





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1857.

No. III.

*Lynne
Atwater*

- ARTICLE I.—1. *A System of Practical Medicine, comprised in a series of original Dissertations.* Arranged and edited by ALEXANDER TWEEDIE, M. D., F. R. S. Vol. 2. Article, Insanity, by J. C. PRICHARD, M. D., F. R. S., etc., etc. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1840.
2. *A Treatise on the Practice of Medicine.* By GEORGE B. WOOD, M. D., Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in the University of Pennsylvania, etc., etc. Fourth Edition. In two volumes. Vol. 2. Article, Insanity. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1855.
3. *Elements of Medical Jurisprudence.* By THEODRIC ROMEYN BECK, M. D., LL.D., and JOHN B. BECK, M. D. Tenth Edition. Vol. 1. Article, Mental Alienation. Albany: Little & Co. 1850.
4. *Mind and Matter: or Physiological Inquiries, in a series of Essays, intended to illustrate the Mental Relations of the Physical Organization and the Mental Faculties.* By Sir BENJAMIN BRODIE, Bart., D. C. L., Vice-President of the Royal Society. With Additional Notes by an American Editor. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co. 1857.

THE frequency and success with which criminal advocates plead insanity as a defence for atrocious crime, are viewed with deep concern by a large part of our people. Those who have at heart the interests of morality and religion, are of course alarmed at the apparent countenance thus given to the

doctrine, that the presumption of excusable insanity and consequent guiltlessness increases in proportion to the atrocity of the crime committed. This tends to subvert all moral distinctions, to enervate and pollute the public conscience, to put men at their ease in taking up a profligate career, and perpetrating the most enormous crimes. Thus it poisons the fountains of public virtue, and saps the foundations of religion. Beyond those who have these paramount interests at heart, another large class look with apprehension upon the bearing of such principles on social order, and the security of persons and property. They justly feel that the blessings of good government are imperiled or lost, when the enormity of crimes is made to ensure their impunity.

This plea of insanity, in exculpation of criminals, is of two sorts. First, where any circumstances can be proved which render it plausible, it is claimed that the culprit was the victim of some derangement or delusion in his intellect, which destroyed his moral agency, at least *quoad hoc*. It is simply an attempt to prove that he was a lunatic, and that by reason of this disorder of his reason, he was incapable of knowing the difference between right and wrong in the premises. Now where such an allegation can be sustained, it is unquestionably a valid defence. Reason, the faculty of judging between right and wrong, is, according to the intuitive and universal judgment of mankind, essential to moral agency and accountability. No maniac is accountable, or culpable, or punishable for actions committed under the influence of his insane delusion. The *principle* in this case is right, and ought to govern the administration of criminal justice. It is often perverted, however, by being applied without the slightest justifiable pretext. Criminals who have never been suspected of insanity before the commission of some heinous crime, are often shielded by the plea of lunacy, when it has scarcely the shadow of support in facts. Some few circumstances of his previous history are hunted up, wearing some aspect of oddity or singularity. Materials of this sort will be thrown up, when astute advocates pass their drag-nets over any man's history. And it would not be hard, in this way, to prove almost any man mad. Yet in such cases no false principle is involved. It is only the misapplication of

a true principle. Unquestionably there are a multitude of cases in which the evidence in regard to insanity, if not adequate to produce conviction of its existence, is sufficient to raise a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt of guilt, on any ground, according to all principles of humanity and law, necessitates the acquittal of the accused. But such a doubt ordinarily labours under just suspicion, if the sanity of the accused has never before been questioned or doubted. A few oddities which never before caused any suspicion of mental derangement, by no means justify such a reasonable doubt of sanity and consequent accountability, as to destroy the presumption of guilt, and warrant impunity, in cases of detestable crime. On such pretexts, the majority of men could be proved insane, if there were any adequate motive for doing it. It is but a step from the theory openly broached by the boldest of this school of thinkers. This theory is, that atrocious crime, and especially bloodshed, whether by murder or suicide, is *ipso facto* proof of insanity, and indicates such cerebral derangement as exempts from responsibility, guilt, and punishment. With this school crime is a fiction, an impossibility, and the only punishment should be medication—the only prisons, insane hospitals. And if their principles are sound, why are they not equally good for the non-existence of all sin and moral evil of whatever sort? Why are the things commonly so called to be counted anything else than the proofs and effects of a distempered brain? There are, however, many others who go far beyond these experienced observers, (who only assert the doctrine of moral insanity) and seem disposed to include all crime under the category of insanity. Professor Friedreich lays down this dictum, “Plus l’acte est atroce, plus l’irresponsabilité devient probable.” A Review, in England, important as the organ of a party in political ethics, uses these words—“The public mind is awakened to the fact, that all crimes are the result of perversions of intellect, and, like other species of insanity, deserve to be treated with more of compassion than vengeance.” In Germany the following question has been gravely discussed among its medical jurists: If monomania consists in a subjection of the intellectual faculties to one predominant idea, ought we not to regard a person as monomaniacal, whose mental facul-

ties are governed by a vivid affection, a violent passion? Or in other words, is the existence of monomania to be conceded, whether the reason is affected by an erroneous conviction, or a *violent passion*? The answer to this is generally in the negative, yet some contend that there is a mixed diseased state of the mental faculties, a mixture of passions and insanity.*

This shows to what extravagant lengths some medical jurists and psychologists, as well as speculative and socialistic reformers, are disposed to press the notion that sin and crime are the effect of such distempers of the mind or brain, as divest them of all moral character and responsibility; that they are proof of the insanity which excuses them. Much more like this might be extracted from the phrenologists, and materializing atheists, *ad aperturam libri*, with which we will not encumber our pages. We give, *instar omnium*, Spurzheim's definition of insanity, partly because it presents very precisely one form of the doctrine which will be the principal topic of this article. According to him, it is "either a morbid condition of any intellectual faculty, without the person being aware of this, or the existence of some of the natural propensities in such violence that it is impossible not to yield to them."† This brings us to the second sort of insanity, which, though of recent discovery, has begun to figure largely in the defence of great criminals. Our readers will understand us as referring to *moral insanity*, so called. This has become the favourite resort in defending these desperate culprits, who give no indications of insanity but the enormity of their crimes. Where there not only is no hallucination proved which amounts to *unreason*, but the absence of it is clearly shown, no other resource remains for defending those whose agency in crime is clearly evinced. *Prima facie*, at least, there seems no good reason why, if it be a valid defence in some cases, it should not be in all. And we think this will be no less apparent on the most rigid investigation.

Dr. Prichard, by whom, according to Dr. Wood, "the subject has been most elaborately considered,"‡ defines this distemper to be "a morbid perversion of the feelings, affections,

* Beck's Medical Jurisprudence, vol. i. p. 793, tenth edition.

† Id. p. 722.

‡ Theory and Practice of Medicine, vol. ii. p. 706.

and active powers, without any illusion or erroneous conviction impressed on the understanding." We ask, at the outset, if there is any conceivable state of moral pollution, perversion, or depravation which this definition will not include and excuse? Is not such a doctrine startling to all who believe in the radical distinction between sin and holiness, virtue and vice? Let it be observed, that what these authors are defining here, is not culpable madness, either in thought, feeling, or action; but such insanity as clears from responsibility and guilt for the commission of crime. The only ground for inferring such irresponsible insanity is found in the irrational and extravagant character of the propensities, passions, and acts themselves, not in any delusion of the intellect.

