the mental health. Hence we are not ashamed to avow it, as a canon of our intellectual hygeine, that we will not, except from necessity, read books which contain known error. We would advise youthful students especially not to be inquisitive about such. As in regard to morals, prurient curiosity leads to concupiscence and corruption, so in regard to the pursuit of truth, eager desire of knowing bad systems undermines the faith. This is the weak place in some truly excellent minds. They spend a whole literary life in acquiring the knowledge of strange, conflicting, heterogeneous systems. There is no infidelity or heresy, from Epicurus and Pelagius, down to Spinoza and Comte, into which they have not groped. The perpetual oscillations of Coleridge's great understanding are due, in some degree, to this morbid penchant; hence his delight in Plotinus, Böhm, and Schelling; and hence his long gestation, resulting in no definite faith, and no completed work. Continual wandering in the mazes of theories which after all are not adopted, ends only in dissatisfaction and pain. It is a trial to converse with mistaken minds, even for the purpose of refutation; but to make such commerce the habit of life, is to court disappointment and weakness, if not to be betrayed

and supplanted. With no common earnestness of entreaty we would therefore exhort the enterprising student to devote his days and nights to the search of verity, rather than the discovery, or as a first object, even the confutation of error. Offences must needs come, and must needs be removed; the Church must still have its controvertists; but in regard to the actor in these scenes, unnecessary polemics do harm.

We have thus prepared the way for a view which we have kept before us from the beginning, and which we trust will elucidate both the object and the method of ministerial study. Granting that positive and unadulterated truth is the sole result to be sought, the question is natural and just, how such truth shall be discovered, amidst the multitude of varying opinions. To the Christian inquirer the problem need cause little hesitancy. If there is a revelation from God, this is to be the capital object of meditation. The truth of the Scripture stands forth at once as the grand topic for life; and this one book is at once the professional guide and the chosen delight of the sacred student. He need no longer ask what shall be the principal aim of his inquiries, or what his line of direction in the research of knowledge. Reason and truth are correlative; and only what is true can afford nutriment and growth. In our mingled state, we receive truth with additions of error; but all the benefit is from the truth, and all falsehood is poison, which overclouds, pains, and weakens the mind. It is not too much to affirm, that even the momentary inhalation of such miasma works some lesion of the inward powers. Who can say how many of our prejudices, distresses, and sins, arise from this single cause?

In the conduct of mental discipline, it will not be difficult to see the applications of this principle, though it may call for constraint and self-denial. There is occasion for circumspect walking in the study of opinion. We desire the knowledge of good and evil; but let us be cautious; let us employ a wise reserve; let us distrust our own strength of judgment; let us be sparing in our familiarity with seducers. It were well, in all cases, to take our stand on the firm ground of divine verity, and thence to make our survey of all that is opposed. Instances may be given of men long trained in the best schools,

who from a sickly taste for strange opinions, have fallen from soundness of faith, and landed in the bigotry and superstition of popery, or the delirious ravings of Swedenborg. Amidst conflicting judgments respecting the doctrinal contents of revelation, there is a just presumption in favour of those which are catholic, those which are prevalent among good men, those which are obvious in the record, those which tend to sobriety and holy living, those which are least allied to enthusiastic or fanatic innovation, those which grow out of first truths, and those which are consistent with themselves.

In the investigation of truth, it is important to bear steadily in mind the great foundation of valid belief. All argumentation runs back into certain propositions which sustain the entire structure of argument, and which commend themselves to the unsophisticated mind, as light to the healthy organ of vision. This is especially important in our study of the Bible. It is less observed than it deserves to be, that while the sacred writers sometimes argue, they oftener assert the truth. This is, above all, true of Him who spake as never man spake; and it became Him, as the authoritative Teacher, the Source of truth, yea, the Truth itself. The same declarations, even now repeated by mortal lips, have, we believe, a penetrative force, greater than is commonly acknowledged. We may accredit reason, without going over to rationalism. The first truth and the first reason are coincident in God. Here subject and object are identical. Even in fallen man, as a reasonable being, truth is fitted to reason. Like light, it makes its own way, is its own revealer, and, to a certain extent, carries its own evidence. However fully we may consent to receive whatever is divinely revealed, there is a previous point to be settled before opening the volume, which is, that God is to be believed; and this is a discovery of natural light. There are truths, the bare statement of which is mighty. The repeated statement of truths propagates them among mankind; most of our knowledge is thus derived. These propositions may be made the conclusions of ratiocinative processes, of processes differing among themselves, and indefinitely multiplied; for men have various ways of proving the same thing. But many a man believes that which he cannot prove to another. It is shallow

to deny or doubt a proposition, simply because he who holds it is unable to bring it within logical mood and figure. Thought is very rapid. Middle terms are often faint in the mind's vision, so as to vanish, while yet the conclusions remain. Nay we are sometimes sure of that, on the mere statement of it, which, so far as consciousness reports, has not come to us as the result of linked reasoning. This seeming intuition may extend to a greater sphere of objects, than those which are usually denominated First Truths.

From these considerations we may be encouraged, both in private inquiry, and in the teaching of others. We are not to be deterred from stating the truth, because we have not time to argue, nor even because it is denied. Assertion propagates falsehood; how much the rather should we use it to propagate truth? The statement of a great truth conveys to the hearer a form of thought, which, although he deny, he may come to believe. Therefore let it be stated. The medium of proof may come afterwards. Truths confirm one another, and become mutual proofs. In this way our studies of Scripture perpetually build up our knowledge and faith. THERE IS A GOD: here is the sublimest asseveration which human lips can utter. It is declared to the babe, and he receives it. Shall no man enjoy the great conception, but one who has mastered the arguments? The arguments are multiform, unlike, perhaps sometimes insufficient; yet the truth abides. There are a thousand arguments, and a thousand are yet to be discovered, just as there are a thousand radii, all tending to one point in which to centre. There is no truth which the mind so readily receives; and we adopt it as a palmary instance of the use of declaring a truth, as the Scriptures often do, independently of ratiocination.

But that which settles the mind as to the real warrant for believing Scripture, is that all inspired teaching is authoritative and triumphant. In the baffling search of truth, the weary mind needs such a resting-place, and acquiesces in it. The Word of God, considered as a body of religious truth and morals, is the chief fund of those who receive it, and the treasure-house of the instructed scribe. It has made the wisest philosophers and the happiest men; and the true business of

the Christian philosopher, is to subject the sacred text to a just interpretation. This suddenly defines and lightens the territory of the clerical student. His work in a certain sense is wholly exegetical. His function, in regard to the divers declarations of the Bible, is like that of the natural philosopher, in regard to the complete phenomena of the universe. And here is task enough; for life is too short for even the united powers of Christian interpreters to exhaust all the meaning of the Scriptures. The prophetic word alone seems to lie before us as a great continent, concerning which as great mistakes have been made as by the early Spanish discoverers about the new world they had touched, and of which only one here and there has taken any safe bearings. The same may be said concerning the border-land between revelation and physical science; many lucubrations must ensue, before the obscure equivocal voices of science, antiquities, and seeming discovery, shall be duly corrected by the everlasting sentences of God's word.

So truly are perverse methods founded in an evil nature, and so prone are we to abuse the best principles, that with the Bible in our hands, as a chosen study, we may slide into the old blunder of undigested and impertinent erudition. The text may be swallowed up of commentary. Indeed, we know not a field in which pedantic erudition careers with more flaunting display, than this of interpretation. Young clergymen there are, whose proudest toils consist in the constant consultation of a shelf of interpreters, chiefly German. We protest against this pretended auxiliary, when it becomes a rival. The commentary, like fire, is a good servant, but a bad master. The state of mind produced by sitting in judgment to hear twenty or fifty different expounders give their opinions on a verse, is morbid in a high degree; and cases are occurring every year, of laboriously educated weaklings, rich in books, who are utterly destroyed for all usefulness by what may be called their polymathic repletion. No:—more knowledge of Scripture is generally derived from direct study of the text, in the original, with grammar and lexicon, than from examining and comparing all the opposite opinions in Pool's Synopsis, De Wette, or Bloomfield. Again we say, commentaries must be used, and thankfully, but just as we use ladders, crutches, and spectacles;

the exception, not the rule; the aid in emergency, not the habit of every moment. There are times when what we most of all need, is to open the eye to the direct rays of self-evidencing truth; and at such times every intervening human medium keeps out just so many rays from falling on the retina. Holy Scripture cannot make its true impression, unless it be read in continuity; a whole epistle, a whole gospel, a whole prophecy at once; and with repetition of the process again and again; but this is altogether incompatible with the piecemeal mode of leaving the text every moment to converse with the annotator. The best posture for receiving light is not that of an umpire among contending interpreters. So far as the text is understood by us, our study of it is converse with positive truth. Suppose some errors are picked up, as they will be, in individual cases: these will be gradually corrected by the confluent light of many passages. The sum of truths will be incalculably greater than the sum of errors. The healthful body of truth will gradually extrude the portion of error, and cause it to slough off. The analogy of faith will more and more throw its light into dark places. All these effects will be just in proportion to the daily, diligent, continuous study of the pure text. Generally it will be found, that the more perusal of the text, the more acquisition of truth. And in application to the case of preachers, if we have learnt anything by the painful and mortifying experience of many years, it is, that of all preparatives for preaching, the best is the study of the original Scripture text. None is so suggestive of matter; none is so fruitful of illustration; and none is so certain to furnish natural and attractive methods of partition. If we did not know how many live in a practice diametrically opposed to it, we should almost blush to reiterate, what indeed comprehends all we are urging, that God's truth is infinitely more important than good methods of finding it.

We have sometimes thought that over-explaining is one of the world's plagues. There are those things which, even if left a little in enigma or in twilight, are better without being too much hammered out. Who ever failed to be sick of the prating of the *cicerone* in a foreign gallery? Why should we deluge an author's inkhorn with water? Wherefore should

Æsop and John Bunyan be diluted with endless commentary? And all this applies itself to the young minister's private study of Scripture. Experience shows that for pulpit and pastoral purposes, one is more benefitted by scholia, or sententious, seed-like observations, such as those of Bengel's *Gnomon*, than by the Critici Sacri, Doctor Gill, or Kuinœl. Baxter says of himself: "Till at last, being by my sickness cast far from home, where I had no book but my Bible, I set to study the truth from thence, and so, by the blessing of God, discovered more in one week than I had done before in seventeen years' reading, hearing, and wrangling." To which add Bengel's maxims: *Te totum applica ad textum; rem totam applica ad te.* And again: "More extraordinary proof there is not, of the truth and validity of Holy Scripture, and all its contents of narratives, doctrines, promises, and threatenings, than Holy Scripture itself. Truth constrains our acquiescence; I recognize the handwriting of a friend, even though the carrier does not tell me from whom he brings a letter. The sun is made visible, not by any other heavenly bodies, still less by a torch, but by itself; albeit the blind man apprehends it not."

The hive of books on interpretation and religious philosophy, in our day, is the German press. Great readers among the younger clergy seem ashamed not to have an acquaintance with these. The question is frequently asked, whether a knowledge of the German language is a necessary or highly important part of ministerial accomplishment. If the ministry at large be regarded, we hesitate not a moment to reply that it is not. There are other attainments far more valuable. Some men indeed, called to lead in theological instruction, to publish expository works, and to wage controversies, may well apply themselves to this medium of knowledge; and as no one can predict what shall be his future vocation in these respects, violence is not to be done to the impulses of Providence, which draw and urge the young student to this field; as Cārey was attracted to Eastern philology, while yet a shoemaker. Such exempt cases, however, cannot be made the basis of a general rule. So far as exegesis is concerned, with its preparations and cognate branches, all that is indispensable in German literature is regularly transferred into English. Much even of

this is impure, seductive, and utterly false; and he may regard his lot as happy, who finds no duty summoning him to meddle with such a farrago. In respect to theology, properly so called, and the philosophy of religion, we know of no single German work which the young minister may not do without. Even those which are orthodox are only approximations to a system of truth from which the theologians of that country have been sliding away; gleams of convalescence in a sick-room, which was almost the chamber of death; laboured vindications of what none among us doubt; or refutations of heresies which happily have not invaded our part of Christendom. Why should the parish minister in New Jersey or Wisconsin toil through the thirty volumes which have been educed by Strauss's portentous theory? Why should he mystify himself by labouring among the profound treatises which show that God is personal, or that there is such a thing as sin? And why should he wear himself out in mastering a theosophic, metaphysic hypothesis, which has exploded by the expansion of its own gases, before the volume has been brought to his hands? All that we have written about the infelicity of living in a tainted atmosphere, has its application here. Upon many a brilliant book from abroad, we may write, as did the great Arnauld upon the fly-leaf of his Malebranche, *Pulchra, nova, falsa.* After some observation, we cannot recall a single instance of one who has become a more effective preacher, by addicting himself to the modern authors of Germany.

Keeping in view the great importance of being something more than a warehouse for other men's thoughts, the earnest minister will early seek the art of original meditation. To himself he will sometimes appear to be making little progress; perhaps even to be walking over his own circular track. But thinking over the same trains is not useless, if one so thinks them over as to secure truth. Novelty is the last object which a wise inquirer will seek. We may be sneered at for the suggestion, but we hold it a wise purpose *quieta non movere*, and till cause be shown, to rest on settled positions. As we did not discover the tenets which we profess, but were taught them, so we may hold them, till maintenance be denial of Scripture reasons. In meditation on these truths, we may so conduct the process

as to revise and correct definitions and notions; to secure just connection of arguments; to change the order of the same; to reject useless steps; to supply chasms; to reassure the memory, and thus to have materials for daily thinking, even by the way, in the crowded street, or in the saddle. We may thus be carrying on the entire column of truths into the regions of further discovery.

When in pursuing theological lucubrations, the student finds himself advancing by cautious deduction from known truths, he has this special safeguard, that such deductions correct previous errors and confirm previous truths; the former by startling us with manifest falsehood—the *reductio ad absurdum*—the latter by arriving anew at familiar truths, or truths consistent with former truths, or inconsistent with the denial of former truths. Or the same may be thus expressed: Every advance in true reasoning adds confirmation to the general system. These are good reasons for studying sometimes without books; a great attainment which some eminent scholars never make in a whole lifetime.

It is, we trust, impossible for any so far to mistake our drift as to suppose that we utter a caveat against reading, or even against extensive reading. Books are and must continue to be the great channels of knowledge, and fertilizing stimulants of the mind. But we would have the young preacher not to look on them as the sheaves of harvest. Great importance attaches itself to sound views of the place which human compositions occupy in mental training. Crude, immature learners regard their courses of reading, especially when rare and diversified, as so much ultimate gain; as furnishing propositions to be remembered, and as the material of future systems; and according to their quickness and tenacity of memory, they exercise themselves to reproduce the contents of favourite authors, in their very sequence, if not in their very words. But the same persons, if destined for anything greater than slavish repeaters, soon arrive at the discovery, that a day of multifarious reading needs to be followed by an evening of reflection, in order to conduce to any progress. And let it be observed, as a curious phenomenon of thought, that these subsequent reflections are not the reproduction or re-arrangement

of notions gathered during previous study. This is useful and encouraging in the premeditation of sermons. It is even possible that none of the foregoing propositions reappear in their modified shape; the mind may work on a track entirely new. This part of the process ought to be well marked. What has been gained is not so much information as discipline; the training of the athlete before contention. Yet the previous reading, indeed all previous reading, is felt to have tended somehow towards the favourable result. This is to be accounted for by several reasons. The powers have been stimulated; thus we manure the ground, in order to crops. In addition to this, the generalizing faculty rises to wider statements, and laws, for which the particulars of the discursive reading have furnished the instances. And further, the analogy of things read suggests new resemblances and opens new trains. But for all this there is no room, where the reading is perpetual, so as to become the only mode of study. Even where the mind, after converse with books, is put upon original activity, care must be taken that these later trains of thought are in the direction of what is useful, and above all of what is divine. The best flights of the preacher's meditation are those with which he is indulged after copious perusal of the simple word of God.

While many will assent to the general correctness of these statements, few, we apprehend, will consent to put them into practice, in the earlier years of mental training; and with some, the faulty methods of these years become the habit of life. But where a man belongs to the class of productive minds, he will spontaneously seek retirement and self-recollection, after the laborious reading of some years. Whether he write or speak, he will do so from his own stores. It is true that much of what he so writes and speaks will be the result of long intimacy with other minds, but not in the way of rehearsal or quotation. Wise and happy quotation adds beauty and strength; but the general truth holds, that the highest order of minds is not given to abundant citation, except where the very question is one which craves authorities. Masculine thinkers utter the results of erudition, rather than erudition itself. For why should a man be so careful to

remember what other men have said? Of all that he has read for years, much if not most, as to its original form has irrevocably slipped away; and it is well that it is so, as the mind would else become a garret of unmanageable lumber. The mind is not a store or magazine, but partly a sieve, which lets go the refuse, and partly an alembic, which distils the "fifth essence." The book-learning of any moderate reader, even if not increased, would afford material for this process. The lust of novelty betrays some young preachers into a feverish thirst for new reading, in the course of which they scour the fields for every antithetic pungency, and every brilliant expression. For fear of commonplaces, they forbear to give utterance to those great, plain, simple, everlasting propositions, which after all are the main stones in the wall of truth. The preacher errs grievously, who shuns to announce obvious and familiar things, if only they be true and seasonable and logically knit into the contexture. The most momentous sayings are simple; or rather, as Daniel Webster once said, "All great things are simple."

In hours of discipline, it would not be unprofitable for the student to make it his rule, every day, to bring freshly before his mind some solid truth, and if possible some new one; but rather the solid than the new. Let him fix the truth in his mind, as something founded, and immovable. Let him proceed to deduce other truths, but with caution. Let him abjure haste and dread paradox. Let him humbly strive to ascend to the highest principles. And let him be more concerned about the laws of thought, than the matter of knowledge. In a word, let him think for himself.

This last advice sometimes works noxious results on a certain class of minds. As given from the desk, without explanation, it is just indeed, but often nugatory. Original and independent thinking is one of the last attainments of discipline. The novice does not know how to go about it. He cannot say, "I will now proceed to generate a thought, which neither I nor others ever had before." The ludicrous attempt is most likely to be made by the Icarus or the Phæthon, of least strength and skill. Whole classes of youth, under famous teachers, have sometimes been stimulated into rash speculation and

innovating boldness, by the abuse of this very counsel. It is necessary therefore to qualify and guard it. All the beginnings of knowledge proceed upon a principle of imitation. Not more truly do we learn to speak and to write, by following a copy, than we learn to investigate and to reason, by imitating the processes of others. Something of this must pertain to the whole preliminary stage of development. But by degrees, the native powers fledge themselves for a more adventurous flight. And when such beginnings are made, and the young thinker is animated with the desire of expatiating for himself, it is prudent that he should consider the nature of the procedure, or how the mind orders itself in original thinking. Briefly then, most of our effort concerns the faculty of attention. We must look steadily in the direction of the dawning thought, as we look eastward for the sunrising. We can often do no more than hold the mind fixed. When Sir Isaac Newton was asked how he effected his vast discoveries, he replied, "By thinking continually unto them." Hence the preacher, who earnestly searches for truths to be uttered in God's house, will often feel himself reduced to a posture of soul which seems passive. Thought is not engendered by violent paroxysms of conscious invention; any more than a lost coin or a lost sheep is found by running hither and thither in a fury of pragmatical anxiety. Let the wise thinker seat himself, and eschew vexing, plaguing cogitations. Those are not the best thoughts which are wrung out with knitted brows. Something must be conceded to the spontaneity of thinking. We do not so much create the stream, as watch it, and to a certain degree direct it. This is perhaps the reason why great thinkers do not wear themselves out; but often attain longevity. It is not meditation which weakens and distempers clerical students, so much as long sitting at the desk, and unrestrained indulgence at the table. Placid easy philosophizing is one of the delights of life and is fruitful. It may be carried on in gardens, on horseback, at the seaside, amidst pedestrian excursions. It is the testimony of Malthus, who says: "I think that the better half, and much the most agreeable one, of the pleasures of the mind, is best enjoyed while one is upon one's legs." In thinking, we may discreetly let the thread drop at times; it will

beyond doubt be found again at the right moment. Interruptions thus do good, and secure repose which might not otherwise be taken. Especially converse with other minds, on subjects of present interest, is among the most useful means of suggestion and correction, as it regards our own researches. And what is true of living friends, is no less true of good books; in their proper place, they afford invaluable helps to our original inquiries.

As a single example, but that the most important, of what we mean by the use of good books, as auxiliary to private thinking, we select works on systematic theology, either such as give a conspectus of the whole, or such as more largely discuss particular topics. These profess to give the classified results of biblical investigation. To the production of these systems, either in the head, in the sermon, or in the printed book, all exegetical research is subsidiary. Fondness for these will be very much in proportion to the strength, clearness, and harmonious action of the intellect. No man can be said to know anything truly, which he does not know systematically. Every mind, even the loosest, tends naturally to methodize its acquisitions; much of every man's study consists in referring new truths to the proper class in his mental arrangement; every man has his system, good or bad, and every sermon is, so far as it goes, a body of divinity. But the great minds of theology have made this their favourite department; and none can commune with them constantly without catching a portion of their energy, and learning somewhat of their art. Melancthon, Calvin, Chamier, Turrettine, Owen, and Edwards, are companions who will teach a man to think, and strengthen him to preach. When studies are miscellaneous and desultory, there is the more reason for employing frequent perusal of scientific arrangements, in order to give unity to the varied acquisitions. As a good parallel, we may mention that the late Judge Washington was accustomed to read over Blackstone's Commentaries once a year. This, however, was not enough for a genuine blackletter lawyer. "Find time," said Lord Chancellor Eldon, "to read Coke on Littleton, again and again. If it be toil and labour to you, and it will be so, think as I do, when I am climbing up to Swyer or Westhill, that the world

will be before you when the toil is over; for so the Law will be if you make yourself complete master of that book. At present lawyers are made good cheap, by learning law from Blackstone and less elegant compilers; depend upon it, men so bred will never be lawyers, (though they may be barristers,) whatever they may call themselves. I read Coke on Littleton through, the other day, when I was out of office; and when I was a student, I abridged it." Our candid judgment is, that writers such as we intend belong chiefly to a former period of Reformed theology. And we have had a pleasurable surprise, in finding the same judgment expressed by the late Dr. Pye Smith, who has been so often quoted as favourable to German divines, with whose works he had a thorough acquaintance. "Perhaps," says he, "the very best theological writings that ever the world beheld,—next to the sacred fountains themselves,—are the Latin works of foreign divines who have flourished since the period of the Reformation. It is no extravagance to affirm, that all the toil and labour of acquiring a masterly acquaintance with the Latin tongue would be richly recompensed by the attainment of this single object, an ability to read and profit by those admirable authors."*

But the great incitement, as well as the true pabulum of thought is to be derived from the Scriptures. It is happy for a student when he finds that his most animated inquiries are over the word of God. This is a study which secures the right posture of mind, not only for calm judgment, but even for discovery. Here is the touchstone which detects the alloy of error. Here only we find positive conclusions which are indubitable. The sacred writings are a moral discipline, and promote holy states which are favourable to the apprehension and belief of truth. No one can fully estimate how much they prevent frivolous and aimless reasonings, by keeping the mind constantly in the presence of the greatest objects. The attainments here made belong to real knowledge; and thus we have returned to the principal topic, which we discussed in the opening of these remarks.

What has been urged in the foregoing paragraphs, will, as

* "First Series of Christian Theology," p. 7. London, 1854.

we are fully aware, be little inviting to many an ambitious scholar. Genuine love of truth is not universal. Great numbers even of good men labour for knowledge of the vehicle; books, citations, masters, authority, learning as distinct from science. This has its subsidiary value, like the study of words; but as an end, it belongs to inferior minds. The tendency may be detected by its shibboleths; the talk of such scholars is altogether of verbal definitions, *sedes quæstionum*, debates, controversial results, treatises, formularies, the bibliography of subjects. We would not undervalue these things, when kept among instruments. But this sort of research affords only knowledge to tell and to be talked of, to get benefit by; ambitious knowledge, anything but knowledge for itself. The quality of such attainment is inferior; it is shell, husk, integument. It is not fixed and permanent, but resting too much in words, being lost if the words be changed. Men of this school are presently gravelled, if pushed back a step or two, out of their authors and formulas, into the nature of things. Such a one will be found rehearsing formulas, or slightly varying them. The evil is fostered by setting inordinate value on mere reading, and by giving the rein to literary curiosity. Take a weak mind and inflate it with books, and you produce a pitiable theologian. Every one can recall some bookish man who is at the same time shallow. His glory is in citation. Where there is no determinate judgment, great knowledge tends only to vacillation, debility, concession when pressed, and frequent change of opinion. The entire mental furniture of such a scholar is a kind of nominalism. He is a treasury of arbitrary distinctions, classifications, common-places. His questions are, Who has said it? Who has opposed it? Where is it found? How expressed? This is the history of truth, rather than truth itself. Except in the sense of remembering, this person can scarcely be said to think without a book in his hand. We see to what extremes this sort of cortical or formal knowledge may run, in the case of Jewish scholars, Masorites, and second-rate papists. All is textual. The disposition is encouraged by what university-men call *cramming*, and by all undigested learning.

It is possible that in our zeal to brand a prevalent evil, we

have dwelt too much on the negative side. For there is another kind of knowledge, and another ministerial discipline. We sometimes find it in unlearned men; and always in those men in whom ponderous erudition has not smothered the native powers; such were Augustine, Calvin, Bacon, Owen, Horsley, and Foster. The learned man who comes to this, comes to it through and beyond his learning. He attains to the "clear ideas" of Locke. By patient thinking he disentangles the body of truth from its lettered and pictured integuments, of authority, treatise and phrase. Perhaps a long period has been necessary, in order to learn terms, and read the tenets of other men; and here many rest, though genius sometimes shortens this period. But true science is not tied to certain phrases. The theologian, above all men, should possess insight. It should not be said of him, *Hæret in cortice.* The matter is not helped when weak but adventurous minds fly away from received formulas: the received formula may contain truth; the new formula may be as blindly and slavishly repeated as the old. The difference lies deeper than this. There is a discipline of mind which leads to genuine knowledge; which does not exclude erudition, but works through it to something higher. It is utterly remote from the idle musings of sundry, who absurdly boast that they are always thinking, but never read. It trains the mental eye to look through diction to essential truth; by which habit the student's notions become his own, and when afterwards expressed, however simply, bear the stamp of originality. It conduces to sincere thirst for truth, as truth, in disregard of fame, of authority, of men, and of consequences; and is therefore opposed to sectarian fire, bigotry, worship of masters, and pedantry. It ceases to swim with corks, and breaks away from the shallows of mere memory and rhetoric. Strength of judgment and firmness of conviction are its results. The mind thus taught does not allow doubts concerning unsettled things to agitate the foundation of things already proved, but maintains its conquests, and leaves no unprotected fortress in the rear. Such is the rare but attainable discipline, which we would covet for every minister of the word.

There is strong inducement to order one's studies in the way

here recommended, in the further consideration, that it leads directly to every good quality in the great work of preaching. The average of any man's sermons will be as the character of his general thinking. A good discourse is not so much the product of the week's preparation, as of the whole antecedent studies and discipline; it flows not from the pitcher, but the deep well. Hence that celebrated preacher spake a weighty thing, who on being asked how long it took him to make a certain sermon, replied, "About twenty years."

The subject commends itself to a class, who constitute the strength of our American Church; we mean the rural clergy, dispersed through the length and breadth of the land, often in small parishes. The history both of England and of New England will evince, that some of the profoundest thinkers have become such in precisely these circumstances. It is a vulgar error to suppose that city pastors are in the most favourable situation for mental culture. Their labours are great, their public and executive duties are many, their interruptions are vexatious, and hence their time, especially for prolonged reflection, is little at their own disposal. No man can be so happily placed for mental culture as the pastor of a retired country parish. He may pursue the uninterrupted studies, which formed a Bochart, a Philip Henry, an Edwards, and a Dwight. Even worldly observers have looked with envy on such a seclusion.

The entire current of our remark has presupposed that the studies of the young pastor are sacred and biblical. Instances occur of clergymen who have devoted their strength to secular literature and science. Cardinal Wiseman, in his later series of Essays, delivers some severe blows at those Anglican dignitaries whose chief laurels have been won in mathematics, natural history, and the minute criticism of Greek plays. A well-known clergyman of our own country is remembered only as a consummate botanist. Such men are contributors to the stock of general knowledge, but they are scarcely to be accounted faithful to the imperative demands of an age and country like our own. "Our office," says Cecil, "is the most laborious in the world. The mind must be always on the stretch, to acquire wisdom and grace, and to communicate them to all who come

near. It is well, indeed, when a clergyman of genius and learning devotes himself to the publication of classics and works of literature, if he cannot be prevailed to turn his genius and learning to a more important end. Enter into this kind of society—what do you hear? 'Have you seen the new edition of Sophocles?'—'No! is a new edition of Sophocles undertaken?'—and this makes up the conversation, and these are the ends of men who by profession should win souls. I received a most useful hint from Dr. Bacon, then Father of the University, when I was at college. I used frequently to visit him at his living, near Oxford. He would say to me, 'What are you doing? what are your studies?'—'I am reading so and so.'—'You are quite wrong. When I was young, I could turn any piece of Hebrew into Greek verse with ease. But when I came into this parish, and had to teach ignorant people, I was wholly at a loss; I had no furniture. Study chiefly what you can turn to good account in your future life.'" To which may be added the remark of a profound observer, Dr. Witherspoon: "It is, in my opinion, not any honour to a minister to be very famous in any branch that is wholly unconnected with theology."* We cite these eminent authorities, in the full persuasion that they are not opposed to the most thorough acquaintance with worldly learning and philosophy as subsidiary to the defence and exposition of the gospel. But these are not so to usurp the time and heart, as to make the Christian minister distinctively a man of science or letters. And we admit, also, a valid exception in favour of such collateral pursuits as are for recreation, in the intervals of labour.

Valuable authorship has in every period of the Church been found among the parochial ministry. This should be borne in mind by the young pastor, in expectation of the day when he shall act upon Lord Bacon's oft quoted adage, that every man owes a debt to his own profession. New generations of men demand new books, even upon old subjects. No works of the pen are more honourable than those which disclose a sincere interest in the good of one's countrymen, and a desire to apply scriptural principles to national emergencies. Questions of

* Works, vol. iv. p. 19.

true philanthropy continue to be safest in the hands of Christ's ministers. At the same time, the ordinary topics of theology and morals invite the attention of all whose hearts God hath touched, even though they dwell remote from city or college.

If we had not already trespassed on the reader's patience, we should take pleasure in examining the question how far the authorship of the Christian Church has resided among the working pastors. Let us say without fear of contradiction, the great and useful works of religious literature have not proceeded exclusively from professional *savans*, scholars or university-men. The inquiry is a curious one, what causes have operated to give the preponderance in literary production sometimes to one and sometimes to the other class. It may be for the encouragement of diffident scholars, in distant and straitened fields, that some of the greatest productions of human genius have issued from retirement and poverty. Wealth has seldom stimulated to aught above the caprices of literature. The conditions of authorship, as shared between professors and private scholars, engaged the acute mind of the father of Political Economy; whose remarks are worthy of all attention. Speaking of Europe, he observes, that where church-benefices are generally moderate, a university-chair will have the preference. In the opposite case, the Church will draw from the universities the most eminent men of letters. It is declared by Voltaire, that Father Porrée, a Jesuit of no great eminence in the republic of letters, was the only professor they had ever had in France whose works were worth the reading. The same remark is applicable to other Roman Catholic countries. After the Church of Rome, the Church of England is by far the best endowed in Christendom. In England, accordingly, says Smith, the Church is continually draining the universities of all their best and ablest members; and an old college tutor, who is known and distinguished in Europe as an eminent man of letters, is as rarely to be found there as in any Roman Catholic country. "In Geneva, on the contrary, in the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, in the Protestant countries of Germany, in Holland, in Scotland, in Sweden, and Denmark, the most eminent men of letters whom those countries have produced, have, not all indeed, but the

far greater part of them, been professors in universities. In those countries, the universities are continually draining the Church of all its most eminent men of letters."* These remarks have an application to the authorship of America, which we are compelled to leave to the reader's own mind.

But this whole subject of authorship is only incidental, and these remarks have trickled from the pen almost beyond our purpose. Even though the Christian pastor should never send a line to the press, he is continually engaged in literary production, and in a most important species of publication. There is no agency in the world which is more operative upon society than the faithful preaching of the gospel; there is none which demands more study, discipline, and wisdom. Hence every man who comprehends the greatness of his vocation will recognize the motives to unwearied exertion in the task of self-control, mental activity, and devoted inquiry after truth.

ART. II.—*The Plan and Purpose of the Patriarchal History.*

ONE of the faults imputed by the modern, and especially the German critics, to the older schools of biblical interpretation, is the habit of neglecting the specific primary design of the several books of Scripture, and the class of readers for whom they were immediately intended, and from whose character and wants their peculiarities of form and structure often flow directly. In avoiding this extreme, the later writers often run into the opposite, by fanciful hypotheses and extravagant refinements; but this does not invalidate the truth of the fact which they allege, or detract from the importance of the general principle which they lay down, to wit, that no book of the Bible can be fully or correctly understood without a due regard to its original and primary design, and to the readers more immediately addressed. The assumption of such primary

* Wealth of Nations, book v. chap. i.

design is not at all at variance with the supposition, that all the inspired writings were intended for permanent and universal use; as appears from the canonical reception and perpetuation of epistles addressed in the first instance to single churches, or church officers, or even private members. If in these cases we are authorized and bound to have regard to the primary design of the composition, there is nothing *a priori* to forbid the assumption of such a design in the other parts of Scripture. That such an assumption is not only allowable, but absolutely necessary to a complete and satisfactory interpretation, may be best shown by means of a particular example; and we know of none better suited to this end, or more interesting in itself, than that afforded by the book of Genesis.

This radical or fundamental part of the Old Testament has often been expounded, and perhaps is usually read, as if it were a desultory journal of events recorded at the time of their occurrence, and intended merely to preserve their memory for its own sake, or to satisfy a vague curiosity, without regard to any more specific purpose, or a view to any definite immediate influence on any particular class of readers. To this inert and superficial view of its design and origin may be attributed without injustice not a few of the jejune interpretations to which the book has been subjected, and not a little of the ill-disguised indifference with which a large proportion of its contents is regarded by the great mass even of believing readers.

The truth of this suggestion may be easily tested by observing the immediate change effected in the aspect of the book to any reader, even prior to detailed investigation, by a simple recollection of the fact which we shall here assume as true, and which is really among the most notorious in literary history, that the book which, after the example of the Seventy, is commonly called *Genesis*, (or Generation,) as containing the *origines* of all authentic history, was composed by Moses, to prepare the chosen people for the complicated system under which they were to live for ages, and more immediately to solve certain questions, which would almost necessarily present themselves, in reference to their condition in the land of Egypt, and the causes by which it was produced. These could only be

explained by exhibiting the history of the chosen race from the beginning of its separate existence; and this exhibition could be rendered intelligible only by carrying it back to the primitive condition of mankind, and indeed to the creation. This view of the first part of the history, as simply introductory to that of the ancient Church, relieves some of the difficulties which arise from the assumption that it was designed to answer scientific or even general historical purposes. The Mosaic Cosmogony is simply introductory to the creation and original condition of man; and this again to the account of the fall; and this to the Protevangelium, or first promise of a Saviour, with its prophetical distinction of the race into two hostile and antagonistic parties, of which Christ and Satan are the heads and representatives. The character and destiny of these two parties forms the subject of all subsequent religious history, beginning with the contrast presented in the family of Adam, between Cain as the despiser, and Abel as the receiver, of the appointed method of salvation, already symbolized by animal oblations. When this experiment, as some have called it, was brought abruptly to an end by letting a corrupted nature work out its effects without control, it was immediately renewed by substituting Seth* for Abel, and then exhibiting the same contrast as before, but on a vastly larger scale, extending through a long series of generations and of ages, until brought to a conclusion, not as in the first case, by brute force, but by a process of moral deterioration, terminating in an actual assimilation and amalgamation of the representative races, and a consequent corruption of the whole earth, which could only be corrected and avenged by a catastrophe like that of the universal deluge, winding up and closing the first great period of human history, and more especially the history of what may, in a wide but not improper sense, be called the "Church before the Flood."

This special reference to the immediate purpose of the book is no less clear in the second great division of the history, or what may be described as the Noachic period, or, viewed in its

* The very name means *substitution.*

relations to the chosen race, the history of the "Church after the Flood." The new world, which emerged, as it were, from the submersion of the old, to be repeopled by the sons of Noah; the unique historical position occupied by Noah himself, as a second father of mankind; the new covenant and promise to the race through him; the special promise to the family of Shem; the early interruption of the history by human crimes and errors; the division of the earth; the confusion of tongues; the origin of despotisms, hostile nationalities, and false religions; the declension even of the chosen race from its original integrity, requiring for the execution of the divine purpose a fresh segregation from the body of that race itself;—these, which are the main points of the history in the second scene or period, all derive their value and their title to a place in this brief but most authoritative record, from their bearing on the end for which the whole book was written, from their serving to explain the extraordinary relative position of the Hebrews with respect to other nations, as the obvious result of causes long in operation, determined and controlled by a divine plan, partially disclosed from the beginning.

But all this, comprehended in the first eleven chapters of the book of Genesis, is merely introductory to the body of the history, contained in the remainder of the book, and exhibiting, with far more minuteness of detail than was admissible before, the third great phase of human progress, corresponding to the "Church of the Patriarchs," or, to use more general terms, the patriarchal period of primeval history.*

This period extends from the migration of Abram into Canaan, to the migration of Israel into Egypt, or more exactly, to the commencement of the series of events which led to that migration, and which cannot well be separated from it. The period, therefore, may be properly considered as terminating where the history of Joseph begins, and as coextensive with that part of Genesis from the twelfth to the thirty-sixth chapters, both inclusive—a period, in round numbers, of about two centuries. Of this extensive and eventful period the de-

* Some German writers, followed by Fairbairn in his Typology, apply the term Patriarchal to the whole ante-Mosaic history; but this is a less convenient designation, as well as less familiar to the English reader.

tailed facts are already familiar to our readers, or accessible in Scripture. All that we can here attempt is either the solution of particular difficulties, which present themselves in no small number, or the presentation of such general views as may serve to place the whole in its true light, and the several parts in their mutual relation. As we have only space for one of these points, and scarcely that, we have no hesitation in preferring the latter, for two reasons; first, because it admits of being made more interesting in a brief survey; and secondly, because correct general views afford a key to the solution of particular difficulties, whereas the converse of this proposition is not true. It will appear, we trust, as we proceed, that some familiar cavils in relation to this part of sacred history, are indirectly but effectually silenced by a simple statement of its plan and purpose. To ascertain this plan and purpose is the chief end which we have in view.

We shall assume it as no longer to be questioned, even by the skeptical interpreter, that Genesis is not a series of detached and independent documents, mechanically strung together by the hand of a compiler,* much less a farrago of heterogeneous fragments accidentally combined—but a bona fide history, most carefully constructed, and with constant reference to a specific purpose. As to this last point, we may cite the strong expressions of a contemporary German writer, among the highest philological authorities of his age and nation, who, though not a believer in the proper inspiration of the book, nor even in the truth of all its historical details, does not scruple to affirm that, of all historical works, ancient or modern, there is not one in which the selection and arrangement of the matter is so constantly and evidently regulated by one dominant idea.† This concession is fatal to the extravagant hypothesis before referred to, and a severe rebuke to the

* This does not exclude the supposition, in behalf of which there is a great deal to be said, that the book contains documents far older than the time of Moses, handed down by oral or written tradition in the patriarchal church, and finally incorporated, by divine authority, in this inspired history; a supposition not to be confounded with the infidel hypothesis of subsequent interpolations.

† Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel. The value of this testimony is enhanced, rather than impaired, by the author's own extravagant hypothesis as to the composition of the Pentateuch.

unworthy views which even some believing writers entertain of the inspired record, as entirely destitute of all scientific or literary merit, when considered as a specimen of historiography. It may also prompt us to inquire, with increased curiosity and interest, what the writer's "dominant idea" is. It is here that the errors, which have been already stated, with respect to the design of the whole book, more particularly show themselves, namely, in application to the history of the patriarchs. It is necessary, therefore, to a just view of the subject, that some false assumptions, which have served to disfigure and obscure the history, should be distinctly set aside. Some of these are so decidedly infidel in origin and spirit, that they might be safely suffered to pass *sub silentio*, but for the fact that they have found their way into English books, and are sometimes unexpectedly encountered even among unlearned readers. It is better therefore to afford the means of refutation or solution than to let them operate unchecked by ignoring their existence.

The first is the idea that the patriarchs were mere nomadic chieftains, like the Bedouin Arabs, and that the germ or essence of their history is just such as might be furnished by the lives of thousands, but embellished and exaggerated into a historical romance, that is to say, an interesting narrative founded on fact, but adorned, to an indefinite extent, by the imagination of the writer. This is the very lowest view of the patriarchal history, consistent with its unity and definite relation to some end or purpose. Besides its infidel rejection of whatever happens to transcend our own experience as of course fictitious, it leads necessarily to an extreme extenuation and belittling of whatever elevation there is either in the characters or the events. On this hypothesis, the scale of everything recorded must be so reduced as to comport with the idea, that we have before us nothing more than the biography of certain wandering shepherds, written in a style of oriental exaggeration. The effects of this extravagant assumption are as bad in point of taste as they are incompatible with our ideas of religious truth, and contradictory to the overwhelming evidence in favour of the whole book, as being not only authentic but inspired of God. It has therefore been held only by a class of

writers as devoid of true taste as of true religion, and is now very commonly abandoned, even among unbelievers. Some, however, who would be ashamed to hold it in its grossest form, attempt to reconcile it with good taste and common sense by a slight modification, which only serves to make it more incredible, without in the least rendering it more attractive. This is the notion, that the lives of the patriarchs are not historical at all, nor even meant to be so regarded, but a poetical description of pastoral life, akin to the Eclogues and Bucolics of the Greeks and Romans. Without attempting to point out the other obvious absurdities of this hypothesis, it is sufficiently exploded by the fact, that so large a part of the pretended pastoral is occupied with dry details of chronology and genealogy. What would Virgil or Theocritus have thought of such an idyl as the tenth or thirty-sixth of Genesis? Under both its forms, the theory in question, which denies to the patriarchal history any higher end than that of entertainment, is now generally laughed at.

From this, by a kind of reaction which is constantly recurring in the history of opinion, has arisen a hypothesis no less extravagant, though morally far less objectionable, as it has no necessary tendency to fritter away or pare down all that is grand and striking in the history. This is the opinion that the history of the patriarchs is strictly true, but not in its most obvious and proper sense, as a piece of individual biography, but rather as the history of races and great revolutions, clothed in the disguise of personal adventure and domestic incidents. According to this notion, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not the names of real individual men, but ideal types and representatives of certain classes, principles, or races. The writers who maintain this strange position account for the origin of such a history by supposing that a few vague traditions of the early ages which had reached the time of Moses, were brought by him or others into this shape, for the purpose of filling up a chasm in history, and making the record of the old world similar in form to that of which authentic memorials were extant.

This hypothesis, like the one first mentioned, has been modified, but so as essentially to change its character, by making

the patriarchal history to be not a mere embodying of old traditions in the form of personal biography, but a deliberate invention, founded upon subsequent events, and intended to account for them. The motive or design of the invention is supposed to have been that of glorifying Israel at the expense of other nations, and especially of those most near akin, and therefore rivals. Hence, it is said, the Moabites and Ammonites, as hated neighbours of the Jews, are traced to an incestuous origin; the Edomites, with whom the Israelites were constantly at war, are represented as the offspring of the wicked Cain; the extermination of the Canaanites is justified by making their remote progenitor the object of a special curse. Hence too the rite of circumcision is made the seal of a divine command and covenant; the institution of tithes is recommended by the example of Melchizedek and Abraham; the sanctity of Mount Moriah, where the temple stood, is traced back to the sacrifice of Isaac; and so of many other salient points in the patriarchal or primeval history.

If this doctrine needs to be refuted, it may be effected by two simple arguments. The first is, that the actual structure of the history does not agree with the alleged design. Not only might the book be read a thousand times without suspecting its existence; but a writer who had wit enough to use such an artifice must have had wit enough to make it more effective, by denying the relationship of Moab, Ammon, and Edom, altogether, and by suppressing all that is humiliating to the pride of Israel in the history of his origin and progress as a nation, or in the character and conduct of the patriarchs.

The other reason is, that such a theory may be applied, with equal probability, to every other history in existence, and being demonstrably false in a thousand other cases, is not very likely to hold good in this. It is the common law of logic, that an argument which proves too much proves too little; much more must one that proves everything prove nothing. The detailed proofs under this head we might leave to the memory or reflection of the reader; but it may not be superfluous to give a single illustration, drawn from our own history, and therefore furnishing a surer, or at least a more impressive test of truth and falsehood than if sought at a remoter

distance. Let us suppose then that a future critic of our national history—and if a German, so much the better—should insist upon the strong improbability that such a Revolution should have been occasioned by a cause so trifling as the stamp act or the tax on tea, and should therefore represent these as symbolical myths, suggested by the rivalry of England and America, at a later period, in the tea-trade with China, and by the disputes respecting an international copy-right. These positions, though notoriously false, would admit of being far more plausibly defended than the favourite postulates of Strauss or Baur. Such a writer would of course find it easy to go further, and represent Washington as an unnatural, impossible character, yet highly significant and appropriate as a generic type of republican and patriotic virtues. It is plain that this ingenious child's play might be carried on *ad infinitum;* and this very facility of endless extension and universal application deprives it of all force, as a proof that the imaginary process was a real one, or that the stream of history flows upwards from its estuary to its source. In spite of such sophistical refinements, the common sense of mankind will still cleave to the lesson taught by all experience and analogy, that primeval history must deal with individualities, and that myths, whether popular or philosophical, can only be obtained from these by generalizing combinations.

From the strained and artificial figments of this theory, or rather whimsey, it is natural to seek relief in the old familiar doctrine, that the patriarchal history was recorded for the moral improvement of mankind, by furnishing examples of virtue and vice, with their appropriate rewards and punishments. Here we may breathe more freely, as we feel that we are passing from infidel to Christian ground. We may also rest assured, at once and *a priori*, that this theory, unlike the bubbles which we have been blowing, contains an element of solid truth. It is none the less certain, however, that considered as an exclusive and exhaustive explanation of the end for which the history was written, it must be rejected as decisively, though not so contemptuously, as the others.

The first objection to this popular and favourite opinion, which prevails especially among the pious and believing, but

unlearned and superficial class of readers, is, that the whole structure of the record and the choice of its materials are as really at variance with this supposition as they are with that of a romance or pastoral. The personal narratives are far too few and meager, and the space occupied by genealogy and other unedifying matter far too large, to admit of our regarding this as the exclusive end, or even as the chief end of the composition. That it has this incidental use and purpose, is no more than may be said, in different degrees, of every human history; but the marked peculiarities just mentioned show conclusively that, be the secondary use and purpose what it may, the chief and direct end must be something else. Had the immediate design of Moses been to teach his brethren general principles of morals, or the specific duties of religion, and to illustrate these by the events of patriarchal history, it must be clear to every sensible, unbiassed reader, that the facts would have been differently chosen in the first place, and in the next place differently framed and put together.

But besides the objections to this theory arising from the meagerness of the record, and the unedifying nature of a part of its contents, there is a still more serious objection in the fact, that it has led to great abuses and perversions of the Scripture, in relation to the character and conduct of the patriarchs and those with whom they are contrasted or compared. Supposing these to be recorded as examples of a good and evil character, the reader is naturally tempted to exalt the one and to depreciate the other, without any definite or certain limit. We find accordingly in writers and preachers who adopt this method, a habitual propensity to justify or explain away every appearance of a fault in the conduct of the patriarchs; a process which in many cases is effected only by a forced interpretation of the narrative itself, or by a still more dangerous tampering with the principles of morals. The true solution of the patriarchal sins recorded often without any direct censure, is afforded by the fact, too often overlooked, and tacitly denied by the hypothesis in question, that the great theme, even of the patriarchal history, is not the patriarchs, but God himself, the execution of his purposes, with which they are only, as it were, accidentally connected, and their

lives recorded, not as models, but as instruments, employed in the development and realization of a plan, with which they were themselves but partially acquainted. This will be rendered clearer by a more direct and positive statement, for which the way is now prepared, of the real plan and purpose of the history.

Bearing in mind, then, that the book was written to prepare the ancient Church or chosen people for their covenant relation to Jehovah and the onerous restrictions of the law of Moses, the specific ends included in this general one may be described as follows; and the test of their correctness will be found in their serving or failing to explain why such and such events have been recorded, and a multitude of others, in themselves perhaps no less important, buried in oblivion. The complete explanation is of course not afforded by any one of the designs about to be enumerated, but by all together; that is to say, if the insertion of a fact may be accounted for by any one of these designs, though not referable to any of the others, the historian is thereby freed from the imputation of an arbitrary and unmeaning choice of his materials.

The first and main design of the patriarchal history was to teach the Israelites of the Mosaic age, that the segregation of a single race, to be the trustees or depositaries of an exclusive revelation, was no new thing, but had been going on for ages, not only in purpose but in act, the promise and command becoming constantly more clear and definite, and the lines of demarcation more distinct and closer together.

In the second place, it was designed to show that this designation of a chosen people was not merely theoretical or nominal, but proved to be real by manifest tokens of the divine presence and protection, often granted to them at the expense of others, either for their punishment and extirpation, or to lead them to acknowledge the prerogatives of God's peculiar people. Here we have an example of the way in which correct general views afford a key to perplexing difficulties of detail. Nothing has given rise to greater cavil than the frequent divine interpositions in the patriarchal history, and often under circumstances where to us they might appear superfluous. Now nothing can be less adapted to relieve this

difficulty than the course which some believing writers have adopted, namely, that of extenuating all that seems to be miraculous, or, if possible, explaining it away, as if the admission of anything supernatural were at best a necessary evil. But this apologetic method, and the difficulty which it undertakes to solve, are swept away together by the simple assumption, that one main design of the patriarchal history was to show the presence of Jehovah with his people—not his gracious or his providential presence merely—but his special and extraordinary presence, so that if the history could really be purged of its miraculous or supernatural element, it would lose one of the strongest proofs of its being what it claims to be. And this remark extends, not only to miracle and prophecy, but to the theophanies or divine appearances in human form, and to all those cases of familiar intercourse between God and the patriarchs, which infidels repudiate as incredible, and which some Christian writers labour to get rid of, by explaining them as oriental figures of speech, or as representations suited to the infant stage of human progress.

The two features which have been described as characteristic of the patriarchal history, would naturally operate on human weakness and corruption as a source of pride. To counteract this tendency, the history is so framed, in the third place, as to hold up in the clearest and the strongest light the absolute sovereignty of the divine choice, and its entire independence of all meritorious claim, not only in the original object, but in any or in all of his successors. To this end it was absolutely necessary that the intrinsic weakness and corruption of the chosen vessels should be clearly seen, and that the providential process which controlled them should plainly appear to have been independent of their own choice, and often in direct opposition to their cherished wishes. In illustration of this last point, we can only make a reference in passing to the singular and otherwise mysterious fact, that the hopes of Abraham respecting Ishmael, the hopes of Isaac with respect to Esau, and the hopes of Jacob with respect to Joseph, were all entirely disappointed, so far as the spiritual birthright and prophetical pre-eminence were concerned. Here, again, the very statement of the general design sweeps away, on one side, all objec-

tions founded on the moral unworthiness of those so highly favoured, and, on the other, shows the inexpediency of trying to explain away or palliate unduly that unworthiness, because such efforts, if successful, would defeat one great end of the history, and of the series of events which it records. At the same time, it is so constructed as to guard against the cavil, that extraordinary favour shown to objects so unworthy, is a virtual connivance at their sins, by visibly connecting those sins with retributive judgments, so that the worst trials of the patriarchs and those allied to them, may be distinctly traced to those very errors, which proved them to be in themselves unworthy of the honours that distinguished them. This may be represented as a third design, distinctly kept in view throughout the history, to wit, that of showing that the patriarchs were favoured, not because of their transgressions, but in spite of them, and not for their own sakes, but for a far higher purpose.

But notwithstanding these correctives, there was still a danger that the chosen people, although well aware that they had no claims upon God, might learn to look upon themselves as intrinsically better than the other nations, from whom they had been set apart, and as therefore entitled to a permanent precedence and superiority. The possibility of such an error is evinced not only by the later history of ancient Israel, but by its actual existence, at this moment, in the minds of all unconverted, and of some professedly converted Jews. Now, one of the highest, and, as it seems to us, most obvious designs of the whole history, is to stifle this absurd and odious presumption, and to keep the people constantly in mind that their separation was not only independent of all merit in themselves, but meant to serve a temporary purpose, and not only reconcilable with the salvation of the Gentiles, but designed expressly to promote it and prepare the way for it; in other words, that the direct revelation of the truth was taken from the nations only to be given back to them in greater fulness and with happier results than if they had not lost it.

Here again a just view of the purpose of the history, even when stated in its vaguest form, disposes of a whole class of objections, not so common among us as among foreign skep-

tics, yet now and then imbibed and reproduced by their American and English copyists; to wit, those founded on the seeming inconsistency between the wideness of the patriarchal promises, and the exclusive institutions of the law. This is even made an argument by some to disprove the Mosaic origin of Genesis, because the author of a system so exclusive could not have recorded prophecies and promises so free and ecumenical. But if it should appear that the restrictions were intended to continue only for a time, and as necessary means for the fulfilment of those earlier predictions; and if the later history of Israel demonstrates their inveterate propensity to lose sight of the end for which they existed as a nation; and if it is reasonable to suppose that this abuse would in some way be provided for in revelation; then the seeming inconsistency in question is a real, though an incidental proof of authenticity.

The way in which this object is provided for, is by continually spreading out before the reader the great map of human history, tracing all nations to a common origin, and showing how the lines of their descent are ever crossing one another. In this way, two great objects are constantly presented; first, the littleness of Israel among the nations, and the consequent greatness of the divine favour which had so distinguished them; and secondly, the bonds which still connected them with other races, and especially with those whose contiguity to Palestine was likely to engender special jealousy, and lead to frequent actual collisions. Here, again, a whole class of objections disappears at once, to wit, those founded on the minute genealogies, not only of the chosen race itself, which might have been accounted for by reference to the expected birth of the Messiah, but of those from which it had been violently severed. Thus viewed, the recorded genealogies of these exscinded branches are exponents of a very different feeling from that of national antipathy; for they ought to have reminded the more favoured race, that after all, Moab and Ammon were the sons of Lot, Ishmael of Abraham, and Esau of Isaac.

It is scarcely necessary to observe, that this view of the subject does not at all forbid the supposition that the genealogies, as well as other features of the patriarchal history, were intended to promote collateral and minor ends; a supposition

which in fact confirms the historical character of the relation, by stamping it more distinctly with the clearest indications of design.

Besides the great moral and religious uses which may thus be traced throughout the patriarchal history, there are others which are not so obvious, and may seem intrinsically less important, but are no less real, and connect it no less closely with the other books. Such is the seeming intention of the writer to prepare the people for the onerous restrictions of the law, by showing that some of them belonged, at least in their principle and germ, to the religion of an earlier age. Such too is the still more obvious intention to familiarize their minds with certain definite localities, to which a more religious interest was afterwards to be attached. The specification of collateral and secondary purposes might easily be multiplied, but with the hazard of obscuring and confusing those predominant designs which have been already stated.

With respect to these, it will not be denied that, if they really exist, they tend not only to establish the unity of the history, and thereby to corroborate the other proofs of authenticity, but also to dispose of many cavils and objections, not by empirical excision of the branches, but by total extirpation of the root. The only question is, what right or reason have we to assume the existence of these several designs, any more than that of others, which have been rejected as supposititious? The answer is, because the latter are paradoxical assumptions *a priori*, contradicting all analogy, and making the confusion often charged upon the record worse confounded; while the former are obtained by an analytical induction from the history itself, and tend confessedly to bring its parts into mutual agreement, and to harmonize the whole with what precedes and follows. Assume that the writer merely wrote for the amusement or amazement of his readers—or that he changed a mass of vague traditions into a concrete and circumstantial history—or that he fabricated persons and occurrences, to suit the course of subsequent events—or even that he simply aimed at moral or religious edification, and you are met at every step by difficulties not to be surmounted—or by facts irreconcilable with the supposed design. But only take for granted—what

is certainly no less intrinsically credible—that Moses wrote this book, by divine direction, to prepare the people for his legislation, and to guard against the errors into which they were perpetually falling afterwards—and all is clear; the parts succeed each other in a natural, intelligible order; the selection of materials explains itself; and the reader becomes conscious of that undefinable but not unreal sense of intellectual ease, which ever accompanies a clear perception of an author's general drift, as well as of his meaning in particular expressions.

Art. III.—*Exegesis of Heb.* vi. 4–8.

The exegetical importance and interest of this passage are not so great as the historical and doctrinal. It is this passage, a rigid interpretation of which is said to have induced the Montanists, the Novatians, and afterwards the Donatists, to refuse admission to the church to the *lapsed*, that is, to those who had in any way become guilty of idolatry, adultery, or murder. Since Spanheim and Wetstein, and latterly mainly through the influence of Hug, the opinion has gained currency that the Latin Church, whose treatment of the lapsed was a more lenient one, as the opposing schismatics quoted this to them irrefragable scriptural authority in support of their own manner of proceeding, was led by this interpretation, which was so much at variance with the other teachings of Paul, to deny first the Pauline authorship, then the apostolicity, and consequently the canonicity of this Epistle, whilst (say the advocates of this opinion) the Greek Church not being involved in the controversy of this practical question, and hence more moderate, because not blinded by the heat of the contest, adopted a different exegesis of the passage from that current in the West. When the Latin Church receded afterwards from this strict interpretation, which made the passage refer to true Christians, they also received this Epistle as canonical. This theory, however, confessedly got up to account for the

doubt that overhangs the authorship of this Epistle, is opposed by most modern writers of note, (Tholuck, Bleek,) and by Davidson in his Introduction, vol. iii. Still there is less of mere hypothesis, and more of verisimilitude about this assumption than in that of Storr, whose supposition was that Marcion having been excommunicated in Pontus and gone to Rome, in the hope of being admitted to church membership there, when he found that the Church of Rome was also very strict against the lapsed, mainly appealing to this passage, denied that this was Paul's doctrine, because the epistle had been written (said he) by Barnabas, who was of a Judaizing tendency. (Gal. ii. 13.) Thus, Storr says, the report arose in the Western Church that Barnabas, and not Paul, was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Luther also, as he interpreted this passage as treating of true Christians, or rather because he understood the writer to maintain that repentance was impossible to those who sin after baptism, doubted the canonicity of this Epistle. Among modern theologians, those who acknowledge a canon at all, have mostly interpreted this passage in such a manner as to make it agree with their general system.

As to this *interpretation* itself, among the ancients who rendered φωτίζειν by "baptize," many were led to delay baptism until a late period of life, as they understood παραπίπτειν to include *any* grievous sin. The Romanists who follow the traditional interpretation, maintain that sin after baptism forfeits grace, which, however, can be restored by the sacrament of penance. Those Anglicans who, with any logical consistency, hold to baptismal regeneration, but not to the doctrine that penance is a sacrament by which forgiveness can be secured, maintain that should baptized persons fall into any grievous sin, especially a second time, there is no certainty of forgiveness. All that remains, in this case, is the baptism of tears, and the galling chain of doubt; the fallen cannot appropriate again what was given plenarily in baptism. Among Protestants, there can really be but two interpretations, (as far as relates to the scope and doctrine of the passage as a whole,) that of the Calvinists, and that of their opponents; of those who hold to the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, and those

who deny it. Lutherans and Arminians teach that the terms used apply to regenerate persons only, and that these are pronounced liable to fall. Calvinists maintain that the "analogy of faith" teaches plainly the saints' perseverance, and that this passage cannot contradict that doctrine; hence the language, strong as it is, cannot apply to the elect, none of whom, being all given to Christ, can be lost. There is, however, a class of Calvinistic theologians who feel constrained, by the force of the terms used, to apply them to true Christians, and to avoid the unscriptural and illogical doctrine, "*renatos labi posse*," which is moreover false in psychology and reason, they adopt various expedients. Some lay special stress on the fact that παραπεσόντας implies a *condition;* this, they say, can never happen in reality. Others endeavour to weaken the force of ἀδύνατον; still others prop their theory by the fact that ἀναχαινίζειν is in the active voice. The last two, being a matter of pure exegesis, will be spoken of in their proper place. Those who maintain that the sacred writer makes a statement involving an hypothesis of what is impossible, generally refer for a parallel to the case of Paul's shipwreck, where he knows that the ship's company will be saved, and yet he tells the soldiers that unless the crew remain in the vessel, they cannot be saved. But

1. This passage furnishes neither parallel nor explanation. God had revealed his purpose that all should be saved; this purpose the inspired apostle had announced; but knowing that in the divine mind end and means are purposed together, he was, as all men are, bound to use all lawful means to preserve life, the revealed will of God, and not his purpose, being the rule of human action. Such a distinction, however, cannot be applied in an inspired epistle, without express intimation to that purpose.

2. The doubt and inconsistency, and the wavering application of those who adopt this theory, at once suggest suspicion in regard to its tenability. For such men as Owen, Doddridge, Dwight, Gray, and others, whilst they suggest this expedient, yet feel its weakness so much that they will at the same time endeavour to weaken the force of ἀδύνατον, or try to lean

against ἀναχαινίζειν, or even here and there imply that it is not true Christians that are described.

3. The writer's subsequent illustration is taken from a reality, and the strong presumption is, that the thing illustrated is real, and not merely hypothetical.

4. There would be no force in the passage on this assumption. The writer had told the Hebrews that he would not be detained with the elements of Christian doctrine, and exhorts them to go on to perfection, adding, "*if* (ἐάνπερ) *God permit.*" Why? is the question that arises in the reader's mind—is there any danger of his not permitting?—Yes, answers the Apostle, standing still in religious attainments is just as impossible as in other things; if you do not advance, you slide back, and are in danger of entire apostasy, and this is the worst that can befal you; *for* (γάρ) persons with such and such experience and privileges, yet falling away, have forfeited their salvation. This is plain reality, not an imaginary case. Should he show so much concern to prevent what he knew could not occur?

5. As for the illustrations and analogies which such writers as Stuart and Barnes *e. g.* adduce, they are all inept; they all imply the possibility, and not the impossibility, of the thing dreaded. It were preposterous to offer motives in order to dissuade persons from falling over a precipice, who were in a condition which made such a fall impossible.

The whole passage is doubtless parallel with that in chapter x., where the writer speaks of men who have forfeited the only sacrifice for sin because they sin *wilfully* after having received the knowledge of the truth; they have trodden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and have done despite unto the Spirit of grace. The difficulty of this passage is due to the imperfection of human language, which is so poor in expressions to designate inward and spiritual things. Picturing them by images taken from the things of sense, it remains at the surface, and Christians, both in common life and in Scripture, are addressed and spoken of according to their outward character and profession, and not according to their inward state. We need hardly urge with Owen, that if truly regenerate persons had been meant,

much stronger, definite, and decisive terms might have been used; but we say that if the Scriptures were teaching the doctrine of "falling from grace," these terms doubtless might designate true Christians; but as they, in numerous and plain passages, teach the opposite doctrine, these terms apply to such as are true Christians only in appearance. They refer to that class of persons who have a real knowledge of the gospel plan of salvation, perceive the goodness and grace of God in pardoning sinners, make splendid professions, have gifts almost like apostles, have doubtless large experiences, and that sometimes for a considerable length of time. All the means of salvation they have made use of—objectively, not subjectively; but in the last, great, decisive conflict they have succumbed, chosen self instead of God; they never have truly experienced the regenerating, converting, and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit; they make finally utter shipwreck of their faith, blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and thus become guilty of the unpardonable sin.

This view is favoured

1. By the fact that every expression in the passage, taken by itself, or in its connection, easily admits of this interpretation, as will be seen below.

2. This assumption best suits the context which requires the possibility of the falling away.

3. By the testimony of observation; the history of the Church abundantly testifies to the truth of this interpretation, as well as to the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints.

The charge of perverting the sense of this passage comes with a very bad grace from those who apply the rack and the wheel to those numerous and most unequivocal passages in the writings of John, and other parts of Scripture, in order to torture them out of the plain asseveration of the doctrine of final perseverance.

As to the language and the style of this passage, they partake of all the peculiarities of this epistle generally; in addition to this, however, the diction of these verses is elevated, sonorous, and rhythmical. Tholuck says that parts of dochmiac verses can be pointed out, which, however, is not saying much. Complete and perfect dochmiacs are: τὲ τῆς δωρεᾶς, (ἀ-) γίου

καὶ καλόν, τε μέλλοντος αἰ (-ῶνος), ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱ (-όν), ἐκείνοις δι' οὗς, θεοῦ ἐκφέρου (-σα), (κατ-) ἄρας ἐγγὺς ἧς.

Literally translated, the passage reads as follows:

"For again to renew to repentance those once enlightened, and having tasted of the gift, the heavenly (one), and having become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and having relished as good God's word and the powers of the future age, and having fallen away, recrucifying to themselves and pillorying the Son of God, is impossible. For land that has drunk the frequent rain coming down upon it, and bearing proper vegetation for those on whose account it is also tilled, partakes of blessing from God; but producing thorns and briars, it is reprobate and near to a curse, whose end is burning."

In the exegesis, the order of the original will be followed.

V. 4. *Ἀδύνατον* is the predicate of the sentence of which *ἀναχαινίζειν* is the subject. For emphasis it is placed first. The Itala, Cardinal Hugo, Clarius, Jeremy Taylor, (On the Effect of Repentance,) Heinrichs, Ernesti, Dindorf, Storr, Kuinöl, Bloomfield, and others, render it "*difficult;*" they refer to Mark x. 27; Acts xiv. 8; Rom. viii. 3, xv. 1. It is difficult to see how the passage in Mark and the parallel passages support this interpretation, for Christ, in the plainest terms, says, "What is *impossible* with men, is *possible* with God;" *difficult* is not the opposite of *possible!* In Acts xiv. 8, the *impotent* man in Lystra is spoken of, *ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν*; this does not mean, he could only walk with *difficulty;* on the contrary, it says plainly, *οὐδέποτε περιεπάτησεν.* The use of the word in Rom. xv. 1, is parallel to this. In Rom. viii. 3, the *impossibility* of salvation by the law is spoken of: *τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου*; this is not the *difficulty* of salvation by the law! The only other passages where the word occurs in the New Testament are Heb. vi. 18, x. 4, xi. 6, in all of which it is undeniably "*impossible;*" and this is its only usage in the classical writers. Another mode of evading the force of the word is to supply "for men," "for us, Christian teachers," "for me the Apostle," so implying that with God it was not impossible. This mode is adopted by Ambrose, (De pœnitentia,) the Schmids, Le Clerc, Limborch, Schöttgen, Baumgarten, Bengel, and others, and for a purely exegetical reason also by De Wette. But this is entirely gra-

tuitous; and besides, if the writer is made to say that it was impossible for him to renew men of *such* a character, the implication would be that he *could* renew men of different character, which is entirely unscriptural. The notion that the use of this word is due to a rhetorical exaggeration, needs no special refutation. There can be no doctrinal objection to the rendering "*impossible;*" for the impossibility of restoration is not due to any want of efficacy in Christ's atonement, nor to any want of power on the part of the Holy Spirit, nor to any want of benevolence in God, but merely to God's eternal purpose; it is *impossible* according to that; it is impossible in the ordinary condition of the divine arrangement in the Gospel scheme.

γάρ, of course, constitutes the connexion with what precedes, introducing what follows as its reason. What that preceding conclusion is, has been disputed. Owen, Stuart, Turner, and the large majority of interpreters, refer it to the first clause of v. 3, "And this will we do;" the desperate condition of apostates is the reason for the necessity of progress in Christian attainments. There seems to be something wanting in this view of the connection of the clauses, and the second clause with its weighty ἐάνπερ, where ἐάν would seem to have been sufficient, is a mere expletive. Ernesti's view is peculiar; he takes the whole passage, iv. 15–vi. 3, to be an explanation of the first part of iv. 14, and here at vi. 4 is given the reason for the last clause of that verse, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. This is exceedingly unnatural, and the idea contained in that clause occurs with far more force in the immediately preceding context; he has not been followed by many. The objection just made lies equally strong against the connection proposed by Cameron with iv. 1. Kuinöl refers γάρ to no passage at all, but to the writer's unexpressed apprehension that the Hebrews might apostatize. This is too difficult of discovery to be right. Whitby, Newcomb, De Wette, and others connect it with μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι: if that were necessary, it would imply that you were near apostatizing, and apostates cannot be renewed again. This, however, is not as natural as the connection pointed out by Abresch and Ebrard, namely with the clause immediately preceding, for the reason given above. We must leave the first principles, and endeavour to make higher attainments; we must

do this at once, ἐάνπερ, if indeed it be not already too late; it depends altogether on the long-suffering of God, for &c.

τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας· The accusatives in the sentence are the objects of ἀνακαινίζειν. Of the various divisions possible of the different characteristics given here of the persons intended, *that* seems to be the most natural which is pointed out by the discriminating use of the Greek connectives καί and τέ. The former connects and separates the broader features, to which the minor, subordinate or co-ordinate traits are appended or attached by the latter, so that the persons alluded to are designated by three characteristics, in which Bengel finds respectively the gift of the Son, the gift of the Spirit, and a gift from the Father; Tholuck a parallel to Paul's triad of faith, charity, hope: 1, illumination and reception by faith of the bread of life, the heavenly gift; 2, participation of the Holy Spirit, the principle of the Christian life; 3, experience of the precious promises for the future, and the influences exerted by the sure expectation of a joyful eternity.—ἅπαξ in opposition to πάλιν, v. 6, *once;* once ought to have been sufficient. The same use of the word is observed in the other passages where it occurs in this epistle, eight times, more than in the rest of the New Testament altogether, (Bleek.) Owen takes this ἅπαξ together with the other participles in verses 4, 5. φωτίζειν is a word of the later Greek; there would be no difference of opinion in regard to its meaning, but for the fact that the word was employed at an early period to denote baptism; hence the Peshito renders the phrase, ܕܢܚܬܘ ܚܕܐ ܙܒܢ ܠܡܥܡܘܕܝܬܐ "who have once come to baptism," and this interpretation is followed by the Fathers, and all the Romish interpreters, and even by Ernesti, Michaelis, Burton, and others. But it cannot be shown that this was the meaning of the word at the time of the apostles, still less that this is its meaning in this passage. Drusius maintains that it means *non tantùm baptizare, sed etiam docere.* The LXX. and Aquila sometimes render יָרָה (to instruct) by φωτίζειν. Hence the vast majority of interpreters since the Reformation, (for instance, Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Schlichting, Limborch, Owen, Bengel, Dindorf, Stuart, Tholuck, Scott, Bleek, Barnes, Schaff, [Sünde wider den Heiligen Geist,] McKeen, [Biblical Repository, 1842,] Bloomfield, De Wette, Ebrard, Turner, and others,)

render it "enlightened," properly instructed in the true nature of the Gospel. It may even mean spiritual illumination; for there are various degrees of it, short of the full beaming forth of the light from God's reconciled countenance.—Closely connected with this, as its consequence or an attending circumstance, is the following clause,

γευσαμένους τε· This does not merely mean *to taste*, in the sense of sipping, touching with the lips, in opposition to enjoying. When the Greek writers wish to express that idea, they generally add *χείλεσιν ἄχροις*; but it means *to experience;* as the previous clause employs the figure of *one* of the organs of sensation, so this employs another. Such expressions as, ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious; taste and see that the Lord is good; to taste death,—abundantly illustrate the usage of this verb.

τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου· Interpreters differ as to what is meant by this *heavenly gift.* Calmet, Owen, (referring to Acts ii. 33,) Lardner, (Letter on the Logos,) and Scott, make the following clause epexegetical of this. Ernesti refers to Acts viii. 20, where the Holy Ghost is called *the gift of God.* Turner refers to Christ's conversation with the Samaritan woman, where he speaks of the living water which he would *give*, and understands 'the heavenly gift' to mean the ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Bishop Hopkins, McLean, Doddridge, and others, maintain that it means the extraordinary gifts alone, which unregenerate men might receive. Dindorf, Döderlein, Kuinöl, Stuart—the professed blessings or privileges of the gospel. Schmid, Bengel, McKeen—Christ. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others—forgiveness of sins. Grotius, Schlichting, and others—peace of conscience. Primasius, Estius, Michaelis—the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Pareus—faith. Klee—regeneration. Schaff—salvation generally. De Wette refers to the 'free gift' spoken of by Paul, *the gift of grace.* Le Clerc, Abresch, Dindorf make *τῆς* = *ταύτης*, the gift being the same as the *φωτισμός* of the previous clause. This is needless; and we may, (with Bleek, Tholuck, and others,) on account of the close connection by means of *τέ*, understand by it *the knowledge of the truth*, as

depending and consequent on illumination. It is *ἐπουράνιος* because given by God, and not found out by man.

καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας· *μετόχους* is one of the words which critics adduce who deny the Pauline authorship of this epistle; it occurs five times in this epistle, but never in the other epistles of Paul. *γενηθέντας* is a Hellenism for *γενομένους*.

πνεύματος ἁγίου· Le Clerc, Grotius, Lardner, Whitby, Stuart, and others, would limit this to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; but there is nothing in the context to warrant this. This attempt, as well as the inference of Anti-Calvinists, that regenerate persons alone can here be alluded to, as they are said to be partakers of the Holy Spirit, arises from a false view of the Spirit's influences. Just as the influence of evil spirits is not confined to the children of darkness, but makes itself felt constantly in the bosom of the children of God as long as they are in the flesh, just so the Holy Spirit's influences are not confined to the elect alone, but in a certain measure are common to all men; in a higher measure they are common to most men; in a still higher to many men; and in a yet more powerful degree, still short of regeneration and sanctification, to subjects such as are here spoken of. It must be remembered that every thought and emotion that is good in any way, in whose heart soever it arise, is due to the almighty Spirit of God. That there is such a difference of degree in the participation of the Holy Spirit, is plain from the fact that, although Christ had breathed on his disciples, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," yet this was followed by that signal pouring out of the same Spirit on the day of Pentecost; whilst in Christ doubtless the Spirit dwelt without measure, in unlimited fulness. (See John iii. 34.)

V. 5. *καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα.* The first question that arises is, why the accusative is here connected with *γευσαμένους*; the classical writers always use the genitive with this verb. The fact that later writers connected it with the accusative also, accounts for this, that the accusative *could* be used here, but not why it *was* used, seeing that in the previous verse the genitive was used. Most interpreters pass this over in silence. Bengel and Vater endeavour to account for it in this way—the genitive is partitive; for the heavenly gift, which,

according to their interpretation, is Christ, is not entirely exhausted in this life, for we shall enjoy Christ's presence in heaven; whilst the preached word of God belongs entirely to this life. A less fanciful and simpler reason is suggested by Böhme and Bleek: the construction with the genitive would cause some inelegance, if not obscurity, in this clause, as all the nouns would be in the genitive, and of *καλοῦ* e. g. it might be doubtful whether it belonged to *θεοῦ* or to *ῥήματος*. By "*the good word of God*," most interpreters (Theodoret, Grotius, Schlichting, Limborch, Kuinöl, Stuart, De Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Turner, and others) understand the fulfilment in some degree of the gracious promises made by God in the Gospel; they refer for equivalent expressions in the Old Testament to Josh. xxi. 45, xxiii. 14, 15. In Jer. xxix. 10, the Lord says: "I will perform *my good word* toward you:" comp. xxxiii. 14. Michaelis understands specifically the promise of the Holy Ghost; Calvin and Braun, the gospel, (*καλόν*) as distinguished from the law in its severity; Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, the doctrine of God generally; Bleek, curiously, a personified attribute of God. If *ῥῆμα* is to be taken in the sense of "promise," then it is an instance of the peculiarity of this epistle, to use hebraizing terms whilst there are more expressive ones in Greek. But in all these interpretations the strangely prominent and emphatic position of *καλόν* is entirely overlooked; this seems to forbid the idea that *καλόν* should be merely an attribute; the rendering of Cappellus (*quàm bonum sit et salutare evangelium*) and of Ernesti (*suavitatem evangelii*) suggests the true rendering above given: the word of God by which his children are fed (Matt. iv. 4) has been tasted by them, and found to be good; they have experienced the fulfilment to be all that the promise had led them to expect.

δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. This again is closely joined to the preceding phrase by *τέ*, the accusative still depending on *γευσαμένους*. There is great confusion and great diversity of opinion among interpreters as to the meaning of this phrase, although primarily they seem to diverge in but two directions, some taking *μέλλων αἰών* literally as "the future world," others as a translation of the Rabbinical עוֹלָם הַבָּא, the Messianic age, and hence *the Christian dispensation*. Rhenferd has written

a large treatise to show that it does not mean the Christian dispensation, (*De phrasi Graeca ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων* in Meuschen's Novum Testamentum ex Talmude illustratum;) but neither he nor Witsius (in his Dissertatio de seculo hoc et futuro) has settled the matter. Davidson (Introd. iii. p. 246) contents himself with the naked dictum, It means *the future world.* Henry, Scott, and others, vaguely—desires of heaven and dread of hell. Böhme confines it to the second advent. But the majority of interpreters understand by it the Christian dispensation, and by the whole phrase either its energetic influences and appliances, (Barnes, Turner, and others,) or the spiritual powers belonging to the new dispensation, which as to its perfect development is future, but begins in the kingdom of God upon earth, (Bleek and others); or the miracles wrought by the Apostles and other believers, and which believers tasted by being their objects, or merely witnesses, (Photius, Wittich, Braun, Sykes, Owen, De Wette, and others.) Stuart distinguishes this phrase from the previous one, *μετόχους πνεύματος ἁγίου*, by making the former refer to the special gifts and influences of the Spirit bestowed in general upon the primitive disciples, the latter particularly to miracles of the highest order. McKeen—whatever in that world is powerful, either in reality, or in influence. The view of this passage, however, will be clearer, if we hold fast the distinction pointed out above between the use of *καί* and *τέ*; if this is founded in truth, then the two clauses of this verse stand in the same relation to one another as the first two clauses of v. 4. In using the expression *καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα*, the דָּבָר טוֹב אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה of the Old Testament prophets, the promise of deliverance from the enemy, the oppressor, and typically from sin, the writer has placed himself on Old Testament ground, and can with propriety denominate the Christian dispensation *μέλλων αἰών*; in this age the *ῥῆμα* has become *δυνάμεις*, (in its peculiar New Testament usage,) the *wonders* of Redemption, not merely objectively, as Cameron explains it—the wonderful mysteries of Christ's Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and Union with the Church—but these truths appropriated subjectively, and producing their several appropriate effects upon the soul and in the heart; and thus Grotius seems to be very near the truth when he takes

this clause to be the exegesis of the previous one. The strange rendering of Tertullian, *occidente jam aevo*, has been accounted for by the assumption of a false lection in his MS.

V. 6. *Καὶ παραπεσόντας.* With a striking and startling simplicity of style, this participle is made to close the enumeration, connected with it by a mere *καί*, which some versions have not been able to improve by the addition of some adversative particle. The suddenness with which this solemn, weighty word is made to wind up a delineation which might have been justly expected to terminate in a totally opposite manner, has the effect, upon the mind of the reader, of a flash of lightning from a serene sky. The verb occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The LXX. sometimes render מָעַל (to act treacherously), by it. The force of the preposition *παρά* in verbs with a figurative acceptation, is more easily exemplified than explained; it corresponds with the English *for-* (the German prefix *ver-*) in such words as *forlorn*, *forsaken*, *forsworn* (which might be *παρόμνυμι*, if there were such a verb; but there is not, Liddell and Scott to the contrary notwithstanding), *forbidden*, *forgiven*, *forgotten*, etc.; so *παρομολογέω* to grant, i. e. treacherously; *παράγω* to seduce (the German *verleiten*), similarly *παρακρούω*; *παροράω versehen; παρακούω* to hear wrong; *παραγινώσκω* to decide wrong; *παραγλύφω* to counterfeit; *παραγράφω* to interpolate; Epictetus calls a spurious Christian a *παραβαπτιστής*; so that the force of this word is not exhausted by the simple notion of *sinning grievously*, (Montanists, Novatians, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Luther, Bellarmine, all Catholic interpreters, and many others), nor does it mean specifically a *relapse* (Stuart and others), but an utter, final, irretrievable lapse, whether this be to Judaism, Paganism, any system of anti-christian or unchristian philosophy, scepticism, or that state so much akin to that of demons, when a man with cool deliberation says, with the poet's Richard III.:

"I am determined to prove a villain!"

The expression doubtless finds its exegesis in ch. x. 26: "we sin *wilfully*," especially in v. 29, and also in iii. 12, where the "evil heart of unbelief" is said to consist "in *departing* from the living God."

πάλιν ἀναιναινίζειν. The Peshito, Erasmus, Michaelis, and others, connect πάλιν with παραπεσόντας, which, however, is grammatically inadmissible, since, if such a connection were intended, πάλιν would have preceded the participle. The motive for this connection is doubtless the apparent pleonasm which it forms with ἀναιναινίζειν, which Grotius and many others assume to exist, although they do not connect thus; but there are so many examples of verbs compounded with ἀνά taking πάλιν, (see Stephanus' Thesaurus, Abresch, Dindorf, Bleek, and others),—Isocrates e. g. has the very expression πάλιν ἀναεκαινισμένης—that with Beza, Bengel, De Wette, and others, the *re*novation, in a wide sense, comprehending the predicates of the previous verses, must be assumed to have taken place, and that the writer means that it cannot take place "a second time," as the Syriac version renders the preposition alone. This verb also has afforded material to the impugners of the Pauline authorship of the epistle, since it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and Paul always uses ἀναιναινόω, itself neither used by the classical writers, nor by the LXX. According to the strict rules of rhetoric, the word ἀναιναινίζειν destroys the image suggested by παραπεσόντας; ἀνάγειν, ἀναστρέφειν, or some such word might have been expected; but the language designating the internal processes of spiritual life and religious truths generally, being *all* figurative, the outward form of the inward truth, the husk, the shell, composed of a material that is material, may and must be perishable, and hence it is of the least possible importance, provided it has served to convey the inner kernel, the substance, which must germinate and live.—There are many, as has been noticed above, who would lay stress on the use of the active voice of this verb, to modify the meaning of the whole passage. Some go so far as to make the preceding accusatives the subject, and supply ἑαυτούς as the object of this verb. It is sufficient to observe that this violence done to the grammar by no means helps to establish their doctrine as in conformity with truth: to suppose that men of such a character cannot renew themselves, implies that men of a different character could, which is entirely unscriptural.—The answer to those who would supply a subject to ἀναιναινίζειν, such as "Christian teachers," "I

the writer," "men," etc., has already been suggested: If men cannot renew *these*, the implication is that they can renew others, which again is entirely contrary to Scripture. The attempt of Cardinal Hugo to heighten the significancy of this verb, has of course the effect of lowering the sense of the whole passage; he understands it of the impossibility to be restored again, so as to become like virgins, after a fall. Even in respect of the language there is no difficulty here; the present active infinitive expresses the notion of the verb simply, without any reference whatever to the agent or the object of the action. Nearly all modern languages afford innumerable instances of the use of the infinitive after adjectives or verbs where nobody asks whether it be active or passive, since the notion expressed is really passive, or rather neuter; nor need one seek far in Greek for such instances. When the writer of this epistle says, (v. 11): *ὁ λόγος δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν*, who asks whether *λέγειν* be active or passive? or what matters it whether it be active or passive?—It must be noticed also that the Fathers and the Romish interpreters understand *ἀναχαινίζειν* of baptismal regeneration (*διὰ λούτρου πάλιν ἀναχαινισμός*, Chrysostom) and eventually of baptism, which, of course, is entirely gratuitous.

εἰς μετάνοιαν, so as to result in a change of mind.—Chrysostom says *εἰς* is in place of *ἐν*, and *ἐν* would be a Hebraism for *διά by;* and he is followed by many in all ages, even by Stuart, mainly because they all render *μετάνοια* by *repentance*, and understand this in their narrow dogmatical sense; this, in their systems, always precedes renovation. But the Scriptures use *μετάνοια* in a wider sense, as including that sorrow for sin, for instance, which is the Christian's daily companion.