Now we ask, is not every wicked propensity, feeling, and act absolutely irrational? Surely this is so, unless we obliterate all moral distinctions, and deny the intrinsic excellence of goodness and turpitude of sin; their correspondent merit and demerit—their respective title to rewards and obligation to punishment. Surely by no intuition or deduction of reason can we reach any other conclusion. The word of God is equally sure and explicit to this purpose. It teaches us that "the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness in their heart while they live." Unless then, we are prepared to make an end of sin and guilt, it will not do to say that irrational impulses, desires, feelings, purposes, or acts, prove any such lack of understanding as destroys moral agency and accountability. And for all who are not themselves demented, we need not expatiate in proof of such self-evident propositions.

But truth compels us to go much further than this. All sinful feelings and desires involve a certain blindness or delusion of the intellect. The intellectual are not in such utter divorce from the emotional and active powers as these medical jurists, with many modern psychologists and theologians, suppose. They are both forms of the activity of the one indivisible, rational, sentient willing soul. Not only so; these modes of its activity do not go on in isolation and independence of each other. They mutually interpenetrate and determine each other. Every man's feelings, inclinations, and purposes are shaped by his views of the objects to which they relate. His

apprehensions, judgments, and reasonings about these objects, are very much controlled by his feelings. To think as we feel, and feel as we think, is among the most familiar experiences shown in every man's consciousness, and confirmed by all his observation. Hence all sin has in it an element of delusion. The "deceitfulness of sin," the "deceivableness of unrighteousness," are specimens of the habitual representations of the sacred writers. That they represent blindness of mind, amounting even to an inability to discern what is most essential in spiritual things, as an invariable element of our natural depravity, no candid person can deny. They set it forth in manifold forms, and especially in the two reciprocal forms of wicked passions bewildering the intellect, and of intellectual blindness begetting depravity of feeling. The wicked are described as saying to God, "depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways," as not liking to retain God in their knowledge. On the other hand, they are described as "having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart," as those who do not, and cannot know the things of the Spirit, as being turned aside by a deceived heart. The crucifiers of Christ knew not what they did. Paul verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. There is then an element of delusion or deceit in all sin; sometimes inducing, sometimes induced by, the impulses of perverse feeling or passion. This blindness may have reference to the intrinsic excellence of goodness in some of its divine or human relations; or to the turpitude of sin in general, or of the particular crime to which the subject is impelled in any case, by the urgency of passion; or to the retribution which will follow it. Or it may, and often does respect all these combined in one concrete whole. But it seldom happens that crimes, great or small, are committed deliberately, in full view of, or with the conscience fully awake to, their baseness or their punishment. It is seldom that sinners do not disguise to themselves their guilt, and criminals their offences, by some veil of plausible pretension. This is true of all the ungodly, in regard to their religion. It was true of Paul, and has been true of the persecutors of all

ages. It was true of the crucifiers of the Lord of glory. It is always true of the profane, the licentious, and the desperate. It is true of the heroes in villainy and crime. Of the monsters who showered the blood of their fellows upon the streets of Paris in the French Revolution, Alison justly observes, "Even the blood which they shed was often the result, in their estimation, not so much of terror or danger as of overbearing necessity. They deemed it essential to the success of freedom, and regarded the victims who perished under the guillotine, as the melancholy sacrifice which required to be laid on its altars. The weakness of humanity in their case, as in so many similar cases, deceived them by the magic of words or the supposed influence of purer motives, and led them to commit the greatest crimes, while constantly professing the purest intentions."*

Now what we complain of is, that the recent definitions of such insanity as destroys responsibility, are so broad and loose, as to include that madness which enters largely into all, or nearly all, sin and crime.

We think those who do not mean to abolish sin and crime will hardly be prepared to take the ground, that every sort of intellectual delusion excuses the crime to which it may lead. To concede this would be to sap the foundations of morals and religion. The reason is, that perverse moral judgments are possible and almost universal among men, which are merely the effects and manifestations of their depravity. So far from excusing wrong, they are in themselves flagrant sins. They are simply the devices of the depraved soul to shelter or mask its own iniquities. The denunciations of God's word charge guilt not merely upon depraved moral feelings, but, with equal emphasis, upon depraved moral judgments. "Woe to

* Charles Yorke, Solicitor-General of England, as quoted by Beck, said, on the trial of Earl Ferriers, for the murder of his steward: "In some sense, every violation of duty proceeds from insanity. All cruelty, all brutality, all revenge, all injustice is insanity. There were philosophers in ancient times, who held this opinion as a strict maxim of their sect; and, my lords, the opinion is right in philosophy, but dangerous in judicature. It may have a useful and noble influence to regulate the conduct of men, to control their impotent passions, to teach them that virtue is the perfection of reason, as reason itself is the perfection of human nature, but not to extenuate crimes, nor to excuse those punishments which the law adjudges to be their due."

them that call good evil and evil good, that put light for darkness and darkness for light.”

If it is difficult to gainsay this, the question will nevertheless arise, what room is left for irresponsible insanity? We answer that, although there are many delusions on moral subjects which do not screen from guilt, and are themselves most culpable, yet there are delusions which destroy moral agency and responsibility in reference to the actions to which they lead. They involve or proceed from that lunacy* which amounts to the loss or wreck of intellect, in regard to the case in hand, and therefore incapacitates for rational and responsible action. But here the question arises, how shall we distinguish one sort of delusion from the other—that which excuses crime, from that which constitutes its essence? A pregnant question, indeed; and yet we apprehend it is not difficult to find the true criterion which marks this heaven-wide difference.

It may be thus stated. Delusion which results from the criminal neglect to employ our faculties aright, or which might be avoided by any employment of them that is practicable by us, is itself culpable. Delusion which does not result from our own fault, and which sinless candour and fidelity on our part could not remove; which arises from a *lesion* of intellect that incapacitates it for rational or reliable judgments in the premises, excuses for crimes committed under its influence. The principle is well stated by the late Dr. Alexander, in the following terms: “On this subject, again, our appeal must be to the unbiassed judgment of mankind; and we think the verdict will be, that error which might have been avoided, and ignorance which is not invincible, do not excuse.”*

If, then, it be true that moral delusions do not of themselves prove insanity, until it is shown that these delusions are more than mere depraved moral judgments, and until it appears that the intellectual faculties are so shattered, that even in the absence of any moral-fault, they are inadequate, in any practicable use of them, to dispel such delusions; much less can any form of mere morbid desire or passion without intellectual aberration, evince irresponsible insanity, or excuse the crimes to

* Alexander's Moral Philosophy, Chap. ix.

which it impels. It seems to us incontestable, in the light of the foregoing views, that the principles we here combat would make an end of all sin and crime, all moral distinctions.