ἀνασταυροῦντας· Some take the two remaining participles as giving the explanation wherein the apostasy consists, others (A Lapide, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Cramer, and all modern expositors) as the reason of the impossibility. It is the reason, doubtless, (as some paraphrase it, *quippe qui*), and, at the same time, they express that wherein the apostasy, not consists, but results, as the significant change of tense most clearly shows. Cappellus well limits the meaning of *παραπεσόντας* by these two participles; *haec est descriptio casus*, says

he; it is only such an entire lapse which is meant, which consists in the person's crucifying and disgracing the Son of God, or consenting to it.—As this is the only passage in the whole Scriptures where this word occurs, there has been a dispute in regard to its meaning, viz., as to whether the preposition has the force of "again," or is merely a graphic adjunct to the verb, and hence is not translated at all; whether *ἀνα* here means *rursum*, or *sursum*. It is left untranslated by Carpzov, Fisher, Raphel, Abresch, Wetstein, Munthe, Bos, Alberti, Krebs, Ernesti, Dindorf, Mai, Schleussner, Bretschneider, Wahl, Böhme, Barnes, and others. It is rendered by "again" in the Peshito, the Vulgate, by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Photius, Theophylact, Tertullian, Jerome, (*recrucifigentes*), Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Valckenaer, Schulz, Heumann, Heinrichs, Kuinöl, Klee, Tholuck, Schaff, De Wette, Turner, etc. It is true, as Bleek observes, a verb compounded with *ἀνά* may have two meanings of the nature here contended for on different sides, e. g. *ἀναβαίνω*, which means both *to go up*, and *to go back*, and many others. Now the one class of interpreters endeavour to support their opinion by the fact that *ἀνασταυρόω* never occurs in profane writers in the sense of *crucifying again;* but this may be simply because they had no occasion for using a word to express such an idea; whilst the opposite opinion is much favoured by the ancient Greek exegetes, to whom the Greek was still a living language, taking it in that sense. Besides, wherever in the New Testament the idea of crucifying is to be expressed, the simple verb, without a preposition, is always used. The meaning is that such persons are actuated by the same temper and feelings that demanded Christ's cruel and disgraceful death; they consent to his death; they, by their conduct or by their words, show that they approve of Christ's crucifixion; they will not have this man to rule over them.—Those who refer all that precedes to rebaptism, make this clause epexegetical of *ἀναχαινίζειν*. Referring to Rom. vi. 6, they say, as by baptism they were crucified with Jesus, so rebaptism would be a recrucifixion. In a merely spiritual sense, without reference to baptism, Calvin and Beza understand it in the same way.

ἑαυτοῖς is variously explained. Many consider it a Hebraism,

like לָהֶם לָהֶם, and hence pleonastic, or little better: "so far as they are concerned," (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Limborch, Michaelis, Ernesti, Böhme, Stuart, and others): Calvin—*quantum in se est.* A very general acceptation is that of a dative of disadvantage, (Storr, Turner, and many others,) or *in semet-ipsos*, (Tertullian, Vatblé, Braun, Kuinöl, etc.,) by which is meant that they do it to their own disadvantage, as they lose Christ thereby, having possessed him before, (Bleek.) Less likely is the acceptation of a dative of advantage: "for their gratification," (Klee and others); nor is that of Grotius, Schulz, Barnes, and others, more pleasing, who take it to mean—through themselves, as making the act their own, because it really adds nothing to the import of the preceding word. Bengel regards it as the antithesis to *παραδειγματίζοντας*, which has reference to others. Better, perhaps, is the interpretation of Tholuck, who understands it to imply that as the first crucifixion was an outward, public act, so this second is one which they commit by themselves, privately; it is an inward act solely.

τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ sets forth the dignity of the person thus treated.

καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας, a word belonging to the later Greek, occurring only once more in the New Testament, where it is rendered in the authorized version, "making a public example." "The disgrace attendant on the punishment of crucifixion seems to have suggested the word; the public contempt thrown upon religion by apostates is the idea," (Turner.) This solemn and awe-inspiring declaration is rendered still weightier by a familiar but impressive illustration:

V. 7. *γῆ γάρ·* The writer wishes to show his readers how great the danger and how awful the consequences of apostasy are, which apostasy would be apparent, if they were destitute of good fruits, which are legitimately produced from a heart which has experienced the blessings of God's word and Spirit. As land, properly watered, but *also tilled*, (*καὶ γεωργεῖται*,) which brings forth fruits such as are profitable to its possessors, partakes of the divine blessing, *so* that which teems with thorns and briers is subject to the curse and destruction. *Γάρ* being a combination of *γέ* and *ἄρα*, and *γέ* denoting a reason, *ἄρα* an explanation, it has a causal and an epexegetical force. Here

the latter is the prominent notion; but it is unnecessary to render it with Stuart by "now." *Γῆ* is improperly rendered in the English version "*the* earth," probably owing to the use which the translators seem to have made of some Latin version, their dependence on which is easily traceable in very numerous instances. The Latin, of course, having *terra*, may be thus translated; the Greek simply says, *land.*

ἡ πιοῦσα, *such as has drunk in*, *imbibed;* it is again the aorist, whilst the following participles, *τίκτουσα* and *ἐκφόρουσα* are in the present; the absorption of the moisture being considered the principal cause of the production. The earth *drinking* is a very common image, both with sacred and profane writers; everybody remembers Anacreon's *ἡ γῆ μέλαινα πίνει*, Virgil's *sat prata biberunt*, and numerous other instances. The earth thus saturated represents the state of those previously described as so highly favoured. The word itself is not without significancy; the rain does not merely come down upon the land in copious showers, but the land has actually received and appropriated it; it is not stony ground, from which the water runs off without penetrating.

τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις δετόν· αὐτῆς is by far the best established reading, although the Vatican and some other MSS. have *αὐτὴν*, others *αὐτὴ*. The Recepta has *πολλάκις* before *ἐρχόμενον*, and so have the editions of Stephen, the Elzevir edition, Griesbach's and Scholz's, all of which follow the Alexandrian MS., the Cod. Rescr., a MS. of the ninth century in the library of the castle of St. Angelo, one at Moscow, and others. But the Vat. MS., the Cod. Claromontanus, the MS. from the convent of St. Germain in Paris, and other uncial MSS., the Itala, both Syriac, the Coptic, and other versions, and Chrysostom, place it after; and these are followed by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bleek, and other modern critics. The difference is, after all, not great; the one reading speaks of *copious rain falling*, the other of *copiously falling rain.* So it is with the other variation; the genitive (Bengel thinks) denotes more of continuance, whilst the accusative would simply indicate the direction; *ἐρχόμενον* suggests the word of Jesus, John xv. 22: "If I had not *come* and spoken unto them, they had not had sin."

καὶ τίκτουσα, *and bearing*, bringing forth; a very natural figure, frequently applied to the earth; perhaps in antithesis to *ἐκφέρουσα*, in the following verse, as implying the accord with natural law and order.

βοτάνην. The word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The assertion of Stuart that it is a Hebraism for עֵשֶׂב, inasmuch as the Greek word in classical usage means herbage or vegetation, without including corn, does not appear well founded. The word does include all productions of the ground, with the subordinate idea of their still being unripe or ungathered.

εὔθετον ἐκείνοις. *εὔθετος* is a very general term, that may here refer either to seasonableness as to time, or to fitness and usefulness as to kind and quality. It is construed with *πρός*, or *εἰς*, (so in the two other passages where it occurs in the New Testament,) although some (Limborch, Barnes, De Wette, and others) connect it here with *ἐκείνοις*. By far the majority of interpreters make *ἐκείνοις* dependent on *τίκτουσα*; it makes no difference, however, as to the sense.

δι' οὓς· The Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, the English version, E. Schmid, Heinrichs, Ernesti, Dindorf, and others, render this "by whom;" but this is contrary to grammar. Owen somehow unites the two interpretations. The correct rendering is, "on whose account," viz. the proprietors of the soil, (Tertullian, Occumenius, Limborch, Wetstein, Bengel, Stuart, Bleek, De Wette, Turner, Ebrard, and others.)

καὶ γεωργεῖται· The Cod. Claromont., a cursive MS., and many versions, also the English, omit this *καί*. It is variously explained. Some conceive that it intensifies the present tense in *γεωργεῖται*—it is *constantly* tilled. This is not very obvious, and hence rather arbitrary. Tholuck, Bleek, De Wette, perhaps also Erasmus, (*fructum reddendum, non quibuslibet, sed iis quorum operâ culta est terra*,) and Ernesti, (*quidem*,) think it is to correspond with *εὔθετον*—as the land yields its fruit to the proprietors, so it is *likewise* cultivated for them. But this is very flat. The opinion of Schlichting, Hezel, Böhme, Kuinöl, and others, seems better, who think it means that in addition to the ground's being watered, it is *also* (*etiam*, *auch noch*) tilled. The truth is, this *γεωργεῖται* is an important *addition*,

and on that account the writer seems to have added this *καί*. It is a very material ground of difference,—this *καὶ γεωργεῖται*,—between this and the other soil; this *καί*, therefore, serves to draw the attention of the reader to it, and to make it emphatic, as if the writer had said, The land brings forth fruit for its proprietors, that is for those, I must not omit to add, for whom it is *also tilled*. The heavenly gift must be cultivated, in other words. This appears also to be the view of Trench: "The *untended* soil, which yields thorns and briers as its natural harvest, is a permanent type and enduring parable of man's heart, which has been submitted to the same curse, and without a *watchful spiritual husbandry* will as surely put forth *its* briers and *its* thorns." (Notes on the Parables, p. 20.)

μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. The difficulty of accounting for the fact that land which is already blessed in being fruitful, should for this fruitfulness receive blessing, and of telling what this blessing would consist in, has perplexed many interpreters. Some, therefore, (Cappellus, Sykes, Peirce, Michaelis, Semler, Zacharia, Ernesti, and others,) flatten the expression down as meaning, It *appears* to be blessed, its fertility shows it to be blessed, &c. This is very frigid, and corresponds neither with the antithesis in the next verse, nor with the thing symbolized. Some (A Lapide, Estius, Baumgarten, C. F. Schmid,) say, it is blessed in being rendered still more fruitful by the divine beneficence. But this is hardly verified by the facts in nature. To say, as many do, "it is regarded with the divine approbation," is affirming something to be the apostle's meaning which it would be as difficult to verify as to deny; and after all, it would be saying but little, in a solemn manner. Tholuck mysteriously refers to the mutual relation subsisting in Scripture between blessing and fertility, and the curse and sterility. God curses the ground, and it becomes barren, it no longer yields its good fruits spontaneously: the fig-tree does not yield the expected fruit, and it is cursed. But this does not relieve the difficulty. Limborch, Bleek, and others refer to John xv. 2: "Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit." But this interpretation takes it for granted that the *εὐλογία* consists in increased fertility. Still, this last reference, together with the exigencies of the passage,

may lead us to the true interpretation. The same difficulty, the same lack of strict applicability to the subject used for illustration, meets us also in the next verse—*blessing, reprobation, the curse, ultimately burning.* All these are doubtless far less applicable to the figure, the earth, than to the object designed to be illustrated, *man.* We must assume, therefore, as is necessary in so many passages of Scripture, and, in fact, in all earnest, impressive writing, where the substance, and not the form, is the thing uppermost in the writer's mind, that the apostle ceases strictly to adhere to the simile, and uses such expressions as are, indeed, in some degree, applicable to both the figure and the thing signified, yet with a decided and pointed allusion to the latter mainly. Christian experience then amply verifies the doctrine that when the soil of the human heart, amply supplied with showers of refreshing from on high, and cultivated by the deeply-cutting plough of self-examination, carefully weeded from the rank growth shooting up from the remaining seeds of corruption, and diligently guarded against those birds of prey, evil spirits, and those destructive creeping things, darling vices and besetting sins, brings forth the fruits of the Spirit, meet for the Master's use—it "*receiveth blessing from God.*"—It is indifferent whether we connect *ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ* with *εὐλογίας* or with *μεταλαμβάνει.*—The Cod. Claromont., the MS. of St. Germain, and other uncial MSS., John of Damascus and Theophylact, omit *τοῦ.*

V. 8. *ἐκφέρουσα δέ.* The subject of this second clause is not merely *γῆ*, nor *γῆ* (*μὴ*) *πιοῦσα κ.λ.*, as some strangely supply, but *γῆ ἡ πιοῦσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις ὑετόν.* There is no outward, visible difference either in the nature of the soil, or in the watering received. There is no outward, visible difference between true and false members of the Church; they have the same faculties, reason, conscience, and will, they receive the same instructions, and are subject to the same common influences of the Spirit.—Bengel and others insist upon it that *ἐκφέρουσα*, especially as relieved by *δέ*, is chosen to form in itself an antithesis to *τίκτουσα.* This opinion is worthy of consideration, as the Greek interpreters, and also Greek scholars of later times seem to incline to it, (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, A Lapide, Grotius, Wittich, Valckenaer,

Klee, and others).—The copula is wanting in v. 8, the construction, however, is plain enough: as *γῆ τίκτουσα βοτάνην* in v. 7 is the subject and *μεταλαμβάνει* the predicate, so in v. 8 *γῆ ἐκφέρουσα ἀκάνθας* is the subject and *ἀδόκιμος* sc. *ἐστίν* is the predicate. Yet some there are who make *ἀδόκιμος κ.λ.* the subject, and supply *ἐστίν* with *ἐκφέρουσα* to make it equivalent to *ἐκφέρει*; that this, however, is as contrary to the rhetoric as to the design of the passage, needs no demonstration.

ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους, the spontaneous, useless, and hurtful productions of the ground, frequently mentioned together in Scripture; so in the curse pronounced upon the ground, Gen. iii. 18 (LXX).

ἀδόκιμος, sc. *ἐστίν*, which may have been omitted here as well as in the next clause for the sake of the rhythm (Bleek). All the Latin versions render this word by *reproba;* it denotes that which has been tried, and found to be useless. The close allusion to the object symbolized has been pointed out above. This word occurs only in Paul's Epistles.

καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς· The divine curse is obviously meant; *βαβαί*, exclaims Chrysostom, *κόσην ἔχει παραμυθίαν ὁ λόγος!* how much consolation there is even in this severity; he might have said "is cursed," but the Hebrews were to make the application to themselves as far as suitable; therefore the apostle introduces this form of expression to soften the apparent harshness.

ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν· ἧς is referred to *γῆ* by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Primasius, Luther, Carpzov, S. Schmid, Bengel, Kuinöl, Tholuck, and others; but it is evidently more natural to connect it with the nearest antecedent, *κατάρας*; so Erasmus, Calvin, Camerarius, Cramer, C. F. Schmid, Stuart, Bleek, De Wette, and others—the result or effect of the curse is final and utter destruction. Hence *εἰς καῦσιν* is unnecessarily called a Hebraism=*καῦσις*. The sentence is elliptical, and some supply *ἄξει τὴν γῆν*, others *βλέπει*, others *ἔρχεται*; but, as Winer (Grammatik, p. 657) observes, *ἐστί* is entirely sufficient.—The interpreters of this clause have quoted Virgil and Pliny to show that it was a practice in ancient husbandry, and Voss to show that it is still done in Italy and in the South of France, viz., to burn over the stubble on grain-fields to make them

more fertile, and hence Grotius calls this clause a metonymy, as the burning applies only to what is *on* the earth. But here a process of punishment is evidently intended, not one of purgation or improvement. Expositors, therefore, have wandered into all sorts of fancies to throw light on the meaning of this clause. Michaelis thinks a punishment is intended designed to improve; some think, the final burning and purifying of the earth is meant; Baumgarten and Bleek suggest the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrha, (this interpretation already departs from the strict rhetorical requirements of the unity of the figure): Braun, Bengel and others—the destruction of Jerusalem, which was ἐγγύς: Storr, M'Knight, Burton, and others find a drought here. This perplexity, however, is at once removed, as has been intimated above, by observing that the writer does not consider himself bound by the rules of rhetoric, that the sign and the thing signified commingle into one, as it were, and that reprobation, malediction, and final destruction by the consuming element have a much nearer reference to men resembling such barren, ungrateful, disappointing soil, than to the soil itself.

The whole passage teaches—1. That no amount of outward privileges, or inward experiences supersedes the necessity of labouring and watching, lest, after all, we should be cast away.

2. That the best evidence of our calling and election is good fruits, the fruits of the Spirit, inward graces, and outward acts, such as to make the saint, and thus collectively the Church, visible.

3. The necessity of the divine influence in order to salvation. Illumination, the good word of God, the Holy Spirit, all are the gifts of God's grace; these are taken for granted where a man has even the appearance of life.

4. If apostasy causes the irretrievable loss of the soul ("it is *impossible* to renew them again to repentance"), then the soul can be lost for ever, and there is such a thing as everlasting punishment.

5. Repentance may not always be possible.

ART. IV.—*The World in the Middle Ages:* an Historical Geography, with accounts of the origin and development, the institutions and literature, the manners and customs of the nations in Europe, Western Asia, and Northern Africa, from the close of the fourth to the middle of the fifteenth century. By Adolphus Louis Kœppen, Professor of History and German Literature in Franklin and Marshall College, Pennsylvania. With coloured maps, from Spruner. New York: folio, pp. 232.

THE most familiar fact to every one at all acquainted with contemporary writings and opinions in relation to the Middle Ages, is, that they run very much into extremes, alternately describing that mysterious period as one of unbroken darkness or unclouded light, perceptibly higher or immeasurably lower, as to some particulars at least of intellectual and moral condition, than the times immediately before and after.

The primary cause of this extravagance is no doubt to be sought in the excitement of controversy between Protestants and Papists, both in the age of the Reformation, and at every later period, when that warfare has been renewed or carried on with more than wonted vigour; so that neither party has been able or willing for the time to admit any truth whatever in the statements of the other, lest the yielding of an outpost should involve the capture or surrender of the citadel.

The lapse of time, instead of weakening the tendency to these extremes, has served to strengthen them, by changing temporary movements into habits, and by causing violent reaction to intensify the impulses themselves.

The extreme of partiality or favour to the medieval church—for it is only in this ecclesiastical aspect that we now present the subject—may be more particularly represented as arising partly from a self-defensive movement on the part of Rome and her admirers, but also from causes of more recent origin, connected with extensive changes in prevailing modes of thought and standards of comparison.

One of these later causes is the powerful propensity, especially among the Germans, to unsettle everything established, and to

give the benefit of every doubt to what is new and paradoxical; a disposition nurtured, if it is not generated, by the national methods of instruction, and especially by that excessive rivalry of teachers in the same institutions, which is one of the most characteristic features of the German universities, and which, by creating a perpetual demand for something new, as an attraction to the student, for whose patronage the teachers are competing, often leads men who know better to violate their own convictions, both of truth and duty, with as little scruple or compunction as a school-boy feels, in taking what he knows to be the wrong side of a question, in a juvenile debating club.

To this morbid appetite for novelty and paradox, a daintier bait could not have been presented than the hope of revolutionizing old opinions, even among Protestants, in reference to what have long been known as the "Dark Ages," but which these reckless demonstrators, by their *novum organum* of antiquarian and critical research, have not the slightest difficulty in evincing to have been light ages in comparison with ours, to their own satisfaction, or at least to that of many readers. For we have a shrewd suspicion that some of the most popular discoveries of this kind, and the most unquestionable in the estimation of the younger Germans and the weaker Germanolaters, are not believed at all by those who broach them, but propounded as mere tests and triumphs of inventive genius, or of logical and dialectic skill—first in the *auditorium* or lecture-room, and then, by a transition almost certain and invariable, through the press.

As another cause of the effect in question—whether really involved in that already named, or wholly distinct from it, is a matter of no moment in relation to our present purpose—we may mention the insensible erection of a standard of comparison and judgment, altogether different from that applied in former times, as a test of moral and religious condition. We mean the esthetic and artistic standard, which confounds the *summum bonum* with the beautiful in art or nature, and by the capacity to appreciate and enjoy this, measures the whole intellectual and spiritual state of individuals, communities and ages. According to this principle or rule of judgment, the invention of organs, the erection of cathedrals, the delineation

of madonnas, holy families and martyred saints, in oil or marble, are enough not only to outweigh the grossest superstitions and absurdities of faith and practice, but to prove directly that the men who exercised these gifts in what is called the service of the Church, must needs have been distinguished by their soundness of belief and eminent holiness of heart and life. This view of the matter is so wholly foreign from all English and American habits of thought, except so far as they are under German influence, that it might seem incredible, if not too clearly proved by the habitual glorification of the mediæval builders, artists, and hymnologists, by modern writers of no small celebrity, as having some sort of religious sanctity, for which no cause whatever is suggested but their skill or genius. But in this way, Greece, when at its lowest depth of moral degradation, might be glorified as eminently pure and holy; or the seed of Cain, including Tubal-cain and Jubal, might be shown to have been morally superior to the puritanical and tasteless sons of Seth.

The fourth and last source of this overweening fondness for the Middle Ages which we mean to specify, is the unfortunate but settled practice of surveying this division of Church history apart from the civil, or rather from the general history of the period; a segregation into which the German writers do not seem to have insensibly or gradually lapsed, but which they have deliberately chosen, and in which they are disposed to pride themselves, as something highly philosophical in theory and practically useful; while to us it seems extremely inconvenient, and the source of many errors and perversions, not the least of which is the absurd exaggeration of the good and evil of the Middle Ages, which must necessarily arise from looking at them by themselves, without connecting and adjusting them by reference to the whole series and system, of which they are but a part.

Without attempting to prescribe a remedy or antidote for all these evils, we may venture to suggest that the obvious corrective of the last is an impartial and comprehensive view of mediæval history in general, as an introduction or accompaniment to the study of its religious or church history in more detail. For such a process we have no lack of materials or apparatus, both exotic and indigenous, both old and new.

The great work of Gibbon, instead of losing its authority, appears to rise in reputation as its age increases, and is one of the few modern English books which even learned Germans recognize as standards. Its merit is not in its style, as boys, and even children of a larger growth too frequently imagine to their cost, but in its noble, comprehensive plan; its luminous arrangement, which contrasts so favourably with the puerile and endless subdivisions of most German histories; its learned and direct use of original authorities; its soundness and impartiality of judgment, when exempt from the bias of religious unbelief, an exception lamentably so extensive as almost to be the rule. The first and last peculiarities of Gibbon make him utterly unfit to be a boy's own book, or to be read by any one whose taste in composition is not formed already upon better models, and his principles already fixed beyond the reach of sarcasm and insinuation, for there is not probably a single sentence in the whole work which is chargeable with open and direct hostility to Christian truth. But Gibbon, unhappily, was more than a mere speculative infidel. He was undoubtedly a wicked man, grossly corrupt, if not in practice, in affection, as abundantly appears from his revolting fondness for prurient and scandalous details, often gratuitously introduced at an expense of labour, space and decency, which cannot be accounted for on any supposition, except one that must constrain every good man to lament that such an author should be still among the highest and most indispensable authorities in medieval history. Greatly superior in purity of style, as well as faith and principle, though not over free from moral and rhetorical defects, is Robertson, whose History of Charles V. is an elaborate and skilful exhibition of the Middle Age, in its historical results and influence on that by which it was immediately succeeded; his subject having been avowedly selected for this very purpose, on account of the extraordinary concentration of hereditary interests and national relations in the person and the reign of Charles, as well as his marked chronological position in the turning point between the old and new world, or to use a more exact form of expression, between the middle and the modern age. We observe that Alison, in his somewhat assuming and dogmatical, but on the whole judicious

estimate of modern writers,* assigns Robertson a place along with Montesquieu and Guizot, in the first rank of philosophical historians, though he finds fault with his "cold academic style;" a style which, we suspect, will, for many generations, be preferred to the awkward but ambitious declamation and the numberless Scotch idioms of Sir Archibald himself.

A service similar to that which Robertson has rendered to the cause of medieval history, but more in the direction of Mahometan and Spanish than of general European history, has been performed by two of our most eminent American historians, Washington Irving in his Conquest of Granada, and Prescott in his Ferdinand and Isabella. More directly devoted to this subject, but less strictly historical in form and method, is the well known work of Hallam, which may now be regarded as a standard authority in English, and as furnishing a valuable supplement or accompaniment to the medieval portion of church history, comprised in a series of dissertations on the progress and condition of the leading states of Europe in the Middle Ages, with separate discourses on the Feudal System, the Increase of Ecclesiastical Power, the Constitutional History of England, and the State of Society in Europe. All the foreign works which we have named are now within the reach of every student, in cheap but accurate American editions.

Different from all these in specific purpose, though coincident in general design, is the work immediately before us, a Historical Geography of the Middle Ages, the production of a Danish scholar, who, besides the usual advantages of European education, has enjoyed the opportunity of travel, and perhaps of residence, in eastern countries, and has recently accepted a professorship in one of our American colleges. If not in form, he is in feeling an American citizen, and seldom mentions his adopted country without some complimentary and even flattering historical allusion or comparison, which cannot fail to win the hearts of many cis-atlantic readers. The work lays claim to no originality of form or substance, being avowedly a compilation from a rich variety of sources, most of which, as given

* History of Europe from the Fall of Napoleon in 1815, to the Accession of Louis Napoleon in 1852. Vol. i. p. 462, vol. iii. p. 607.

by the author near the close of the volume, are probably familiar to but few even of our native scholars. In one sense, however, it is really original; we mean in the pervading life and spirit which the author's intimate acquaintance with his subject, and his real enthusiasm for it, have imparted to details that must otherwise have been peculiarly uninteresting and unattractive to the general reader. The book appears in two distinct forms, very much unlike in appearance, the one being that of a distinguished looking folio, the other of two modest duodecimos. The first of these forms was selected to accommodate the maps, which constitute the basis of the work, the text on which it comments. The absence of these maps makes the other form decidedly inferior in value, but by no means destitute of it, as the book is intelligible even without maps, or with maps of an ordinary character, especially the lively introductory sketches, with which the principal divisions are prefaced, and which may be read together, with pleasure and advantage, even by some who do not choose to wade through the intervening masses of minute detail.

The author's plan is to describe the civilized world, with its prominent features and its main divisions, as it was at eight successive epochs in the course of the Middle Ages, giving to that phrase, however, a liberal latitude of meaning. The selected epochs are, the close of the fourth century (A. D. 395), after the final division of the empire into Eastern and Western, and just before the first great inundation of barbarians; the early part of the sixth century, before the accession of Justinian (A. D. 527), and after the first great migration; the close of the same century, after the second inundation of the same kind; the beginning of the ninth century, during the reign of Charlemagne, and the culminating period of the Saracenic empire, both at Bagdad and Cordova; the consolidation of the great modern states, at the death of Otho the Great (A. D. 973); the period of the Crusades; that of the feudal wars of France and England, and the conquests of the Turks and Tartars, towards the close of the fourteenth century; and the corresponding part of the fifteenth century, after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, the re-organization of the German Empire, the conquest of Granada, and the discovery of Ame-

rica. To these well-chosen epochs correspond six maps, purporting to be drawn from the latest and best sources, and certainly upon the whole very clear and satisfactory, though here and there exhibiting a singular confusion of languages in the national and other geographical designations.

The life and animation, which have been already mentioned as characteristic of the work, sometimes find vent in appropriate poetical quotation, or in vivid topographical description, not unfrequently derived from personal experience and recollection. There is also something pleasing in the author's patriotic warmth and kindliness of feeling in relation to his Scannavian fatherland, of which he seems to be a worthy representative, in moral qualities as well as in the almost proverbial talent of the Northmen for the ready acquisition of languages and foreign learning. The English of the work before us, even if it has undergone correction by a native hand, is creditably free from grammatical solecisms, and from those almost insensible but also irresistible breaches of conventional usage, which impart so ludicrous a character to many very praiseworthy attempts to write a foreign language. The only literary blemish, which is likely to arrest the eye of English readers, is one that may be reckoned absolutely unavoidable to some extent, in the manipulation of so many proper names, by one to whom the current English forms cannot always be familiar. We refer to the occasional substitution of a foreign or an ancient name for one which has long since become stereotyped or petrified in English usage, such as that of *Mount Appenine* for *the Appenines*, and other cases still more insignificant. Sometimes, indeed, a little inconvenience may arise to many readers from such changes, as for instance in the uncouth combination *Dshingiskhan*, which some will no doubt have to read aloud, before they recognize an old acquaintance.* As inadvertencies or accidents, these trifles are unworthy of attention; but there are writers of our own who affect such correctness, as they call it, and would probably be pleased to vary every foreign name

* An English reader is apt to be especially impatient of such foreign combinations as express the simple sounds of his own alphabet, such as *dj*, *dsj*, *dsh*, *dsch*, all which are used in other languages to represent our *j*, and faithfully copied by English and American translators.

as often as the name of the Arabian impostor, who, besides the antiquated forms *Mahoma* and *Mahound*, has within a few years figured as Mahomet, Mahomed, Mohammed, Muhammed, Mehemet (in Egypt), and Muhummud (in India), without attaining perfect accuracy after all, which indeed is no more necessary in the case of the false prophet than in that of James, John, and Jerome, which no English writer in his senses ever dreams of writing Jacobus, Joannes, or Hieronymus. We return from this digression only to express our fears that this work, with all its excellences, is not calculated for the latitude or longitude of this utilitarian republic, that it presupposes the existence of a class of readers, and a previous training, which are hardly yet on hand, but which it may be the ultimate effect of such works to produce; as Sir Walter Scott says that the minds of children are improved, not by books expressly written for them, but by those immediately intended for their elders. That Professor Kœppen may exert this pedagogic influence upon us, by his present and his future publications, we sincerely wish, as well for his sake as our own.

L. F. Alexander.

ART. V.—1. *The Elements of Intellectual Philosophy.* By Francis Wayland, President of Brown University, and Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1854.

2. *A System of Intellectual Philosophy.* By Rev. Asa Mahan, First President of Cleveland University. Revised and enlarged from the second edition. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1854.

3. *Empirical Psychology; or, the Human Mind as given in Consciousness.* By Laurens P. Hickok, D. D., Union College, Schenectady. Published by G. Y. Van Debogert. 1854.

THE almost simultaneous appearance of these treatises is in itself significant. That three of the most devoted and experienced teachers of mental philosophy in our American colleges should, within a few weeks of each other, have issued

volumes designed for elementary text-books on the subject, betrays, at least, a deep and united conviction, that such a text-book has hitherto been a desideratum. It is safe to say that these authors are not alone in feeling such a want. We venture to assert, that it has been felt by nearly all teachers of this science, at least, if we except those who have supplied it for themselves, and hoped to supply it for others, by some publication of their own. Even while we now write, we see that another book, which has not yet reached us, has been published, doubtless with a similar intent. Professor Bowen, who now holds the chair of Mental Philosophy at Harvard, has published an edition of Stewart's Elements, with annotations designed to adapt it, as we understand, to the class-room and to the present attitude of this science. His distinguished predecessor in the same chair, Dr. Walker, now President of the College, had before published, on a similar plan, Reid on the Intellectual Powers, which has already reached its second edition, and been adopted in some of our principal colleges. We need not remind our readers that some years ago Professor Upham of Bowdoin College, published two volumes on the subject, prepared especially for this purpose, and which, whatever their merits or defects, were so rapidly and extensively adopted as text-books, as to show the extent and urgency of the want they were designed to meet. Although greatly deficient in that vigour and condensation which are so vital in works of this description, yet, being for the most part sound in the principles inculcated, and broken into short chapters highly convenient for teacher and learner, they met with a wide and cordial welcome. As the first important tentative effort, not to throw new light on any great problems of philosophy, but to put the elementary principles of the science into a shape better adapted to the recitation room, and the necessities of beginners, it surely had high merits, and a corresponding success. For amid other important contributions to this science made by the Scotch school and others in Britain and America, the dearth of works at all suited to the wants of our higher colleges was absolute. No stronger proof of this could be had, than the fact that Professor Upham's book, for want of a better, is, as we are informed, used by at least one Professor in the English universi-

ties—simply because its minute subdivisions into chapters and sections, render it easy to select the topics on which to exercise his pupils.

And yet, it is in no spirit of disparagement, that we say it is only for want of a better, and until a better is produced, that this has a place in our higher institutions of learning. It is no contradiction of what we have said in commendation of it, to add that the field on which it entered, still remained open and inviting to other adventurers. There was still a void, which all who felt it to be their mission, were warranted to fill in whole or in part, as best they might, "according to their several ability." A work more compact in style, more logical in its structure, more vigorous in grasping the great problems of the science, more commensurate with its present state, was clearly demanded.

Those will readily understand us, who have known anything of this department in our colleges, when no resource in the way of text-books was known except Locke and the Scotch metaphysicians. They were encumbered with a twofold difficulty. Aside from the truth or falsity of their doctrines, they were never prepared with especial reference to the purposes of recitation. They were designed, to a great extent, to advocate or combat principles then in question, and now settled beyond rational controversy. The consequence is, that a large space is occupied in vindicating particular principles, and refuting all sorts of objectors, which so far as elementary instruction is concerned, can now better be disposed of in a most brief and summary manner. While there is much waste in tedious discussion of what now may be taken as undisputed principles, on the other hand, some of the finest forms of analysis on many subjects, which have been elaborated by later philosophers, British and continental, are wholly wanting. Thus, now by excess, now by defect, these treatises, masterly in their way, make exceedingly awkward text-books. Moreover, with the exception of Reid, they are too diffuse or antiquated in style, or too loose in arrangement, or confound psychology proper too much with the whole field of metaphysics, to serve well for rudimental studies and recitation exercises. So far as we know, on these accounts, teachers have felt serious embarrassments in the use of these text-books, while students have not been able to lay

hold of fundamental principles with sufficient clearness and certainty to acquire a thorough knowledge of, or retain a permanent interest in them.

That these difficulties have been generally felt, is sufficiently evinced by the fact, that so large a number of the principal professors of mental science in our colleges have undertaken to remove them. Besides these, various smaller works of less significance have been prepared for our higher schools and academies, some of which have had considerable currency. It was understood, we believe, that the late Dr. Marsh was meditating an elaborate work on this subject, which was prevented only by his untimely death.

It is hardly to be presumed that the recent works under consideration so completely supply this great desideratum, as to leave no place for further attempts. This may be said without implying that they have not made important contributions towards it, as in our judgment some of them at least have done. As to the question, which will best answer this end, doubtless different men will answer differently, according to their several stand-points for viewing and treating the subject. Some instructors would find one, and some another, of these treatises, most helpful in teaching, according as their respective doctrines and method harmonize best with their own metaphysical system, or with their personal idiosyncrasies.

There are obviously two methods of meeting the want in question, which have their respective advantages and drawbacks. The first is to take the standard treatises of the Scotch metaphysicians, which need no new trial to prove their worth, and by judicious omissions, transpositions, and divisions, together with notes supplementing the text with the more important results of later investigation, to adapt them to the present wants of the class-room. The other is to make a book wholly new, whether more or less original, with the design of making its style, method, and matter commensurate with the present state of the science and the wants of teachers and pupils. The former method, it seems, has been preferred by the learned and experienced professors of Harvard—the latter by the other authors under consideration. The former course is clearly the least arduous and perilous. Its successful execution requires

learning and judgment, perfected by experience in teaching; but it requires no original or constructive power, and is little embarrassed by the most formidable perils of authorship. It has the great advantage of making the substance of the book consist of matter which has already won undisputed rank in the philosophic world. In the case of Dr. Walker's edition of Reid, the notes are almost exclusively those of Sir William Hamilton, and occasional extracts judiciously selected from Stewart, Cousin, Jouffroy, and other leading metaphysicians, the better to elucidate matters which have been more fully ventilated by Reid's successors than himself. The basis of the whole, however, is Hamilton's Reid, as doubtless Hamilton's Stewart must be the basis of Dr. Bowen's edition of his Elements, while it must sustain the same relation to the first which the "Elements" themselves originally bore to Reid's "Inquiry"—that of an elegant finishing and adornment of the structure, which Reid alone had the strength and courage to plan and rear. But with respect to the use of Reid as a class-book, when thus arranged, (though we think it is susceptible of further improvement in this respect,) and brought up to the latest advances, we will not say of "Rational Psychology," but of all that is rational in psychology, one pre-eminent advantage must be patent to all. It brings the pupil's mind into contact with a great formative intellect that has given a turn and an impress to all subsequent psychological investigation, and that, beyond all rational dispute, has, more than all others, established the authority of those primitive and universal cognitions of the human race, which are the only bulwark against scepticism, and the necessary condition of every real knowledge or philosophy, against all pretended philosophical assaults whatsoever. It also puts him in contact with Sir William Hamilton, that mighty man, who, in philosophic learning and analysis, has scarcely an equal in the present, or superior in any age. Now, other things being equal, this is a signal advantage in any department of study. A thorough acquaintance with the great works which have permanently shaped opinion in any branch of human inquiry, will do more to illuminate and invigorate the mind, as well as to settle it immovably in the truth, than a knowledge of thousands that are only second and third rate.

Let any one master Augustin, Calvin, Turrettin, Owen, Edwards, or, we had almost said, either of them, and he will be a mightier theologian than he who, ignorant of these, has ransacked all the common-place writers on divinity. And so of every other science. He who finds truths or opinions fresh and concentrated at their fontal sources, can readily trace them through all their streams, eddies, cross-currents, deviations, and confluence with other streams, or their defilement by foreign and filthy admixtures. He can see all important truths in their logical unity with first principles, and their antagonism to subtle and sophistical errors. But he who sees them otherwise, sees them only in fragments and atoms, floating hither and thither, without centre of attraction or bond of unity.

Yet the other method has its advantages, in the hands of a man equal to the undertaking. When there is adequate philosophic insight to originate and construct a clear, profound, true treatise on mental science, in a simple and concise style, with such a method and such divisions and subdivisions as the experience of an able teacher would suggest, it would obviously possess a unity, a compactness, a directness of movement in every part, which is impossible in a work that is the product of several minds, each working by himself, and supplemented by fragmentary excerpts from various authors. But alas! how rare are minds thus furnished for such a work. Yet this should not discourage any who feel called to it from tentative efforts, even when convinced that they shall succeed but in part. A partial contribution is better than none, and a partial failure is no discredit.

We are thus brought to the works named at the head of this article, which it is full time to notice more definitely.

First in order, and in our view, not least in merit, is Dr. Wayland's book. It is characterized by those qualities, as to matter and style, which have long since earned for him an honorable rank among American writers. It consists essentially, as he informs us, of the lectures which he has long delivered to the classes of Brown University. His views are generally sound and sensible, expressed in a clear and dignified style, which sometimes becomes ornate and vivid. He especially aims to give all his disquisitions a practical turn. He

closes almost all his chapters with judicious suggestions in regard to the improvement and right use of the faculties treated of. These strike us as the most valuable and attractive portions of the book; especially in the chapters on Reasoning, Taste, and Imagination poetic and philosophic. As to substance and radical principles, it is easy to see that the work rests essentially on Reid, with some modifications from his Scotch successors, down to Hamilton. The author propounds some views, on minor points, original with himself, some of which do, while others do not, command our assent. For example, after having defined taste as that whereby we "cognize the beauties of nature and art," we do not see on what ground he should deny that it is a "faculty," pp. 387, 8. We doubt whether it is a true or wholesome doctrine, that it is in the power of expressing our emotions by the tones of the voice, more than in anything else that the gift of eloquence consists, p. 58. While there is something of truth, there is more of exaggeration in such a statement. These and any other things the like, however, are minor matters. The great fault of the book seems to us one of omission in two particulars. 1. It makes scarcely any, if any, reference to the psychological principles and problems which the Germans have brought into such prominence. With the exception of an occasional reference to Cousin, there is no intimation either of the existence of continental metaphysicians, or of the great questions with which they have agitated the whole philosophical world. It is vain to say, that the doctrines of the Transcendental school have no foothold in this country, which renders them worthy of attention, or that it is useless and unprofitable to our American students to consider them. When they are introduced to our cultured and inquisitive minds, by writers of such might and fascination as Coleridge, Morell, and Cousin, it is but the merest fatuity to ignore their wide prevalence and influence. If any one author has exercised a stronger moulding influence on a certain class of minds in our country, that have grown up within the last twenty years, than Coleridge, we have yet to learn who he is. There are few of our prominent seats of learning and faculties of instruction, in which his inspirations have not been felt more or less, and, according to the measure

of them, for better or for worse. To say nothing of such men as Drs. Marsh, Henry, Professor Shedd, and a host of collaborators, who have toiled so successfully to bring this class of authors into notoriety; to leave out of sight a far different sort of men, whose Transcendentalism has pushed them to the opposite extremes of infidelity, as in the case of Theodore Parker and the Boston Transcendentalists, and of Romanizing ritualism, as in the case of the Mercersburg school, or to that mid-point in which both these tendencies blend with Rationalism and Mysticism, in forms ever changeful, undefined, yet beautiful as the kaleidoscope, as in the case of Dr. Bushnell, the two books by Drs. Hickok and Mahan, are sufficient evidence of the growth and influence of this school. They are both decidedly, though not equally, transcendental, and take their life from Coleridge, Kant, and Cousin. Both are from men who have long been prominent educators of youth, and contain the substance of their teachings. One, although so far re-written as to be essentially a new book, is yet a third edition. Our young students and scholars are sure, therefore, to be brought into contact with this sort of philosophy, not only in the formal treatises we have indicated, but as it is implicated or expressed in much of our current and influential literature. How constantly does it underlie and energize the writings of Carlyle, giving them half their electric power and strange fascination? We think, therefore, that justice to our educated youth, requires that they should be carefully taught what this vaunted philosophy is; what are its pretensions; or if this be impossible, on account of its inherent obscurity, that it be demonstrated how and why it is thus impossible; what of truth and what of error the system apparently contains; where its fallacies, extravaganzas, and principal vices and perils of every kind, lie. Let it be shown what of truth it contains as against the sensational school, and what of error as compared with the true system; where its tendencies to sceptical idealism, to pantheism, to a rationalizing infidelity, an arrogant self-deification, begin, and within what limits, if any, they may be avoided. In short, let the angle of divergence from the straight path of truth be clearly delineated. If this be not done; if the very existence of transcendental metaphysics, their problems, claims, and

tendencies, be ignored, we see not what is gained, while much is lost, by dropping the old masters.

Another omission, which we should not notice in a book purporting to treat only of "intellectual philosophy," were it not that Dr. Wayland long ago published a text-book of Moral Philosophy which is silent on the subject, is the want of any analysis of the will, desires, susceptibilities, indeed the whole emotional and optative faculties of the mind. Saving a casual sentence here and there thrown out in the discussion of other subjects, both volumes pass by these points. Dr. Wayland, alluding to conscience incidentally, in his recent work, declines going into a discussion of it, on the ground that it properly belongs to moral philosophy, in which he has treated the subject in form and at length, on the same principle, we suppose, that the affective and voluntary faculties could properly be referred to the same department. In one aspect, they belong to psychology, in another, to moral philosophy. At all events, they belong somewhere, and must have a place in every proper system of mental and moral philosophy. Without them the first is incomplete, and the latter without any logical basis. Possibly, however, Dr. Wayland intends to follow the Scotch metaphysicians through and through, and publish a separate volume on the Active and Moral Powers—as a distinct branch of psychology. The greatest objection to this course is, that it looks like countenancing the too common error, which divides the human soul in twain by completely divorcing the intelligence from the will. As Dr. Wayland's works usually live, we have made these suggestions with all deference for his consideration, in preparing future editions.