But is it the intent of the medico-psychologists with whom these doctrines originate, to put an end to moral distinctions, and establish a universal license and impunity for crime? Taking them as a class, we think not. The great body of those respectable, including some eminent, physicians, who have promulgated or sanctioned these views, are actuated by compassion for the unfortunate, not by sympathy with crime. Their object has been to procure, for a class whom they believe demented in such a sense as to destroy responsibility, the treatment due to maniacs rather than to criminals. There are, indeed, among the advocates of these views, those who ignore and detest the doctrine of human depravity. It is a favourite resource for such to refer all the misconduct of men to cerebral disease, or other physical derangement, or to untoward external circumstances, anything which does not necessitate the hypothesis of inward corruption, or make the evil-doer the culpable source of his own misdeeds. In this category, in various degrees, we find some of the chief schools of radical and social reformers. Many of these believe that a change of outward circumstances and treatment, in the way of dietetics, hygiene, medications, and social reconstruction, will cure the moral distempers of men. All systems of materialism, by a logical necessity, attribute moral aberration to physical derangement, and make light of guilt and retribution. The same tendency appears in all pantheistic schemes, which, besides identifying mind and matter, run into a fatalistic optimism, and maintain that whatever man is or does, is, in the strict sense, necessary and best—the development and efflorescence of the divinity within him. But, of all classes, the phrenologists have a signal preëminence here. Placing the different faculties of the mind in different parts of the brain and skull, it is by the examination of these bodily organs that they study its properties, and to a very great extent, determine their psychology, their philosophy, their theology, their ethics, their jurisprudence and politics. The whole tendency of this method is to generate confusion and error in whatever concerns men as moral and

responsible beings. Perverse feeling, thinking, and action, on this theory, inevitably suppose and arise from a morbid condition of the brain or some portion of it. Its proper treatment is fit medication. Moral and intellectual insanity may find a place in this scheme. Responsibility, sin, crime, and punishment, are words almost without meaning. Moreover, allotting each faculty to some special section of the head, on whose healthy state the healthful condition and exercise of the faculty itself depend, any extravagance of thought or feeling is attributed to a morbid condition of the correspondent cerebral organ, i. e. to irresponsible insanity. And as these organs are the directive and impulsive causes of all cognitive, sensitive and voluntary action, they irresistibly control it—each one according to its relative energy. If any of them are in disproportionate strength, irresponsible and unavoidable insanity results. This tallies precisely with Spurzheim's view of moral insanity, as "the existence of some of the natural propensities in such violence that it is impossible not to yield to them."

It is not at all surprising, that medical writers on the phenomena of mind, normal or abnormal, should have erred in a similar direction, if not to the same extent; or even that many of them should have been influenced by the method of phrenology.* Their training, their line of observation and inquiry, primarily and immediately respect the body, not the soul. To this their whole professional life is devoted. The mind is their study only in an incidental way, as it affects, or is affected by the body. Their examination of it is limited simply to the

* The following extracts from Dr. Guy's *Forensic Medicine*, are in striking illustration of this remark:

"If the brain be the material organ of the mind, and the propensities and moral sentiments be an integral portion of the moral constitution, which all must allow, then their manifestation must also be dependent on material organism; and disease in the latter must be followed by a corresponding derangement of the former. But observation, as well as reason, proves that the *affective* as well as the *intellectual* faculties are liable to such derangement; for no portion of the brain enjoys immunity from disease." Page 308, Harper's edition, 1845.

"A morbid activity of the sexual propensity, amounting to disease, without any lesion of the intellectual powers, is now admitted by the ablest physiologists. *Dr. Gall was the first to direct attention to this subject, in connection with cerebral physiology.*" Id. p. 312.

mutual inter-dependence between it and the body, and this, chiefly, as either one or both are in a morbid state. Hence they are naturally predisposed to look with favour on that method of psychological investigation which primarily ascertains the laws and faculties of the mind, from the study of the real or supposed bodily organs in which they are manifested. There are abundant exceptions to this remark. But it cannot be denied, that, so far as this noble profession has shown sceptical tendencies, they have usually leaned to the materialistic side. The method of studying the mind, which we have pointed out, admirably prepares them for many of the ministries of mercy to diseased humanity which constitute their higher vocation. Their vocation, too, makes them far more familiar with insanity and all forms of morbid, mental action, than any other class of men. They often find the mind the most potent restorative agent for the body; and physical medication is generally indispensable to the cure of a distempered mind—*mens sana in corpore sano*. Hence they are most valuable and indispensable witnesses in all judicial questions pertaining to insanity, or to the indications of it, or of any morbid state of mind or body. Hence, too, it has happened, that much more largely than any other class of men, they have discussed the whole subject of insanity in itself, and its ethical and legal relations; and within their proper province, we are indebted to them for light which could emanate from no other source. Still, their training and experience do not make them masters of intellectual philosophy, any more than psychologists are of course experts in anatomy. As to all facts pertaining to bodily distempers, or indicating morbid mental action, we look to them for light, and defer to them as generally the most competent observers and witnesses. As to the question, whether these facts indicate such insanity as destroys responsibility, they are no better judges than other men of equal general intelligence. The unperverted common sense of mankind will ordinarily give a safer spontaneous judgment upon such facts, if clearly understood, and upon their bearings on moral responsibility, than any special and conflicting opinion which may arise from exclusive attention to the reciprocal relations of the mind and body. For although it may be the province of the philosopher to

develope in formal statement and definition the conditions of moral responsibility, yet all tolerably enlightened men, who are under no disturbing bias, will judge with intuitive certainty, in any concrete case, whether it involves merit or demerit.* However this may be, it is certain that those who undertake to teach in departments which they have not mastered by special study will find themselves betrayed into loose and crude statements, pregnant with consequences from which they themselves must shrink, as soon as they are developed. It is true, indeed, that with reference to the body and soul, all have them at hand for constant inspection, and know enough about them for the ordinary conduct of life. So all the liberal professions interlock by a *commune vinculum*. In each there is some vague and general knowledge of what pertains to the others. This is one thing. It is quite another to be able to instruct or discourse, to any good purpose, in departments which have not been mastered by comprehensive as well as special study. The lawyer or divine who undertakes to discuss scientifically the principles of surgery or medicine, usually makes an awkward figure. Nor have physicians, who have undertaken to settle questions in psychology and ethics, succeeded much better, unless like Locke, they have made it a special and chief study. And even this illustrious philosopher, with all his merits, was remarkable for loose and vacillating phraseology, and had a strong sensuous, nay, in a few places, a materialistic bias, so that the French materialists had only to twist his writings somewhat, in order to impress them into their service.

It is only by the study of *consciousness*, that we can obtain any valid science of the human mind, or of collateral departments, just as it is by the study of anatomy alone that we can attain any scientific knowledge of the human body. In other

* Says Sir Benjamin Brodie, "The existence of illusions is not to be regarded, in every instance, as justifying the plea of want of responsibility. . . . It is a very great mistake to suppose that this is a question which can be determined only by medical practitioners. Any one of plain common sense, and having a fair knowledge of human nature, who will give it due consideration, is competent to form an opinion on it; and it belongs fully as much to those whose office it is to administer the law, as it does to the medical profession." *Mind and Matter*, p. 105.

words, each must be studied *directly and immediately in their own proper phenomena*, before they can be understood in themselves. Not till they are thus, in some good degree, understood in themselves, may this intelligence in regard to either be increased and perfected by studying their mutual relations. But when we are studying the sentient and intelligent principle, the I MYSELF, we are not examining a congeries of muscles, nerves, or bones—and, when we are studying these, we are not studying the rational soul. Here, we apprehend, is the true reason why phrenology, amid many valuable discoveries, has made so signal failure in its pretensions to be a science of mind; and why physicians so often stumble in dealing with points strictly psychological, and with the ethical problems thence arising. Morell very forcibly observes, “It is of great importance that the two sciences should each hold their proper limits, and that the one should not be allowed to assume the ground which peculiarly belongs to the other. To mark the boundaries of physiology and psychology, we must simply inquire, what are the phenomena which we learn by *consciousness*, and what those which we learn by *outward observation*. These two regions lie entirely without each other; so much so, that there is not a single fact learned by consciousness which we should ever have learned by external observation, and not a single fact learned by external observation of which we are ever conscious. A sensation, for example, is known simply by consciousness; the material conditions of it, as seen in the organ and the nervous system, simply by external observation. No one could ever *see* a sensation, or be *conscious* of the organic action; accordingly, the one fact belongs to psychology, the other to physiology. . . . I will suppose for a moment that we know nothing whatever *reflectively* of our own mental operations; that the study of the human mind had not yet been commenced, and that we were to *begin* our investigation of them upon the phrenological system, some notion of which had previously been communicated to us. We might in this case proceed with the greatest ardour, and examine skull after skull for a century; but this would not give us the least notion of any peculiar mental faculty, or aid us in the smallest degree in classifying mental phenomena. We could never know that the

organs of the reasoning powers were in front, and those of the moral feelings on the top of the head, unless we had first made those powers and feelings *independently* the objects of our examination." In a note, he adds, "The Phrenological Journal admits that we must know our mental phenomena *reflectively* before we can *allocate* them—but persists in calling cerebral observation a *method* of studying psychology. I confess myself unable to see what *psychological* truth it unfolds that is not equally clear without it. Does it reveal a mental fact? Not one. These are all facts of consciousness. Does it give us a classification? No."* To the same effect Mill, sufficiently inclined to the sensational side, while admitting with Morell the value of the physiological facts which phrenologists have noted, and the utility of their hypothesis, for the purpose of experimental investigations, says that they "hastily worked it up into the vain semblance of a science. . . . The verification of any such hypothesis is attended, from the peculiar nature of the phenomena, with difficulties which phrenologists have not shown themselves competent even to appreciate, much less to overcome."†

We have dwelt the longer on this point, because we wish to make it clear, that, when we look beyond the intuitive dictates of common sense, in investigating the faculties of the mind, and those conditions of it which involve responsibility, or the reverse, to the deeper and clearer unfoldings of philosophy, this philosophy cannot be developed by those whose studies are chiefly medical and physiological. If developed at all, it must be by those who have made it their business to examine the mind itself, in its faculties, laws, and operations, and the ethical questions thence emerging, by the immediate inspection of its phenomena in consciousness—i. e. by adepts in mental and moral philosophy. It is no disrespect to say this, any more than it would be a reflection on the metaphysicians to say that they would make themselves ridiculous in an anatomical chair. This, we apprehend, explains, in part, at least, why many distinguished physicians have propounded

* See Morell's History of Modern Philosophy, pp. 305-311. Carter's edition.

† Mill's Logic, p. 295. Harper's edition.

dogmas in reference to those morbid mental states, which, if good for their purpose, as we have seen, are good for a great deal more, and really subvert all moral distinctions—a consequence from which most of them would recoil with horror.

This, however, is not the only cause which has led to the enunciation of these dangerous principles. Another equally powerful is found in the intrinsic difficulties of the subject, and the peculiarity of the phenomena which have of late been referred to moral insanity, or insane impulse without intellectual hallucination. Some writers make a formal distinction between moral insanity and what they call *insane impulse* without delusion; but on no solid ground that we can discover, unless that the former is chronic, the latter sudden and momentary.

The difficulties pertaining to this subject will at once appear, if we bring to view some of the phenomena which are referred to this distemper. Dr. Prichard notes as effects and indications of it—1. A state of excitement, long-continued, and analogous in kind to the exhilaration produced by a free use of strong drink. 2. Absence of reserve; the subjects of it often talk loudly and coarsely to perfect strangers about their family affairs, their property, and their feelings towards their nearest relatives, &c. 3. Garrulity—many enter into long stories, always relating to themselves. 4. The propensity to make extravagant purchases. 5. A total disregard of veracity and of moral obligations in general is a feature of this form of mental disorders. 6. An irresistible propensity to drinking fermented and other intoxicating liquors is often the result of moral insanity, and one of the principal characteristics of particular cases. 7. Perfect selfishness, indifference to the feelings of others. 8. A dislike towards relations and friends formerly loved, and even the objects of warmest affection, is well known to be a feature of madness, and it belongs particularly to moral insanity. 9. A proneness to suspicion. 10. Melancholy—sorrowful dejection of mind, or lowness of spirits without any erroneous belief, or the conviction of any unreal fact impressed upon the understanding. They view everything through a medium of gloom.*

* Library of Practical Medicine, vol. ii., article, *Insanity*. By Dr. Prichard.

Professor Wood says,* “There are numerous individuals mingling in society, and participating in the ordinary avocations of other men, whose sentiments and conduct are so peculiar as to attract attention, but who can reason so well upon all subjects within their capacity, and whose intellect is often so clear, and, in many instances, even strong, that no one questions their sanity. They are simply said to be singular, or eccentric. Now the fact is, that such individuals are not unfrequently as much under the control of their morbid feelings, act as irrationally in obedience to those feelings, and are morally as little responsible for their acts, as others who carry out in their conduct some false conclusion of the intellect. Such persons should certainly be considered as insane. . . . It must not be understood that the patient may not form erroneous judgments, in moral insanity. Like all others under the influence of strong feelings of any kind, he is liable to be warped in the formation of his opinions; but these are not manifestly absurd, or of a character to exhibit any peculiar deficiency of the reasoning power.” He meets the difficulty of distinguishing this from culpably inordinate passion, by suggesting the analogous difficulty of drawing the line in a multitude of cases between disease and health. He also signalizes as another form of moral insanity, *excessive irascibility*. “The least opposition is apt to throw the patient into ungovernable rage, driving him to the commission of acts of which in his cooler moments he repents, and for which he may be ready to apologize, but which are repeated again under similar circumstances. A regard to public opinion, or the fear of personal consequences will often be sufficient to control the expression of these feelings. But when no such restraint exists, they are allowed full sway, and the patient seems to take an insane delight in their indulgence. To abuse and strike a fond parent, or other near relative or friend, to curse and swear, &c. . . . Yet, towards the world at large, their conduct may be irreproachable; and though often willing to admit themselves in the wrong to the objects of their excitement, they find plausible excuses with which to deceive the

* Practice of Medicine, vol. ii. pp. 706-7.

multitude." We have known such specimens ourselves. They exhibit madness assuredly—the madness of depraved, uncontrolled, violent, cowardly passion, which luxuriates in torturing the defenceless objects whose weakness or affection ensures impunity, and reins itself into the utmost propriety, when its indulgence would expose it to public scorn. If this mean and detestable passion is guiltless, and excuses the barbarities in which it revels, what is not? Talk of an "insane delight" in its indulgence! What delight afforded by the exercise of any malevolent passion is not insane? But is it insane in such a sense as to be excusable? And what are nearly all the forms of moral insanity mentioned by Prichard, but cases of moral perversion, or depravity, or of vain infatuation, which, in every person, labouring under no unavoidable delusion of intellect, so far from excusing crime, are themselves inexcusable? With one or two exceptions, these instances hardly touch the difficulties which this subject involves. The real point in issue is most distinctly brought to view in Dr. Beck's *Medical Jurisprudence*, a work which displays great justness and sobriety of view in reference to this whole subject. He refers to this alleged moral insanity what Prichard and his school attribute to another sort of derangement—the insane impulse we have already referred to. Of this sort are what they call homicidal impulse, suicidal impulse, pyromania, or impulse to burning and arson, together with destructive impulse, or inclination to destroy whatever comes in their way. It will be best illustrated by a few examples, which Dr. Beck quotes from Marc.