Messrs. Mahan and Hickok, whatever may be their merits or demerits, are not chargeable with these omissions. So far from ignoring the Transcendental philosophy, the former builds his treatise chiefly upon it, not without many and earnest protests against the extreme aberrations and impious daring of some of its illustrious advocates; while the latter is not often transcended in his Transcendentalism. Dr. Mahan says, "the individuals to whom I feel most indebted as a philosopher, are Coleridge, Cousin, and Kant—three luminaries of the first order in the sphere of philosophy:" and that he has aimed to

"give to the public a work, on this great science, which should meet the fundamental philosophic wants of the age." Yet, we are pleased to find that he combats with zeal and ability, many of the more extravagant and dangerous dogmas of these philosophers. He battles everything in Kant and Coleridge which puts in doubt the validity of our perceptions of external objects, or casts a shade of doubt over the objective reality of the material world. He stoutly assails with remorseless ridicule and invective, the fiction of Kant, that *nooumena* are the only realities in sensible objects, while *phenomena* are but "baseless fabrics of a vision." He not only argues, but inveighs against the blasphemous pantheistic dogma of Cousin, that human reason is "impersonal," and that "this principle is God the first and the last of every thing!!" He likewise holds up to merited detestation, the equivalent statement of Coleridge, the mouth-piece of Schelling, that reason is an "organ identical with its appropriate objects;" and that "God, the soul, and eternal truth are not the objects of the Reason, they are the Reason itself." Indeed for one who defers so greatly and avowedly to these philosophers, he exhibits a freedom from servility as rare as it is wholesome. It is quite refreshing, as we look over his index of topics, to find how often the phrases, "error of Coleridge," "error of Kant," "paralogism of Cousin," recur. Withal, he devotes a whole chapter to a clear statement and refutation of the several systems of egoistic and pantheistic idealism, successively elaborated by Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. If we pass from the general drift of the book, to its method and style, it has some decided merits. The style is clear, terse, and direct, to a degree that is uncommon in those who are "sounding their dim and perilous way" through the mystic depths of Transcendentalism. The work is also broken into small sections, headed by formal titles, often not more, or even less than a page in length; and this without breaking the chain of arguments which often include many such sections. This feature of it greatly adds to its convenience and value as a text-book. The method is, for the most part, direct and logical. It is well adapted to bear the learner onward to the core of his system, and foster a constant and lively sympathy with it.

Having thus shown our appreciation of the merits of the work, we shall with equal freedom and fairness indicate some features of an opposite kind. He begins with that threefold distribution of the mind into intellect, sensibility, and will, which Dr. Hickok also adopts, and which is now quite general among all those who seek to limit moral responsibility to acts of the will, considered as endued with the power of contrary choice, or self-determination of the will. This work is chiefly confined to the intellect, although he treats of conscience as falling appropriately under this head. He also indicates his opinions with sufficient plainness in regard to the will—the full statement of his philosophy concerning it, having (as we judge from an intimation on p. 14) been given to the public in a separate volume, which we have not seen. He then divides the faculties of the intellect into two classes, which he calls primary and secondary. In the former he classes the intuitive powers, which give us our first ideas and elements of knowledge by immediate intuition, without the intervention of reasoning, argument, or any other medium. In the latter, he classes the various faculties which act upon, *i. e.* analyze, combine, compare the primitive cognitions given by the primary faculties. He proceeds first to the consideration of the primary faculties, to which he refers sense, consciousness, and reason, insisting, with great warmth and decision, upon the German distinction between reason and understanding—a thing of course in one who defers so greatly to Kant, Coleridge, and Cousin. Upon this distinction we shall offer some suggestions in the sequel. For the present we have only to observe, that, granting its validity, we cannot see the propriety of ranking consciousness as a distinct faculty of the mind, either primary or secondary. It is rather a common property of all exercises of intelligence, whether of the primary or secondary faculties—that by which, in knowing, we know that we know. So it is a common property of all our mental exercises, whereby, in feeling or willing, we know that we thus feel or will. It enters into all the cognitions by the senses, and by the reason as defined by these philosophers, together with all operations of the understanding, and what are styled by Dr. Mahan secondary faculties. It is not, therefore, a distinct faculty, first or second, but an element in

all the exercises of every faculty. This is the view of it given by philosophers of all schools, so far as we know.

After making this classification, we see no good reason why Dr. Mahan should put two of his primary faculties, sense and consciousness, before, and one, reason, after the so-called secondary faculties, in the order of treatment in his book; for, although he makes reason the supreme faculty, yet on all logical grounds the primary faculties go together not less than the secondary. We are sorry to observe that he contends warmly for Kant's arbitrary distinction between understanding and judgment. This by no means follows, even if the distinction between understanding and reason be conceded. In any case, judgment is a property of the understanding, and is inseparable, according to Reid, from nearly, according to Hamilton, from quite, all acts of intelligence. We cannot perceive a material object without a judgment that it exists. We cannot cognize any *a priori*, universal, or necessary truths, without a judgment that they are such. We cannot form even a conception or imagination, however false, without at least a mental judgment or affirmation that such a mental state exists. Were it otherwise, we see no reason for his ranking judgment, association, memory, imagination, as faculties specifically different from the understanding. They are branches of it. In this respect, Dr. Mahan's method is as arbitrary as transcendental, without shadow of warrant in common or philosophical language, and fitted only to produce confusion in both. We will only add, that, in developing his theory of imagination and of reasoning, he, like Dr. Wayland, takes considerable strides into the departments of rhetoric and logic. We do not complain of this, for these sciences so flow into and flow out of the true science of mind, that it is difficult to draw any but an arbitrary line of demarcation between departments which so interpenetrate each other. And his elaborate and able chapter on imagination, while it does not in everything command our assent, will well repay careful study. Beyond this, he intrudes somewhat into the domain of theology, which also has strong points of contact with mental science. And here the evils of the extravagant exaltation which this system gives to the reason, are in some measure developed. But as we hope again to advert to

the distinction between reason and understanding, we will defer further remark on this subject for the present.

We hasten to notice Dr. Hickok's book, which, if it comes last, deserves not the least of our attention. It is an extraordinary book, although less so than its counterpart, which the author published a few years ago, under the title of *Rational Psychology*. In this general method he has an eminent example in Wolff, who undertook to exhaust the philosophy of mind in two great treatises, entitled respectively *Psychologia Empirica* and *Psychologia Rationalis*. Dr. Hickok displays his enterprise and courage in the serene confidence with which he prosecutes a work in which such illustrious men have already failed. Whether his ability is equal to his confidence is now to be considered. As he is more intensely transcendental than Dr. Mahan, so his method and arrangement are wholly different. While his book has little more than half the matter contained in Dr. Mahan's, full half of that is taken up with disquisitions pertaining to the susceptibility, and will; while there is a long preliminary dissertation upon anthropology, the relations of the mind and body, and the great divisions of the human race. The result is that but little over a hundred pages of small size are devoted to the intellectual faculties, the main stress of the volume being manifestly laid upon the subject of moral agency in its theological bearings. This, however, is perhaps all that would be expected on "the human mind as given in consciousness," by the readers of the author's heavy volume on *Rational Psychology*, in which he undertakes to determine *a priori* whether any such experience as consciousness is possible, and if possible, what it *must necessarily be*. Those who have settled beforehand *what it must be*, need surely occupy but little space to ascertain *what it is*. But knowing the liability of critics to the charge of misrepresentation in cases of this sort, we prefer to let the author speak for himself. We quote the first sentences of the book under review:

"Psychology is comprehensive of all the necessary principles and the developed facts of mind. The necessary principles determine the possibility of an intelligent agency, and reveal in the reason how mind must be constituted in order to any cognition of a nature of things as existing in space and time;

and is thus distinguished as *Rational Psychology.* The developed facts of mind are taken as they reveal themselves through an actual experience in consciousness, and when combined in systematic arrangement, they give the specific science known as *Empirical* Psychology. It is this last only which comes within the field of present investigation.

"*Empirical* Psychology is thus inclusive of all mental facts which may come within human consciousness. The being of mind, with all its faculties and their functions; every phenomenon in its own manifestation, and its law of connection with other phenomena; all, indeed, about which an intelligent inquiry can be made in reference to mental existence and action, come within the province where this philosophy should make itself thoroughly and familiarly conversant."

Again, he says in his *Rational Psychology*, p. 18: "In the conclusions of this science, (Rational Psychology,) it becomes competent for us to affirm, not as from mere experience we may, that this *is*—but, from these necessary and universal principles, that this *must be.* The intellect is itself investigated and known through the *a priori* principles that must control its agency."

Still further: "Such, also, is a truly *transcendental* philosophy, inasmuch as it *transcends* experience, and goes up to those necessary sources from which all possible experience must originate." (*Rat. Psych.* p. 22.)

If it be lawful for those who, like ourselves, have not soared to those giddy heights which transcend our own consciousness, to indulge in a judgment *a priori*, we are of opinion that a science of mind "as given in consciousness" *must be* much more "rational" than any which undertakes to determine beforehand what this consciousness must be, or whether it is possible. Such a science is preposterous on the face of it. Dr. Hickok himself being judge, "all about which an intelligent inquiry can be made in reference to mental existence and action," comes within the province of what he calls *Empirical Psychology.* According to our conceptions of rationality, the question whether any science of mind beyond this is rational, answers itself to all rational men. And how, pray, are these *a priori* principles themselves, which are to determine the anterior possibility of experience or consciousness, to be found, except as

they are "given in consciousness," and evolved in its light? And if one should reason out *a priori* that the present consciousness and experience of himself and the race were impossible, what then? Which witness will he believe? In all his practical procedures, he will soon show whether he trusts his own consciousness or his rationalizing sophistry. A Berkeley and a Fichte will show that they consider matter something more than an idea, when they see a stiletto entering their bosoms—a Hume and a Brown, that they believe causes have a real power to produce effects, when they flee from a burning house.

The fact is, that these absurd conclusions, which contradict the first data of consciousness, are the products of speculation, which either takes for its premises some imaginary deliverance of consciousness, or reasons illogically from some true one, without detecting the fallacy. But all men proceed, and all sound philosophy proceeds on the hypothesis that our first principles and intuitive judgments, which are the basis of all reasoning, must have an authority paramount to all arguments which contradict them, and that all such arguments must have a covert fallacy, no matter how cogent they may seem to be.

As to our primitive judgments and intuitive ideas themselves, as given either in perception through the senses, or in the mind itself through what these men call the reason, there is no such conflict as this *Rational Psychology* supposes. Dr. Hickok, (*Rat. Psych.* p. 42,) referring to Hume's sophisms, speaks of the case as one in which "consciousness contradicts reason, the reason belies consciousness," and hence contends for the necessity of rational psychology to end this "drawn battle." But if a *rational* system is the judge that ends the strife, then it is not true that "reason belies consciousness," and the alleged necessity is imaginary. We are sometimes at a loss to know whether Dr. Hickok, like Mahan, Coleridge, and most of this school, considers reason a purely intuitive, or likewise a discursive faculty. If the latter, it would seem to have usurped some of the functions of the understanding, as usually defined by them. He speaks of it as "overseeing" and "comprehending" the whole "operation of the sense and understanding." (*Rat. Psych.* p. 534.) So far as it operates discursively, either in

itself or through the understanding, in speculation about the legitimacy or possibility of our consciousness, it, like every human faculty, must soon prove its impotency.

But whether speculative or intuitive, we utterly deny that the intuitions of any one faculty are amenable at the bar of any other—much more that consciousness, through which alone we know the cognitions of any faculty, must vindicate its affirmations before them, or can be subverted by them. Dr. Mahan well contends that intuitions, of whatever faculties, "can never be opposed to each other." Nor is it the province of one sort of intuitions to impeach the possibility or validity of another. But the very idea of a "rational" psychology to supervise and legitimate a psychology given in consciousness, implies the contrary. It implies that the intuitions of one faculty may be subverted by those of another, which, in our judgment, is the radical error underlying the most dangerous systems of philosophy, ideal and sensational. It was by arraigning sense-perceptions at the bar of reason so called, that Kant, and Coleridge after him, came to the conclusion that the "things which we envisage, (*i. e.* as we suppose, represent to ourselves through the senses,) are not that in themselves for which we take them." The *noumena* or real entities are totally different from the *phenomena* of material objects as apprehended through the senses. Therefore our intuitive apprehensions of such phenomena are not trustworthy. They are nullified by the judgments of that higher faculty, the reason. But if our intuitions of external objects are not reliable, if our faculties deceive us here, why may they not deceive us in all our intuitive convictions, whether of the reality of objects of sense, or of universal, necessary and moral truths, as given us by the reason? The all-annihilating idealism and pantheism of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, are legitimate logical consequents of such a procedure. On the other hand, if the cognitions of necessary and universal truths which originally arise from within the mind itself, are not deemed valid till they have been arraigned and tried at the bar of the senses, then there is no reason for trusting the perceptions of sense. Universal scepticism is the logical result. Not only so, but all ideas of the good and the beautiful are resolved into "transformed sensations," till utilitarianism, epi-

cureanism, and materialism are enthroned in morals, religion, literature, science, and the arts. Such was the result of the French sensational school, based on an overstrained interpretation of Locke's extreme and incautious deliverances in this direction, called forth in combating the contrary error. Such must ever be the result of resolving all our ideas into sensations, or the products of sensation. All philosophy and all knowledge is undermined, and gives place to a dreary scepticism, as soon as we take the ground that the intuitions of the mind, either through sense, or reason, or that its consciousness, are not trustworthy until they are validated by some faculty beyond themselves. Each is good within its own sphere, and has no warrant for leaving its own domain. It is because Dr. Hickok's process of legitimating the affirmations of sense and consciousness seems to us to imply the contrary, that we have thus dwelt upon it. The great merit of Reid as a philosopher, lies in the fact that he established the doctrine for which we are contending, and gave to the intuitive judgments of the mind, whether in its outward perceptions, or its inward, instinctive, axiomatic beliefs, their proper and unquestionable authority. In doing this, he rendered a service to mental science, not unlike that which Bacon rendered to physics. As a consequence, the fruits of investigation in this department since his day, culminating in Sir William Hamilton, have been equally rich and splendid. His great position is thus stated by himself, and it is impregnable: "The faculties of consciousness, of memory, of external sense, and of reason, are all equally the gifts of nature. No good reason can be assigned for rejecting the testimony of one of them, which is not of equal force with regard to the others."* Thus alone could he rear any effectual barrier against the scepticism, we were about to say nihilism, of Hume, and put inquirers on the true and fruitful track of inquiry.

We wish it to be understood, that we do not mean to imply that Dr. Hickok discredits the testimony of sense and consciousness in fact. He has validated it to his own satisfaction, at the bar of Rational Psychology. What we protest against is, the principle that it needs to be thus legitimated. This is

* Inquiry, Essay VI., Chap. iii.

the mother heresy. If we are not authorized to trust our senses and consciousness till we have digested his transcendental demonstrations, we are afraid we are doomed to scepticism. And indeed it seems to us, that Dr. Hickok himself finds it necessary to trust his consciousness rather than his rational psychology. After telling us that "the qualities of substances and the exercises of agents alone appear in consciousness, and thus that all experience can vouch for is the quality and the exercise, and not the essential being in which the qualities inhere, and from which the exercises spring," and that "there is thus an occasion for scepticism to come in, modified in various ways, and which can be excluded only through the most profound demonstrations of transcendental science;" he tells us on the next page, that "there is also in this one consciousness the additional testimony that these exercises are not thrown upon its field as shadows passing over a landscape, but that they come up from some *nisus* or energy that produces them from beneath; * * and thus that there is some *entity* as opposed to non-being, which *abides and energizes in consciousness*," pp. 73–5.

The following from the chapter on Anthropology, besides being for the comfort of dyspeptics, is one among many illustrations of a tendency to arbitrary and capricious generalization, in a mind intensely speculative, prolific in subtle and tenuous threads of thought, now true and striking, and now the reverse. He says, "Where the digestive organization is vigorously active, and the vital force goes out strongly in the process of assimilation and nutrition, there will be the *melancholic* temperament. * * * * Jeremiah in Judea, Homer in Greece, Dante in Florence, Cowper in England, and Goethe in Germany, are all, in different forms, examples of the melancholic temperament," pp. 48, 9. We will not weaken the emphasis of such a statement by any comment.

According to Morell, the order of topics in Hegel's philosophy of mind viewed subjectively, were Anthropology, Psychology, Will. This is, with hardly a deviation, the order adopted by Dr. Hickok in this volume. But how the first of these topics becomes an integral part of the "science of mind as given in consciousness," except as all sciences are more or less

implicated with it, is not evident to us. The intellectual faculties he classes under the three grand divisions of Sense, Understanding, Reason; and more philosophically than Dr. Mahan, he includes under the understanding, as branches of it, all that the former ranks as secondary faculties distinct from understanding. In this system of philosophy, such a division seems to us natural and logical.

We do not think Dr. Hickok's style the most felicitous for elucidating abstract and recondite subjects. They need the aid of the utmost simplicity, clearness, and point in expression. A turgid and ambitious style aggravates even transcendental formulas, which, we confess, are greatly alleviated, when they are articulated in the lively and pithy sentences of Cousin, or even of Mahan. But our readers will better comprehend our meaning, if we give them a specimen of what we object to. The following is the definition of understanding:

"The Understanding is that Intellectual Faculty by which the single and fleeting phenomena of sense are known as qualities inhering in permanent things, and all things as cohering to form a universe. In the sense, the operation of the intellectual agency is engaged in putting the content in sensation within limits; in the understanding this agency is employed in putting that which has been defined into its grounds and sources. The first is a *conjoining* and the last a *connecting* operation. The sense-object is a mere aggregation; the understanding-object is an inherent coalition. In the sense the object appears; in the understanding, it is thought. One is a perception; the other is a judgment." p. 127.

Perhaps our readers are now prepared to appreciate the nature and grounds of the distinction between reason and understanding. But although there are several things of a minor sort, which we had marked for comment, we hurry forward to those portions which have an ethical or theological aspect, and which, of course, have a paramount importance.

First: We think Dr. Hickok's use of the word *supernatural* as groundless and mischievous as it is transcendental. The higher faculties of reason and will in man, he constantly, in all his metaphysical works, pronounces supernatural. Thus on page 371 of this book, he says:

"In the possession of reason, man is competent to apply necessary and universal principles, for expounding and comprehending all the perceptions of the sense, and the judgments of the understanding. In this sphere he rises above the natural, and is truly supernatural."

So in vindicating his peculiar views of the nature of virtue and the power of contrary choice, he says:

"Nature is working in him, and upon him, and were he only nature, he must obey her currents, and float as the stream should carry him. He is not only nature; he is supernatural. In his spiritual being he has a law of worthiness, and he may hold on to this imperative which awakes in his own spirit, and resist and beat back all the imperatives which awake in his animal nature." p. 376.

We are aware that in this Dr. Hickok has the sanction of Coleridge, in one of those fancies which he was wont to intermingle with his grandest enunciations of momentous truths. Dr. Hickok says, "*Nature* of things *a nascor.*" Coleridge says, "Nature, that which is *about to be* born, that which is always *becoming.* It follows, therefore, that whatever originates its own acts, or in any sense contains in itself the cause of its own state, must be *spiritual*, and consequently *supernatural:* yet not on that account necessarily *miraculous.* And such must the responsible WILL in us be, if it be at all." (*Aids to Reflection*, p. 155.)

Now supernatural, and nature as contrasted with it, have a fixed and intelligible meaning in ordinary and scientific use. *Nature* means the sum of all created things, properties, laws, powers, agencies, together with their workings and effects. *Supernatural* is used to characterize operations and effects which creature agents and powers are incapable of producing *propriis viribus*, and which can only be produced by the interposition of divine power. It is, therefore, not only in monstrous violation of all usage, that the human will or reason, or any of their acts, are called supernatural; but it looks to us akin to a deification of them. It must be a most potent and pestilent stimulus to human pride and glorying. It eviscerates the most pregnant terms and definitions relative to miracles and grace, of their meaning. A supernatural work of renova-

tion in the soul, after all, may mean nothing more than an act of that Supernatural Power, the Will, paying due homage to this Supernatural Excellency, the Reason. A supernatural revelation may be a revelation of our own reason. We are sorry that Dr. Hickok should have adopted a use of terms, which brings all professions of faith in a supernatural religion, on the part of transcendentalists, into just suspicion; especially as we have no doubt that he is himself a supernaturalist, in the accepted sense of the word.

We confess that, with such a starting point, we should not, in advance, look for a safe and sound analysis in the ethical portion of his book; and we are sorry to say that our apprehensions have been realized.

In regard to the nature of virtue or moral goodness, Dr. Hickok takes the same ground which he had previously taken in his *Rational Psychology*, and which lies at the foundation of his recent treatise on Moral Philosophy. This is nowhere more clearly stated than in the following passage, p. 297:

"The man can be worthy, and thus attain his highest good, only in the possession of a radical spiritual disposition fixed in conformity to the claims of his own excellency. He obeys neither man nor God ethically, except as he directly sees that the proper dignity of his own spirit requires it of him; and that spirit, permanently disposed to that end, is a righteous spiritual disposition."

Again, p. 172: "The insight of reason into its own being, gives, at once, the apprehension of its own prerogatives, and its legitimate right to control and subject nature and sense to its own end, and hold every interest subordinate to the spirit's own excellency."

Surely, then, man has something whereof to glory! According to this, every man is his own Deity. No allegiance is due to God, which does not flow from the allegiance first due to ourselves. Our obedience to God is not even "ethical," unless rendered because we "directly see" that our own "proper dignity" and "excellency" require it. Surely this makes us quite level to, if not above Him, who by reason of his perfection "cannot deny himself," and by reason of his infinitude, because he could swear by no greater, sware by himself! We

confess that it passes our comprehension, how a mortal could reach such an elevation. It overflies all recorded hero-worship.

According to this view, right is analyzed or resolved into other elementary ideas simpler than itself. It is what is due to the excellency of our own spiritual and rational nature. But then what constitutes the excellency of that nature, unless its capability of moral rectitude? The question then returns, What is moral rectitude? what is the idea of right? Thus this new definition of right, like every other which explicates it into elements simpler than itself, aside from other faults, is of that circular kind, which soon returns to its starting-point; it being the nature of all simple ideas, that they cannot be resolved into anything simpler than themselves. We are glad to see that the attempt to resolve it into utility, or gratification of self-love, or desire of happiness, which we have felt compelled to combat so strenuously in time past, is now generally abandoned. By the three authors under consideration, these heresies are condemned. The revolt of conscience, which has nearly exorcised these degrading but once popular theories from current ethical writings, will, in our opinion, quickly dispose of Dr. Hickok's new theory. It is indeed a scheme of self-love or self-hood, absolute and unmitigated. If it tends less to sensuality, it tends more to pride than the other—the root of the original apostacy, and the mightiest antagonist of that Gospel, which first of all abases man and exalts God; which excludes all boasting, and leaves not the flesh whereof to glory, and builds itself upon "humility, the low, but deep and broad foundation of all our virtues."

As God casteth down all high imaginations, and maketh humbleness of mind the only path to true elevation, so we deem it our duty to say that such a scheme is debasing in its whole tendency. It is only by looking above himself to the First Good and the First Fair, to the supreme source and model of all goodness, that man can become truly good. Nor can he improve or dignify himself at all, except as he goes out of himself to nobler standards. As some one has said, all creatures receive their true proportion and grandeur by tending upward

towards higher forms of being, and even the dog is conscious of a nobility acquired from looking upward to his master.

> "Unless above himself
> He can erect himself,
> How mean a thing is man!"

What astounds us most of all, is that after thus analyzing the idea of right and moral obligation into such elements, Dr. Hickok should give it as one attribute of "the intuition of the ultimate right" that it is "simple." By this, says he, "is meant that it is wholly uncompounded, and thus incapable of further analysis." (*Moral Philosopny*, p. 53.) But he certainly does analyze it into that which is due to the "spirit's own excellency."

That which is laboured out at greatest length is the power of contrary choice. It is true, he does not use the phrase; but, as we think our readers will soon see, he asserts the thing, under more circuitous phraseology. Dr. Mahan takes the same course in incidentally asserting the same doctrine, pp. 237, 8. These are pleasing indications that, to maintain in plain terms that we have a power with the same internal state and external motives which prompt a choice of a given thing, to choose the direct contrary, has already become a forlorn hope. Whether the new strategy of circumlocution will succeed any better, remains to be seen. We of course cannot undertake to follow Dr. Hickok through all his toilsome disquisitions.

He says, "The definition of the human will is a capacity for electing." "Election is the taking of the one when it might have been not the taking of that, but some other," (p. 255.) "I know that I could have done differently, if I pleased; and I know, moreover, that if I was pleased to do wrong, that pleasing was not inevitable. It was not determined in the conditions of nature, but wholly in my spiritual disposition; and to that there was a full alternative," (p. 272.) The merely spontaneous desires and preferences of the soul, however free, have not the element of liberty and responsibility, because in their very nature they go to some certain object, without alternative. "Cause in liberty is not only spontaneous, but with an open alternative." "In man, though fallen, the alternatives still lie open," (pp. 320, 1.) "The law is nigh to every man,

and speaks out from the conscious imperatives awakening within his own spirit. Man is competent to obey this law," (p. 389.) "When wrongly disposed, it (the spirit of the man) is competent to change the disposition, and take again the end for which existence is given," (p. 390.)

The author's doctrine is thus placed beyond all doubt. His alternative lies not objectively in having different objects within our election, to be chosen or not chosen, as we please; it lies not subjectively in the power and liberty of choosing according to our inclinations; but it lies deeper than this, viz. in the power of choosing the contrary of what we do, the inward inclinations and external motives to, and the objects of, choice remaining the same. It goes the length of asserting full ability in fallen man to keep the law of God, and to change his sinful disposition. An inability lying "in any kind of necessity is a natural inability, without alternative, unavoidable, and wholly irresponsible." It must be "always in contingency and avoidable," in order to be "responsible," (p. 366.) Hence, it is argued that such texts as Rom. viii. 7, and 1 Cor. ii. 14, assert not inability, but only the "absurdity" of the idea that a man can be carnal and spiritual at the same moment, (pp. 364, 5.) It cannot be necessary for the confirmation of our readers to rehearse the arguments which we have, in former articles, arrayed against this whole scheme. It, however, gives us pleasure to present a complete refutation and denial of it, from this book itself, wherein, as it appears to us, by a single blow, the author strikes down the fabric he had erected with such protracted toil. Nothing is more cheering than to see such triumphs of Christian feeling (however empirical,) over the most transcendental speculations.

He says, p. 357, "In the case of going against a radical disposition, or of changing that disposition, the deep consciousness of moral impotence in the human mind will never be satisfied to clothe its conviction in any other form than that of directly expressed inability. A sense of great guilt, and of great danger, may press upon the spirit in the conviction of its perverse and depraved disposition, and the man may know and own his responsibility for every moment's delay to 'put off the old, and put on the new man,' and yet be deeply conscious

that the spirit has so come to love its bondage, and to hate its duty, that he can only adequately express his sense of his helplessness, by emphatically saying, 'I cannot change;' 'I find myself utterly helpless;' 'I am sold under sin;' 'Some one else must help me, for I cannot help myself.' The deep conviction cannot rest in any weaker expressions." On the next page, Dr. Hickok says such language is "no hyperbole, but honest, felt conviction." He also says that this corrupt state of the soul is anterior to consciousness. "It is as plain a truth in the book of human experience as in the Bible, 'that men go astray as soon as they are born.' With the opening dawn of consciousness, we find the spirit already has its bent, and is permanently disposed to self-gratification, not to dignity," (p. 298.)

Moreover, although he repeatedly denies that the spontaneous moral affections of the soul involve any moral accountability, further than as they are the products of the will having the "alternative" of contrary choice, yet he says, p. 282, "Our spiritual feelings are the subject of commands, and come within the reach of legal retributions. Love and hatred, joy and sorrow, in the sense of spiritual affections, are enjoined upon us in regard to certain objects. This may very readily induce the conviction, that they are themselves volitions. But their distinction from all direct acts of the will is manifest in the utter impracticability to immediately will them in or out of being."

If now we consider the conditions which he affirms to be necessary for willing, his self-refutation is complete. He says, p. 103, "The willing state, as capacity for putting forth any voluntary exercises, must thus be preceded by both an object known, and an object felt, and must thus be occasioned by an intellectual and an emotive state. In these only, is the condition of willing at all given." What then becomes of the omnipotent power of the will to choose in independence and contravention of all desire? In our view, there is more precious irrefragable truth in these few brief quotations, than in all the countervailing speculations of the book.

When we find, moreover, that the liberty asserted by our author is confessedly of such a kind that "the logical understanding can neither find it, nor get a conception of it," that it

is to this faculty an absurdity," (p. 273); that, as we have already seen, the powers requisite to it are affirmed to be *supernatural;* that God, the most consummate of moral agents, is acknowledged to be "above all occasion for alternatives to perfect rationality," such as he contends are requisite to moral agency in man, (p. 254); that his scheme requires him to define desire as "the mere craving of the animal susceptibility," thus excluding it from the sphere of the spiritual and rational, we feel excused for not travelling beyond the record in search of rebutting arguments, plenty as they are. It is hard to make any demonstration of a false dogma that is not suicidal.

We are unwilling to close this article, already protracted beyond our first intention, without a few suggestions in regard to the great distinction between reason and understanding, which is so fundamental with Drs. Mahan, Hickok, and others of this school.

Dr. Mahan defines reason as "the faculty which apprehends truths necessary and universal," (p. 41.) Dr. Hickok describes it as 'the capacity to attain principles which were prior to any faculty of the sense or understanding, and without which neither a faculty of sense nor of understanding could have had its being; principles strictly *a priori* conditional for both faculties," (p. 156.) On the next page, he speaks of it as attaining "its necessary and universal *principles* by its own insight." These definitions, as we understand them, agree substantially with each other, and with that given by Coleridge. We have already quoted Dr. Hickok's definition of understanding. Those who comprehend it, and see where precisely the boundary between it and the reason lies, are more fortunate than ourselves. Dr. Mahan, as we have seen, makes the understanding only one of several secondary faculties which operate upon the elementary intuitions given by sense, consciousness, and reason. It will probably be safest, therefore, to go to the fountain-head of authority, so far as the introduction of this distinction into British and American metaphysics is concerned. Coleridge compares them thus: "1. Understanding is discursive; reason is fixed. 2. The understanding in all its judgments refers to some other faculty as its ultimate authority. The reason in all its decisions appeals to itself as the ground and *substance*

of their truth. (Hebrews vi. 13.)* 3. Understanding is the faculty of *reflection;* reason of contemplation. Reason, indeed, is far nearer to SENSE than to understanding; for reason (says our great Hooker) is a direct aspect of truth, an inward beholding, having a similar relation to the intelligible and spiritual, as sense has to the material and phenomenal." (*Aids to Reflection*, p. 142.)

No doctrine, however erroneous, ever gained extensive and permanent favour, which had not its element or side of truth to recommend it. All great and pernicious heresies even, are half-truths, or truths turned into lies, by intermingled errors. There is no doubt an element of truth in this system, in so far as it asserts that there are certain intuitive beliefs, first principles, universal and necessary ideas, which are not obtained through the senses; are not the products of reasoning, but lie at the foundation of all reasoning; which shine in their own light and are their own evidence; and that the mind has a faculty by which it knows the truth of these things intuitively and infallibly, as soon as they are suggested to it. This is only briefly stating the doctrine of common sense and first principles which was so elaborately and triumphantly established by Reid, although, as Hamilton has shown, it had been in one form or another recognized or implied in the writings of nearly all philosophers before him. Hamilton has, with his masterly and unrivalled analysis, given the criteria of these first principles—as follows: "1. Their Incomprehensibility (i. e.—we know that they are, but not how, or why they are)—2. Their Simplicity—3. Their Necessity and Absolute Universality—4. Their Comparative Evidence and Certainty." (*Hamilton's Reid*, p. 754.) We suppose it to be true still further, that in the faculty of knowing these axiomatic truths, or primary maxims which are presumed in all reasoning, lies a chief element of man's rationality; insomuch that, if he were without it, (e. g.—if he did not see that every event supposes a cause, and that thought implies a thinker,) however he might have some sort of intelligence, he could hardly be a rational or reasonable creature.

* "Because he (God) could swear by no greater, he sware by himself!"

Conformably to this, understanding is used to denote the faculty of intelligence simply, of whatever sort that intelligence be, and so, our intelligent or intellectual powers as a whole, without respect to one sort more than another. Reason, when used to denominate the mental faculties, is often employed interchangeably with it. But nevertheless, it always includes, especially in its meaning, the faculty of perceiving the intuitive truths of which we have spoken. There would doubtless be less violence in speaking of the understanding or intelligence, than of the reason, of a brute.

But conceding thus much is conceding all that the truth will bear. As understanding signifies generally the faculty of intelligence, so, applied to man, it signifies his entire intellectual powers. And this meaning is so inwrought into the very texture of our language in the best literary, common, and philosophical use, that the attempt to restrict its application to some single faculty or class of faculties, and those obscurely and variously defined, can serve no possible object, but to make darkness visible. So with regard to reason. While it always implies the faculty of knowing necessary and self-evident principles, and is, unlike understanding, inapplicable to those beings who, having some intelligence, have not this power, nevertheless, in the case of those, who, like men, possess it, it has a wider import, and is used to denote, at least, all the higher faculties of the intellect. So far from being "fixed," or confined to the intuition of the self-evident, it is oftener used to denote the discursive operations of the mind, in ratiocination, than understanding. Indeed Dr. Wayland, following Stewart, makes it merely the faculty of reasoning, and goes the extravagant length of denying to it, what these writers make its only office—the intuition of first truths. He says, "All reasoning must commence from truths *not* made known by the reason!" p. 283. Reid, more to the purpose than all, says: "We ascribe to reason two offices, or two degrees. The first is to judge of things self-evident; the second to draw conclusions that are not self-evident from those that are. The first of these is the province, and the sole province of common sense; and therefore it coincides with reason in its whole extent, and is only another name for one branch or degree of reason."

(*Intellectual Powers*, Essay vi. Chap. ii.) It is clear therefore, that this arbitrary restriction upon the word Reason, which Coleridge has borrowed from Kant, and others from Coleridge, is no less unwarrantable, than the correspondent process with the word Understanding. Hamilton observes, that Kant, as was his wont, twisted these and other terms out of their accepted and well-defined use, and after all, never consistently adhered, in his own practice, to these arbitrary and unwarrantable definitions.

But we should not deem mere errors of definition, even when the whole method of psychological analysis is founded upon them, entitled to any great attention, were it not that graver evils seem to be intertwined with this distinction, which have brought it into just suspicion among the friends of evangelical truth and piety. Whether they attach necessarily to it, or arise from the extravagance of its advocates, may be a question. With regard to the evils themselves, there can be none.

1. The imperial, autonomic, and almost divine prerogatives ascribed to Reason by this school, are utterly inconsistent with all the declarations of Scripture and all the evidence of fact, in regard to human wisdom, which is from these sources proved to be foolishness with God. There are indeed a few truths which the human mind sees intuitively in their own light, as soon as they are distinctly set before it. They are, however, very few. The few axioms of grammar, logic, and mathematics; those of metaphysics, such as that effects imply a cause, qualities a substance, intelligence an intellect; a few contingent first truths, such as the permanence of the laws of nature, and the reliableness of our faculties in their proper sphere; the first principles of morals; some dim and vague idea of a supreme Deity—these pretty nearly, if not quite, exhaust the circle of intuitive beliefs, of truths evident in themselves. These, however, are so interlaced with errors and delusions in most of our race, as to become vastly deteriorated; often the truth turned into a lie. Hence all true knowledge begins in a profound sense of our own ignorance; and, especially in religion, if any man will be wise, he must first become a fool that he may be wise. Now in opposition to all this, we

have seen how the claims of vast, superlative, authoritative insight which are made by this school for this faculty, lead them (Dr. Mahan excepted) to try the validity of our knowledge by sense and consciousness, at its bar; and if some succeed in thus confirming it to their minds, others, including Kant, Coleridge, and the whole German ideal school, are driven by the process, and, if it be legitimate, quite rationally too, into sceptical idealism. For if we cannot trust one faculty of intelligence in its own sphere, why should we trust another out of its sphere?

But more and worse than this; whether the testimony of other facultics be thus arraigned and tried or not, this dangerous process is quite sure to be applied to the truths of revelation, and of morals and religion generally. Those who conceive themselves possessed of such a faculty, variously styled "supernatural," "autonomic," "divine," will be pretty surc to make it authority for all their own favourite dogmas, even though they are expressly condemned by the word of God, the unbroken testimony of the Christian Church, and by their own Christian consciousness. What indeed is any revelation, when it confronts the decisions of a faculty, which, according to the express definition of Coleridge already quoted, can appeal to "none greater than itself," and so is itself either equal to, or one with the infallible God? Coleridge, amid his eloquent advocacy of various Christian doctrines, strikes down the doctrine of vicarious atonement at one fell blow, as being contrary to the intuitive judgments of the reason. That in this he has had followers, the American Church knows, alas! too well. We need not further show how Dr. Hickok establishes his theories of the nature of virtue, of the will, of inability, by its autonomic authority, even when they are admitted to be logically inconceivable. Dr. Mahan moves in the same track at no unequal pace. He thus defines the idea of liberty as given by the Reason. "The antecedent being given, either of two or more consequents are possible, and consequently, when any one does arise, either of the others might arise in its stead. * * * The existence of the idea of Liberty can be accounted for only on the supposition of the appearance in consciousness of the element of liberty in the action of the

will," pp. 237–8. This is cool and all-inclusive. It is a short and easy method against all antagonists. If any notion, however baseless, be espoused, its very existence in the consciousness is evidence of its truth! It thereby becomes a self-affirmation of reason. We do not wonder that *rational psychology* gains adherents, when it affords this easy resource for demonstrating dogmas, that have been contested from the foundation of the world. The question has not been, whether men are free-agents. This, we grant, is a first truth. But the question is, What is fairly implied in free-agency, and whether such a notion as this does not utterly overthrow it. The Great Supreme is not a free-agent in this sense—Dr. Hickok being judge, p. 254. In a like spirit, Dr. Mahan enounces as a canon, "If God himself should directly require us to affirm as true, what our intelligence thus affirms to be false, we could not comply with the requisition." The "*judicium contradictionis*" in regard to scriptural language undoubtedly has its place, but only within very narrow bounds. And wherever it is asserted without duly defining these bounds, it falls into just discredit. It is not only to be confined to propositions in contradiction of intuitive, self-evident principles, but also to cases in which we are so sure of a perfect knowledge of all the circumstances, relations, and bearings, as to be able to assert infallibly that these first principles are violated. Now, in the first place, these first principles are much fewer than most polemics suppose. All are apt to imagine that their own favourite dogmas, or those of their coterie, or sect, or other dogmas from which these are immediately deducible, are first principles. There are few of the so-called first principles that will bear the application of the test of universal acceptance. "Unaquæque gens hoc legem naturæ putat, quod didicit." Then again, how seldom are we capable of prying far enough into the divine administrations, to be sure that admitted first principles are applicable, or are contradicted by propositions that from our point of view seem to violate them? Without such limitation of the *judicium contradictionis*, every article of the Christian faith is at the mercy of Pelagian, Socinian, and Transcendental assaults.

2. This system obviously tends to intellectual pride and the

undue exaltation of human nature. It is the extreme on one side, while sensationalism is the extreme on the other side, of a sound Christian philosophy. It is the less debasing of the two. From Plato downward its tendencies have not been so much to grovelling sensuality, as to a refined intellectual pride and self-sufficiency. When mingled with and modifying Christianity, whether in the Neo-Platonism of early times, or the Platonizing English divines, it is not difficult to trace in it somewhat of this conscious superiority to Catholic Christianity. Nor is this tendency yet extinct, if we may judge from the fact that Dr. Hickok resolves all moral obligations into the obligation which each one owes to his "spirit's own excellency," and that Dr. Mahan has heretofore been chiefly known as a defender of Oberlin Perfectionism.

3. So far as we have seen, this school either overlook or deny the effects of sin in blinding the mind to moral and spiritual truths, which shine in their own light, and are self-evidencing to all who have eyes to see them, but to none else. We observe that while others are silent, Mr. Morell is especially impatient with this idea. Now no truth is more constantly asserted in the Bible, or more firmly held by the Church, or more familiar in religious experience, than that while the natural man may perceive many important elements of spiritual truth, he perceives not that which is most vital—its divine beauty and attractiveness, "the things of the Spirit," until the "eyes of the understanding are enlightened" by the Holy Spirit. It is perfectly obvious, that, so far as the field of Christian theology is concerned, either this extravagant view of the insight and authority of reason must be abandoned, or that the evangelical doctrine of spiritual blindness and spiritual illumination must fall before it.

4. The close affinity of this system with the intuitional theology, which makes the inspiration and normal authority of the word of God identical in kind (however superior in degree) with the intuitions and inspirations of ordinary Christians, is too obvious to need extended illustration. It accords in every part with the high prerogatives of intelligence and authority ascribed to the Reason. So far as our observation goes, the

rationalism of transcendentalists, like Morell's, most frequently takes this turn.

5. This system, claiming, as it does, such an amount of inward and self-evidencing light in man's constitution, tends to the disparagement of external sources of illumination and instruction, whether from the works of nature or revelation. To say nothing of the Germans, Coleridge's disparagement of the argument from miracles, and other external sources for the inspiration and divine authority of the Scriptures, is among the most striking features of his system. His disgust with them was such that he felt the need of a treatise entitled "Christianity defended from its Defenders"—not a whit less extreme than the previous neglect of the internal evidence of the Bible had been in some popular apologetics. Dr. Mahan tells us that "reason exists in all men, and equally in those who possess it at all," p. 262; that the idea of God "must be ranked among the *primary* intuitions of Reason," p. 438; that "theology is the science of God systematically evolved in the light of the fundamental ideas of reason pertaining to Him," p. 461; that "we should not go to the Bible to *prove* that a characteristic is to be affirmed of God, but the teachings of inspiration should be adduced, to show the correspondence between the affirmations of science and the word of God," p. 462; as already cited, and without qualification, that we cannot believe even on the authority of God, what "our intelligence affirms to be false;" that the "so-called common systems of theology" are characterized by an almost, if not quite, total want of scientific development, inasmuch as they are without "one or more great central truths or principles which impart unity and harmony to the whole," p. 470; that theologians have erred in going "*beyond the circle of the mind's convictions* to find some facts in the external world from which, as a logical consequent, the truth of the divine existence would follow," p. 470; and, finally, that the common treatises on natural theology, like Dr. Paley's, "appear really worse than useless, if presented as grounds of proof of the existence of God, particularly as the infinite and perfect." As Dr. Mahan, like Dr. Hickok, has gone considerably into the domain of theology, we have given our readers a little opportunity to judge of his

tone in dealing with so momentous a subject. We would only, in reply to all this, refer to the knowledge, or rather ignorance of God which men possess and ever have possessed, where they are not enlightened, directly or indirectly, by divine revelation; to the words of Paul, "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, *being understood by the things that are made*, EVEN HIS ETERNAL POWER AND GODHEAD;" to the words of Christ, TAKE THE YOKE AND LEARN OF ME; to the fact that Christ and he crucified is the "one central principle" of every tolerable system of Christian theology. These men seem to forget that whatever ideas may belong to the human mind, they are in it only potentially, until developed into activity and consciousness, by contact with the external world and objective truth in all the processes of training and culture; that if they carry the reaction from sensationalism so far as to disparage sources of light outside of the mind's own self-affirmations, they will prepare the way for a rebound to that excessively outward, sensational, and debasing system, from which philosophy has just emerged.