"In a respectable house in Germany, the mother of a family returning home one day, met a servant, against whom she had no cause of complaint, in the greatest agitation; she begged to speak with her mistress alone, threw herself upon her knees, and entreated that she might be sent out of the house. Her mistress, astonished, inquired the reason, and learned that whenever this unhappy servant undressed the little child which she nursed, she was struck with the whiteness of its skin, and experienced the most irresistible desire to tear it in pieces. She felt afraid that she could not resist this desire, and preferred to leave the house."

“A young lady, whom I examined in one of the asylums of the capital, experienced a violent inclination to commit homicide, for which she could not assign any motive. She was rational on every subject, and whenever she felt the approach of this dreadful propensity, she entreated to have the strait waistcoat put on, and to be carefully guarded until the paroxysm, which sometimes lasted several days, had passed.”

“A distinguished chemist and poet, of a disposition naturally mild and sociable, committed himself a prisoner in one of the asylums of the Faubourg St. Antoine. Tormented by the desire of killing, he often prostrated himself at the foot of the altar, and implored the divine assistance to deliver him from such an atrocious propensity, of the origin of which he could never render any account. When the patient felt that his will was likely to yield to the violence of this inclination, he hastened to the head of the establishment, and requested to have his thumbs tied together with a ribbon. This slight ligature was sufficient to calm the unhappy R., who, however, finished by endeavouring to commit homicide upon one of his friends, and perished in a violent fit of maniacal fury.”

“Under this head of *moral insanity*, besides the impulse to murder, there is also included a propensity to break and destroy whatever comes within reach of the individual; in short, an irresistible impulse to commit injury, or do mischief of all kinds. And this is observed in cases in which it is impossible to discover any motive influencing the mind of the person who is the subject of it. No illusive belief, for example, can be detected, that the lunatic is performing a duty in perpetrating that which manifests his disease.”

Professor Wood mentions, under the head of insane impulse, the case of a lady, to whom the late Dr. Parrish was called after she had taken a fatal dose of opium. Though unable to save her, he succeeded in restoring her to a brief interval of consciousness, in which she assured him that she had no cause whatever for the act, but that she had been unaccountably seized with a disposition to suicide upon seeing a bottle of laudanum. “I once,” says he, “attended a lady, who had taken laudanum to destroy herself, and who declared, after her recovery, that she had been led to the act by reading the

account of the suicide of another lady of whom she had some knowledge.”

Dr. Prichard observes, with reference to suicide from insane impulse, that it is likely to be accompanied or preceded by homicide. “Persons apparently in sound health, both of body and mind, have been seized, as if possessed by an evil spirit, with an unaccountable impulse to destroy some of their friends and relatives, and at the same time themselves. A lady, whose case was reported in the public journals in 1835, after having thrown four of her children into a well, jumped into it. She had previously sent a poisoned cake to another child who was absent.”*

To such cases, treated by these writers, under the head of insane impulse, as distinguished from moral insanity, but by Dr. Beck, more properly under the common head of moral insanity, we may add two or three instances of a different kind. There are few who have not met with persons whose ordinary conversation abounds in falsehoods, uttered without any conceivable motive. Without the slightest mental illusion, or inducement of any sort, these persons, otherwise respectable and blameless, appear to prefer to make false representations for the mere pleasure of the thing.

A *penchant* for theft is sometimes surprisingly exhibited by affluent persons, who have no object to gain by it, and have no conceivable motive beyond the pleasure afforded by the practice itself.

A milder type of the same infirmity is the propensity to make extravagant purchases, for the mere pleasure of doing it, without respect to any use of the articles purchased, either for traffic or otherwise. This, however, may be accounted for in many, perhaps all cases, from motives of vanity—the desire to appear possessed of ample means, or engaged in large business. We have known men who would purchase recklessly, simply from the depraved desire to figure as “great operators.”

The most striking instance of morbid and unaccountable passion which has of late been brought to our attention, is that of the young woman in New York State, which recently was so

* Library of Practical Medicine, vol. ii. p. 193.

widely published in the newspapers, who had a violent propensity to stick needles into her body, where they remained until her sufferings required her to resort to physicians to have them extracted; and who, notwithstanding, would repeat the process, until at length, if we rightly remember, she had done it some hundred and fifty times.

To this general head, also, some have referred epidemic and contagious crime. Dr. Hunt, an English physician, quoted by Dr. Beck, says: "There is a species of insanity, of a *contagious* nature, and of a *temporary* duration, totally unconnected with diseased structure, but yet evidently connected with a suspension of the healthy action of the cerebellum—a disease which will certainly yield to circumstances, and which ought not, on any pretence, to become the subject of judicial retribution. They are closely allied to the contagious hysteria of the hospitals." This he urges as a reason why a body of men who committed numerous horrid murders under the lead of a maniac, in Kent county, England, should not be punished. We all know that particular forms of crime, vice, and folly, at times become fashionable. But to refer them to excusable insanity is absurd and monstrous. No doubt many are stimulated to all forms of sin, by the contagious excitement and countenance of example. But if this is an excuse, what must not be excused? Says Dr. Beck in regard to it, "*what an admirable defence of mobs and lynch law!*"

The foregoing cases bring to view all the varieties of phenomena which have given rise to the doctrine of moral insanity, including that form of it which some writers distinguish from it under the title of insane impulse. The ground of such distinction is not evident to us. They have the common and essential feature of moral insanity—distemper in the affections and passions, or the moral and active powers, without illusion in the understanding. The difference is merely accidental. At most, it is not greater than the law recognizes in persons of acknowledged sanity, who commit acts of violence with cool atrocity, and those who commit them without premeditation, under a paroxysm of passion, or the immediate excitement of high provocation. The instances adduced as examples and proofs of

moral insanity by its most prominent advocates, by no means fall under one category.

Many of them class simply under the head of ordinary wickedness or folly. Extreme selfishness, jealousy, suspicion, garrulity, want of prudent reserve, mendacity, and even melancholy, are common among the sane as well as among the demented. Without further evidence of mental lesion, they imply no lack of moral agency and responsibility for crime, unless all instances of sin, and folly, and infatuated passion, imply as much.

Some other cases fall under the head of malignant and violent passion. It is indeed true that antipathy towards the dearest friends is among the most frequent effects of insane illusion. It is also true, that, without such illusion, it is no evidence of any insanity, but that obdurate wickedness which marks those who are given over to vile affections. We have seldom seen a youth self-ruined by dissipation and crime, who did not charge his ruin to the indifference, hostility, or other fault, of his parents, family, or other friends, who have spared no pains or sacrifice to rescue him from his degradation, while their generous efforts were thwarted by his perverseness. Some of the most painful exhibitions of human depravity, are seen in those who, to the public gaze, are "wise as serpents and harmless as doves," while by their own firesides, they vent their ill-humour in spite and rage upon helpless wives and children. Where no illusion of the intellect is pretended, and a fear of evil consequences will restrain and curb the indulgence of evil propensities that run riot when unawed by such fear, will any one claim that crimes committed under their influence are blameless, and entitled to impunity? Another class of these phenomena, are mere foibles or frivolous eccentricities, which the subject of them knows, or may know, to be such; and which he ought to restrain like any other propensities, within lawful bounds. Is it not pitiful to adduce a propensity to break or destroy, which abounds in every promiscuous collection of boys in the street, or at school, and which adequate penalties will not fail to correct, as a symptom of insanity? There are few men who have not some foibles or oddities which have hardened into tyrannous habits, in consequence of a weak

and unmanly indulgence of some whimsical fancy. Says Brodie, "we have been told of a very eminent person who had acquired the habit of touching every post that he met with in his walks, so that at last it seemed to be a part of his nature to do so; and that if he found that he had inadvertently passed by a post without touching it, he would actually retrace his steps for the purpose. I knew a gentleman who was accustomed to mutter certain words to himself, and they were always the same words, even in the midst of company. These were foolish habits, but they might have been mischievous. To correct them at last would have been a very arduous undertaking. But might not this have been easily done in the beginning? and if so—if, instead of touching posts, or muttering unmeaning words, these individuals had been addicted to stealing or stabbing—ought they to have been considered as absolved from responsibility?" Who has not seen oddities, less obtrusive and ridiculous perhaps, but scarcely less decided, in all sorts of men, not excepting the most eminent for character and position? Is this insanity?