ART. VI.—**Nahum's Prophecy concerning Nineveh, explained and illustrated from Assyrian Monuments*, by Otto Strauss. Berlin and London. 1853. 8vo. pp. 136.

GERMAN commentators have been very unequal, and even capricous, in the amount of attention respectively devoted to the different books of Scripture. The influence of fashion has been as marked in this as in less important matters. A few of the more adventurous lead the way, while the general throng are content to follow in their footsteps. Some portions of the Bible have been examined with the most laborious minuteness. Not only every shade of reasonable or possible exposition, but every variety of extravagant and absurd conjecture has been

* Nahumi de Nino vaticinium explicavit, ex Assyriis Monumentis illustravit Otto Strauss.

in turn propounded, defended, and impugned; and publications representing every different opinion have accumulated without end, until the very mention of another upon the exhausted and worn-out theme awakens sensations of disgust and weariness. If a hasty opinion were to be formed respecting the forward state of Biblical exposition from these few themes so unsparingly elaborated, one might judge that little room remained for the profitable expenditure of additional toil, that further explorations were superfluous, and that all future students of the Scriptures would have to content themselves with working up into new forms and combinations the materials already fully furnished to their hands. But the labours of recent German commentators, of whom it is that we now speak, have been at the greatest remove from an even distribution over the whole available surface. In some neglected spots, and these not barren and unproductive, but promising the largest return to him who shall till them with patient diligence and skill, the fallow ground lies almost untouched by the ploughshare.

It is remarkable that so considerable and important a portion of the prophetic writings as the twelve small treatises from Hosea to Malachi, from time immemorial bound together and regarded as one volume, should not have attracted more attention, or have been subjected to a more careful scrutiny by the scholars and critics to whom we refer. This undue neglect is attributable in part, no doubt, to the inconsiderable size of these compositions taken individually. It cannot be because they are deficient in interest or importance. There are difficulties and obscurities enough to attract the highest exegetical talent and skill, and to afford ample scope for their exercise. There are passages of a sufficiently rare sublimity and beauty to call forth the enthusiasm of the admirers of genius; while the results to be developed possess not only the value which in every case belongs to the discovery, elucidation, or confirmation of the true meaning of the inspired word, but must of necessity enter as elements into the settlement of many of the most important questions of Old Testament investigation. It may be expected that light will thus be thrown upon obscure or doubtful points of the sacred history, a new insight will be

gained into the true idea of Scripture prophecy and the proper method of its interpretation, and a fuller conception will be arrived at of the system of truth unfolded under the former dispensation, and particularly of the doctrine of the Messiah in the increasing clearness of its successive announcements.

The Minor Prophets have of course had a place assigned them in the more comprehensive class of expositions, such as those of Rosenmüller, Umbreit, Ewald, the Exegetical Manual conducted by Hitzig and others, and (better than the preceding, though still upon a rationalistic basis,) the grammatical and critical commentary of Maurer, which come upon them in course, while going over the whole Old Testament, or large portions of it. But there has been a surprising deficiency of able monographs, or special commentaries devoted to these books for the detailed settlement of their exposition, and the full and minute discussion of all the questions relating to them. The volume of Hesselberg upon the Minor Prophets (1838) is too trifling in size, and altogether too feeble and insignificant to meet the wants of the case. That of Ackermann, (1830,) is interesting from its constant comparison of the Vulgate, Septuagint, and other ancient versions, and from the condensed statement which it presents of the views of the earlier Roman Catholic expositors, but it contains nothing in the way of new and independent investigation. This deficiency has, however, at length made itself felt, and there seems now a fair prospect of its being supplied. Credner led the way in his commentary on Joel, (1831,) a work to which cannot be denied the praise of acuteness, philological ability, and extensive research. It will long be prized as a storehouse of valuable materials by the future students of Joel, but it is sadly vitiated by the extravagance of its hypotheses, and by unworthy views of inspiration and of the character of the prophets. Where an interpreter has no higher idea of religion than as a weak delusion, nor of a prophet than as a crafty and managing demagogue, he is utterly destitute of that sympathy with the inspired oracles, which, in their case, as in that of every intellectual product, must be acknowledged to be a prime requisite to successful exposition. Nor can the smaller and more recent volume of

Meier (1841) upon the same prophet, be regarded as in any respect an advance upon his predecessor.

The commentary on Amos by Gustavus Baur* of Giessen, (1847,) exhibits no very decided proofs of ability or of original talent, but is nevertheless a useful compilation, presenting a convenient *resumé* of the views of previous expositors. This book is governed by a higher tone of religious sentiment than either of the preceding, though it is still far from what it ought to be. Baur has adopted his views of prophecy and of the prophets from Ewald, and the long dissertation upon this subject with which his book is prefaced, might as well have been superseded by a simple reference to the discussion of the latter, whose ideas he has borrowed without essential modification, certainly without improvement.

The commentary on Hosea by Simson, (1851,) the only publication of its author of whose existence we have any knowledge, is not only vastly in advance of the nearly worthless production of Stuck, (1828,) but is entitled to a distinguished place among the helps for the right understanding of this part of Scripture. Had its author been, what unfortunately he is not, a believer in divine inspiration in its true and orthodox sense, his exposition would have been nearly all that could have been desired. His high and enthusiastic admiration of Hosea's genius, and of the loftiness of his sentiments and aims, his respect even for his divine commission, which in a certain sense, involving nothing supernatural either in his call or his endowments he repeatedly asserts, prevent that belittleing of his subject, that suspicion of unworthy motives, that mangling of the book by the knife of an unsparing criticism, and that torturing of its sense by an ingeniously perverted exegesis, which are almost sure to be found in interpreters out of sympathy with that which they profess to expound. Far the larger portion of this commentary might be read without meeting with anything to betray the unsound theological tenets of its author. In a very few instances, and only where there is a concurrence of several ancient versions against the Hebrew, he departs from the generally received text. In almost every

* Not to be confounded with Bruno Bauer, infamous from his treatment of the Gospels, nor with the subtle and distinguished skeptic F. C. Baur, of Tübingen.

case he stoutly maintains its correctness, and evinces not only candour and ingenuousness, but uncommon skill and ability in the investigation even of the most perplexed passages. In a book containing so many difficulties and obscurities as Hosea, it is not, perhaps, to be expected that the views of any expositor will prove satisfactory upon every point. But even where the reader is disposed to dissent from Simson's own opinion, he is provided with the materials for making up an independent judgment in the history of interpretation, which is given in all disputed passages: and from this carefully digested statement of the principal views of commentators and translators, Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern, with the grounds upon which they respectively rest, he may intelligently make his own selection.

Caspari, as our readers know, has furnished valuable expositions, and of a decidedly evangelical cast, of Obadiah, (1842,) and of Micah (1851:) only the amazing diffuseness of the latter upon unimportant and subsidiary points, and its sadly confused arrangement, detract from its excellence, and from the comfort of using it. The commentary of his friend and former associate Delitzsch on Habakkuk, (1843,) stands in the very front rank of these monographs for ability, originality, and soundness of exposition. Two brothers of the name of Strauss, (unconnected in family or in views with David Frederic Strauss, of mythical notoriety,) possessing evangelical sentiments, very considerable learning, and a fair proportion of exegetical ability, have written, one the volume before us upon Nahum, and the other, (F. A. Strauss, scarcely the equal of his younger brother,) upon Zephaniah (1843.) A commentary upon this latter book was also promised by Delitzsch ten years ago, but has not yet made its appearance. Hengstenberg, besides commenting upon selected portions of the Minor Prophets, has, in his Christology, a second edition of which is now passing through the press, expounded Zechariah throughout. And a fresh exposition of at least the first part of this book, under the title of the Night Visions of Zechariah, is in course of publication, from the pen of Baumgarten, favourably known from his other productions, particularly his commentary on the Pentateuch, and his treatise on the Acts of the Apostles. We

took up his work on Zechariah with avidity, as there are few transatlantic scholars whose views we were more anxious to see upon this enigmatical portion of Scripture, but were disappointed to find its prolixity such as to make it almost unreadable.

Those parts of the Scripture which relate to Nineveh have of late gained additional interest from the astonishing discoveries recently made upon the site of this queen city of the ancient world. The exhumation of its palaces, with their sculptures and inscriptions, has set us face to face, as it were, with generations, every vestige of which had been supposed to have perished more than twenty centuries ago; and it has naturally awakened a fresh zeal in the examination of all sources, sacred and profane, whence anything could be gathered touching the civilization, the history and the fortunes of the Assyrian empire. And on the other hand, the students of the Scriptures are turning to these exhumations with equal interest, to discover what these records so marvellously snatched from destruction may contain newly to confirm or to elucidate the sacred volume. Strauss has devoted himself diligently to this side of his subject; and everything in the researches of modern times, no less than in the statements of ancient writers, which bears upon the interpretation or the verification of Nahum's prophecy, has been carefully gathered and compared. The names of Rich, Botta, Flandin, Layard, Rawlinson, Hincks, Bonomi, Vaux, and others well known from their researches or their publications upon Assyrian affairs, are of frequent occurrence in this volume. Several interesting coincidences are pointed out between the sculptured scenes found amid these ruins and the language of the prophet. Much more sparing use is made of the inscriptions, whose true reading and genuine sense must still be considered as in a great measure doubtful, although the marvellous advances already made toward their decipherment and interpretation give reason to hope that full success may yet crown the efforts put forth in that direction. And what results may then be developed for the restoration of the history of that long buried empire, and the corroboration of the exactness of scriptural statement, it is impossible now to conjecture. The caution observed by our author upon this

point, in the present incipiency of our knowledge upon this subject, is eminently judicious. It is hardly possible that the inscriptions still existing in Nineveh can be read without throwing some light upon its history, as its sculptures have already done upon its civilization and customs; especially if that chamber piled full of terra cotta tablets, upon which Mr. Layard was so fortunate as to light in a state of perfect preservation, should prove to be, as has been conjectured, but is almost too good to hope for, the treasure-house of records referred to in Ezra v. 17, in which all royal decrees were placed for safe-keeping. Enough has already been made out of the monuments to ascertain that they will in all probability furnish us with the names of monarchs hitherto unknown, with the succession of their reigns, and perhaps some of the prominent events in which they took part. In the very fragmentary and imperfect state in which Assyrian history has come down to us, any new accession will be welcome, especially if it shall teach us how existing gaps are to be filled up, or shall give any hint as to the proper manner of piecing together those scraps which are already possessed. As Nineveh was destroyed two hundred years before the father of Greek history took up his pen, and its very name was unheard by Xenophon, though he led the retreat of the ten thousand past its site, it is not surprising that the notices left of it are of the most brief and scanty description. The histories of the Assyrian Empire by Herodotus (if, as is most probable, he actually wrote what he is known to have projected) and by Ctesias, which if preserved would no doubt have yielded ample, and to a great extent reliable materials, have both been unfortunately lost. And the few scattered fragments which have been preserved rather add to the complexity of the subject by the difficulty of reconciliation and adjustment, than afford any clear and satisfactory information. Possibly the monuments may assist in clearing up what is now so dark and obscure; though we fear the too extravagant expectations of some of the learned and sanguine explorers are not destined to be realized. That these relics, which, numerous and deeply interesting as they are, considering the previous paucity of such remains, must yet be an inconsiderable fragment of the ancient city, and that

not carefully selected with a view to its historic worth but casually preserved from plunder, the conflagration and the tooth of time, should contain a full and connected history of the empire, is surely too much to anticipate. At any rate, in the present uncertainty which shrouds the subject, it is precarious to rely with any confidence upon assumed identifications of the monarchs of the monuments with the monarchs of history, or even upon the correctness of the periods to which the ruins have been by ingenious and plausible arguments referred.

It is casting no reproach upon the most brilliant of the intellectual achievements of modern times, to say that the secrets of the mysterious arrow-headed character have been as yet but imperfectly disclosed. The only matter of astonishment is that anything whatever has been made of them, and that the enigma has yielded at all, notwithstanding the patience, the ingenuity, and the learning brought to bear upon them. The Greek on the Rosetta stone furnished a key to the Egyptian hieroglyphics, without which they might never have been resolved. But here was no such aid as this. It had been known from the days of Peter della Valle that strange and unintelligible characters were cut upon the face of the rocks in many parts of the old Persian empire, which from the peculiar shape of their constituent elements received the name of arrow-headed, or cuneiform. Similar inscriptions were found in the ruins of Persepolis. What might be the contents of these inscriptions, in case they were significant, what the language in which they were written, what the power of the individual characters, whether ideographic, syllabic, or alphabetic, or what even might be the direction in which they were to be read, no one knew. A more hopeless task than that of deciphering and translating under such circumstances cannot well be imagined. It was undertaken, however, and has to a wonderful extent been accomplished. A careful comparison revealed the fact that all the cuneiform inscriptions, though bearing a general and marked similarity, were nevertheless not written in the same character: that there were, in fact, three plainly distinguishable kinds, differing greatly in the complexity and the respective number of their written signs. The whole three were frequently found in parallel columns

upon the same rock, and it was from this circumstance conjectured that such inscriptions were trilingual, bearing the same legend in three different tongues. This has now been discovered actually to be the case: the Persian monarchs, in order that these public records might be read more widely by the subjects of their empire, causing them to be inscribed in the three languages which then divided its territory among them, in the same manner as their cognate representatives do now. Just as the Persian, Arabic, and Turkish are intermingled at present, so were tongues in a measure corresponding to these in the age of Cyrus, and in all probability these indicate the languages contained in the Persian, Assyrian, and Median or Scythic inscriptions, as they have been respectively termed.

Numberless abortive attempts had been made by the most eminent scholars, but there was no actual progress in deciphering the character until the year 1800. A few preliminary steps had been doubtfully taken, but all was as dark and mysterious as ever. It was then the good fortune of a young German scholar, with no great pretensions to oriental learning, but ingenious, and of untiring patience, to start from a fortunate conjecture, and to work out by means of it one-third of the alphabet. The discoverer was George F. Grotefend, at that time studying at the university of Bonn, and whose death was announced a year since. He addressed himself to the examination of the simplest of the three kinds of cuneiform writing. From the circumstance that the arrow-heads of which it was composed were always inclined in one direction, it was inferred that that was the direction of the writing. Tychsen had pointed out the sign which marked the division between words; and since as many as eleven characters were sometimes found between two such signs, Grotefend concluded that they must each represent, not a syllable, but a simple alphabetic sound. A careful inspection of some Persepolitan legends which he had before him, showed the frequent repetition of certain formulæ, accompanied now by one, now by another word. The constant terms he conjectured from the ordinary structure of oriental inscriptions to be royal titles, and the variable to be the names of the monarchs. He selected two of these assumed names, which stood so related,

that he judged them to be those of father and son. They were of equal length, each composed of seven letters, and, though having some characters in common, of different initials. As these inscriptions were known to belong to the period of the Achæmenides, the verification of his conjecture depended upon his finding two princes of that line whose names would answer these conditions. Cyrus and Artaxerxes were rejected as of unsuitable length; Cyrus and Cambyses from the sameness of their initial. Darius and Xerxes were chosen; and by recurring to the original mode of spelling, as nearly as that could be determined, they were adapted to the corresponding words in the inscription. With the letters thus conjecturally fixed, he proceeded to spell out the words of the title, *eghre khshehioh*, which he discovered to mean "great king" in the Zend or old Persian language. Every new trial served but to verify the conjecture which he had made, and to show that he had hit upon the beginning of a true solution. Many years of indefatigable research on the part of many able scholars, among whom Lassen of Bonn particularly distinguished himself, were needed to develope the system thus initiated, to justify completely its results, and to apply the needed correction, until now the whole alphabet has been ascertained with a satisfactory degree of certainty, and the contents of the inscriptions can be pretty accurately made out.

The Persian inscription could now be read; but the other two kinds remained as dark and inexplicable as ever. The next step was to make use of the key afforded by the former to unlock the mysteries of the latter. The second species of the arrow-headed character was now attempted, fortunately the very same as that since dug from the mounds at Nineveh; for the minor diversities and the divisions to which these have led, need not here be referred to. This Assyrian species is greatly more complicated than the preceding, and even with the aid afforded by its previous solution, the investigation has been encumbered with the most formidable difficulties, such as must have been absolutely insurmountable without this aid. Instead of the forty characters of the first species, it numbers upwards of six hundred, and it is still in dispute to what extent these are to be regarded as syllables, abbreviations, or ideo-

graphs. The Persian character of the trilingual inscriptions, which was now intelligible, fixed the spelling of the proper names in the Assyrian character, and determined throughout the general sense of the legend. The great multitude of the written signs, and the confused and arbitrary way in which they have the appearance of being sometimes used, together with the absence of marks in this species to determine the end of words, greatly complicated the problem, and embarrassed its solution. The highest honour must here be awarded to Col. Rawlinson, who, during his connection with the British army in the East, devoted himself with enthusiastic zeal to the deciphering and interpretation of the cuneiform monuments. With few aids, and in ignorance of much that had been done in Europe toward their solution, he succeeded in working out an independent alphabet for the first or Persian species, differing in but a single letter from that developed by Lassen. By the aid of a telescope he copied the Behistun (*Βαγίστανον ὄρος* of Diodorus Siculus) inscription, the greatness of whose elevation upon the perpendicular face of a precipice had defied the attempts of all previous travellers to reach or to examine it. Its long trilingual legend gave a most important clue for the study of the second or Assyrian species. It cannot be denied that this is far from being wholly disentangled yet. The power of many of its characters is well defined, and the meaning of a considerable number of words may be regarded as settled with tolerable certainty. That no small measure of perplexity yet remains may be inferred from the statements of Rawlinson himself,* that many of the Assyrian signs sometimes represent phonetically a complete syllable, and sometimes are only of the sounds of which the syllable is composed—nay, that certain characters represent two entirely dissimilar sounds—sounds so dissimilar that neither can they be brought into relation with each other, nor, even supposing the sign properly to denote a syllable, which syllable on occasion may be compressed into its dominant sound, will the other power be found to enter at all into the full and original pronunciation, while on the other hand, great numbers of charac-

* See his Commentary on the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Babylonia and Assyria, pp. 5, 6.

ters have accorded to them precisely the same sound. Such "inconvenient laxity" is almost if not quite inconsistent with the idea of intelligible writing, and will undoubtedly be regarded by most persons as indicating a defect in the explanation, and as showing that the *ultimatum* is not thus far reached. Patient ingenuity may yet show how all this is to be explained, and may bring certainty where there is still much darkness and doubt. It is not wonderful that a subject so perplexed is not to be unravelled at once. We shall wait with much interest for the finished results. Meanwhile, in the present chaos of conflicting interpretations, it cannot with fairness be asked of us to rely with any great confidence upon the identifications assumed as already made out, when doctors so widely disagree that the name of the builder of the Khorsabad palace, which Rawlinson read successively Arkot-sin and Sargina, was by De Saulcy made out to be Esarhaddon, by Grotefend, Nabopolassar, and by Luzzato, Chyniladanus.

Abandoning, therefore, the inscriptions, as unable for the present at least to furnish any reliable information, we are thrown for our knowledge of Assyrian history upon a few passages incidentally referring to it in ancient writers. It is with the utmost difficulty that these fragmentary accounts are put together into anything like a consistent unity. And it is worth observing how different is the course pursued by historians in their patient endeavours to reconcile these perplexed statements, from the method which those adopt in relation to the Scriptures who are forward to charge upon them falsehood or inconsistency, upon the first appearance of the slightest difficulty. What can be ascertained regarding the origin and growth of the Assyrian empire does not here concern us, but only its final catastrophe, as that alone comes within the survey of the prophet. That Nineveh was one of the greatest cities of ancient times, scarcely excepting Babylon itself, we learn from the statements made of its magnificence and extent, and it is in fact apparent from the ruins themselves. Of its fall, the following account is given by Ctesias.* "Arbaces, a Mede, a valiant and prudent man, and general of the forces

* Preserved in Diodorus Siculus ii. 2: the quotation is abridged from Bonomi, "Nineveh and its Palaces," pp. 64, 65.

which were sent every year out of Media to Nineveh, was stirred up by Belesis the governor of Babylon to overthrow the Assyrian empire. Hereupon Arbaces prevailed with the Medes to invade the Assyrian empire, and drew the Persians, in hopes of liberty, to join in the confederacy. Belesis in like manner persuaded the Babylonians to stand up for their liberties. He sent messengers into Arabia, and gained that prince for a confederate. Sardanapalus, being informed of the revolt, led forth the forces of the rest of the provinces against them; whereupon, a battle being fought, the rebels were totally routed, and with a great slaughter were forced to the mountains, seventy furlongs from Nineveh. A second and a third battle were fought with like success. While Sardanapalus was rejoicing at these victories, and feasting his army, Arbaces induced the Bactrians to revolt, fell suddenly upon the king's camp, and making a great slaughter of some, forced the rest into the city. Hereupon Sardanapalus committed the charge of the whole army to the queen's brother, and took upon himself the defence of the city. But the rebels twice defeated the king's forces, and the king being afterwards besieged, many of the nations revolted to the confederates, so that Sardanapalus now perceiving that the kingdom was like to be lost, sent post into all the provinces of the kingdom in order to raise soldiers, and to make all other preparations necessary to endure a siege. And he was the more encouraged to this, for that he was acquainted with an ancient prophecy that Nineveh could never be taken by force till the river became the city's enemy. The siege continued two years. The third year it happened that the river, overflowing with continual rains, came up into a part of the city and tore down the wall twenty furlongs in length. The king hereupon conceiving that the oracle was accomplished, in that the river was an apparent enemy to the city, utterly despaired; and therefore, that he might not fall into the hands of his enemies, he caused a huge pile of wood to be made in his palace court, and heaped together upon it all his gold, silver, and royal apparel, and enclosing his eunuchs and his concubines in an apartment within the pile, caused it to be set on fire, and burnt himself and them together; which when the revolters came to understand, they entered through

the breach in the walls and took the city, and clothed Arbaces with a royal robe, and committed to him the sole authority, proclaiming him king."

The account given by Herodotus is that Deioces, the first independent king of the Medes, succeeded in subduing several surrounding nations under the Median yoke. After a reign of fifty-three years, he was succeeded by his son Phraortes, who subjected the Persians, and who in the twenty-second year of his reign made an unsuccessful incursion into Assyria, in which he perished with the greater part of his army. He was succeeded by his son Cyaxares, who proceeded with all his forces to the attack of Nineveh, being equally desirous of avenging his father and becoming master of the city. He vanquished the Assyrians in battle, but when he was engaged in the siege of Nineveh, he was surprised by an army of Scythians, who beat him in a pitched battle, gaining not only the victory but the empire of Asia. After a space of twenty-eight years, however, the Medes recovered their possessions, after which they took Nineveh.

Scholars have been divided as to the best mode of reconciling these accounts. One method is to suppose that Herodotus and Ctesias record two different events, which took place at distinct periods. There must then have been two successive Assyrian empires; the first overthrown by Arbaces about 800 B. C.; after which Nineveh rose again to its former splendour, the various kings reigned who are named in Scripture, Pul, Tiglath-Pileser, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon, and it was finally destroyed a second time, two hundred years later, by another Mede, Cyaxares. On this hypothesis, Nahum must have lived in the interval between the first and the second captures of Nineveh, and consequently it can be the second only which he predicts.

Strauss gives his suffrage with those who follow the opposite method, and who endeavour to harmonize the statements as descriptive of the same event. The different names given to the persons engaged in it need create no difficulty in the mind of him who has observed the transformation of other oriental names by Greek writers. The remaining diversity is explained by assuming both accounts, which were drawn from wholly

different sources, to be partial, each needing to be supplied from the other. Upon this hypothesis, it will be correct to illustrate the fulfilment of the prophecy by the account of Ctesias as well as by that of Herodotus. This is accordingly the course which our author pursues.

The year of Nineveh's overthrow has been variously fixed between the extremes of B. C. 625 and 597. Strauss adopts the opinion that it took place B. C. 606, for the following reasons. 1. Alexander Polyhistor relates that Nabopolassar, being sent by the last king of Nineveh to oppose the Medes under Astyages, (the same with Cyaxares,) contracted an alliance with him, and that Nineveh was attacked and overthrown by their united forces. Now as according to the canon of Ptolemy, Nabopolassar was in authority from B. C. 625 to 604, the fall of Nineveh must be placed somewhere between these limits. In 605 or 4 he was compelled by increasing age and infirmity to give up his army into the hands of his son Nebuchadnezzar, and he died the same year. 2. The capture of Nineveh is named by Herodotus among the last of the enterprises of Cyaxares. It must have succeeded his war with the Lydians, the close of which is determined by an eclipse of the sun noted at the time to have been B. C. 610. And as according to Ctesias the siege of Nineveh lasted three years, it cannot have been concluded before 606.

After this time Nineveh never flourished again. Strabo mentions it only as a ruined city. Xenophon, who in his famous retreat passed directly by the spot where Nineveh had once stood, does not even mention its name, and seems to have had no suspicion of the vicinity of the site of that once mighty city; he speaks of that part of the ruin now known as the Birs Nimroud, under the name of Larissa. Lucian, in the second century of the Christian era, declares that it had utterly perished, and its very site was unknown.

The meaning of the name *Nahum* is "he who comforts or is comforted," and Hengstenberg makes upon it the remark that he was consecrated to the God of comfort, as Hosea to the God of help, and Micah to the incomparable God. He is called the Elkoshite, to designate, not the family from which he sprang, (an opinion mentioned by Jerome and Cyril, and

adopted by Epiphanius,) but his birth-place. This is not to be identified with Elkosh, in the vicinity of Nineveh, of which mention is first made in the middle of the sixteenth century, where the tomb of Nahum is exhibited to the credulous, but according to Jerome's explicit testimony, was a place in Galilee, still existing in his own day, and which had been pointed out to him. The opinion of Knobel and Hitzig that it was the same place with Capernaum, (which signifies "the town of Nahum,") seems to be without foundation. Of the life and actions of the prophet, nothing is known; the legends regarding him are not worth repeating.

Our author supposes Nahum to have prophesied in the reign of Manasseh, during the brief captivity of that monarch. His principal arguments are the following. The position of this book in the collection of Minor Prophets, after Micah, and before Habakkuk and Zephaniah, indicates that it belongs somewhere between the first part of the reign of Hezekiah and that of Josiah. Nahum borrows expressions from Joel, Micah, and Isaiah, and is himself quoted by Jeremiah. The allusions in the prophecy to Sennacherib's expedition, i. 9, 12, and death, i. 14, the insulting language of Rabshakeh, ii. 13, and the power of Assyria yet unbroken, i. 12, agree with this assumed date. That no gross sins nor apostasy from God is charged upon the people, is alleged to point to such a time of affliction and repentance as the captivity of Manasseh. And the words i. 13, "I will burst thy bonds," are taken to be an allusion to the future deliverance of the captive king. Where the data are so few and of such doubtful character, it would be presumptuous to speak with confidence. But we confess that this view is less attractive to us than that which has been commonly received from the days of Jerome, that the prophecy of Nahum was delivered in the reign of Hezekiah, perhaps shortly after the disastrous invasion of Sennacherib.

The first chapter opens with a majestic description of Jehovah in the attributes about to be displayed in Assyria's overthrow, which is followed by a declaration of his settled purpose to accomplish its complete destruction. The effects of God's presence upon external nature, as depicted verses 4, 5, are conceived to be, not the natural phenomena of a storm, a

drought, or an earthquake, described in exaggerated terms; nor symbols of the overthrow of kingdoms; nor expressions borrowed by anticipation from the final judgment, and wrought into this description of an antecedent judgment, because this is viewed as indissolubly linked with that, both being parts of one all-comprehensive display of God's punitive justice; nor simply imaginary, the inward affright of the guilty being reflected in the world around, which seems to them, in their terror, to be on the point of dissolution; but they belong to the vision of the prophet, to whose mind such scenes were actually presented, and they indicate the glory of the divine Being, and the absolute control over all objects of nature which is at every moment possessed by him, even when not thus terrifically exerted.

This jealous, avenging, almighty, and yet gracious God, shall make an utter end of the oppressor of his people. "Affliction shall not rise up the second time," by which is understood, agreeably to the hypothesis adopted of the date of the prophecy, that the carrying away of Manasseh in chains by the Assyrians was the last affliction that the people of God should experience from that quarter.

The 15th verse commences the second chapter in the Hebrew text. Messengers are seen in the distance, bearing the welcome intelligence of the destruction of Nineveh, which is then represented as actually taking place under the eyes of the prophet. "He that dasheth in pieces," is not the Messiah, though he bears a name somewhat resembling it, Micah ii. 13, but the instrument of Nineveh's overthrow, the Chaldeans and Medes, though they are not specifically named. On the approach of these formidable foes, the king of Nineveh is urged to the most strenuous measures of defence. Such measures would be necessary, for Jehovah had resolved upon his people's exaltation, and by consequence upon their oppressor's fall. For the Lord is returning to [or restoring] the excellency of Jacob as the excellency of Israel. He shall come back with his grace and power to them whom he seemed temporarily to have forsaken, and shall vindicate to Jacob the possession of those prerogatives and advantages which belong to them as God's Israel, his true and elect people. He would do this

because they had been so mercilessly abused, and their vine branches (the whole people is the vine, its individual members the branches, though the literal reference to the products of the ground need not be excluded,) had been marred. The military preparations of the besieging army are now vividly depicted. The reddened shields and scarlet-clad soldiery are capable of illustration from ancient customs, but here specially betoken the coming slaughter, and the wrath of God, of which they are the instruments. The chariots flash with steel, as their metallic ornaments and the weapons which they carry glitter in the sun—not chariots armed with scythes, as their employment, according to the positive testimony of ancient writers and the negative testimony of the monuments, belongs to a later date. The firs or cypresses (lances of that material) are shaken both from the motion of the car and brandished by the warrior. They are first seen in the distance, v. 3; then follow, with insane, lightning-like speed, their approach and the onset, v. 4. The besieged king shall remember his nobles, by whom seem to be here intended, not so much satraps commanding distant provinces whose aid he shall expect, as those in the city upon whom he can rely in this urgent extremity, for its defence. His reliance is vain; they shall stumble. They hasten to the wall, and the engine has been prepared—such a war machine as is seen repeatedly upon the monuments, a sheltering roof, beneath which battering-rams are plied against the wall. The gates opening upon the river and the artificial channels connected with it shall be opened; whether they shall be left open through negligence, as in the case of Babylon, or forced open by the enemy in spite of the difficulty of approach, is not stated by the prophet nor recorded by history: and the occupants of the palace shall melt with fear. It will not be worth while to detail all the strange explanations which have been offered of this simple verse, (v. 6.) The opinion of Hitzig, in the first edition of his Commentary, that the gates of the rivers were sluices, and the submerging of the city and palace was a measure of defence analogous to the breaking of their dykes by the Dutch in modern times, is a sufficient specimen. Huzzab, in v. 7, has been explained in more than twenty different ways. It is not a proper noun, the name of the Assyrian

queen, but as in the margin of the English version, a verb:—"it is established," fixed by the divine purpose. What is decreed, follows: She, the city, personified as a queen, is ignominiously stripped of her clothing and led into captivity, while her attendant maidens, (who, if they have a distinct signification, and are not merely added to complete the image already suggested, are not inferior and dependent cities, but the women of Nineveh,) with voice and gesture lament her fate. Nineveh has all her days been a pool of water, an emblem not of her future desolation, but of the past abundance of her wealth and population. They shall flee away, *i. e.*, these waters which she has contained, her treasures and inhabitants, and no efforts can stop them. Then, with an assertion of her utter ruin, and an exclamation at its completeness, the chapter closes.

The third chapter does not describe a second capture of the city different from the former, but resumes the same topic, for the sake of assigning the causes of this destruction, which are found in the crimes of which Nineveh had been guilty. The whoredoms and witchcrafts charged upon her are those acts of intrigue and crafty policy by which, under pretence of alliance and friendship, she sought her own aggrandizement and inveigled other nations to their ruin.

To show how little reason Nineveh had to think herself secure, the example of No Ammon (Eng. ver. margin) is appealed to, a city no less powerful and strongly defended, but doomed to destruction. No Ammon is rendered by the Septuagint in this place, "the portion of Ammon," and in Ezek. xxx. 14–16, Diospolis. The Vulgate has in both places Alexandria, which is thus explained by Jerome in his Commentary, on the authority of his Hebrew teacher: "Non quod eo tempore Alexandria vocaretur, quippe quæ longo post tempore ab Alexandro M. Macedone nomen accepit; sed quia sub nomine primo [*i. e.* No] semper Ægypti metropolis fuerit et abundantissima populis." Its maritime location probably led to this conjecture. That No was a city of Egypt is plain from v. 9. There were two places in that country called Diospolis, one near Mendes in Lower Egypt, the other the famous Thebes of Upper Egypt, mentioned by Homer as the city of a hundred gates, and whose remains are the grandest of all the ruins of antiquity. Since

the time of Bochart there has been a general agreement among interpreters, that this last city is the one here intended. It is described as situated among the rivers, the Nile and its artificial branches or canals. The sea which composed its rampart and its wall, was also the Nile, the Hebrew word being in a few instances applied to rivers of large volume, *e. g.*, the Euphrates, Isa. xxi. 1, and perhaps as here to the Nile in Isa. xviii. 2, xix. 5. So that it is not necessary to translate with Ewald, "whose wall was a rampart from sea to sea," from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean. The period of the capture of Thebes here referred to, and the agents in its accomplishment, are by no means certain. It has been attributed to the Assyrians under Shalmaneser, Sargon (which is, however, according to Strauss, but another name for the same monarch,) with an appeal to Isa. xx.; Sennacherib, on the authority of Josephus, Arch. x. 1, 4, who yet says nothing of the overthrow of Thebes, nor even of a victory of the Assyrians; and Esarhaddon, who, according to the more than doubtful authority of Abydenus, subdued Egypt and parts of Syria. It has also been attributed to the Ethiopians, who made themselves masters of Egypt about the close of the eighth century before Christ; to the civil disturbances among the Egyptians themselves in the seventh century; to an irruption of the Scythians mentioned by Herodotus; to the Carthaginians, inasmuch as it is said by Ammianus Marcellinus that the city Hecatompylos was once taken by them: and by Bochart, who reduces the age of Nahum's prophecy to correspond, it is identified with the invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, foretold by Jeremiah and Ezekiel. As it is extremely hard for a German to confess ignorance, even where he has no data to guide him, Strauss maintains the view, adopted from Jerome, Cyril, Theodoret, and Cocceius, but which can only be justified by a plain necessity, that it is not a past but a future destruction by Cambyses which the prophet intended. The silence of the Theban monuments as to any previous sack of the city is regarded as conclusive that none had occurred. It is hard, on this hypothesis, to see why the fate of Thebes should be adduced as lending confirmation to that which had been denounced upon Nineveh.

As Thebes had fallen, so should she. How desperate soever

the efforts for her defence, however prodigious the numbers she enclosed, her destruction should be sudden, complete, and unlamented.

Every prophecy of the Scriptures had no doubt a special appropriateness to the times in which it was delivered. As a wise teacher of his people, God brought out from the stores of his infinite knowledge just those particular lessons which they each time needed for their instruction, their warning, and their encouragement. In his word, as in creation and providence, everything has its proper place and season. In the time of Nahum, for example, God's people specially needed to be informed that this great overshadowing power, by which they were oppressed, should not be suffered to destroy them, but should be itself destroyed. And yet, as this message was designed for the guidance and comfort of men in all ages, its lessons can never become obsolete. Whatever was written aforetime, as the apostle tells us, was written for our learning. While the Holy Spirit, who spake by the mouth of Nahum, had therefore specially in view the prophet's cotemporaries, he so framed his lessons as to adapt them to the wants of all coming time.

The predictions of this book and of other books of Scripture are not to be regarded as mere anticipations of certain portions of the world's history, which lose very much their interest and their value when that history has passed into actual occurrence, and can be gathered in all its details from others who were witnesses of the events. One prominent design of these disclosures regarding the fate of the great nations of the earth, is to teach the relation which God sustains to human history, and which, as our eyes are so much directed to the agency of second causes, we are prone to overlook or to forget. By thus foreshadowing events, however, which lie far beyond the reach of human sagacity to discover, which are yet in all the contingency of remote causation and of human liberty, God steps as it were visibly into the arena, and shows himself to be concerned in whatever takes place among men. Such predictions reveal that God rules in all the affairs of men: that while he was specially the God of Israel, he was likewise the Governor of all the nations of the earth; that he

controlled and conducted the fortunes of them all, even the most mighty and powerful, shaping their destinies as best pleased him, or best comported with his holy ends. They reveal that his government of the nations is a moral government, one of righteous retributions. It is the crimes of Nineveh, which, after a long seeming impunity, secure her overthrow. Her destruction is not an act of capricious sovereignty; it results not from the mere turning of fortune's unsteady wheel; it is the just reward of her iniquities. And they reveal the subordination of this universal and omnipotent moral government to the scheme of saving mercy. It is not barely in punishment of her own sins that Nineveh was to be overthrown, but to accomplish in this signal way the deliverance of his people, among whom God was preparing a salvation for the whole earth, and to avenge the wrongs committed against them. It was to evidence not only that he "will take vengeance on his adversaries," but also that "he is good; a strong hold in the day of trouble; and he knoweth them that trust in him."

These three lessons of the universality of God's government, its retributive character, and its subordination to his scheme of grace, were important for the prophet's cotemporaries. They are equally true and important in all time; and they are conveyed even more powerfully and impressively to those who have not barely the prediction, but the record of its actual accomplishment. These teachings we have in the prophecy in common with those to whom it was first delivered. But in addition, it furnishes to us who live after the fulfilment an instance of divine foreknowledge, which clearly establishes the inspiration of the prophet, and by consequence, the heavenly origin of our religion. It gives additional value to the evidence of divine revelation derived from this source, when the prophecy in question is not symbolical nor figurative, but literal; and when its language is neither obscure nor doubtful, but plain and unambiguous, and its accomplishment is evident and striking. There is also the special advantage in this case that the events foretold are not such as took place in an obscure corner, but are prominent, notorious, and undeniable, concerning one of the grandest, most powerful, and most mag-

nificent cities of the ancient world. And the record of its fall is preserved, not in the Scriptures, not by Jewish writers, but by those who had no knowledge whatever of these predictions having been uttered, who had no suspicion of the service they were doing the religion of the Bible by the record they were making, and who cannot by possibility have been guilty of any collusion, with the view of producing a seeming correspondence between the event and the prophecy, if none actually existed. And now in the proof that there is in this book a real prophecy, which, as shown by heathen authors, and as they who visit the site of Nineveh at the present day can see with their own eyes, has been literally fulfilled; and that this prediction was uttered at such a time and under such circumstances as to preclude the possibility of its having been a so-called *vaticinium post eventum*, a shrewd conjecture based on known causes, or even a vague anticipation, or an enthusiastic rhapsody, there is a demonstration that this was a divinely communicated truth, and that he who uttered it was a prophet sent from God. And it is the more important to insist upon this class of the Christian evidences at the present day, because it has become the fashion with many to decry the external defences of religion, and upon this has followed the disposition to make of revelation only a subjective state, not an objective and supernatural communication.

In tracing the correspondence between a prophecy and its fulfilment, it is important to observe, both in this and in other cases, that what is presented in one picture in the prophecy, need not always occur at the same point of time in the history. The prophetic eye ranges over a long vista of the future, over a long train of events conspiring to one grand result, but which may yet require many years, or even centuries, for their accomplishment. Thus the subject of Nahum's prophecy is the fall of Nineveh. He depicts it as attacked by the overwhelming forces of its enemies, and leaves it utterly desolate and waste. Now it is no detraction from the truthfulness of the prophecy, nor from the exactness of its correspondence with the event, that its capture and sack by Cyaxares did not complete its desolation, but was only the first decisive step in its downward progress. From that fatal blow it never rallied,

but sunk gradually away until it became the perfectly irredeemable desolation which Xenophon beheld it two hundred years later, and which it has remained until this day. The vision of the prophet was not restricted to the condition of things at the conclusion of the siege of Cyaxares, but reached beyond to its ultimate result; and the desolation which succeeded is accordingly portrayed without any note being taken of the chronological interval which separated them.

Now, whatever diversity there may be among the authorities in Assyrian history as to many of its facts and dates, there can be no disagreement as to these points:—That Nineveh was one of the most magnificent and powerful cities of the ancient world; that it was suddenly and signally overthrown at a period when its wealth and power were at their height; that this was effected by an invasion of the Medes and Babylonians, somewhere about B. C. 600; and that the desolation of the city has been so complete that for ages its very site was unknown or disputed, and that all which now remain of its former grandeur are a few ruined mounds. That this corresponds precisely with the prophetic picture of Nineveh's utter hopeless destruction, in spite of her great wealth and power, and the multitudes of her population compared to swarms of locusts, is too plain for argument. It is also to be noted, that while the particular people is not mentioned which were to be the instrument of Nineveh's overthrow, that they may be partially at least intimated. In both the descriptions of the invading army given ii. 3, 4, and iii. 2, 3, almost exclusive mention is made of horsemen and of chariots. The destruction must have been effected, therefore, by some power, a main part of whose military strength lay in their cavalry. This was notoriously the case with Media, which was celebrated throughout the ancient world for the excellence and numbers of its horses.

We would, without doubt, be able to point out more minute coincidences between the prophecy and the accomplishment, if we only had more detailed and reliable accounts of the events as they actually took place. That the city should be pillaged, ii. 9, put to the sword, iii. 3, set on fire, iii. 15, and deserted of its population, who should either betake themselves

to flight, ii. 8, iii. 18, or be led into captivity, ii. 7, is plainly declared. And this is all confirmed by the historical records, or by existing monuments. If the account of Ctesias is to be received as describing the final capture of the city, i. 10, "while they are drunken as drunkards they shall be devoured as stubble," may be considered as predicting the advantage gained by their enemies at the time of the drunken revel of Sardanapalus. That the disastrous overflow of the Tigris during the siege is intimated, i. 8, is also possible, but not certain.