We come now to those cases which present the real difficulty, and offer the only plausible pretext for this theory of moral insanity, which, without any illusion of the intellect, is claimed to be an excuse for crime. The essential feature in them all is a strong propensity to commit crimes more or less nefarious, without any hallucination of intellect, contrary to its dictates, and without any motive such as is ordinarily requisite to move the most depraved natures to perpetrate them, to feel any inclination to shed blood, burn houses, or even utter falsehood, unless they regard them as means to some end they wish to accomplish, such as the gratification of revenge, or the seizing of plunder. It implies a state that is morbid and abnormal, undoubtedly, to feel strongly impelled to do such things, not only without motive, but against the strong remonstrance of the conscience, the judgment, and the tenderest natural affection. A few cases on record, as we have seen, involve all these conditions. The larger number of those, however, which have been reckoned with this class, may be put in another category.

In our view they are only illustrations of that great principle

enounced by our Saviour, and corroborated by all experience, "he that committeth sin is the servant of sin." If one sin induces such bondage, what must be the effect of continued and persistent sinful indulgence, especially in particular kinds of vice and crime? It is among the most familiar facts that the habitual practice of vice or crime, for the sake of the unlawful exhilaration or gains they afford, often begets a morbid pleasure in, and craving for, the thing itself, irrespective of its desired consequences. To steal or rob habitually, for the sake of plunder, although at first it may be repugnant to the feelings, and nothing could tempt to it except the greed of gain, may, and often does, engender a morbid passion for the mere excitement of such criminal deeds. The habit of lying, begun at first for the sake of some desired object to be accomplished by it, may become a second nature, till the practice itself gives a morbid satisfaction, aside from any end sought by it. It is notorious that free drinking for exhilaration, sooner or later produces an infuriate appetite for any alcoholic liquid, which often operates with a sort of demoniac energy. Yet who doubts that even sots can control this appetite, and do control it, when adequate motives operate upon them? And who doubts that they ought always to be under the sway of such motives?

We accept as the sound view of such cases, practical and theoretical, the following summation by Dr. Beck, of the arguments of Regnault and Collard de Martigny, who have opposed the doctrine of moral insanity, as advocated by Esquirol, Pinel, Prichard and others.

"The main scope of their argument is, that most of these cases are only the evidence of depraved passions, and while they allow that some are correctly styled maniacal, and therefore do not bring these into the controversy, they assert that all countries have at various periods presented criminals whose actions in every respect resemble those of the homicidal monomaniacs of the present day. Nero and Tiberius, Robespierre and Collot D'Herbois, (say they) had as much thirst for blood as Papavoine or Cornier, (alleged subjects of moral insanity.) The malignant passions also concentrate on a single idea, and though the individual is under their influence, yet on points not con-

nected with the prevailing idea, they will appear calm and intelligent.

“To the argument that the monomaniac has no motive to urge him to crime, it is urged that criminal murderers do not all destroy for money. In many of the instances of supposed insanity, early debauchery, with a profound ignorance of the obligations due to God and man, marks the character. Such persons may acquire a passion for blood. The desire to kill exceeds the desire to obey the laws.

“The frequency of cruelty in children, the tournaments of former times, the gladiators of Rome, the bull-fights of Spain, and the fondness for witnessing executions in all civilized countries, are urged as proofs that this disposition can be extensively and permanently encouraged. Above all, they object to the act itself being deemed the material proof of the presence of insanity. Because one person murders another without any assignable motive, is the criminal, by consequence, to be considered a maniac?”*

We would not, however, bring within the scope of these principles all the examples we have cited. The case of the mother murdering herself with her own offspring, in the absence of any known special depravity of character, may fairly be presumed to have arisen from some hallucination of intellect, whether it had previously been detected or not. But what shall we say of those cases in which the artist and the servant-girl sought—the one restraint from the public authorities, the other to be removed from a lovely infant, because they were afraid of imbruing their hands in blood—a crime which they at once abhorred, and felt a strong impulse to commit? What shall we say of the propensity of the girl to stick needles into her body? Here is undoubtedly a morbid and abnormal mental state, without derangement of intellect. And like the class of cases, under the previous head, involves in a strong impulse to commit crimes, without motive, from which the normal instincts of human nature, even in its fallen state, recoil, so that even hardened and desperate men will not ordinarily commit them

* Medical Jurisprudence, *ut ante*, pp. 791–2.

without a strong inducement. But unlike these cases, it does not appear to be the growth of previous vice and crime.

We think the truest answer to this question will be reached, if we take into view the distinction which some psychologists have noticed between mechanical, animal, and rational motives. Mechanical motives are such as instinct, which moves to the performance of rational acts and the accomplishment of rational ends, by a blind impulse, without any exercise of reason or rational will. So the beaver constructs its dam, the bee its cells, and the infant sucks the breast. Rational motives are those desires which go forth to objects apprehended by the reason as desirable either in the relation of means or ends. They can have place only in rational beings. To this class belong all desires having regard to duty, our future good, the good of mankind, whatever pertains to the soul, God, and immortality, together with all desires which respect objects viewed as a *means* to these or other ends, as the gratification of any desire, whether holy or wicked. *Animal motives* are those desires and lusts which arise blindly without any exercise of understanding, or any rational apprehension of the object desired; while at the same time, in those having intelligence, they can be gratified only in the exercise of reason and rational will; in animals and infants, only by instinct working rational results without the exercise of reason. To this class belong hunger, thirst, and the various appetites of our animal nature.

Now in men who have not become such monsters of depravity, that they are "past feeling and commit iniquity with greediness," murder, suicide, torture of one's own body, injury or destruction of offspring, are so revolting to the whole sensitive and rational nature even of fallen man, that they can be moved to commit them, only as means of gratifying some other passion or desire. Except in the case of those who, by reckless indulgence of violent and lawless passion, have contracted a thirst for blood, the existence of such a passion to shed blood, irrespective of any end to be accomplished by it, is clearly abnormal. And it is so, just in this particular, that what in any normal state, even of fallen man, operates only as a rational motive, seeking the means to accomplish some desired end, here operates as an animal motive. The craving for blood,

or to stick needles into one's self, or gratuitous lying, arises, as these writers say, "without motive," i. e. without any exercise of reason, and without regard to it as a means to any desired end. It becomes a mere appetite. As hunger is an uneasy sensation, craving without any exercise of reason the food which alone can allay it, so this is an uneasy sensation, fixing on the deed of blood, or whatever else that alone can allay it.

Now, the question in regard to these animal appetites, whether natural or acquired, arising with or without fault in the subject of them, from wicked courses or from disease, but unaccompanied by any insane derangement of intellect is, Do they excuse crime or wickedness committed under their influence? We say not. Like all other animal appetites which become inordinate, we are bound to deny them, and restrain their indulgence within the confines prescribed by reason and conscience. Can it be otherwise? Are the drunkard, the glutton, the debauchee, excusable because they are impelled by violent appetites? And are men excusable for taking human life, for lying, stealing, abusing their dearest friends, because they have a strong appetite for it, when they labour under no lesion of intellect, which disables them from knowing their duty in the premises? * Believe it who will. We believe that this cannot be maintained on any principle, which will not abolish all responsibility and all guilt. Must it not result in the great conclusion of these charitable reformers already noted, either that "all crimes are the result of perversions of the intellect, and like other species of insanity deserve to be treated with more of compassion than vengeance;" or, that we ought to "regard a person as monomaniacal whose mental faculties are governed by a vivid affection, a violent passion?"

* "A disease has been described under the name of *Bulimia*, in which the patient is affected with an inordinate appetite, which nothing can satiate, and which his will seems powerless to resist. One individual, whose case is recorded in the Transactions of the Royal Society, would eat an ordinary leg of veal at a single meal, adding to it a store of sow-thistles and other wild vegetables. Another would devour raw, and even living cats, rats, and dogs, the entrails of animals, and candles, to the extent of fourteen pounds daily. . . . Suppose your patient with *Bulimia* were to be in the habit of robbing butchers' shops and larders, ought he to be considered as not being responsible for his actions, because he was driven to do so by an inordinate appetite?"—Brodie's *Mind and Matter*, pp. 161-2.

It is to no purpose to say that these passions or appetites are irresistible, and therefore excuse the crimes to which they prompt. In what sense are they irresistible? In no other possible sense, but that the subject has not allowed the countervailing considerations presented by reason and conscience their due influence over his mind. And can less than this be said in reference to any sin or crime whatsoever? This word *irresistible* plays an important part in all the pleas for this theory. But it is to no purpose, unless it can be shown that it respects some external coercion, rather than urgency of inward passion and inclination. Nor does it alter the case to call it the loss of will, or of power to will. This is only a circuitous way of saying, that correct principles and motives have not sufficient sway to overbear the vitiated appetites. Is it not one part of the discipline allotted to us to struggle against the incitements to sin, whether they arise from physical or moral infirmity, or a vitiated state of any of our faculties, mental or corporeal? Is it not our business to deny worldly lusts, mortify our members which are on earth, and keep our bodies in subjection? Can it excuse crime, that the propensity to it is so strong, and moral and rational considerations are so slightly regarded, that the impulse becomes irresistible? Does it excuse slander, lying and blasphemy, that the "poison of asps is under the lips," or murder, that "the feet are swift to shed blood?" Would not a profounder dread of punishment deter most of those criminals from committing crimes, in whose behalf the plea of moral insanity is set up? Is a peevish, gouty man to be excused for violence to his neighbour, as Brodie well asks, because some physician examined his blood and found it to contain lithic acid? He adds, "When the boy Oxford yielded to what was probably a less violent impulse, which caused him to endeavour to take away the life of the queen, the jury acquitted him on the ground of his being the subject of 'moral insanity.' It seems to me that juries have not unfrequently been misled by the refinement of medical witnesses, who, having adopted the theory of a purely moral insanity, have applied that term to cases to which the term insanity ought not to be applied at all. . . . If I have been rightly informed, Oxford himself was of this opinion, (that he might have controlled his violent

impulse,) as he said, when another attempt was made to take the life of the queen, 'that if he himself had been hanged, this would not have happened.' "

But if this theory has sometimes bewildered juries, it has found little favour with courts. Nor have juries hereby expressed approbation of the theory in question. Upon this they have not directly passed judgment. They have simply expressed their humane unwillingness to be the instruments of inflicting sore punishments upon persons whom medical experts—the highest recognized authorities on the subject—pronounce lunatics. This only shows what the proper province of this class of witnesses is. It is simply to testify as to the actual phenomena of the case. Whether these imply the privation of moral agency and responsibility, other men are as competent to decide as they. It belongs, as it seems to us, exclusively to the jury, under the guidance of the court. Here, as elsewhere, we have found that the great maxims of the law are seldom anything but the eternal principles of justice, developed by the experience and wisdom of ages, in their application to the relations between man and man. Dr. Prichard complains that "modern lawyers and writers on medical jurisprudence have laid down the dogma, that illusion or hallucination is essential to mental derangement, and a criterion of its existence. . . . But the decisions of courts of justice, and even the opinions of the most learned lawyers and physicians, cannot impose laws on nature, or on the physical constitution of man."* And we add, that a school of physicians, who have never made the laws of man's intellectual and moral nature their chief and immediate study, cannot reverse the immutable laws of moral obligation and human accountability.

The principles of law which we find recognized in the authoritative decisions of English and American courts on this subject, stated indeed with various degrees of explicitness, are:

1. That morbid mental states which involve delusion of intellect, and these only, may excuse from crime committed under the influence of such delusion.

2. It is not every state of mental delusion that will serve for

* *Lib. of Medicine*, vol. ii. pp. 178-9.

defence of one that is convicted of committing a crime. The delusion must be such as disqualifies him for knowing the distinction between right and wrong in reference to the crime he has committed, or for understanding its nature as an offence against the laws of God and man. Says Chief Justice Hornblower, in his celebrated decision, (*State vs. Spencer*), "*Whatever the insanity of a person may amount to, if he is conscious at the time of committing an atrocious act, and has reason enough to know that he ought not to do it, he is guilty in the eye of the law.*"* Thus it has been decided over and over again, that the murder of another in revenge, for imaginary injury, the belief of which is produced by insane illusion, while the mind is sound on all other points, cannot be excused on the ground of insanity. The simple reason is, that if the injury had been real, it would have been no justification. The lunatic's "act, as to criminality, is to be judged as if the thing he imagines to be true were really so. If a man is under the delusion that I am going to take his life, he would be exculpated in taking my life. But if he acted only under the delusion that I was going to carry off his property, or pick his pocket, he would not be exculpated in taking my life, for those facts, if true, would be no justification of his act, unless he were also under the *insane delusion* that he had a right to take my life for such an act."† Brodie adduces an analogous case of delusion not caused by insanity. Because a Socialist believes that all property ought to be equally distributed, would he be exculpated for appropriating or inciting others to appropriate the property of their neighbours, by fraud or violence? ‡

3. The insanity should be shown to have existed at the time of the commission of the crime it is adduced to exculpate. If it did not exist then, it cannot have been the cause of it.

4. There should be some evidence of insanity, besides the

* Zabriskie's Reports, vol. i. p. 204.

† Id. p. 205.