Fortunately, however, the most essential points are those which are undeniable. There is no need, in order to make out an irrefragable argument, of insisting upon anything more than the grand event itself. Even if the prophet had recorded more minutely the particulars of this event, they would have been of little service to us, so long as our historical accounts are so vague and general. We may be justified, perhaps, in regarding it as a part of the wise orderings in this matter, that just those things should be most distinctly announced by the prophet, which the historian was afterwards to preserve. Here, then, we have the prophet Nahum announcing, one hundred years before the event, not as a speculation, nor a venturesome conjecture, but as a certain fact, that Nineveh should be overthrown. She was then the mistress of Asia. No city could vie with her in wealth, in magnificence, in the number of her citizens, in the amount of her various and far-reaching trade, the extent of her dominion, or the power of her armies. Nothing could have been intrinsically more improbable. Were any one now to utter a similar prediction in regard to the great emporiums of the old world or the new, regarding London, Paris, or New York, it can easily be imagined with what incredulity it would be received, and with what crazy absurdity it would be charged.

If the prediction had, however, been left in this indefinite form, it would have included within its scope quite a range of possibilities. These the prophet farther narrows down. This overthrow was not to be effected by some great natural convulsion, such as an earthquake, nor the bursting out of a volcano, nor by the pestilential infection of the district. If Nineveh had perished, and yet had perished in some such way as this,

the prophecy would have remained unfulfilled. Its destruction must be effected by a hostile invasion—an invasion, too, of some people, a prominent arm of whose military should be their cavalry. This, as has been seen, was all effected precisely as predicted. But all this might have happened, and yet the city, in a few years, or at least in the course of ages, after its capture, might have recovered from the blow, and risen to its former superiority and renown. Or if not this, it might have continued to exist as an inferior or subject city in all time to come, or to say the least, a village. The probabilities were immensely against its utter extirpation. Yet it was predicted that "he should make an utter end of the place thereof," that "it should be empty, void, and waste," that insulting witnesses of its desolation should ask where it had been, and as Zephaniah (ii. 14) farther declares, that it should be tenanted by wild beasts. And now while Jerusalem still exists, and Damascus, and even small villages like Hebron still stand from the days of Abraham, in less than three hundred years after these words had passed the lips of the inspired prophet, Xenophon led the retreat of the Greeks over the site of Nineveh, and never mentions its name, nor seems to have suspected that this great city had ever been there. If any one can imagine that all these particulars came to pass by chance, he will only afford an evidence that there is no credulity equal to that of those who are resolved to disbelieve the Scriptures.

But again, there is here another argument for the divinity of our religion, of a different kind. Not only the correspondence of the event with the prophecy, but the occurrence of the event in itself considered, will supply an argument. The overthrow of Nineveh was grounded on its crimes, and on its oppression of God's people. Now if it be true in actual fact that every power, however mighty, which presumed to trample upon and to oppress God's people, has been successively dashed to pieces, it affords no mean evidence that they were truly under divine protection, and that their cause was avenged by an omnipotent arm. The fact that this was brought about by the agency of second causes, need not blind us to its having been effected by the providence of God. Had this occurred only in the case of Nineveh, it might have been thought a casual co-

incidence, or too slender at least to base an argument upon it. But when we see it repeated afresh in the instance of every oppressor since, in Babylon, Persia, Syria, Rome, not to mention minor and less prominent examples, the idea of chance is excluded; it is evidently a permanent law, whose only explanation can be found in the admission that Israel were really what they claimed to be, and what the Scriptures claim for them, the people of the living God.

There is only one more topic connected with this prophecy, to which reference shall now be made. It is the position which it holds in the scheme of Messianic announcement. We read, Rev. xix. 10, that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy;" that is to say, it was the office of prophecy to testify concerning Jesus, to make disclosures regarding the coming Saviour. Peter says, in his discourse to the people from the temple-porch, Acts iii. 24, "All the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days," *i. e.*, the days of Christ and of the gospel period. It is said of our Saviour, Luke xxiv. 27, that beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto Cleopas and his fellow-traveller in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. It is plain, therefore, that the Old Testament, from beginning to end, sustains a relation to Christ. This is true alike of its histories and of its prophecies; both are conditioned by the connection in which they stand with the scheme of grace and the coming salvation. The office of the Old Testament historian is not barely to record the events of the ancient world: his task is simply to trace the progress of God's scheme of mercy among lost men, and to point out the preparation made for its consummation in the person of the great Redeemer. Consequently he had to do, not with the dynasties of Egypt or of Assyria, the rise or revolutions of ancient empires, or the progress of civilization and the arts, but simply with the fortunes of the chosen people, of Abraham and his descendants, in the midst of whom the scheme of mercy was being prepared, and from amongst whom the coming Saviour was to arise. The history concerns itself with other nations only as they are implicated with or affect the history of Israel. And in tracing the history of Abra-

ham's descendants even, the sacred historian treats them with strict reference to God's plan of grace. When they cut themselves off from connection with this, he has no further concern with them. Hence Ishmael and his descendants are thrown aside, to pursue the history of Isaac; Esau is again left out of view, to follow the fortunes of Jacob: and when at a later period the ten tribes were cast off in their apostasy, the history restricts itself, in the sequel, to the kingdom of Judah.

Now, a relation is sustained by the prophecies of the Old Testament to God's gracious scheme of mercy, precisely similar to that apparent in the history. It is not given to the prophets to predict any future event whatever taken at random. The object is not barely to give a proof of supernatural prescience, but to prepare the people for the coming salvation, to train them to a constant expectancy of it, and clearer views regarding it. These lessons are of course varied by the particular emergencies of the people at different periods, and the special instruction which was in each instance timely and needful. But universally Christ and his salvation was the end toward which all was directed. In order to this, it was not necessary that the person of the Redeemer should in every instance be distinctly held up to view. This is the case in the majority of instances. Most of the prophets do speak positively and distinctly of the coming Messiah, and bring to view some of the characteristics of his person, or some of the attributes or events of his reign. But even where he is not explicitly referred to, he is impliedly. Nahum, if he does not predict positively the coming and the reign of Christ, does so, at least, negatively, and in a way which was specially appropriate to the times when his prophecy was uttered.

Former prophets had foretold the coming and the work of Christ. To prepare the people for his advent, however, it was needful that they should first be sifted by periods of severe chastisement and trial. They must by divine judgments be punished for their sins and their idolatries, to reclaim them to God's service. For this work of chastisement we are distinctly told the Assyrians were raised up; and when they thought to destroy, they transcended their commission. When Assyria

appeared as the enemy of the people of God, with her increasing sway and unchecked power, there was great danger that the pious portion of the people would give way to despondency, and suppose that now at length God had abandoned them for their sins, and would give them up to complete destruction, and that his scheme of mercy would be broken off in the midst. It was needful, therefore, to reassure them, to show them that this was not the case; that the covenant of grace was still sure in spite of their unfaithfulness; that God would punish them for their sins, but would not utterly destroy them; and that in pledge of his covenant care, in proof that "the Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble, and that he knoweth them that trust in him," their oppressor should be destroyed, and they should be delivered. This great overgrown power, which had usurped to itself the mastery of the world, should not be permitted to retain its lawless ascendency. The dominion of this world belongs of right to the Lord, and to his Christ. Every attempt to place this sovereignty in other and ungodly hands, is a usurpation; and as such, must fall, in order to make way for him whose the sceptre and the diadem rightfully are. The crimes of Nineveh, and especially its hostile attitude to God's people, make it, for the time, the chief embodied form of opposition to the kingdom of God. It is, in the pinnacle of power to which it has attained, the concentration, the culminating point for the time being, of the kingdom of darkness on earth, its most powerful representative, its chief agent in obstructing the progress of the kingdom of God. But this kingdom of darkness must fall before the kingdom of light. The destruction of Nineveh, which has allied itself to the former, must consequently follow as one of the preparatory steps towards placing the sovereignty of the earth where it ought to be, and shall be, in the hands of Prince Immanuel.

While, therefore, the prophecy of Nahum is in form predictive only of the fall of Nineveh, it has a wider significance, and by reason of the principles which it involves, impliedly reveals the overthrow of every other form of opposition to the kingdom of God, and thus, negatively at least, announces that the kingdom of God shall be set up triumphantly and gloriously

over all the earth. If Nineveh must fall because it is allied to the kingdom of evil, because it is a usurpation of that sovereignty over the nations which belongs to Messiah alone, so every other form which that kingdom of evil may assume, and every subsequent usurpation must fall likewise, that Messiah's triumph may be complete. If Babylon rise upon the ruins of Nineveh, and practise the same oppressions, and show the same hostility to the people of God, then, while it is not written in so many words in the book of Nahum that Babylon too must be similarly destroyed; yet the spirit of the prophecy, and the reasons upon which it is based, require that it should, and that every obstacle should be completely removed out of the way which would obstruct Messiah's universal reign.

That it is legitimate to understand this prophecy in the extended sense which has now been given to it, that in predicting the utter overthrow of Nineveh it was the design of the Holy Spirit, speaking by the mouth of the prophet, virtually to predict, even though this was not expressed in so many words, the downfall of every opposing power and the erection of the kingdom of God over all the earth is, besides the considerations already adduced, still further apparent from a remarkable usage of the sacred writers, by which terms and expressions primarily descriptive of the fall of one hostile power are applied interchangeably to that of others, or by which one is made distinctly and in express terms the type of others. Thus Isaiah, speaking of the deliverance of Israel from the captivity of Babylon and from all future foes, announces to Jerusalem, the holy city, that there should no more come into her the uncircumcised and the unclean, and exclaims, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace." When now Nahum adopts this very language from Isaiah, and applies it to the joy consequent upon the overthrow of Nineveh, it seems to be with the view of calling attention to the connection which really subsists between the two events, as in essence really one, of the same character, and referable to the same causes. And when still further the apostle Paul repeats this language, of the proclamation of the gospel, and of the setting up on earth of the

kingdom of God, he seems again to intimate an identity, an innate oneness between the message which announced the fall of those great persecuting powers, and the erection of that kingdom which was finally to supplant them.

So again nothing is more frequent than the prediction of one event under the symbol of a recurring of another past. Thus when it is said, Isaiah xi. 15, 16, that "the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod;" the meaning is not that the miracle of drying up the Red Sea and the Jordan should be in that precise form again repeated, but this miraculous deliverance from the oppression of Egypt stands as the type and pledge of deliverance from other future oppressions. Later, in the book of Revelation, when the language of the Old Testament prophets respecting the fall of Babylon is as it were re-enacted, the intention is to describe the overthrow of another power hostile to the kingdom of God, in spirit and character identical with the ancient Babylon, which shall be in reality the same thing revived, only in another form, a fresh manifestation of the same ungodly, persecuting power, and which is consequently doomed to the same destruction that befell its prototype.

Thus Nahum's predictions have a meaning for all time to come, so long as there remains aught in which the spirit of Nineveh survives—aught which has inherited its criminality and its hostility to God's people. The doom of Nineveh shall attach in substance, if not in form, to all its successors. And not until the last foe of God and of human salvation shall be finally destroyed, shall it in its full import be accomplished.

Dr C. Hodge

ART. VII.—*The Life of Archibald Alexander, D. D.*, First Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. By James W. Alexander, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner, 145 Nassau street. 1854. 8vo., pp. 696.

CONSIDERING the variety of his gifts, the extent of his attainments, and the character of his influence, it is not extravagant to say that Dr. Alexander is entitled to the first place in the list of distinguished men, who have arisen in the American Presbyterian Church. We do not doubt that in one or more endowments other men have been equally favoured; but in the combination of the gifts which secure ascendency for good, we do not think our history furnishes another name entitled to be placed beside that of the venerable subject of this memoir.

Dr. Alexander was born in what is now Rockbridge county, Virginia, on the 17th of April, 1772. His parents, William Alexander and Ann Reid, belonged to the Presbyterian colony which early settled that part of the valley of Virginia. Archibald Alexander, his grandfather, came to this country from Ireland about the year 1736, and settled first in Pennsylvania, and after a residence of a few years removed to Virginia. He was a man of eminent piety and of great influence. His son William, father of Dr. Alexander, was an elder of the Presbyterian Church. The subject of this memoir, therefore, was descended from that vigorous race of Scotch-Irish, to which our Church and country are so deeply indebted.

His first teacher was John Reardon, a young man born in in Ireland, but reared in London, whom his father purchased as a convict servant. He had for some time attended a classical school, and had read Latin books as far as Virgil, and had some knowledge of Greek. At the age of seven, Dr. Alexander was sent from home to school, attending to the usual rudimental branches of an English education. When ten years old, he was placed under the care of the Rev. William Graham, a graduate of the College of New Jersey, who had set up an academy in that neighbourhood. Here he first entered on classical learning. No one exerted the same formative influence on the mind and character of Dr. Alexander, as the re-

markable man with whom he was thus early brought into contact. Mr. Graham was an accurate classical scholar, addicted to the study of natural philosophy, but specially devoted to mental science and theology. In reference to both of these departments he was an independent thinker, and disposed, perhaps to too great a degree, to repudiate authority in matters of opinion. He was constantly urging his pupils to think for themselves, and not to rely on books, but was withal very impatient of contradiction, and dissatisfied with all free thinking which did not lead to his own conclusions. Dr. Alexander expressed, in mature life, the opinion that the system of mental philosophy which Mr. Graham had evolved by his own investigations, "was in clearness and fulness superior to any which has been given to the public in the numerous works recently published on this subject." p. 18. To all these elements of power were added soundness in doctrine and an evangelical spirit. Though his ordinary delivery was feeble, yet from the instructive character of his discourses, the knowledge of the heart which they displayed, and the clear and cogent arguments they included, he was as a preacher universally respected. Such a man could not fail to make an abiding impression on the minds of his pupils.

The usher in Mr. Graham's school, James Priestly, was also a remarkable man. He could repeat almost verbatim any sermon he heard preached. He had the ordinary school classics so completely by heart as never to use a book, when hearing his classes in Ovid, Virgil, Horace, or Homer. He was accustomed to take his pupils to some sequestered, romantic spot, and there "spout before them the orations of Demosthenes, in the original, with all the fire of the Grecian orator himself." At a subsequent period of his school career, Dr. Alexander had the advantage of the instructions of Archibald Roane, afterwards Governor of Tennessee. Thus on the frontiers of Virginia, amidst primeval forests, in the infancy of our civilization, men of genius and learning were engaged in the work of education, and forming minds which were destined to exert a wide and lasting influence on our Church and country.

When he reached his seventeenth year, Dr. Alexander entered as tutor the family of General Posey, who resided

near to Fredericksburg, Virginia. His residence in this family was very important, not only in reference to his intellectual improvement, but also in its influence on his character. He had three pupils, one of whom was larger than himself, and they had already made such progress in their studies, that he was often obliged to devote the night to preparation for his morning lessons. To this pressure he was wont to "attribute all the accuracy he afterwards attained in the Latin language." Access to a library containing some valuable books, and constant intercourse with educated persons, also tended to his intellectual progress. After a year thus spent, he returned home in the year 1789.

Having prosecuted his studies for some months privately, he formed the purpose of going to Princeton College, then under the presidentship of Dr. Witherspoon. Mr. Graham, however, interposed with objections, and urged his taking degrees at Lexington, and the journey was abandoned. A serious illness which occurred the very day after he was to have left home, showed that the hand of Providence was engaged in his detention. After suffering great pain and weakness, he so far recovered as to be able to visit the Sweet Springs in the summer of 1790, for the restoration of his health.

As soon as he was sufficiently restored, he turned his attention to preparation for the ministry, and went to Mr. Graham with the request that he would direct his studies, expecting, as he says, that he would put into his hands some ponderous Latin vloumes of theology. Instead of this, his preceptor said to him, "If you mean ever to be a theologian, you must come at it not by reading, but by thinking." He was soon associated with a class of ten or twelve fellow-students, who met every Saturday at Mr. Graham's study for recitation and debate. During this period he read with much care, besides other works, Edwards on the Will, on Original Sin, and on the Affections; Bates's Harmony of the Divine Attributes, and some treatises of Owen and Boston. On the 20th of October, 1790, he was taken under the care of the Presbytery of Lexington, and was allowed "the privilege of exhorting in social meetings for religious worship." This was a new thing in that part of the

country, and many came together to hear the young candidates exercise their gifts. "I was," says Dr. Alexander, "exceeding apprehensive I should utterly fail, and not be able to say anything, for I had never spoken in public, except what I had committed to memory. I had once attempted to speak in a juvenile debate, without the least success. We arrived at the place early in the evening, and retired to the grove. When we returned to the house, Mr. Lyle (his fellow-student) appeared to be much animated and elevated. He told me he had a remarkable flow of thought, and seemed confident of a prosperous issue; which only discouraged me the more, as I was weighed down with a heavy burden. After singing and prayer, Mr. Graham first called upon Lyle, who arose with an awful cloud upon his brow, seized fast hold upon the chair upon which he had been sitting, and with many contortions of countenance forced out a few words; but his flow of thought had deserted him. He hemmed and groaned, rolled up his pocket handkerchief into a ball, made a few convulsive gestures, and sat down. After another prayer and hymn, I was called upon. Although I did not know a single word I was to utter, I began with a rapidity and fluency equal to any I have enjoyed to this day. I was astonished at myself, and as I was young and small, the old people were not less astonished. From this time I exhorted at one place and another, several times every week. It was still a cross for me to hold forth at Lexington; and after efforts unsatisfactory to myself, I often suffered keen anguish of spirit, from various causes. At other times my heart was enlarged, my feelings were lively, so that I found delight in the utterance of truth. At that time I seldom followed any premeditated train of thought; the words which I first spoke generally opened a track for me, which I pursued."

In the spring of 1791 he attended Mr. Graham, in the capacity of a ruling elder, to the General Assembly, which met in Philadelphia, and of which he gives a very interesting account. The men of that generation have all passed away. Dr. John Woodhull, the moderator of the Assembly that year, Dr. Allison of Baltimore, Dr. Ewing and Dr. Green of Philadelphia, Dr. Witherspoon and Dr. Samuel S. Smith of Prince-

ton, Dr. McWhorter of Newark, and Col. John Bayard,* were all distinguished men, whose personal appearance, character, and manner of debate it is pleasant to have transmitted by so intelligent an observer.

On his return from Philadelphia he devoted himself to his theological studies, under the guidance of Mr. Graham, and was licensed to preach the gospel October 1, 1791. "This was indeed," he says, "a solemn day. During the service I was almost overwhelmed with an awful feeling of responsibility and unfitness for the sacred office. That afternoon I spent in the fields, in very solemn reflection and earnest prayer. My feelings were awful, and far from being comfortable. I seemed to think, however, that the solemn impressions of that day would never leave me." The winter after his licensure was spent in preaching in the northern part of Virginia, about Winchester. In April, 1792, he was appointed a missionary by the Commission of the Synod, and travelled extensively through the lower counties of the State and the borders of North Carolina. He seems to have continued to act as a missionary in the service of the Synod, in connection with the Presbytery of Hanover, until the fall of 1794, when he was ordained, and installed pastor of the church of Briery, November 7th. He was led to pay special attention to the deistical controversy, from the alarming prevalence of infidelity in his native State. He also cultivated with much zeal mathematical and physical science, and to the end of life kept himself acquainted with the course of discovery to an extent which was surprising to all around him. After spending a few years in the discharge of his pastoral duties, Dr. Alexander was induced to accept the presidency of Hampden Sidney College, which he continued to hold until the spring of 1801. He was associated in the instruction of the college with John H. Rice and Conrad Speece, two names afterwards famous in our church. The duties incident to this important charge had no small influence in the intellectual development of the subject of this memoir, and served to prepare him for the larger sphere of usefulness to which he was destined.

* Dr. Alexander speaks of Col. John Bayard as the father of Samuel and James A. Bayard, the distinguished United States Senator from Delaware. The latter, however, was the nephew, and not the son of Col. Bayard.

At this period of his life he is thus described by Dr. Rice: "He is endowed with faculties of the highest kind, and has cultivated them with the greatest assiduity. No man of his age has greater extent or variety of information. His powers are peculiarly fitted for the investigation of truth. With a sound judgment, a vigorous understanding, a quick perception, a great compass of thought, he has the capacity of holding his mind in suspense, until a subject is viewed in all its bearings and relations, and until the rays of evidence, however widely they are dissipated, are brought to a focus on the point under investigation. Possessing such intellectual powers as these, he is animated with a love of truth, and thirst after knowledge, which prompt to unwearied diligence in research, and unremitting application to study. His knowledge, then, must be considerable. His taste is refined, his imagination rich in imagery, his elocution copious, and his trains of reasoning are close and logical; his eye sparkles with intelligence, and his voice is as melodious as the notes of a nightingale. But in addition to all these excellencies, he is remarkably modest; it is impossible for you to be in his company without seeing his superiority, and yet such is his modesty, that it gives you no pain to acknowledge it."

Contemplating a journey to the north for the restoration of his health, he resigned in the spring of 1801 his connection with the college and his pastoral charge. The Presbytery of Hanover sent him as a commissioner to the General Assembly, which met in Philadelphia, whence he proceeded on an extended tour through the New England States. This was an eventful journey, to the incidents of which he was accustomed to refer with interest, to the latest period of his life. His position as president of a college, his reputation, his interesting appearance, gave him access to all the distinguished men of the day. His style of preaching, so effective, and yet so different from that then prevalent in New England, excited the liveliest interest. To this day it would not be difficult to trace his progress by the traditions yet extant of the effects produced by his sermons. We doubt whether, since the journeys of Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent, any stranger has made such an impression as that produced by Dr. Alexander during this tour. The theo-

logical excitement, then almost universal through New England, arising out of the prevalence of the peculiar opinions of Hopkins and Emmons, greatly added to the interest of this journey. It brought Dr. Alexander everywhere into contact with new modes of thought, and doubtless contributed not a little to his comprehension and due appreciation of those systems, which in our own church were soon to enter into conflict with the genuine doctrines of the Reformed churches.

On his return from the north, he spent the winter of 1801–2 principally in Charlotte county, Virginia, and on April 5th, 1802, was married to Miss Janetta Waddel, daughter of the celebrated Rev. Dr. Waddel. We cannot resist the desire of inserting the following beautiful tribute of filial affection from the author of this memoir, to a mother who so well deserved his gratitude and love. Speaking of his father's marriage, the author says: "It may be safely said that no man was ever more blessed in such a connection. If the uncommon beauty and artless grace of this lady were strong attractions in the days of youth, there were higher qualities which made the union inexpressibly felicitous during almost half a century. For domestic wisdom, self-sacrificing affection, humble piety, industry, inexhaustible stores of vivacious conversation, hospitality to his friends, sympathy with his cares, and love to their children, she was such a gift as God bestows only on the most favoured. While during a large part of middle life he was subject to a variety of maladies, she was preserved in unbroken health. When his spirits flagged, she was always prompt to cheer and comfort. And as his days were filled with spiritual and literary toils, she relieved him from the whole charge of domestic affairs. Without the show of any conjugal blandishments, there was through life a perfect coincidence of views, and a respectful affection which may be recommended as a model. It pleased God to spare to him this faithful ministry of revering love to the very last, and when the earthly tie was broken to make the separation short." (p. 272.)

In May, 1802, he returned to Hampden Sidney, and resumed the care of the college. He remained in this position, increasing his knowledge and maturing his opinions, until the fall of 1806, when he accepted a unanimous call from the

Third Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia to become their pastor. Dr. Alexander was now in his prime. "Wider range of knowledge, sounder experience, keener sagacity, more prophetic forecast, there may have come with advancing years, but in whatever can attract in the man, or impress in the preacher, he was," says our author, "just now at a point of culmination."

During his residence in Philadelphia, he was not only the attractive preacher and laborious pastor, but also a diligent student. "In everything connected with the criticism and interpretation of the sacred text, he used assiduous application; taking lessons in Hebrew of a learned Jew, perusing the Septuagint, collecting other versions, and pushing more deeply those researches which he had long before commenced, into the original of the New Testament. His shelves began also to fill themselves with those folios and quartos, bound in vellum, of Latin theology, which always continued to be characteristic of his library. In some departments of learning he was no doubt surpassed by many of his brethren; but it is believed that none of his coevals had read more extensively in the theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including Romanist and Lutheran, as well as Reformed divines."

In no one particular does the providential training of Dr. Alexander for the great business of his life, appear more conspicuous than in his being thus led to a familiar acquaintance with the history of doctrine. This enabled him to perceive that the principles which underlie modern peculiarities of doctrine were identical with those which had already been fully discussed in earlier periods of the church, and which had proved their true character by the various forms of error into which they had unfolded.

These and kindred studies he continued to pursue to the end of his laborious life. He was seldom seen without his pen or some huge volume in his hand. "Theology," says our author, "had been the study of his life. Its difficult questions had been the constant occupation of his profoundest meditation, and he had during his residence in Philadelphia gathered round him the great masters of Latin theology, whose works had appeared in Holland, Switzerland, Germany, and France, in the

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. . . . . To these great authors he turned with unabated zest during the whole of a long and studious life. He once said to the writer, that on a perplexed subject he preferred Latin to English reading, not only because of the complete and ingenious nomenclature which had grown up in the dialectic schools of the church, but because the little effort required for getting the sense kept his attention concentrated. . . . . His penchant for metaphysical investigation urged him, from an early date, to make himself acquainted with the philosophies of the periods from which each system took its tincture, and without which it is impossible to survey the several schemes from a just point of view. Thus he perused, and generally in their sources, not only the peripatetic and scholastic writers, but the treatises of Des Cartes, Leibnitz, Wolff, and Voetius; and there was no subject on which he discoursed with more pleasure or success than on the exposition and comparison of these ingenious though now exploded systems. He made himself familiar with the Christian Fathers, both Greek and Latin, and perused them at intervals during forty years; some of his very last labours having been in this field. At a certain period he examined all they had written on the Divinity of our Lord, and this formed a subject of lively intercourse between him and Dr. Miller. It is particularly remembered with what surprise and admiration he spoke of the felicitous subtilty of Cyril. It was his delight to seek out the portions of truth in the books of ancient authors. Nor did he confine himself to writers on one side. Through long years he was wont to seek with patience the best works in defence of popery; the argumentative dissertations of the extreme Lutherans and Dutch Remonstrants, as well as the Fratres Poloni and other champions of Socinianism. It need scarcely be added that he was familiar with English theology, as treated both by authors of the Established Church, and by the great Nonconformist divines. His recent travels in New England, and the prevailing excitement caused by the speculations of Hopkins and Emmons, served to keep him observant in regard to the phases of opinion in the American churches. . . . There were other branches of learning, tributary to the teacher's place, which occupied his attention. His extraordinary tenacity of memory,

which seemed never to let go a fact entrusted to it, gave him both taste and facility for historical study; and we have never met any one who was more at home in all the annals of ecclesiastical record. For reasons already indicated, the events were made to revolve in his mind around the momentous points of theological determination; so that the history of doctrine, including the rise and progress of errors, the decisions of councils, controversial authorship, and establishment of symbols and of sects, became favourite objects of inquiry. On these subjects he amassed an extraordinary amount of original manuscript, and from these sources he was accustomed to enliven and diversify his dogmatic instructions. In the classical languages he was well read, though without scrupulous care for those niceties of metre and accent, in which English scholars take a pride. The Greek of the New Testament was familiar to him from incessant perusal. No day passed without deliberate study of this sacred original. And in his later years a beautiful Glasgow edition of Griesbach was commonly in his hands during all the private hours of the Lord's day. . . . . We have already recorded his first acquaintance with the Hebrew Bible. From that hour he never relaxed his efforts to master the venerable language. To the last of his reading he perused at least one chapter of Hebrew every day. In natural connection with this, the study of criticism and hermeneutics, although in regard to the latter he was indebted chiefly to the older schools, his curiosity was wakeful and his knowledge extensive. The history of great manuscripts, versions, and editions, was deeply fixed in his mind, and he always spoke of them with the familiarity which the mineralogist has with the specimens of his cabinet."

The numerous responsible and important positions which he was invited to occupy, furnish evidence of the estimation in which he was held by his contemporaries. At an early age he was elected President of Hampden Sidney College; in 1802 he was chosen Phillips Professor of Theology in Dartmouth College; the same year he received a call to become the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Baltimore; in 1806 he was called to Philadelphia as pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church in that city; in 1810 he was elected President of the

University of Georgia; in 1812 he was chosen the Professor of Theology in the Seminary in Princeton; in 1820 he was again elected President of Hampden Sidney College, and immediately after the Synod of Virginia chose him their Professor of Theology.

Meagre as the above account is, and inadequate as we conceive it to be to convey a just view of the attainments of Dr. Alexander, it is still sufficient to show that as it regards learning, there are few of the ministers whom our Church has produced who stand with him on the same level. It was not merely that he had read so many books, or investigated so many subjects, but that he knew so much; that his capacious memory was filled with such stores of facts, with such clear ideas of the various systems of philosophy and theology, to which he had directed his attention. Many men lose almost as fast as they gain, what they read or study; one year fades away before the next has run its course. But with Dr. Alexander anything once learned was held in permanent possession; so that his mind was to an extraordinary degree replete with the accumulated treasures of a life of uninterrupted study.

Having thus traced, as well as we could, the progress of the subject of this memoir in knowledge, and shown his claims to be regarded as a truly learned man, we turn to the formation of his religious character as it is developed in the work before us. He enjoyed the inestimable advantage of a correct doctrinal education in his youth. He was early taught the Westminster Catechism, an educational process of priceless value. The principles of moral and religious truth contained in that sublime symbol, when once imbedded in the mind, enlarge, sustain, and illuminate it for all time. That God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, is a height of knowledge to which Plato never reached. That the eternal Son of God became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and so was and continues to be both God and man, in two distinct natures and one person for ever, is a truth worth all other knowledge. A series of such precise, accurate, luminous propositions, inscribed on the understanding of a child, is the richest inheritance which can be given to him. They are seeds

which need only the vivifying influence of the Spirit of life, to cause them to bring forth the fruits of holiness and glory. Dr. Alexander experienced this benefit in its full extent. He learned the Catechism as a matter of custom. Its truths were not pressed upon his heart and conscience. They lay in his mind as a form of doctrine, (what men are wont erroneously to call dead orthodoxy, as though truth can ever be dead.) Still, even as mere speculative knowledge, it occupied his mind to the exclusion of error. The understanding is the regal faculty, and when filled with the self-evidencing truths of divine revelation, it does and must control to a great degree the convictions and principles even of those not yet renewed. His mind being thus stored with truth, as soon as his moral and religious feelings were excited, they had the proper forms at hand in which to express themselves. The intellectual and emotional elements combine by a kind of elective affinity, and form that knowledge which is eternal life.

The first great question which awakened his attention was, whether anything more is necessary to salvation than a knowledge of the doctrines of the gospel, an assent to their truth, and a decorous moral and religious deportment; whether there is any such thing as regeneration, considered as an inward, supernatural change of heart and nature. His early life had been passed without this question having presented itself to his mind. It is the question whether religion is a work of nature or of God; whether it is something to be acquired and done, or something to be experienced. He says on this subject, "My only notion of religion was that it consisted in becoming better. I had never heard of any conversion among the Presbyterians." He was in this state of mind when, at the age of seventeen, he went to reside in the family of General Posey. Here he was brought into connection with Mrs. Tyler, an aged Christian lady, well bred and well informed, who exerted a great and salutary influence over him, by her pious example and conversation, and by directing his attention to proper religious books. General Posey had in his employ a pious millwright, with whom Dr. Alexander had frequent conversations. "One day," says the personal narrative, "he unexpectedly turned to me and asked me whether I believed

that before a man could enter the kingdom of heaven he must be born again. I knew not what to say, for I had for some time been puzzled about the new birth. However I answered in the affirmative. He then asked whether I had experienced the new birth. I hesitated, and said, 'Not that I know of.' 'Ah!' said he, 'if you had ever experienced this change you would know something about it.' Here the conversation ended, but it led me to think more seriously whether there were any such change." This, he adds, became about the same time a matter of frequent discussion in the family; the ladies affirming their belief in regeneration, and the gentlemen denying all faith in any such miraculous change. As Mrs. Tyler's eyes were weak, she often requested Mr. Alexander to read for her, and generally placed in his hands for that purpose the writings of John Flavel, whose views on regeneration became a special object of interest. About this time he read "The Internal Evidences of Christianity, by Soame Jenyns, Esq.," with great delight. "At every step," he says, "conviction flashed on my mind, with such brightness and overwhelming evidence, that when I ceased to read, the room had the appearance of being illuminated. I never had such a feeling from the simple discovery of truth. And it is my opinion that no argument of the external or historical kind would have produced such a conviction." Secret prayer now became with him a habitual exercise. On one occasion while reading to his aged friend Flavel's sermon on Rev. iii. 20, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock," his feelings became so excited he was obliged to lay down the book, and seek his place of retirement. "No sooner had I reached the spot," he says, "than I dropped on my knees, and attempted to pour out my feelings in prayer; but I had not continued many minutes in this exercise before I was overwhelmed with a flood of joy. It was transport such as I had never known before, and seldom since. I had no recollection of any distinct views of Christ, but I was filled with a sense of the goodness and mercy of God; and this joy was accompanied with a full assurance that my state was happy, and that if I was to die then, I should go to heaven. This ecstacy was too high to be lasting, but as it subsided, my feelings were calm and happy.

It soon occurred to me that possibly I had experienced the change called the new birth." With instinctive wisdom, he left that question to be determined by his future conduct. He knew that a holy life was the only satisfactory evidence of regeneration. The reading of "Jenks on Justification" was attended with feelings of delight analogous to those which followed the perusal of Jenyns. The way of acceptance with God became to him now "as clear as if written with a sunbeam." "I now began to read Flavel," he says, "for my own instruction, and also Burkitt. . . The two great doctrines of Justification and Regeneration I began to understand, at least in theory. A good sermon was now a feast to me. . . . This year, 1788–89, was in many respects the most important of my life. If I had not the beginnings of a work of grace, my mind was enlightened by the knowledge of the truth, of which I had lived in total ignorance. I began to love the truth, and to seek after it as for hid treasure. To John Flavel I certainly owe more than to any uninspired author."

It would be presumptuous to express any confident judgment on the nature of the religious exercises above delineated. The "joyful frames," more than once experienced, could of themselves decide nothing. The sources of such joy in the imagination, in the physical constitution, in the natural affections, are so numerous and so wonderful, that it is a familiar fact that such seasons are often experienced by those who give no satisfactory evidence of genuine conversion. But the clear apprehension of the truth, the cordial approbation of it, and desire for divine knowledge, are indications which can hardly be mistaken.

Having returned home in the spring of 1789, Dr. Alexander was induced to accompany his pastor, Mr. Graham, and several young friends in a visit to the counties of Charlotte and Prince Edward, where a very remarkable revival was in progress under the preaching of the celebrated Dr. John Blair Smith. The party reached Briery in season to attend the celebration of the Lord's Supper on the Sabbath. There was a great concourse of people, who bore the aspect of tender and earnest solemnity. Dr. Smith preached the action sermon, and Mr. Graham delivered a discourse after the communion, which se-

cured him, in the estimation of those who heard him, a place "among the ablest preachers in the land." Mr. Graham remained more than a week, and preached several times in private houses. "I understood his discourses," says Dr. Alexander, "and thought I could find the evidences of vital piety, as proposed by him, in myself. But hearing much of sudden conversions, and of persons being convulsed with severe conviction, I concluded that the hopes which I entertained must be fallacious, and that they prevented my being truly convinced of sin." Though very backward to speak of his own experience, he unbosomed himself, when personally addressed, to Mr. Graham, "who made little or no reply." When an occasion offered for conversation with Dr. Smith, "I related to him," he says, "my various exercises, but added that I had still fallen into sin after these exercises; upon which he said in his decided, peremptory way, that then they were certainly not of the nature of true religion, which always destroyed the power and dominion of sin; and proceeded to account for the joy I had experienced on other principles. From this time I abandoned all persuasion that I had experienced regenerating grace. My desire now was to be brought under such alarming convictions of sin, as I had heard of in the case of others. But that evening, which I spent in the forest, I was greatly distressed on account of my exceeding hardness of heart. I rolled on the ground in anguish of spirit, bewailing my insensibility." In this state of mind he journeyed homeward. "The conclusion forced itself upon me that I should certainly be lost for ever. My mind was calm and thoughts deliberate, and when I came to this result I was nowise agitated, and began to contemplate the justice of God in my condemnation. Yet I felt that I could never entertain any hard thoughts of God, even when suffering under his heavy displeasure." Happily he found in the Rev. James Mitchell a wiser counsellor than his previous advisers. That gentleman sought an interview with him, and drew from him the statement of his difficulty that he had not "experienced those convictions without which he could not expect to be saved." "To this Mr. Mitchell answered, that no certain degree of conviction was prescribed; that the only purpose which conviction could answer was to

show us our need of Christ, 'and this,' added he, 'you have.' He then represented Christ as an Advocate before the throne of God, ready to undertake my cause, and able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by him. A new view opened before me at this moment. I did feel that I needed a Saviour, and I knew Christ as an Advocate was able to save me. This mere probability of salvation, after having given up all hope, was like the dawn of morning on a dark night; it was like life from the dead. From that instant I entertained a joyful hope that I should yet be saved. These new views affected me exceedingly. I was like a man condemned to die, who is unexpectedly informed that there is a friend who can obtain a reprieve. I was unable to say anything. My tears prevented utterance."

We have here an instructive illustration of the two methods in which even good men and experienced Christians deal with anxious inquirers. Dr. Smith undertook to judge of the exercises of the heart, and to decide whether or not they exhibited evidence of regeneration. He led the inquirer to refuse to hope in Christ until he was satisfied he had experienced the new-birth. He thus drove him to the borders of despair. Mr. Mitchell pointed the wounded spirit to Christ, and bid him hope for acceptance on the ground of his merit and mediation. This brought peace. Had any one persuaded the bitten Israelites not to look in faith on the brazen serpent until they felt themselves cured, they too would have despaired. Our first duty is to receive Christ, and in receiving him, he brings conviction, repentance, and all the graces and blessings of the Spirit.

When Mr. Graham and his company returned to Lexington they were like burning coals; they must either be extinguished or make a conflagration. When on the day of Pentecost the Spirit was poured out on the disciples, they began to speak as the Spirit gave them utterance, and multitudes were added to the Church of such as should be saved. And thus in all subsequent ages, when his divine influence is dispensed in any unusual measure, those who are its subjects are endowed with unwonted power, and are generally made the means of communicating a new life to others. Though no little opposition

was excited by the measures adopted by Mr. Graham and his associates, a lively interest in personal religion was awakened in the community, and many were brought to the saving knowledge of the truth.

Dr. Alexander entered with much zeal into the work, though far from satisfied as to his own state. About this time a young woman, who was regarded as one of the most hopeful converts, was, on reading one of Gilbert Tennent's sermons, suddenly seized with such terrible apprehensions of her danger, that she began to tremble, and falling prostrate, was taken up in a state of terrible convulsions. This occurrence led Dr. Alexander to think that he had received an irreparable injury from the clergyman (good Mr. Mitchell) who had persuaded him that no such conviction as this was necessary. "I determined, therefore," he says, "to admit no hope until I should have a like experience. I read all the religious narratives I could procure, and laboured much to put myself into the state the writers described themselves to have been in, before enjoying hope. But all these efforts and desires proved abortive, and I began to see more of the wickedness of my own heart than ever before. I was distressed and discouraged, and convinced that I had placed too much dependence on mere means, and on my own efforts. I therefore determined to give myself incessantly to prayer until I found mercy, or perished in the pursuit.

"This resolution was formed on a Sunday evening. The next morning I took my Bible and walked several miles into the dense woods of the Bushy Hills, which were then wholly uncultivated. Finding a place that pleased me, at the foot of a projecting rock, in a dark valley, I began with great earnestness the course which I had prescribed for myself. I prayed and then read in the Bible, prayed and read, prayed and read, until my strength was exhausted; for I had taken no nourishment that day. But the more I strove, the harder my heart became, and the more barren was my mind of every serious and tender feeling. I tasted then some of the bitterness of despair. It seemed to be my last resource, and now this had utterly failed. I was about to desist from the endeavour, when the thought occurred to me,

that though I was helpless, and my case nearly desperate, yet it would be well to cry to God to help me in this extremity. I knelt upon the ground, and had poured out perhaps a single petition, or rather broken cry for help, when, in a moment, I had such a view of a crucified Saviour, as is without a parallel in my experience. The whole plan of grace appeared as clear as day. I was persuaded God was willing to accept me, just as I was, and convinced I had never before understood the freeness of salvation, but had always been striving to bring some price in my hand, or to prepare myself for receiving Christ. Now I discovered, I could receive him in all his offices at that very moment, which I was sure at the time I did. I felt truly a joy that was unspeakable and full of glory. How long this delightful frame continued I cannot tell. But when my affections had a little subsided, I opened my Bible and alighted on the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of John. The sacred page seemed to be illuminated; the truths were new, as if I had never read them before, and I thought it would be always thus. . . . . For several days my mind was serene. But before a week had elapsed, darkness began to gather over me again. Inbred corruption began to stir. In a word, I fell back into the same state of darkness and conflict as before." This, however, was but as the alternation of clear and cloudy days. The struggle was over. In the autumn of that year (1789) he made a profession of his faith, in which he continued steadfast, unmovable, and always abounding in the work of the Lord, for sixty-two years.

The narrative above given is surely adapted to teach us in matters of religion to look not at processes, but at results. If a man is led to forsake sin, to trust in Christ, to worship him and to keep his commandments, it is of small consequence how these results were brought about. The attempt, however, is constantly made to force our experience through the same steps of progress with that of others. God dealeth with souls in bringing them to Christ and holiness variously, just as the wind, the emblem of the Spirit, is sometimes scarce perceptible though all-powerful—sometimes a zephyr, and sometimes a storm—yet in every form accomplishes the same great work. Delay, suffering, and waste of strength would be prevented, if

men could learn wisdom by the experience of others, and be induced to believe that Christ will accept them just as they are; that waiting to become better, or striving to attain certain states of preliminary feeling, is only one of the various forms of unbelief. There is another lesson of a different kind suggested by the account above given. How different are theory and experience! What becomes of the boasted power of man—of his ability, plenary or natural, to repent, believe, and change his own heart? Had any miserable sophist gone to the youthful subject of this memoir, lying on the ground in his agony in the depths of the forest, and told him, "You can if you will," would it not have been as much a mockery as when Satan said to Adam and Eve, "Ye shall be as gods?" It is well enough for men in their studies to split hairs and quibble about ability and inability, can and can't; but when it comes to the death-struggle, these distinctions are all discarded, and a solemn, fearful consciousness of absolute helplessness is produced. And until in one form or another this sense of impotence is experienced, there is no real apprehension of the help of Christ. Then, again, when men tell us that conversion is effected when the soul summons all its powers and determines to make God its portion, or purposes the general good, how does this agree with the experience of God's people? Is conversion, so far as it is a conscious process, a self-determination, so much as it is a beholding the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, as that glory is revealed to it through the word and by the Spirit, taking the whole soul captive in admiration, gratitude, love, and submission? Men do not create themselves; they do not come forth from the darkness of spiritual death, to behold the light of God's countenance and the glories of the new creation, by any energy of their own. The whole change is one of which man is the subject, rather than the agent.

We have not the means, if we had the inclination, to trace further the formation of the religious character of the eminent subject of this memoir. He seldom spoke either of his own experience or of his methods of religious culture. He lived with God; and men knew that he had been on the mount by the shining of his face; but he was not wont to tell what he saw, and he made no record. He was eminently unworldly. He made no

effort to become rich. He never sought the honour which comes from men. He kept aloof from all worldly amusements. He mingled very little in any active pursuits. While taking the liveliest interest in all religious and benevolent enterprises, it was by his counsels, countenance, and prayers, rather than by active agency, that he endeavoured to promote their objects. He was seldom seen in public, except in the pulpit, and every one saw that he was there for no purpose of self-display. All this tended to give him that saintly character for which he was remarkable. By thus keeping himself unspotted from the world, by this habitual fellowship with God, and by the obvious consecration of all his powers to the service of Christ, he came to be regarded with a reverence seldom felt for man. This was the great secret of his power. This was the halo which encircled his brow, attracting all eyes and offending none.

It is very difficult to convey any adequate impression of Dr. Alexander as a preacher to those who never or but seldom heard him in the pulpit. He differed from himself so much in different moods of mind, and on different occasions, and doubtless also at different periods of his life, that his coevals were his only competent judges. All witnesses unite in testifying that from the very outset of his ministry he was regarded as one of the ablest and most effective preachers in the land. In his native State especially, the liveliest admiration was evinced for his pulpit talents, and the tradition of his success is still fresh in every place he visited in early life. It is said that at first his discourses were very imaginative and ornate, a character which certainly did not belong to them in later years. Nor did he owe his power as a preacher to his skill in elocution. No two things could be more different than his simple conversational method and the oratorical declamation of many justly celebrated public speakers. His preaching was that of an able, learned, wise, spiritual man, who always and manifestly spoke with the single object of doing his hearers good. His manner was simplicity itself. His voice clear and various in its intonations, adapting itself wonderfully to the feeling uppermost in his mind. His eye was like a veiled diamond or a burning coal, according as he was in repose or excited. You never lost the sense of its power. His keenness of vision kept

him in communion with his audience, as he could read every countenance, even the most distant, and adapted his remarks or tone to what was thus revealed, so that each man in his turn felt himself personally addressed. To all these advantages, intellectual and physical, was added the unction of a devout spirit. This was the holy oil upon his head, whose fragrance filled the sanctuary, and made all feel that they were present to hear God's messenger, and not to listen to an oration.

Dr. Alexander's manner in preaching was to a remarkable degree determined by his feelings. If he felt dull and heavy, he made no effort to appear otherwise. There was no striving to get up feeling, no emotionless vehemence of tone or action.

His discourses were generally a stream, as distinguished from an artificial canal. They followed "their own sweet will," always keeping their course, but still free. One thought suggested another, and when the sermon was completed, it was a continuous whole, and not a combination of parts. This at least is true in reference to his most characteristic discourses. Many of his sermons indeed were logically constructed and prearranged, the whole plan of which was visible at the time and on review. But this was not the character of his mind, nor his usual manner. We have often sat in admiration and witnessed this process of spontaneous evolution, no one knowing what was to come next, and yet something always did come making a real advance on what had preceded, awakening attention and exciting expectation. This was especially his method in remark, for which his talent was extraordinary. He seldom laid down any proposition to be regularly established. He seldom stated premises from which a remote conclusion was to be drawn. His first remark seemed to be almost fortuitously determined; either suggested by what some one else had said, or occurring to himself at the moment. But that remark was sure to be followed by a continuous stream, which never turned back upon itself.

Dr. Alexander was very much in the habit of adhering to the figure of his texts. If he preached on the passage, "I am the vine, ye are the branches," instead of abstracting from it the general proposition that believers are partakers of the life of Christ, and proceeding to discuss it as a theme of religious

philosophy and experience, he would keep up the figure of a vine throughout. Or if discoursing on the text, "The Lord is my Shepherd," it would not be a sermon on providence, as a point of doctrine, but one in which the shepherd and his flock were never lost sight of. This contributed not a little to the endless variety in his preaching, which was so remarkable.

His methods of preaching, however, were so distinct the one from the other, that those hearing him in one style, could have no idea of what he was in another. One of his favourite methods was the descriptive or graphic. He would take some scriptural scene and reproduce it. He would so describe the event as to make it all pass before you, awakening the feelings which an intelligent spectator might be supposed to have experienced. Many years ago we heard him in Winchester, Virginia, depict the scene of Abraham offering up Isaac, when he excited the sympathy of his audience to the highest pitch. Everybody knew how it was to end, and yet everybody felt relieved when the angel arrested the hand of Abraham. It was not, however, sympathy in the mere sufferings of Abraham, but in his faith, submission, and gratitude; so that the pleasure of his hearers was not so much æsthetic as religious. They went away filled, not with admiration of the preacher, but with devout affections towards God. On another occasion, at a communion season in Princeton, he preached on the last three days of our Saviour's life. It was to all appearance nothing more than a simple narrative of events with which every one was familiar. Yet after thirty years, the impression of that discourse lives in the recollection of all who heard it. Not long before his death, he preached a sermon on the Transfiguration, in the chapel of the Seminary. After the service was over, we asked ourselves whether the preacher had stated one new fact, or brought forward one new idea. We could recall none; and yet all present felt they had been with Jesus, and beheld his glory. There was a strange power of this kind about him. No one could find out where it lay, or in what it consisted ; but devout persons would follow him gladly from place to place, to be moved and elevated by its influence.

Another style of his preaching may be called the experimental, in which he was *facile princeps* among the men of his

generation. Perhaps most of those who remember him with personal gratitude, recall him as their spiritual guide, who revealed to them the workings of their own hearts. Under his preaching was realized what the apostle describes as the effect of intelligible discourse, guided by the Spirit, 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25. Those who heard were convinced. Their conscience and consciousness bore testimony to the truth of what he said. They were judged, or examined. Their feelings, which lay as a confused, unintelligible mass, were analyzed, examined, and their true character discerned and estimated. Thus the secrets of their hearts were revealed. They were brought to know and estimate themselves aright, and so falling on their faces, confessed that God was indeed with the truth and with the preacher. All classes of persons felt the power of this searching process. The procrastinating, the sceptical, the hardened, were astonished to find with what accuracy they were depicted, and thoughts and feelings, misgivings and purposes, which they thought hidden from all eyes, were brought to light. The anxious inquirer, the young convert, and the experienced Christian, each in his turn had his heart thus analyzed and interpreted to his consolation or guidance. Many can recall the solemn hours when the preacher, in his kind, paternal manner, told them all they ever felt, showed them where they had erred, and what they were to do. Often the inquirer or the young convert could follow him step by step up to a certain point, and when he left them, and detailed experiences of which they as yet knew nothing, would sit and weep. Still more frequently the Christian would find his heart probed to the core, its hidden evils disclosed, or its doubts and difficulties removed, and the light of divine truth made to reach its secret places. This was a rare gift, due, under God, to his own profound and varied experience, to his habit of noticing and analyzing the operations of his own mind, to his frequent intercourse with all classes of Christians, to his power of extracting from those with whom he conversed their thoughts and feelings, to his extended knowledge of books of casuistry and religious biography, to his familiar acquaintance with the Scriptures, the great treasury of spiritual knowledge, and to his always drawing from life. If he undertook to describe how certain

men felt, it was no imaginary picture that he drew, but one the original of which he knew. He would tell either what he had himself felt, (never, however, naming himself,) or what he had observed in others. Personal experience, observation, and Scripture, not fancy, were sources whence he drew. What was drawn from life, was found to be true to life.

In dogmatic preaching, when some point of doctrine or duty was selected to be established and enforced, Dr. Alexander differed less from other men. His discourses of this kind were replete with truth and wisdom; everything was clear and to the point; but this was not the kind of preaching in which he most delighted, or in which he was most impressive.

Sometimes in the midst of a sermon, he would pause, and utter with peculiar solemnity a truth or sentiment which seemed to have no immediate connection with the subject in hand, and then resume the thread of his discourse. These were shafts shot at a venture; and we have known them to penetrate so deep as never to be extracted.

On the whole, the subject of this memoir was a preacher *sui generis*. He was what he was, in virtue of high gifts and endowments, manifested and exercised without rule or effort. He imitated no one, and was incapable of being imitated. He stands alone, enshrined in the memory of those who knew him, an object of admiration, reverence, and gratitude.

The greater part of Dr. Alexander's public life was spent as a teacher of theology. He was elected by the General Assembly in 1812, the first professor of the Theological Seminary then just established at Princeton. His election took place under peculiarly solemn circumstances. It was "amid the prayers and tears of the Church he was elected, and amid the prayers and tears of the Church he was laid in the tomb." Nearly forty years intervened between his election and his death; and we believe during all that time not an individual of our Church ever doubted that he was, of all men in our connection, the man best suited to the office. To say that he was able, learned, orthodox, and pious, would be to say little. He might have been all this, and yet unsuited to his position. He was to a remarkable degree free from those faults, whether of levity, imprudence, extravagance, or exaggeration, in opinion

or conduct, pride of intellect, and eccentricity, which so often mar the character of able and good men, and seriously interfere with their usefulness. On the other hand, he was eminently wise and moderate in his opinions, prudent in his deportment, serious in his manners, reverential and devout in his spirit, humble before God and man, faithful, punctual, and diligent, so that the influence which emanated from the whole man was healthful. And we are deeply satisfied that it was to this freedom from faults, compatible with ability and piety, and the possession of these minor excellencies, if they may be so called, which are often wanting in good and great men, that Dr. Alexander was in a large measure indebted for his eminent success and usefulness as a professor. He was always ready at the right time and place. During his long official life, we do not believe he ever missed an exercise through neglect or forgetfulness, and very rarely from any other cause. He was always prepared for what he had to do. He never disappointed the expectations of his pupils by any failing on his part.

The three great sources of influence, ascendency over the intellect, power over the religious feelings, and ability to win the affections of his pupils, united in Dr. Alexander, each in an eminent degree. His talents and learning rendered all his lectures instructive. They communicated knowledge, removed difficulties, illustrated important principles, and produced conviction.

In teaching theology he adopted all the methods of a text book, lectures, catechetical examinations, and written exercises. His students were for many years accustomed to read Turrettine, on which they were examined. Lectures were delivered on the prominent topics. Questions were handed out, to which the students were expected to write answers; and themes were proposed for extended dissertations. On Thursday evening, the two lower classes assembled for public speaking, Dr. Alexander presiding and criticising the performances. On Friday evening there was a meeting of the theological society for the discussion of points of doctrine and ethics. The professors attended these exercises, and concluded the debate with whatever remarks they saw proper to make. It was here Dr. Alexander appeared in his element. His talent for extemporaneous

remark found fit occasion. His older pupils will remember while they live, the knowledge and mental excitement derived from these exercises. Sometimes a state of real enthusiasm was produced by a lecture which seemed to dissipate the darkness which hung over some difficult subject. On one occasion of the kind referred to, the late William Nevins, D. D., of Baltimore, loved and admired by all who knew him, came to the room of two of his classmates, and said, "Brethren, it is a shame that we should enjoy such advantages, and do nothing to secure to others the same privileges. Our class ought to endow a scholarship." This was the origin of the scholarship of 1819. When a committee of the class waited on Dr. Miller to inform him of what they purposed to attempt, Mr. Nevins in his frank manner told him of the occasion of the movement, when the holy man, with tears in his eyes, lifted up both his hands, and said, "My young friends, I do not believe such a man as Dr. Alexander walks the earth." This incident is mentioned simply as an illustration of the ascendency exercised by Dr. Alexander over the minds of his students.

Having incidentally mentioned the name of Dr. Miller, we may be permitted to pause and in a sentence pay our humble tribute to that sainted man. He could be appreciated only by those who knew him intimately, who saw him day by day, and year in and year out, in all circumstances suited to try and to reveal the true character. We have never heard any one who enjoyed such means of knowing him, speak of him otherwise than as one of the holiest of men. May the writer be further pardoned for obtruding himself for a moment, so far as to say, that during twenty-nine years of intimate official association with these two venerated men, he never saw the slightest discourtesy, unkindness, or acerbity manifested by the one towards the other; and that he never heard a disparaging remark from the one in reference to the other. Thank God, the Princeton Seminary has a history! The past is safe. The memory of the two eminent men who were its first professors, and who gave it character, rests over it as a halo, and men will tread its halls for their sake with something of the feeling with which they visit the tombs of the good and great.

The influence of Dr. Alexander over his students, however,

was not due to his intellectual abilities alone. It was attributable, perhaps in a higher degree, to his power over their religious feelings. Of all sources of influence this is the greatest. The man who can bring us into communion with God, who can reveal to us the glory or the love of Christ, who can unseal the fountains of penitence, or kindle the expiring embers of faith and hope—the man whom God uses to do us such services as these, is one "for whom some would even dare to die." Certain it is, we never knew a man who was even second to Dr. Alexander in this respect. This gift in him was so rare and pre-eminent that all others seem lost in it. The obligation of his pupils to him for knowledge and intellectual improvement, though neither forgotten nor undervalued, is still merged in this deeper debt. When they think of him, it is as he appeared on some well-remembered occasion, in the pulpit, at the communion table, or in the Conference.* Even his lectures were devotional. We well remember that his class went to his lectures on pastoral theology as if going to the sanctuary. It was a season of worship.

This article is already unduly protracted, and yet we have done no justice to our subject. We have said nothing of Dr. Alexander as an author, or as a theologian, or as a Presbyterian, or as to his position and influence in reference to all the great questions and enterprises of the day. Had we the time and ability it would be instructive to contemplate him under each of the above aspects. But our space is exhausted. We must refer our readers to the Memoir prepared with so much skill by his accomplished son.

* A social meeting of the professors and students for religious conversation or conference on Sabbath afternoons.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Female Prose Writers of America. With Portraits, Biographical Notices, and specimens of their writings. By John Hart, LL.D. New edition, revised and enlarged. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. 1855.

This is an elegant volume of 536 pages. In preparing this work for a new edition, the biographies, in the case of authors still living, have been carefully revised and brought up to the present time, and a considerable number of new names has been introduced, increasing considerably the size of the volume.

Historical Discourses relating to the First Presbyterian Church in Newark, originally delivered to the congregation of that Church during the month of January, 1851. By Jonathan Stearns, D. D., Pastor of the Church. Newark. Pp. 311.

This volume is embellished with portraits of President Burr, Drs. McWhorter, Griffin, and Richards, an engraving of the church edifice, and a map of Newark or Pasayak Town in 1666—1680, on which the Passaic is set down as "the Great River Pasayak." This history embraces a period of a little more than three hundred and eighty years, and is a very important contribution, not only to the ecclesiastical, but also to the civil and political annals of New Jersey. There was at first only a theoretical distinction between the church and the town; all the business of the congregation was for seventy years conducted in town meetings. The history of the church, therefore, is largely a history of the town.

The notes to this volume are copious and of much interest, derived, in many instances, from manuscript sources not easily accessible. We have been particularly interested in the author's investigations and discussions with respect to the origin and early history of the College of New Jersey, including some new views and statements in relation to its two successive organizations, and the regency of Dickinson and Burr.

A Manual of Sacred History. By John Henry Kurtz, Professor in the University of Dorpat. Translated from the sixth German edition by Charles T. Schaeffer, D. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1855. 12mo. pp. 436.

This well known work of a Lutheran divine in Germany, translated by a highly esteemed pastor of the same communion in this country, is a favourable sample of the influence exerted

by one of the latest German schools of biblical interpretation and historiography. While many things, especially in modes of expression, will be found to vary from our usage, we cannot but regard it as a valuable aid to our own students and instructors, from its clear and pregnant summary of facts, its lively and original suggestions, and its constant exhibition of unity in all God's plans and dispensations, of which even the most pious and attentive readers of the Bible are too much accustomed to lose sight. There is also an advantage, or at least a satisfaction in receiving such a book from one who is known to be familiar with the latest processes and fruits of labour in that singular country, so amazingly prolific both of good and evil, yet himself devotedly attached to the great doctrines of the Reformation. Even where nothing actually new is thus presented, it is something to be satisfied on good grounds, that the old conclusions stand unshaken by the winds and floods of infidel, half-infidel, and pseudo-Christian speculation.

This book is, according to the Lutheran standard, thoroughly orthodox in matters of doctrine, and is more thoroughly religious in spirit, than any similar German work with which we are acquainted. All the doctrinal peculiarities of the Lutheran Church as to the person of Christ, as to the design of his death, as to the nature, efficacy, and necessity of the sacraments, and especially as to baptismal regeneration, are here brought prominently into view. This is nothing more than was to be expected from a professed and zealous Lutheran divine.

The English translation is, in our opinion, highly creditable to its author; not only accurate, so far as we have yet had time to judge of it, but less disfigured by undue adherence to German idiom, by awkward stiffness, and by weak verbosity, than any version we have recently examined. This leads us to expect, with some impatience, the fulfilment of the promise in the preface, to put within the reach of American readers the still more important and more able work of the same author on the history of the Christian Church, which after being wholly and repeatedly rewritten, is now appearing in a form which Dr. Schaeffer very justly represents as being, on the whole, the best manual of Church history in any language.

The Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistles of John and Judas, and the Revelation, translated from the Greek, on the basis of the common English version, with Notes. New York: American Bible Union. 4to. pp. 253.

This volume, although issued by a Baptist Society, and with a view to Baptist ends, is understood to be the work of a Presbyterian minister, in full communion with our own Church.

As we have not his permission to destroy the incognito maintained throughout the publication, we content ourselves with saying, that he has no reason for concealment, if the most extensive and exact aquaintance with the text, philology, and exegesis of the New Testament, as well as with the niceties of English diction, and the utmost tenderness in dealing with the venerable English Bible, even while correcting it, can give a man a place among the biblical critics of the age and country.

Memoir of the Rev. Josiah Pratt, B. D., late Viear of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, and for twenty-one years Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. By his sons, the Rev. Josiah Pratt, M. A., and the Rev. John Henry Pratt, M. A. New York: Carters, 1855. pp. 501. 8vo.

The name of Pratt has long been associated with the great missionary movement in the early part of the present century. As he left no diary, and few memoranda, his biographers have been obliged to draw their information chiefly from the archives of the Missionary Society. This gives peculiar prominence to that form of benevolent exertion in which the subject was especially engaged; a circumstance which, far from diminishing the interest of the work, conspires with his piety and evangelical spirit to constitute its chief attraction.

Discourses on Truth. Delivered in the chapel of the South Carolina College. By James H. Thornwell, D.D., President and Chaplain. New York: Carters, 1855. 12mo. pp. 328.

These discourses, marked by the well-known characteristics of their author's mind, are particularly interesting at this time, when he is just preparing to exchange the service of the State, in which he has been long distinguished as an educator of her youth, for the immediate service of the Church, as an instructor of her rising ministry.

Israel and the Gentiles. Contributions to the History of the Jews, from the earliest times to the present day. By Dr. Isaac Da Costa, of Amsterdam. New York: Carters, 1855. 12mo. pp. 628.

The author of this interesting work is a descendant of a Jewish family who during the seventeenth century sought refuge in the Netherlands from the persecutions of the Spanish peninsula. A lively interest in Jewish history, especially the modern part, engaged him in studies and inquiries which resulted in his public acknowledgment of Jesus as the promised Messiah; a profession which he has held fast for more than five and twenty years, not only with fidelity, but with a spirit of humility enhanced by contrast with the arrogance which has so often been the premonition of relapse, and even of apostasy. His early studies, ever since continued, and his access to materials not generally known, together with his evident ability and

piety, impart a high degree of interest and value to this sketch of Jewish history, and especially to the third book, which relates to the Jews of Spain and Portugal. The first coincides very nearly with the sacred history; the second describes the twofold exile of the East and West, from the destruction of Jerusalem to the close of the middle ages; while the fourth exhibits the peculiar relation of the Jewish people to the Reformation, the succeeding revolutions, the great movements of our own day, and the future triumphs of Christ's kingdom.

The Four Witnesses: being a Harmony of the Gospels on a new principle. By Dr. Isaac Da Costa, of Amsterdam. Translated by David Dundas Scott, Esq. New York: Carters, 1855. 8vo. pp. 480.

Another work of the same author, represented by himself as the fruit of early and protracted study, reduced to form and published as an antidote to Strauss's infidelity, and now reproduced in English with a view to more extensive usefulness, as a vindication of the authenticity and harmony of the Gospels. A very cursory inspection of the volume yields abundant evidence of accurate learning, as well as of an ingenious and original mind, not without some things of a more questionable character. The subject of the work is intrinsically so important, and at the present time so full of interest to many minds, that we content ourselves with barely announcing its appearance, in the hope of being able to return to it hereafter, and to do it justice. In the meantime we congratulate the public on the beautifully printed foreign books which Mr. Carter is furnishing at native prices, only regretting that American typography is so far inferior to European, that it cannot afford title-pages more in keeping with the body of the works to which they are prefixed.

Paley's Evidences of Christianity. With notes and additions, by Charles Murray Nairne, M. A. New York: Carters, 1855. pp. 501.

A new edition of this work would be welcome, were it only as a proof that the demand for it continues. The one before us is described upon the title-page as belonging to the "University Series." Whether the value of the treatise is enhanced by the additions, is a point respecting which there may be various opinions. It is always hazardous to overlay a standard work of long established reputation with notes and extracts in a different style, and sometimes in a different spirit. Nothing can be less akin to Paley's mode of reasoning than the "new calculus," commended by the editor (p. 17) as having superseded "the dogmatic method of interpretation, which prevailed in the church during the seventeenth century," and promising "inestimable service" to the cause of Christian truth," in the hands of "judicious men such as Schleiermacher, Neander,

Hengstenberg, Dorner, and others." The application of this calculus to Paley, in the way of illustration and improvement, is a bold experiment, to which we wish all the success that it deserves.

The Land of the Forum and the Vatican; or Thoughts and Sketches during an Eastern Pilgrimage to Rome. By Newman Hall, B. A., author of "Come to Jesus," "It is I," "The Sinner's Friend." New York: Carters. 1756. pp. 463, 12mo.

The author of several well known books on themes of practical religion, here attempts the treatment of a secular subject in a religious spirit. The book contains the fruits of what the English writer calls an *Easter* (and the American printer an *Eastern*) *Pilgrimage to Rome* in 1853, as preserved by himself, by "the beloved companion of his home, and charm of every excursion from it," to whom the volume is inscribed, and by their travelling companion, who seems to be referred to in the preface as a son of Richard Cecil. That the author should have thought it necessary to apologize for his freedom from asperity and coarseness, even in exposing the corruptions of the Roman Church, is symptomatic of a very different taste and practice in the mass of contemporary writers on such subjects. The hope of useful entertainment excited by the title will not be disappointed.

Things to be thought of. Addressed to the Young. By the author of "Little Things." Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union. pp. 90.

Earnest and useful admonitions and suggestions on the Purpose of Life, Completeness of Character, Diligence, Influence, Wandering Thoughts, and Minor Morals.

The Living Temple, a brief Memoir of Jane Bethel. Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union. pp. 83.

This is a real life, and not a picture—the autobiography of one who seemed to all who knew her a temple of the Holy Spirit, recorded as a proof that grace will enable even the humblest to endure every burden, and to triumph over every foe.

Irish Amy. Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union. pp. 312.

This interesting story, founded on fact, is designed to show how much good may be done by the introduction of outcast children into Christian families. The materials were furnished by the author's experience with a sewing class of fourteen young girls, taken indiscriminately from the streets, whose astonishing improvement, both in knowledge and in manners, leads her to suggest this mode of usefulness to any reader who

may ask, What can I do? We may add that the literary merit of this little work is far above the average standard.

The Bible Hand-Book: an Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture. By Joseph Angus, D. D., Member of the Royal Asiatic Society. London: Religious Tract Society. 1854. 12mo. pp. 660.

The best compendious introduction to the study of the Scriptures that has come into our hands; containing the results of much learned inquiry, in a form suited both to professional and popular instruction, with some peculiarities of method and opinion, which do not materially impair its value.

The Westminster Shorter Catechism, with Analysis, Scriptural proofs, explanatory and practical inferences, and illustrative anecdotes. By Rev. James R. Boyd, author of "Elements of Rhetoric" and "Eclectic Moral Philosophy," Editor of "English Poets, with Notes," etc. New York: Dodd. 1854. pp. 264.

This descriptive title gives a just idea of the author's somewhat novel plan, which appears to have been carried into execution with commendable diligence and good success.

Evangelical Alliance Prize Essay on Infidelity, its Aspects, Causes, and Agencies. By the Rev. Thomas Pearson, Eyemouth, N. B. Cheap edition from the fortieth London edition. New York: Carters. 12mo. pp. 328.

The matter of the elegant two-dollar volume, which was reviewed at length in our number for April 1854, is here presented in a clear, small type, for sixty cents! For our judgment of the merits of the work, the reader is referred to our last volume, pp. 349—377.

Family Expositions on the Epistles of St. John and St. Jude. By the Rev. E. Bickersteth, Rector of Watton, Herts. New York: Carters. 1855. pp. 253.

The name of Bickersteth renders unnecessary either criticism or minute description of this unpretending volume. Every reader of his other works will know at once what qualities of mind and heart to look for, in these family expositions of the last four canonical epistles.

The Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay: with reminiscences of some distinguished contemporaries, selections from his correspondence, and literary remains. Edited by George Redford, D. D., LL.D., and John Angell James. In two volumes. New York: Carters, 1855. pp. 428 and 346.

An autobiography, begun in old age, and given to the world in its original form, is seldom likely to exalt the reputation of its author. To this dictate of reason and experience the present work is no exception. While no one can peruse it without entertainment and some curious information, or without a kindly

feeling towards the venerable writer, the impression made on thousands, in America and England, by the charming productions of his youth and his maturity, will scarcely be improved by the familiar gossips of his senile recollections, which his two distinguished editors have left, with a reserve almost too scrupulous, to take care of itself. If we were not apprehensive that the book would suffer still more by comparison with Jay's own life of Winter, we should strongly recommend the latter for republication.

A Journey to Central Africa: or Life and Landscapes from Egypt to the Negro Kingdoms of the White Nile. By Bayard Taylor. With a map and illustrations by the author. New York: 1854, Putnam. 12mo. pp. 522.

Photographic Views of Egypt, Past and Present. By Joseph S. Thompson. Boston: 1854, Jewett & Co. 12mo. pp. 358.

Two acceptable additions to our stock of African geography and history, with entertaining narratives of personal adventure. While the first work covers much more ground and introduces us to newer scenes, we cannot but prefer the other, where they come into comparison, that is to say, in their accounts of Egypt. The superiority of Mr. Thompson lies not only in his greater acquaintance with the bearing of the subject, but also in the life of his descriptions and his narratives, in which even the occasional reader of the "Independent" newspaper can scarcely fail to recognize one of its most readable anonymous conductors.

The Characteristics and Laws of Figurative Language. By David N. Lord. Designed for use in Bible Classes, Schools, and Colleges. New York: Franklin Knight, 1854. 12mo. pp. 306.

The Premium Essay on the Characteristics and Laws of Prophetic Symbols. By the Rev. Edward Winthrop, A. M., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Norwalk, Ohio. Second edition. New York: Franklin Knight. 12mo. pp. 192.

These two works, apart from their intrinsic value, which we shall not here undertake to estimate, are interesting and important, as authoritative and official statements of the principles adopted by a well-known and increasing school of biblical interpretation. The first is by the founder and ablest representative of that school, and although intended for a text-book in rhetorical instruction, has an avowed and special bearing on the explanation of *prophetic figures*, as distinguished from *prophetic symbols*, the peculiarities and laws of which are treated in the other work, composed by a disciple of the same school, and apparently without pretensions to originality, but very convenient as a popular and simple summary of doctrines which must otherwise be sought for piecemeal in the volumes of a quarterly, now seven years of age. In this respect, the two works are a

valuable aid, as well to those who wish to learn the system, as to any who may be preparing to refute it.

The Problem Solved; or, Sin not of God. By Miles P. Squier, D. D., Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy, Beloit College. New York: M. W. Dodd, corner of Spruce Street and City Hall Square. 1855. pp. 255.

The problem of the origin of evil has been so often solved to the satisfaction of the authors of the several solutions, without any relief to other minds, that we fear Dr. Squier will stand alone in the opinion that his book has at last met the case. He seems to think it enough to assert that God is not the cause of sin, that he neither permits nor decrees it. We do not see that this meets the question, why he did not prevent it. Indeed, the boldness which enables a man to entitle a book on this subject "The Problem Solved," is, as we think, a sure evidence of blindness. A man without eyes will walk with confidence, where even the dimmest vision would make him tremble.

The Papal Conspiracy Exposed, and Protestantism Defended in the Light of Reason, History, and Scripture. By the Rev. Edward Beecher, D. D. Boston: Stearns & Co., 91 Washington Street, 1855. pp. 420.

We rejoice that Dr. Beecher has chosen for his powerful pen a theme which will enlist on his side the sympathy of all Protestants. He arraigns before the jury of his countrymen "the corporation claiming to be called the Church of Rome," on the charge of "treason against God and hostility to the human race." He calls upon them to consider not any plausible professions of its advocates, "but the organic laws of the corporation itself, its avowed principles, the inevitable tendency of such laws and principles, and finally the actual results of these tendencies as embodied in history." We commend this book, not to theologians only, but also to politicians, who are so prone to endeavour to persuade themselves and others that popery in our age is a sucking dove.

Specimens of the Greek and Roman Classic Poets, in a chronological series from Homer to Tryphiodorus, translated into English verse, and illustrated with biographical and critical notices. By Charles Abraham Elton, author of a Translation of Hesiod. In three volumes. Philadelphia: F. Bell, 1854.

These are handsomely printed volumes, and may serve not only as an aid to the student of the classics, but also to give to English readers some insight into the poetry of Greece and Rome.

Quintus Curtius Rufus: Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great, edited and illustrated with English notes, by William Henry Crosby, formerly Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854.

Words to win Souls: Twelve Sermons, preached Anno Domini 1620–1650, by eminent Divines of the Church of England. Revised and abridged from a very scarce collection, by the Rev. Thomas S. Millington. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 285 Broadway, 1855.

A very interesting and instructive specimen of the method of preaching in the seventeenth century.

Organic Christianity; or, The Church of God, with its Officers and Government, and its Divisions and Variations, both in Ancient, Medieval, and Modern Times; embracing a thorough Exposition and Defence of Church Democracy. By Leicester A. Sawyer. Boston: I. P. Jewett & Co. Also Cleveland, Ohio, and New York. 1854. pp. 455.

This is an able and elaborate work, written by a man who has full confidence in himself and in his cause. This is stamped on the title-page. The "Church Democracy," of which he regards his book as containing a thorough defence, is Congregationalism. "Presbyterianism," he says, p. 414, "is modified Episcopacy, and both are modified despotisms of the hierarchical or sacred-order kind. Enlightened Congregationalism abhors those principles, as having been the source of incalculable evils to mankind, and as liable to reproduce them in all times to come. The essential elements of Congregationalism are two: 1. The democratic government of the church by its membership, or by persons holding their appointment from the membership, and accountable to them; 2. The supreme government of every church by itself, to the exclusion of synods, presbyteries, conventions, and all general bodies whatever." The first of the principles here stated, so far from being peculiar to Congregationalism, has been held by many Papists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians. The doctrine of the sovereignty of the people is held in France, England, and America, without converting the governments of those countries into democracy. Congregationalism, as we understand it, is real democracy, which forbids the delegation of power, and claims its immediate exercise, as well as its ultimate possession. Congregationalism is, 1. The actual government of the church by its membership, and, 2. The absolute independence of each church of all others. The first of these elements is so palpably against all scriptural usage and authority, that we do not wonder that Mr. Sawyer endeavours to conceal its weakness from himself and others, by substituting for it as an equivalent an entirely different proposition. The second principle, we take leave to say, is just as unreasonable and unscriptural as the absolute independence of each family of all other families. The reason why a Christian is bound to submit to the membership of a particular church, is, according to the Congregational theory, the "church-covenant." He has promised to obey them. This is analogous to

the old infidel theory of the "social compact," as the foundation of civil government. The scriptural doctrine is that we are bound to obey our brethren as brethren; that is, because they are brethren, or those in whom Christ dwells by his Spirit. The ground of obedience, therefore, exists with regard to all brethren, and not merely in reference to those with whom we may choose to enter into a special compact. It is the obvious duty, therefore, of all Christians to unite in one church organization, each part being subject to the whole. This, in the present state of the world, is prevented by denominational differences. But such differences are an evil, and do not belong to the normal state of the church. As in civil matters, the most anomalous and anarchical system would be for each family to be independent of all other families, so of all forms of church government, Popery excepted, Congregational Independency has, in our opinion, the least to say for itself. The system will require a great many more "thorough defences."

Synonyms of the New Testament, being the substance of a Course of Lectures addressed to the Theological Students of King's College, London. By Richard Chenevix Trench, B. D., Professor of Divinity, King's College, London. Redfield, 110 & 112 Nassau street, New York. 1854. pp. 243.

Professor Trench is already well known to American readers, and his works are highly esteemed. The book before us will be found perhaps the most valuable of his publications. While availing himself of the work of Tittman on the same general plan, and of the assistance of annotators and critics, he has bestowed upon it a large amount of personal labour and investigation.

The Atonement of Christ, and the Justification of the Sinner. Arranged from the works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller. By the Editor of his complete works. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 396.

This is a work constructed by weaving together detached passages of the writings of the eminent man whose name it bears.

The Night of Toil; or a Familiar account of the Labours of the first Missionaries to the South Sea Islands. By the author of the "Peep of Day." American Tract Society.

The Bible Primer. First Part. Primer of the Pentateuch. American Tract Society.

A beautiful little book.

The Life of Faith. By W. Romaine, A. M., Rector of St. Andrews, London. 18mo. pp. 185. American Tract Society.

This is the original treatise of Romaine, published in 1793, and is too well known to need any commendation.

What is Calvinism? or the Confession of Faith in Harmony with the Scriptures and Common Sense. In a series of Dialogues between a Presbyterian Minister and a Young Convert. By Rev. William D. Smith, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 265 Chestnut street. pp. 260.

This is a judicious and able work, and well adapted to correct the misrepresentations concerning our doctrinal standards, which our Methodist brethren seem to regard it as one part of their vocation to disseminate. We must have names for everything; but it seems a pity that the glorious system of truth proclaimed by the apostles, and running through all ages of the Church like a stream of living water, should be called Calvinism. It is well enough to speak of Lutheranism, because it is beyond controversy that Luther's doctrine of the Person of Christ and of the Sacraments, originated with himself. But no one pretends that the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession, or any one of its features, originated with Calvin. The system is at least as old as Augustin, and never ceased to be professed and defended in the Church.

The Youth's Casket of Gems and Pearls. Selected and arranged by the Editor. Presbyterian Board.

The Child's Cabinet of Things both Rare and Useful. Selected and arranged by the Editor.

A Warning Cry from Niagara. By the author of "Come to Jesus.

Fear Not, and *Rest in Christ.*

Mary Searching for Jesus. By Rev. James Drummond.

The above are among the recent attractive publications of our Board.

Revival Sermons. First Series. By the Rev. Daniel Baker, D. D., President of Austin College, Texas, &c. &c. With an Appendix. Third edition with additions. Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 144 Chestnut street. 1855.

A Parisian Pastor's Glance at America. By Rev. J. H. Grandpierre, D. D., Pastor of the Reformed Church, and Director of the Missionary Institution in Paris. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington street. 1854.

The amiable and accomplished author of this little volume seems to have designed it for the instruction of fellow Christians in France. It is, however, a grateful memorial to his numerous friends in America.

Plain Words to a Young Communicant. By James W. Alexander, D. D. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 683 Broadway. 1854. pp. 113.

The design of this work is to give to young Christians "advices somewhat more full than can, in ordinary cases, be given orally to individuals by their pastors." It consists of short, pregnant paragraphs, under seventy-five heads, and is fraught with spiritual wisdom.

Memoirs of Joseph John Gurney, with selections from his Journal and Correspondence. Edited by Joseph Bevan Braithwaite. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 554, 608.

The fervent piety and enlarged catholic spirit of the subject of this memoir, whose name is as well known in this country as in Britain, have given him a place in the affections of all classes of Christians. The interest felt in his life will be as great outside of the Society of Friends, to which he belonged, as within it. These volumes are from the press of Lippincott, Grambo & Co., Philadelphia.

An Address on the Relations of Utilitarianism to Individual and National Culture, by Edward F. Stewart, A. M.

This is an earnest protest against an exclusive or predominant devotion to material interests, of which there are such strong symptoms among as, and a plea in favour of intellectual and artistic culture.

Dancing; a Discourse on the Fashionable Amusement of Dancing. By the Rev. Samuel R. Wilson. Cincinnati. 1854.

Patience Essential to Success. A commencement Discourse, preached in the Chapel of the Forsyth Collegiate Institute. By Samuel K. Talmage, D. D., President of Oglethorpe University. Macon. 1854.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

An important Historical work has lately appeared: "The Life and Correspondence of Lord Metcalfe, late Governor-General of India, Governor of Jamaica, and Governor-General of Canada." By John U. Kaye, author of "The History of the War in Afghanistan." 2 vols. 36*s.*

"Athens and the Peloponnese. With Sketches of Northern Greece." From the German of Herman Hettner. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

"Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negro." By Alfred Wallace, Esq. With remarks on the vocabularies of Amazonian Languages. By R. G. Latham, M. D., F. R. S. With plates and maps. 18*s.*

"History of the Reigns of Louis XVIII. and Charles X." By Eyre Evans Crowe, author of "A History of France." 2 vols. 28*s.*

"Thirty Years of Foreign Policy; or a History of the Secretaryship of the Earl of Aberdeen and Viscount Palmerston."

"Inquiry into the Principles of Church Authority; or reasons for recalling my subscription to Royal Supremacy." By Rev. R. J. Wilberforce.

"Literary remains of Henry Fynes Clinton, M. A. Edited by C. J. Fynes Clinton, M. A." These consist for the most part of a Journal, Political, Personal, and Literary, kept by this great scholar from his earliest years to his death.

"The Geography of Herodotus, developed and illustrated from Modern Researches and Discoveries. By J. Talboys Wheeler, F. R. G. S. With maps and plates."

"The Baltic, its Gates, Shores, and Cities; with a notice of the White Sea." By Rev. T. Milner, M. A. 10*s.* 6*d.*

"Census of Great Britain in 1851. Reprinted by Authority in a condensed form from the Official Tables." 5*s.*

"Diary kept during a year's Journeying and Residence in Northern Persia, and the provinces of Turkey adjacent to the South-West of Russia." By Lieutenant-Colonel Stuart, 13th Light Infantry. This book gives some curious and quite reliable information with regard to Persian habits and customs.

"Turkey; its History and Progress; from the Journals and Correspondence of Sir James Porter, fifteen years Ambassador at Constantinople, continued to the present time. With memoirs of Sir J. Porter by his grandson, Sir George Larpent, Bart." 2 vols. 30*s.* The Journals extend from 1747 to 1762, and afford an opportunity of comparing Turkey in the middle of the 18th, with the same in the middle of the 19th century.

"Queens before the Conquest. By Mrs. Matthew Hall."

"Four years at the Court of Henry VIII.; being selections from the despatches of Sebastian Giustiani, the Venetian Ambassador." The literary world need not be reminded that the reports of the Venetian Ambassador are unusually full and accurate, and are very much relied upon as historic sources.

"Pegu; a narrative of the concluding operations of the second Burmese War. Being a relation of events from August 1852 to the conclusion of the war, June, 1853, continued to 1854." By Lieutenant F. B. Laurie, Madras Artillery, author of "A Narrative of the operations at Rangoon, 1852." With plans and views. One thick vol. 14*s.*

"History of the Ottoman Turks, from the foundation of their Empire to the Present Time; chiefly based upon Von Hammer." By Professor Creasey, author of "The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World," and of "The Rise and Progress of the British Constitution." This will be in all proba-

bility republished. Professor Creasey is a brilliant writer of History, and has won considerable reputation by his previous efforts.

It is pleasing to see a continued and very much increased interest in Alison's History of Europe. Cheap editions and costly editions are multiplying. The Atlas which Alison, when he first published his History, feared to add to his work, already cumbrous, has at length appeared. It is by A. Keith Johnston, under the superintendence of Mr. Alison. It contains 107 coloured maps and plans of countries, battles, sieges, and sea-fights. £2 12*s.* 6*d.* library edition; on large paper, £3 3*s.* The third volume of the continuation contains "Asia Minor, Greece, and Turkey in 1821—The Greek Revolution, Battle of Navarino, and establishment of Greek Independence—The war between Russia and Turkey, 1827–1829—France to the Revolution of 1830—Domestic History of Great Britain to the Monetary Crisis of 1825."

Alison, after all, is the most reliable Historian of Modern Europe. His work is written with conscientious faithfulness, the inaccuracies are small in importance, his style is rich, and he has somewhat enlarged historic diction in its picturesque powers, and he is wonderfully fair towards those most opposed to him. In this age when litterateurs seem to have taken possession of the field of history, it is gratifying to see one extended work written under the impulse of one grand feeling. Even if we cannot sympathize with that feeling, we can all appreciate the epical force and dignity that it gives to the narration.

"Akerman's Numismatic Illustrations of the narrative portions of the New Testament," referred to in Conybeare and Howson, may be had for 5*s.* 6*d.* There are thirty-two allusions in the Gospels and Acts to the coinage of Greece, Rome, and Judea. Akerman gives us all that is necessary for us to get the force and meaning of the allusions.

"The Necessary Existence of God. By William Gillespie." Sir William Hamilton says that this is among the very best specimens of Speculative Philosophy lately put forth in Great Britain.

"The Druses of the Lebanon; comprising a visit to the Druse village in the Lebanon and the Anti-Libanus. With a description of the country, character, and domestic habits of that extraordinary people"

"Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria: including her private correspondence with Charles I.; chiefly from unedited sources, in public archives and private libraries in France and England. By Mrs. G. P. Everett Green."

Bopp's Comparative Grammar. Translated by Professor Eastwick. 3 vols. £3. 7*s*.

St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. With critical notes and dissertations. By A. P. Stanley. Mr. Stanley, it will be recollected, was the biographer of Dr. Arnold.

Polynesian Mythology and Ancient Traditional History of the New Zealand Race. By Sir George Grey, late Governor of New Zealand.

The fourth volume of Hamilton's edition of Dugald Stewart is out.

We notice a work which is intended to subserve edification rather than science: Theologia Germanica. Translated by Susanna Winkworth, with a preface by Rev. C. Kingsley, and a prefatory letter by Bunsen.

History of the propagation of Christianity among the Heathen since the Reformation. By Rev. William Brown, M. D., Secretary of the Scottish Missionary Society.

Gill's Exposition of the Old Testament. In six volumes. £3 18*s*.

Israel in Egypt, or the Books of Genesis and Exodus illustrated by existing monuments. 12mo. pp. 437. 6*s*.

Domestic Commentary on the Old Testament, by a Clergyman of the Church of England. Vol. II. Chronicles to the Song of Solomon. 8vo. pp. 575. 13*s*. 6*d*.

A sixth edition of Haldane's Books of the Old and New Testament proved to be canonical. 8vo. pp. 166. 1*s*. 6*d*.

A Critical Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Romans, by R. Knight. 8vo. pp. 700. 15*s*.

Theodoret and Evagrius, Histories of the Church from A. D. 322 to A. D. 427, and from A. D. 431 to A. D. 544. Translated from the Greek, with a general index. 8vo. pp. 480. 5*s*. Published by H. G. Bohn.

Theophylacti in Evangelium S. Matthæi Commentarius. Edidit Græce et Latine G. G. Humphrey. 8vo. pp. 499. 14*s*.

The Octavius of Minucius Felix. Edited by H. A. Haldon, Classical Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. pp. 260.

Three Treatises of Tertullian, (de Spectaculis, de Idololatria, and de Corona Militis,) with English Notes, an Introduction and Index, by G. Gurrey. 8vo. pp. 171. 7*s*. 6*d*.

A Treatise on the Episcopate of the Ante-Nicene Church with especial reference to the early position of the Roman See. By Rev. H. M. Gorham. 8vo. pp. 200. 3*s*. 6*d*.

History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V., by H. H. Milman. 3 vols. 36*s*.

The Bible in the Middle Ages: with remarks on the libraries,

schools, and social and religious aspects of Mediæval Europe, by L. A. Buckingham. 8vo. pp. 306. 7*s.* 6*d.*

John de Wycliffe, a Monograph: including an account of the Wycliffe MSS., by R. Vaughan. 4to. 16*s.*

History of the Protestant Church in Hungary from the beginning of the Reformation to 1850, with special reference to Transylvania. Translated by Rev. J. Craig. With an introduction by D'Aubigné. 8vo. pp. 464. 10*s.* 6*d.*

A third edition of Sir. J. Stephen's Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography. 8vo. pp. 1040. 24*s.*

Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as propounded by Archdeacon Wilberforce shown to be inconsistent alike with reason, with Scripture, and the Church: and his unsound views of the Holy Trinity exposed, by Theophilus Secundus. 8vo. pp. 202. 3*s.* 6*d.*

An Historical and Explanatory Treatise on the Book of Common Prayer, by W. G. Humphrey. 8vo. pp. 322. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Protestant Doctrine of Justification and Scheme of Salvation philosophically confuted in sixteen articles, by C. Cholmondeley, (Rom. Cath.) 8vo. pp. 264. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, commenced in March last, is published at Cambridge thrice in the year.

Apostolical Succession overthrown and Evangelical Succession established by a Comparison of the Qualifications, Functions and Endowments respectively assigned by Jesus Christ to the Apostles and their Successors in the Ministry of the New Covenant. 8vo. pp. 196. 5*s.*

Cyclopedia Bibliographica: a Library Manual of Theological and General Literature, and Guide to Books for Authors, Preachers, Students and Literary Men, Analytical, Bibliographical and Biographical, by James Darling. Imp. 8vo. pp. 1664. £2 12*s.* 6*d.*

A History of India under the first two Sovereigns of the house of Taimur, Baber, and Humayun, by W. Erskine. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 901. 32*s.*

History of the Byzantine and Greek Empires from 1057 to 1453, by G. Finlay. 8vo. pp. 680. 15*s.*

Christian Records and Historical Enquiry concerning the age, authorship, and authenticity of the New Testament, by Rev. D. Giles. 8vo. pp. 300. 9*s.* If this is anything like a kindred work by the same author on the Old Testament, it is flimsy and sceptical enough.

The History and Theology of the three Creeds, by Rev. W. W. Harvey. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 696. 14*s.*

Alexandria and her Schools: four lectures by Rev. C. Kingsley. 8vo. pp. 199. 5*s.*

Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries, by Rev. F. D. Maurice. 8vo. pp. 401. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Jesus tempted in the Wilderness: three discourses by A. Monod. 12mo. pp. 120. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Ordericus Vitalis; his Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, translated with notes and the introduction of Guizot, by T. Forester. Vol. III. 8vo. pp. 512. 5*s.* Bohn's Antiquarian Library.

The Church of England and Erastianism since the Reformation, by J. R. Pretyman. 8vo. pp. 374. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Theodoreti Episcopi Cyari Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ Libri quinque, cum Interpret. Latina et Annotationibus H. Valesii. Recensuit T. Gaisford. 8vo. 10*s.*

Narrative of a Journey through Syria and Palestine in 1851–2, by C. W. M. Vande Welde. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 1086. 30*s.*

The Church: an explanation of the meaning contained in the Bible, showing the ancient, continued, and prevalent error of man, the substitution of worship for religion, etc., by W. Atkinson. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 1182. £1 10*s.*

Christianity and Mankind, their beginnings and prospects, by C. C. J. Bunsen. 7 vols. 8vo. pp. 3430. £5 5*s.* This includes his Hippolytus and his Age, 2 vols.; Outlines of Universal History applied to Language and Religion, 2 vols.; and Analecta Ante-Nicæna, 2 vols.

The Jordan and the Rhine, or the East and West: being the result of five years' residence in Syria and five years in Germany, by Rev. W. Graham. 8vo. pp. 596. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Notes of a Traveller on the Social and Political State of France, Prussia, Switzerland and Italy, etc., during the present century, by Laing. 2*s.* 6*d.*

History of England, from the peace of Utrecht to the peace of Versailles, 1713–1783, by Lord Mahon. Vol. VII., 1780–3. 8vo. pp. 604. 15*s.*

The Antiquity, Literal Meaning, and Authenticity of the Mosaic Narrative examined and established, by Rev. A. Strahan. pp. 122. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Journal of a Residence in Northern Persia and the adjacent Provinces of Turkey, by Lieut. Col. Stuart. 8vo. pp. 407. 12*s.*

On the Figures and Types of the Old Testament, by Rev. J. R. West. pp. 120. 1*s.* 6*d.*

The Prákrita-Prakásá: or the Prákrit Grammar of Vararuchi, with the commentary of Bhámaha: the first complete edition, with copious notes, an English translation and index of Prákrit words; to which is prefixed an easy introduction to Prákrit Grammar, by E. B. Cowell.

Cumming's Sabbath Evening Readings on Luke. 8vo. pp. 538. 6*s.*

Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ: a Calendar of Ecclesiastical Dignitaries in England and Wales, continued to the present time, by T. D. Hardy. 3 vols. 8vo. 37*s.* 6*d.*

The Errors of Infidelity, by D. McBurnie. pp. 180. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Nicolini's History of the Jesuits: their origin, progress, doctrines, and designs. 8vo. pp. 520. 5*s.* 6*d.* Bohn's Illustrated Library.

History of Russia, from the foundation of the empire by Rourich to the close of the Hungarian War, by A. Rabbe and J. Duncan. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 286. 2*s.* 6*d.*

History of Russia, from the earliest period to the present time, compiled from the most authentic sources, including Karamsin, Tooke, and Segur, by W. K. Kelly. In 2 vols. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 502. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Nemesis of Power: Causes and Forms of Revolution, by J. A. St. John. pp. 254. 5*s.*

Tregelles on the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, with remarks on its revision upon critical principles, together with a collation of the Critical Texts of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, with that in common use. 8vo. pp. 368. 10*s.* 6*d.*

History of French Literature in the Eighteenth Century, by Prof. Vinet of Lausanne. 8vo. pp. 500. 9*s.*

The Works of Philo Judæus, translated from the Greek by C. D. Yonge. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 520. 5*s.*

Thoughts on Education in India, its object and plan, by T. A. Wise. 8vo. pp. 65. 2*s.*

The Testimony of Sacred Scripture, the Church of the first five centuries, and the Reformed Church of England to the nature and effects of Holy Baptism. 8vo. pp. 419. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay, with reminiscences of some distinguished contemporaries, selections from his correspondence, &c. Edited by G. Redford and J. A. James. 8vo. pp. 484. 12*s.*

Marco Polo's Travels; the translation of Marsden. Edited, with notes, introduction, and index, by T. Wright. 8vo. pp. 550. 5*s.* Bohn's Antiquarian Library.

The Teachings of the Types, by R. Aitken. No. 4. Our Individual Relationship to Christ as our Saviour. 8vo. 2*s.*

Lectures on the Christian Faith and Life, by C. Brereton. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

The National Restoration and Conversion of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, by W. Chamberlain. 8vo. pp. 578. 14*s.*

Church Historians: Pre-Reformation Series. Vol. VIII., Part 1. William of Malmesbury.—Reformation Series. Vol. II., Part 3. Fox's Acts and Monuments.

Preparation of Prophecy, or the use and design of the Old Testament examined. 8vo. pp. 417. 9*s*.

Exposition of the Seventh Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, by A. McKidd. 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

An Inquiry into the Principles of Church Authority, or Reasons for recalling my Subscription to the Royal Supremacy, by R. J. Wilberforce. 8vo. pp. 284. 5*s*.

Three volumes have been published of the Collected Works of Dugald Stewart, edited by Sir W. Hamilton.

Edward Irving: an Ecclesiastical and Literary Biography. pp. 288. 3*s*. 6*d*.

Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, with a translation, by C. J. Ellicott. 8vo. pp. 140. 7*s*. 6*d*.

The Doctrine of the Sacrifice deduced from the Scriptures. A series of Sermons, by F. D. Maurice. 8vo. pp. 322. 7*s*. 6*d*.

Exposition of the First Seventeen Chapters of St. Matthew, by D. Bagot. 8vo. pp. 340. 7*s*. 6*d*.

The Ecclesiastical Principles and Polity of the Wesleyan Methodists: their Ordinances, Institutions, Laws, Regulations, and General Economy. 8vo. pp. 668. 10*s*. 6*d*.

The Public Pearl, or Education the People's right and a Nation's glory: two Lectures. 12mo. pp. 326. 4*s*. 6*d*.

The Baltic, its Gates, Shores, and Cities, by Rev. T. Milner. 8vo.

The Chinese Empire, a continuation of Huc and Gabet's Travels in Tartary and Thibet, by the Abbé Huc, many years Missionary Apostolic in China. Translated from the French. 2 vols. 8vo.

Rambles in Iceland, by Pliny Miles. 16mo.

Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders, with illustrations of their Manners and Customs, by E. Shortland. 8vo. 4*s*. 6*d*.

The Geography of Herodotus developed, explained, and illustrated from Modern Researches and Discoveries, by J. T. Wheeler. 8vo. pp. 607. 18*s*.

FRANCE.

Commentaries of John Calvin on the New Testament. Vol. I. Containing the harmony of three Evangelists. 8vo. pp. 392. 7 francs 50 centimes.

Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul and other Apostles,

by the Abbé A. Arnaud, Professor in the Seminary at Brignolles. 4to. pp. 196.

History of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, author of the schism of the Greeks, from original and mostly unpublished documents; accompanied by an introduction, historical notes, etc. By the Abbé Jagar. Second Edition. 12mo. pp. 255. 3 fr.

Alcuin and his Influence among the Franks, literary, religious, and political, with unpublished fragments of a commentary of Alcuin on St. Matthew, and other pieces published for the first time, by F. Monnier. 8vo. pp. 138. 3 fr. 50 c.

The Summa Theologiæ of Thomas Aquinas, translated entire into French for the first time, with theological, historical, and philological notes, by the Abbé Drioux. 7 vols. 8vo. 35 fr.

Sum of the Catholic Faith against the Gentiles, by Thomas Aquinas. The Latin text with a translation, and accompanied with numerous notes, by the Abbé P. F. Ecalle. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 296. 5 fr. 50 c.

Universal History of the Catholic Church, by the Abbé Rohrbacher. Second edition, corrected and enlarged. 29 vols. 8vo. 160 fr.

Studies on the new historical documents borrowed from the recently discovered Philosophumena, and relating to the commencement of Christianity, and particularly of the Church of Rome, by the Abbé Cruice. 8vo. pp. 164. 4 fr. 50 c.

Chronological and Dogmatical History of the Christian Councils, from the Council at Jerusalem held by the Apostles in the year 50, to the last Council held in our days. By the Abbé André d'Avallon. Vol. IV. 8vo. pp. 296. 6 fr.

History of the Church of France, composed from original and authentic documents, by the Abbé Guettie. Vol. IX. 8vo. pp. 276.

History of the Rivalry and the Protectorate of the Christian Churches in the East, by C. Famin. 8vo. pp. 268. 7 fr. 50 c.

New Theological Encyclopedia, or new series of Dictionaries on all parts of religious science, etc., published by the Abbé Migne. Vol. XL. XLI., Dictionary of Manuscripts. 8vo. pp. 816. 14 fr. Vol. XLII., Dictionary of Anthropology. pp. 400. 8 fr. Vol. XLIV., Marvels and Curiosities. pp. 320. 7 fr. Vol. XLVII., Palæography, Cryptography, Dactylology, Hieroglyphics, Stenography, and Telegraphing. pp. 336. 7 fr.

Essay on Providence, by E. Bersot. 8vo. pp. 220.

The Complete Works of Francis Arago are to be published in 12 vols. 8vo., from 600 to 650 pages each, at 7 fr. 50 c. per volume. The first three will contain thirteen biographical

notices read by him in the annual sessions of the Academy of Sciences, several of which have never been printed. They concern Fresnel, Volta, Young, Fourier, Watt, Carnot, Ampère, Condorcet, Bailly, Monge, Poisson, Gay Lussac, and Malus, giving not barely the principal events of their lives, but an analysis of their works, discoveries, etc. These are to be preceded by an unpublished paper entitled by Arago The History of my Youth. Three other volumes will contain brief scientific papers (notices), *e. g.*, on thunder, steam-engines, the sun, scintillations, the system of the world, the voltaic pile, Sir W. Herschell, etc. Two will be devoted to scientific memoirs, mostly unpublished, *e. g.*, on the rapidity of light, polarization, photometry, magnetism, the planets, etc. Two will contain Reports to the Academy, to the Chamber of Deputies and Municipal Council on various points of science; and lastly, his Popular Astronomy.

Political and Moral Tableau of Russia in the 16th and 19th centuries, by the Baron Siztema de Grovestins. 8vo. pp. 80. 3 fr.

The Coptic version of the Pentateuch, published from MSS. of the Imperial Library of Paris, with various readings and notes, by A. Fallet. No. I. 4to. pp. 96. 7 fr. 50 c. This number contains the first sixteen chapters of Genesis, without title or introduction. The text is formed from the Parisian MSS., compared with the older edition of the Pentateuch by David Wilkins, London, 1731.

The Revival of Syriac Studies, by F. Nève, Professor at Louvain. 8vo. pp. 37. This is reprinted from the Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne, for January and February, 1854. It contains, among other things, the history of the study of Syriac in Europe since the 16th century, and a tolerably complete bibliography of Syriac printed works, under the three heads of Exegesis, Patrology, and History.

An important Arabic work is about to be published at Leyden, under title of Selections (Analectes) from the History and Literature of the Arabs of Spain, by al-Makkari. It is edited jointly by R. Dozy of Leyden, G. Dugat of Paris, L. Krehl of Dresden, and W. Wright of Oxford. It will consist of four parts, each to contain 350 pages, and to cost 7 florins. Al-Makkari lived in the first half of the 17th century. He wrote a life of Ibn-al-Khatib, who flourished at Granada in the 14th century, prefacing it with a vast series of fragments from ancient authors, many of which are now lost, on the history and literature of the Spanish Arabs. This introduction, which occupies half of the work, is now the most interesting and im-

portant part of it. An English translation, which, however, was considerably abridged and otherwise faulty, was published of this work of al-Makkari by de Gayanges. It is the purpose of the present editors simply to furnish a corrected edition of the original text. There are three complete MSS. of this work upon the Continent, and two in England, besides others more or less mutilated. The quotations will also, as far as practicable, be verified by comparison with the text of the authors from which they were originally taken. It was their intention at first to have accompanied the original with a new translation; but this feature of the plan has been abandoned, or its execution left to other hands.

GERMANY.

The second part of the first volume of Dillmann's Ethiopic Old Testament has appeared, pp. 229–380 text, and pp. 119–164 critical annotations. 2½ thalers. This issue contains the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy. The same MSS. were used as in the first part. The annotations exhibit as before the various readings of the MSS., as well as all those passages in which the translator seems to have had another than the received Greek text before him, or in which he has either misapprehended its meaning, or inaccurately rendered it. It is the opinion of Professor Dillmann, (in which he coincides with Ludolf,) that the entire Pentateuch proceeded from one translator, except only a portion of the book of Exodus. The precise limits of this portion cannot be accurately fixed; but from about Exod. xiv. 9, to about xxxi. 7, there seems to be such a difference in its whole character and the mode of rendering, that he thinks it necessary to assume a different translator. He supposes the whole to have been first translated by one person; but that in some way this passage was wholly lost or greatly corrupted, and that it was re-translated or corrected by another hand. The original text of the version seems to be retained with least purity in Deuteronomy, and with most in Leviticus; one reason of which may have been that Leviticus was, from the character of its contents, less frequently used, and another that the rhetorical style of Deuteronomy, and its numerous phrases recurring with more or less modification, increased the liability of errors in transcription. The version receives the praise of being generally well executed. The song of Moses in Deut. xxxii., is admirably rendered; while his blessing in the next chapter is less successfully handled, probably on account of its obscurity in the Septuagint. In the

list of clean and unclean animals, both in Leviticus and in Deuteronomy, the Greek names are simply transferred. Old Ethiopic MSS. have no settled division into sentences or verses; but each transcriber punctuated apparently at his own discretion. There seems to be more reason to believe in the existence of sections or chapters, though even these may have varied considerably. The ecclesiastical use of the Scriptures would have led to this, even if these sections were not borrowed from the Greeks in the Old Testament, as they certainly were in the New. In some books the ancient division appears to have been pretty accurately preserved. In others, different modes of division have been confused, or they have been altered purposely or by mistake, or even omitted altogether. In one of his MSS., that of Bruce, Dillmann found in Genesis 52 sections, in Exodus 17, in Leviticus 34, in Numbers 53, in Deuteronomy 12. In another, that of the British and Foreign Bible Society, there were in Genesis 280 sections, in Exodus 110, in Leviticus 85, in Numbers 125, and in Deuteronomy 37; though there were in this same MS. traces of another mode of division still, which gave to Numbers 56 sections, and to Deuteronomy 9. These last correspond with the sections of Bruce's MS., in the book of Numbers, in almost every instance; but no two agree in Deuteronomy. The Bible Society's MS. also distinguishes the lessons for public worship; but the marks for this purpose are often obliterated. Since the era of printing, the modern chapters and verses have been introduced among the Abyssinians from the Greeks, and are frequently noted in their most recent manuscripts. [For account of first part, see Biblical Repertory for January, 1854, p. 210.]

A. Kuenen has published the books of Exodus and Leviticus from Abu Said's Arabic version of the Samaritan Pentateuch, 8vo. pp. 153—356. Genesis was published in 1851. The views of the editor regarding the author and character of the version, are reserved for the prolegomena, which are promised when the Pentateuch shall be completed. Of the six manuscripts known to exist of this version, Kuenen was only able to obtain the use of three. His preceptor and friend Juynboll, well known from his own publications in Samaritan literature, failed in the endeavour to obtain the Barberinian codex from Rome; and the rules of the English libraries forbade his using the two which are in the Bodleian at Oxford, unless during a personal visit there. Two MSS. were furnished him from the Royal Library at Paris, and he had access to another in Leyden. One of the

Parisian MSS. is adopted as the basis of the text, and the various readings of the others are carefully noted.

E. Riehm, The Legislation of Moses in the Land of Moab. A Contribution to Introduction to the Old Testament. 8vo. pp. 136. ⅔ th. This treatise, which is dedicated to Huffeld and Umbreit, was originally prepared by its author in order to his admission to the degree of licentiate of theology, by the faculty at Heidelberg. Its character will sufficiently appear from the statement that he denies the Mosaic origin of the book of Deuteronomy, assigning to it a date much posterior to that of the other books of the Pentateuch. It could not have been written, according to his account, before the latter half of the reign of Manasseh.

A second edition, partially rewritten, and somewhat enlarged, of Knobel's Commentary on Isaiah. 8vo. pp. 467. 1 th. 27 ngr. This belongs to the Condensed Exegetical Manual to the Old Testament.

Another part has appeared of The Prophet Isaiah, translated and explained, by Dr. M. Drechsler. The first volume (ch. i. —xii.), and the first part of the second (ch. xiii.—xxvii.), were published by Drechsler during his life. The present publication completes the second volume, and contains ch. xxviii.—xxxix. 8vo. pp. 222. 1 th. It is edited by Delitzsch and Hahn, (the commentator upon Job and the Song of Solomon,) from the papers of Drechsler, which contained abundant materials for this part of the work, but were not in a state of readiness for the press, and needed a laborious revision and abridgment. Wherever the editors have introduced any remarks of their own, they are accompanied by their initials. From the 40th chapter, Drechsler has left no materials of any consequence. That portion of the commentary will have to be an entirely new and independent production. Its preparation has been undertaken, not by Delitzsch, as we were previously informed, but by Hahn. It is but a few years since he had to perform a similar service for another lamented scholar, Hävernick, whose posthumous lectures on Old Testament Theology he edited.

R. Nagel, The Prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Three sketches from Scripture life for thinking Christians of our time. 8vo. pp. 52. ⅓ th.

P. Schegg, The Minor Prophets, translated and explained. In two parts; the first extending from Hosea to Micah, the second from Nahum to Malachi. 8vo. pp. 1154. 5 th.

D. Burger, Commentarius in Ecclesiasten, in usum juventutis academicæ. 8vo. pp. 86. 24 ngr.

A. Hilgenfeld, The Gospels, with respect to their origin and historical import. 8vo. pp. 355. 1 th. 24 ngr.

E. Zeller, The Acts of the Apostles critically investigated with respect to its contents and origin. 8vo. pp. 524. 2 th.

W. A. Van Hengel, Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, originally delivered in academical lectures, now revised for publication. (In Latin.) Fasc. I. 8vo. pp. 167. 1 th. 6 ngr.

L. Steugel, Commentary on the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans. Edited from manuscripts of the author by J. Beck. 2 vols. Second Edition. The first was published in 1836. 8vo. pp. 544. 24 ngr.

J. E. Huth, On the passage in Paul's Epistle to the Galatians iii. 19, 20. Commentatio. 4to. pp. 26. ¼ th.

W. F. Besser, Bible Hours. Exposition of the Holy Scriptures for the people. Vol. 6. The Epistles of Peter. 8vo. pp. 568. 1 th. 6 ngr.

F. L. Steinmeyer, Disquisition upon the introductory portion of the first Epistle of Peter. 8vo. pp. 48. ¼ th. This is an academical dissertation in Latin upon 1 Peter i. 1–12.

C. Stern, Commentary on the Revelation of the Apostle John. 8vo. pp. 462. 2 th.

E. Bœhmer, The Revelation of John to be explained of things done in the age of the prophet. Fasc. I., expounding chs. vi. vii. viii. 8vo. pp. 60. ⅓ th.

C. A. Auberlen, The Prophet Daniel and the Revelation of John considered in their mutual relation, and explained in their principal passages. 8vo. pp. 451. 1⅔ th.

A new edition of De Wette's Commentary on the Revelation. 8vo. pp. 193. 27½ ngr. With a preface by Dr. Lücke.

Tischendorf has published a Novum Testamentum Triglottum, or the New Testament in Greek, Latin, and German. 4to. pp. 930. 2 th. The Greek text is taken without material alteration from the second Leipsic edition (1849) of his New Testament; the variations of the received text, and all other readings of any critical value are given; and the Ammonian sections and the canons of Eusebius are exhibited. The Latin text is an attempted restoration of the translation of Jerome in its earliest form, following chiefly the two oldest MSS. which are supposed to exhibit this version, Codd. Amiatinus, and Fuldensis. The variations of the Clementine Vulgate are given in the margin. The German text is based upon the original edition of Luther in 1545. Learned prolegomena accompany the volume.

The same distinguished critic has projected a work to be

called Monumenta Sacra Inedita. A New Collection. As is well known, he has during the last fifteen years devoted much of his time and labour to the securing of accurate reprints of the oldest MSS., and the most important for sacred criticism, that their examination by scholars might thus be facilitated, and the danger of their loss or destruction might thus if possible be averted. This work is in continuation of the same idea. The first volume was announced for November. Only 200 copies were to be printed, and the price of subscription was 16 thalers. Its contents were chiefly collected by Tischendorf recently in the East. They consist, first, of five Greek palimpsests, written from the 5th to the 7th century. One contains fragments from the four gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of Paul; the other four contain fragments of the Old Testament from Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings, and Isaiah. In addition to these, there are fragments of two of the oldest Evangelisteria (Lessons from the Gospels) written in the 6th or 7th century, and which were found in the libraries at Venice and at Rome; also a portion of the Psalms in Greek, which were found upon papyrus several years since in an Egyptian tomb, and deposited in the British Museum, and a fragment from the Prophets, (Isa. lxvi. 12—Jer. i. 7,) which, in the judgment of Tischendorf, undoubtedly belongs to the same old MS. of which fragments were published by him in 1844, under the name of the Codex Friderico-Augustanus. New type were cut expressly for this work. Critical prolegomena and three plates of fac simile are promised.

A fourth enlarged edition of Tholuck's The Old Testament in the New Testament. 8vo. pp. 116. 16 ngr. This consists of two treatises originally published as appendices to the author's Commentary on the Hebrews: the first is on the quotations from the Old Testament in the New, and the second on the notion attached to offerings and priests in both Testaments.

J. H. Kurtz, History of the Old Covenant. Vol. 2d. Part I. 8vo. pp. 320. 3 th. The striking ability and evangelical sentiments displayed in the first volume, published originally in 1848, (2d edit. 1853,) as well as in other works by the same author, warrant very exalted expectations in regard to this.

A second edition of Ewald's Antiquities of the People of Israel, published as an Appendix to the 2d and 3d vols. of his History of the People of Israel until Christ. 8vo. pp. 426. $1\frac{3}{4}$ th.

Rab. L. Herzfeld, History of the People of Israel from the

completion of the second temple to the appointment of Simon Maccabeus as high-priest and prince. Vol. I. No. 2. 8vo. pp. 161–320. ¾ th. This is spoken of as a work of great learning and research.

H. Lichtenstein, History of the Israelites from the Babylonish Exile to the most recent times. 8vo. pp. 263. 18 ngr.

Scientific Treatises on Jewish history, literature, and antiquities. 8vo. pp. 164. 1⅙ th.

A new and unaltered edition of J. L. Hug's Thoughts (Gutachten) on the Life of Jesus by Strauss. 8vo. pp. 462. 24 ngr.

L. Donin, Brief Sketch of Church History. 8vo. pp. 168. 8 ngr.

F. Peterson, Universal History of Religion, from the Standpoint of Christian Revelation. Vol. 2d, Nos. 2 and 3. 8vo. pp. 65–192.

A. F. O. Münchmeyer, The Doctrine of the Visible and Invisible Church. A historico-critical essay. 8vo. pp. 181. ⅚ th. The first part of the treatise discusses the history of this doctrine, and the second exhibits what its author supposes to be the truth in relation to it.

W. Menzel, Christian Symbols, (Symbolik.) No. 1. 8vo. pp. 1–80. 11¼ ngr. To be completed in 12–14 numbers.

J. H. A. Ebrard, Lectures on Practical Theology. 8vo. pp. 378. 1⅔ th.

R. Stier, The Lord's Supper, an exegetical and dogmatical treatise. 8vo. pp. 105. ⅓ th. This is reprinted from the sixth part of his Discourses of the Lord Jesus.

C. Rösen, (Cath. priest,) The Pragmatic Sanction, which has come to us under the name of St. Lewis IX., King of France. A Church-historical treatise. 8vo. pp. 55. 8 ngr.

H. Rückert, History of the Culture of the German People at the time of the transition from Heathenism to Christianity. Part 2d. 8vo. pp. 527. 3 th.

A. Jäger, On the Relation of the Emperor Maximilian I. to the Papacy. 8vo. pp. 76. 14 ngr. Reprinted from the Transactions of the Royal Academy of Sciences for 1854.

O. Jäger, John Wickliffe and his Importance for the Reformation. An investigation of his doctrine, his theoretical and practical opposition to the Catholic Church, and his relation to Huss and Wessel, and to Luther. 8vo. pp. 149. 18 sgr. This is a prize essay, called out by a proposal from the evangelical theological faculty at Tübingen. In the development of his theological views, special relation is had to his main work, the Trialogus. In the opinion of the writer, the prac-

tical and the theoretical, antagonism to the Church and to scholasticism, were in Wickliffe undivided. After his death these found distinct representatives, the practical in Huss, the theoretical in Wessel. These were once more combined in a higher degree and a more developed form in Luther.

C. W. Spicker, History of the Religious Peace of Augsburg, September 26, 1555, with an introductory history of the Reformation. 8vo. pp. 317. 1 th. 15 sgr. The subject was suggested by the approaching tri-centenary anniversary.

K. F. A. Kahnis, The Internal Progress of German Protestantism since the middle of the last century. 8vo. pp. 262. 1 th. 6 ngr.

John Huss's Sermons on the Gospel of the Advent, translated from the Bohemian into German by J. Nowotny. 8vo. pp. 28. 3 ngr.

T. Harnach, The Worship of the Christian Church (Christliche Gottesdienst) in the Apostolic and Old-Catholic Age. 8vo. pp. 484. 2 th. 10 sgr. The author is professor of theology at Erlangen, and belongs to the strict Lutheran party.

Some articles from the pen of Hengstenberg, entitled Freemasonry and the Office of the Evangelical Pastor, have been reprinted from his Kirchenzeitung, and have called forth various replies.

A second enlarged and improved German edition of Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church has been published at Leipsic. 8vo. pp. 680. Schaff likewise published during his recent visit at Berlin a book upon America, The political, social, ecclesiastical, and religious condition of the United States of North America, with special reference to the Germans, from personal inspection. 8vo. pp. 278. $1\frac{1}{3}$ th.

Dr. Stalberg, Contributions to the History of German Historiography in the Middle Ages. I. Jornandes. 4to. pp. 24. $\frac{1}{3}$ th.

W. Wachsmuth, History of the Political Parties of Ancient and Modern Times. Vol. 2d. Containing the history of the political parties of the middle ages. 8vo. pp. 522. 2 th. 24 ngr.

A fourth edition of E. Rheinhold's History of Philosophy considered in the main points of its development. Vol. 2d. Containing the history of modern philosophy to the time of Kant. 8vo. pp. 408. $1\frac{1}{2}$ th.

The second volume of Oischinger's Speculative Development of the Principal Systems of Modern Philosophy from Descartes to Hegel. 8vo. pp. 608. 2 th. 18 ngr.

J. Gihr, The latest Philosophy in its Historical Progress. Published in numbers. No. 4. 8vo. pp. 145–208. $\frac{1}{3}$ th.

L. Noach, Propaedeutic of Philosophy. Introduction to the philosophy and encyclopedia of the philosophical sciences. 8vo. pp. 492. 2 th. Also by the same author, Freethinkers in Religion, or the Representatives of Religious Enlightenment in England, France, and Germany. Vol. 2d is devoted to France, and finds the religious lights of that country in its scoffing sceptics and atheists. 8vo. pp. 376. 1 th. 9 ngr.

Grässe's Universal Literary History of all known Nations of the World, from the most ancient to the latest times, has reached the second part of the third section of the third volume. 8vo. pp. 193–384. 1 th. This section treats of the 18th century, and the first half of the 19th.

Latin Hymns of the Middle Ages, published from MSS. and explained by F. J. Mone. Vol. 2d contains those relating to the Virgin Mary. 8vo. pp. 459. 1 th. 24 ngr.

Two volumes of Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie for Protestant Theology and Church, have been issued, large 8vo. pp. 792 and 798. It appears in numbers, ten of which constitute a volume, at the price of 8 ngr. per number. The second volume extends from Bekehrung to Columbian, and contains nearly five hundred articles. It may give some idea of the character of its contents to say that among the longest articles in the second volume are those on Benedict of Nursia and the Benedictines, 14 pages; Bengel, 10 pages; Beza, 12; Bible text of the Old Test., 17; of the New Test., 28; Bible versions, 15; British and Foreign Bible Society, 10; Bucer, 11; Bullinger, 11; Calvin, 27; Chilism, 14. Herzog has 114 coadjutors, among whom may be named, (in addition to those mentioned Rep. Oct. 1852, p. 711,) as among the ablest and best known to our readers, Baumgarten, Bertheau, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Dorner, Ebrard, Kurtz, Lange, Lepsius, Rödiger, Tischendorf, etc.

K. F. Leaderhose, Frederic Myconius, Pastor and Superintendent of Gotha. A life from the period of the Reformation. With a portrait of Myconius and a fac simile. 8vo. pp. 336. 24 sgr. It is the purpose of the writer to publish successively the lives of several of the Reformers. Frederic Mecum or Myconius, who has been called the apostle of Thuringia, was born December 26, 1491, at Lichtenfels, three leagues from Coburg. When thirteen years old he went to the school at St. Annaberg; when nineteen he entered the Franciscan convent in that place. In 1516 he became priest at Weimar. From 1524 to the end of his life in 1546, he laboured uninterruptedly in Gotha. With the exception of journeys to the Rhine and to England, visitations in Thuringia with Melancthon, and an abode of some

length in Leipsic, on business connected with the Reformation, he never left Gotha. One of his publications in 1540, with a preface from the pen of Luther, was entitled, "How to instruct the simple, and especially the sick, in Christianity."

G. Klemm, The Condition and Influence of Women in different zones and ages. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 411. 2 th.

J. Thaler, History of Tyrol, from the earliest times to our days. Prepared from historical sources. Part I. Its ancient history, extending from its first settlement in the Etruscan period to about the middle of the thirteenth century, when the duchy was established. 8vo. pp. 147. 18 sgr. The whole is to be completed in three volumes.

F. I. Proschko, Excursions into the Territory of Austrian History and Tradition. 8vo. pp. 116. 22½ sgr. The contents are, 1. A brief sketch of the insurrection of the peasantry in Upper Austria in 1625–6. 2. Kepler in Lintz, a series of interesting passages from the public archives, which relate to the abode of this distinguished astronomer in that place, 1611–1628. 3. The siege of Lintz in the first war of the peasants, giving an account of the two attacks made upon it in July, 1626. 4. The founding of the convent of Schlägel, and 5. That at Hohenfurth.

S. Sugenheim, History of the Origin and Extension of the States of the Church. 8vo. pp. 439. 2 th. 15 sgr. This essay received the prize from the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen. It sketches the growth of the States of the Church from the Emperor Constantine to the surrender of Ferrara to the papal see in 1598. The first four chapters treat of the origin of the title and claims of the papacy to this territory; the next three of the anarchy during the abode of the popes at Avignon; the last three, the fall of the great families, and the conquests and acquisitions of the popes in the 15th and 16th centuries.

Monuments of Art, A Survey of its Progress from the first artistic attempts to the stand-point of the present. Published by E. Guhl and J. Casper. 3 vols. pp. 223, and 106 copperplates, folio. 29 th. 14 sgr. This work has been eight or nine years in publishing. Its aim is to illustrate each period in the history of art by characteristic examples exhibiting its general features and its predominant tendencies. The earliest stages as found in the Celtic monuments of the north of Europe, in those of Central America, the valley of the Nile, the region of the Euphrates and India, occupy the first eleven plates. Greece and its colonies, Etruria, and Rome fill the next twenty-two. Plates 34–64 contain the monuments of the middle ages, the

old Christian, Romanesque, and German styles, together with those of Islam in their principal phases. Then follow the monuments of modern art.

Crusade of the Landgrave Lewis the Pious. An epic upon the siege of Acre at the end of the twelfth century. From the only existing MS. by F. H. von der Hagen. 8vo. pp. 300. 2 th. 20 sgr. This poem was written in Silesia between 1302 and 1305, and evidently belongs to the period of declining art. Its chief interest arises from the vividness with which the minute details of the crusade are depicted, the mode of warfare, the relations between the Christians and Saracens, the jealousies of the Christians among each other, etc.

W. L. Holland, Chrestien of Troyes. An investigation in literary history. 8vo. pp. 284. Chrestien, surnamed *de Troyes*, from the place of his birth, was one of the most fertile of the French romantic poets of the twelfth century. Some of his principal pieces are William of England, the romance of Erec, containing the adventures of the round table, the romance of Cliget, etc.

Dr. Herzog, The Waldenses, their ante-reformation condition and doctrines, their reformation in the sixteenth century, and the reflex influence of the same, exhibited principally in their own writings. 8vo. pp. 470. 2 th. 15 sgr.

A. Kastner, History of the Town of Neisse, with special reference to church life in the town and the principality of Neisse. Part 2d. From 1608 to 1655. Period of the bishops Charles and Charles Ferdinand. With a lithograph plan of the town of Neisse in 1594. 8vo. pp. 599. 2½ th.

A. Von Kremer, Topography of Damascus. Published by order of the Imperial Academy of Sciences. With 3 lithograph plates. 4to. pp. 51. 1⅔ th.

F. Liebetrut, Journey to the East, especially to Jerusalem and the Holy Land. With a lithograph view of Bethlehem and Jerusalem, a plan of the holy city, and a map of the Holy Land. 8vo. pp. 600. 1¾ th.

Ulrich Jasper Seetzen, Travels through Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, the Transjordan-lands, Arabia Petrea, and Lower Egypt. Two vols. 8vo. pp. 832. 4½ th. Seetzen was in the East from 1803 till 1811, when he fell a victim to Arab avarice. Letters were published from him in Europe at the time, but his complete journals have never until now been printed. They are edited now by Prof. Kruse, in whose hands they have been for many years, with the co-operation of Heinrichs, G. F. Müller, and others.

K. Graul, Director of the Evangelical Lutheran Mission at

Leipsic, has published three volumes of his Journey to the East Indies over Palestine and Egypt. The object of his journey was to visit the missions in India under the charge of the society with which he is connected. The first and second volumes are devoted to Palestine, Egypt, and Sinai; the third, in which he says he has arrived at the threshold of his proper subject, is devoted to the western coast of Hindostan. 8vo. pp. 352. $1\frac{2}{3}$ th.

A. Jellinck has published from a MS. in the Royal Library at Paris, a treatise of Rabbi Shabtai Donolo, entitled, Man as the Image of God. 8vo. pp. xiv. and 16. $\frac{1}{3}$ th.

E. Braun, Art-mythology, (Vorschule der Kunstmythologie.) Folio. pp. 65, with 100 copperplates. 5 th.

W. F. Rinck, The Religion of the Hellenes developed from their myths, the teachings of their philosophers, and their worship. Part 2d. Section 1. The worship and public festivals of the Hellenes. 8vo. pp. 328.

L. Preller, Greek Mythology. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 893. 2 th.

M. Uhlemann, The Judgment of the Dead among the Ancient Egyptians. 8vo. pp. 16. 5 sgr.

Suidæ Lexicon ex recognitione Imman. Bekkeri. 8vo. pp. 1158. $6\frac{2}{3}$ th.

H. A. Zwick, Handbook of the Mongolian Language. 4to. pp. 482, of which 400 are lithographed. $6\frac{2}{3}$ th.

F. Bopp, Comparative Accentuation System, with a condensed view of the grammatical agreement between the Sanscrit and the Greek. 8vo. pp. 304. 2 th.

H. N. Rüs, Grammatical Outline and Vocabulary of the Oji-language, with especial reference to the Akwapim dialect, together with a collection of proverbs of the natives. 8vo. pp. 276. $3\frac{1}{3}$ th.

M. Haug, On the Pehlvi Language and the Bundehesh. 12mo. pp. 46. 6 ngr.

A third fasciculus of Vuller's Persian Lexicon has been published. 4to. pp. 401–632. 3 th.

W. Schott, Descriptive Sketch of Chinese Literature. 4to. pp. 126. 2 th. A treatise read in the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Feb. 7, 1850.

Upalekha de Kramapâtha libellus. The Sanscrit text, with various readings, prolegomena, a Latin version, notes, and index, by W. Pertsch. 8vo. pp. xxiii. and 64. $1\frac{1}{3}$ th.

The Hudsailian poems contained in the MS. of Leyden, edited in Arabic and translated with annotations, by J. G. Rosegarten. Vol. I. Containing the first part of the Arabic text. 4to. pp. 296. 5 th.

Bible Poems of Cædmon the Anglo Saxon, published by K. W. Bouterwek. 8vo. pp. ccxliii. and 353. 7⅓ th. The writings of Cædmon compose the earliest monument of the English tongue known to exist. He died about the year 676. It is of him that Bede relates, among other marvellous things, that he often composed sublimely during his sleep, and wrote it all off when he awaked. This book contains a folio fac simile from the Bodleian MS.

Munich, it seems, has had its crystal palace and its industrial exhibition, (from July 15 to Oct. 15, 1854,) as well as the rest of the world, with its Guide of 35 pp. 8vo., and its Catalogue of 372 pp.

Studien und Kritiken, 1854, No. 4. G. V. Lechler, The Old Testament in the Discourses of Jesus. K. H. Graf, On the position of Bethel, Ramah, and Gilgal. R. A. Lipsius, On the object and occasion of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. W. Grimm, On the passage in the Epistle of James iv. 5, 6. Reviews.

G. W. Nitzsch, Ord. Prof. of Philology at Kiel, has become Ord. Prof. of Classical Archæology in the University of Leipsic; and Justus Olshausen, Ord. Prof. of Oriental Languages at Kiel, has been transferred to the same professorship at Königsberg.