‡ These principles were carried out in the recent great trial of Huntington, for enormous forgeries in New York. Two eminent physicians testified their belief that he was afflicted with *moral insanity*. Judge Capron instructed the jury that no insanity could excuse him, which did not disable him from knowing the moral and legal character of his acts of forgery. The jury found him guilty. So did the verdict of the whole country.

commission of the crime itself. Otherwise culpable crime is impossible. It becomes itself the effect and proof of irresponsible lunacy. Symptoms of insanity, after the crime, appearing in those who have never been suspected of it before, should be scrutinized with great jealousy. Instances of astounding ingenuity on the part of culprits in feigning insanity, are on record, which have baffled the most eminent practitioners.*

It will be observed, that we do not make the criterion, whether the prisoner is capable of knowing right and wrong in the abstract, and in the general, as judges have sometimes stated it. This may be, while his insane delusion utterly disables him from doing it in regard to the particular case in question. Nor is it merely whether he did actually know the wrong of his own act, according to the law of God and man. For every man is bound to know the law, unless there is some physical or mental inability to know it, besides his own criminal neglect. The true question is, was he rendered unable to know the true character of the act by *insane delusion* of any kind? If he was, he is exculpated. If not, he is guilty. In the words of Alison, a Scotch criminal lawyer, "If he labours, as is generally the case, under an illusion or deception as to his own particular case, and is thereby disabled from applying it correctly to his own conduct, he is in that state of mental alienation which renders him not criminally answerable for his own actions."†

With these explanations, we conclude by adding our earnest endorsement of the following judicious deliverance of Dr. Beck, which, though given with special reference to dubious cases of monomania, is equally just with regard to the plea of moral insanity. "It is from long continued and anxious reflection on the difficulties which thus present themselves to the consideration of the medical witness, that I am led to withdraw much of the objection which I have felt and expressed to the *dictum* of the English law on this subject. There must be some rule to guard the sacred interests of society—something to repress

* "Why should it not be enacted that the MURDER, (for all the difference of opinion is only about this) shall not be the first and earliest proof of insanity?"
—Beck, p. 795.

† Beck, p. 770.

and keep in check that tendency to 'shed the blood of his fellow,' which unfortunately is too common; and at the same time humanity forbids that the horrid spectacle should be permitted, of taking away the life of the insane by judicial process. Let the question put by Lord Lyndhurst be presented to every jury: *did the prisoner know, in doing the act, that he offended against the laws of God and man?** Let the following remarks of the Scotch Law Commentator† be kept in mind, and with the acknowledged mildness of our laws, and the unwillingness to convict capitally, I feel a strong conviction that no practical injustice will be done. But to aid in effecting all this, it is very necessary that the medical witness should have every facility allowed him for studying the nature of the case, and that its history should be ascertained."

W H Green

ART. II.—*An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.* By the Rev. THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, B. D. Tenth edition, revised, corrected and brought down to the present time. Vol. II. Containing the Text of the Old Testament considered, with a Treatise on Sacred Interpretation, and a brief Introduction to the Old Testament Books and the Apocrypha: by SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D. D., LL. D. London, 1856. 8vo. pp. 1100.

HORNE'S Introduction to the Scriptures has long held a conspicuous place among the standard volumes of a good minister's library. Notwithstanding its extensive erudition, however, its sound theological views and excellent spirit, which are its strong commendation, it has acknowledged and serious deficiencies, and is much behind the present state of biblical learning, particularly in the departments of criticism and special introduction. Its author's ignorance of German debarred him from the use of the ablest treatises which have been written upon these

* To which we add, *or was he prevented by insane delusion from knowing it?*

† The substance of which appears in the previous quotation from Alison.

subjects, and of itself unfitted him for their complete and satisfactory treatment. A sense of this deficiency has led of late years to numerous translations of works of this description from the German. But aside from the fact, that the selections for this purpose were not always wisely made, and the translations were, in some instances at least, carelessly executed, the necessity which exists, can never be adequately supplied in that way. <The best of the Germans have their crotchets, which, though greatly admired at home, find little favour before the tribunal of Anglo-American common sense.> Their books, too, which are prepared for quite a different region, are not adapted to the particular exigencies of the English or American theological public. We need not foreign works translated, but native works which shall incorporate the valuable results of continental learning and research without their objectionable features, and which shall be designed expressly to meet the wants of ministers and students and readers amongst ourselves.

No small degree of satisfaction was created, consequently, by the announcement some time since, that a new edition of Horne's Introduction was in preparation by the author, in conjunction with competent scholars, familiar with the entire range of literature in their respective departments. The Evidences of Christianity and Sacred Antiquities were retained for revision by the original author; while the Sacred Criticism and Special Introduction were, in the Old Testament, committed to Dr. Davidson, and in the New, to Dr. Tregelles, by whom they have been entirely rewritten. We confess that the previous publications of Dr. Davidson, in this his chosen field, were not of a character to lead us to anticipate from his pen so masterly and satisfactory a production as we would wish to have seen, and as the importance of the subject and the necessities of our literature demanded. And, in truth, the literary blemishes of his other writings are here reproduced without abatement, his tiresome and swelling verbosity, his endless repetitiousness, his lack of condensation, clearness and precision, his pages studded with citations and his margins with learned references, while there is a painful lack of comprehensiveness and vigorous grasp of mind, so that he has furnished a congeries of materials instead of a well-compacted treatment of

his theme. While we were prepared for defects of this sort, which not only deform his books but greatly prejudice their serviceableness, while we were prepared too for occasional sneers at the illiberality and bigotry of the holders of old opinions, and for the adoption of German innovations, to the utmost extent to which it was safe to go, we did not once venture to entertain the suspicion that his departures from received and well-established views would be so serious as in point of fact they are. We feel it to be our duty to warn our readers against this book, which, coming to them in the guise of a new edition of an honoured work, is governed by a wholly different spirit, and to advise them of its dangerous character and tendency. We do not hesitate to pronounce it utterly unfit to guide the studies of any learner in the department of which it treats. Its chief effect will be to mislead, unsettle and confuse. We would almost as soon place Theodore Parker's translation of De Wette in the hands of a student as this of Davidson, without first making him aware of the status which it occupies. An open antagonist is seldom as damaging to the cause of truth as an incompetent auxiliary; the latter, by his weak show of defence, while he is perpetually vaunting the strength of the enemy, creates a distrust, especially among the uninstructed and unwary, in the cause of which he is a professed champion, greater than any actual opposition could produce.

These are grave charges; but they can be sustained by the most abundant references to the book before us. We do not propose to enter here upon a refutation of the errors it contains. That might require, instead of the few pages which we shall devote to the subject, a volume of the same formidable dimensions as Dr. Davidson's own. All that we feel called upon to do is simply to recite some of the positions taken by the writer, that the Christian public may be aware of his views, and of the sort of instruction they may expect, who commit themselves to his guidance. It will not be needful nor possible here to refer to all that we consider erroneous or ill-judged, to the numerous unfounded or unproved assertions which are put forth as if undoubted or well established, to the doubtful hypotheses which receive an undue share of credit, if not implicit or explicit sanction, to the forms of statement which even when

the substance is correct, are loose and inaccurate, to that lack of a just sense of proportion which infects our author in common with his German masters, and which leads to the improper exaltation of what is trifling, even to the obscuring or undervaluing of what is of far greater moment. Such an undertaking would involve us in endless quarrel with what we find on almost every page. We shall accordingly confine ourselves to some of the more marked and serious departures from commonly received views, and such as prepare the way for, even if they do not involve, dangerous theological consequences.

Before adducing any of the particular opinions which we reprobate, we say in the general, that our most decided objection to the book is the spirit which pervades it, and the evident leanings of the writer throughout. It is often not so much what he says, the conclusion to which he comes, or the statement he actually makes that is objectionable, as the way in which he says it. Everything is set to trembling in the balance. It would appear as though there were to him nothing solid and undoubted. Nothing is so well attested or so long established, but it must be called repeatedly in question. Everything must be approached precisely as though nothing were settled, and all were now to be examined for the first time, with no antecedent impressions as to the side on which the truth would be found to lie. In fact, it is upon this that Dr. Davidson chiefly plumes himself. This is his ideal of impartiality and freedom from prejudice. The consequence is perpetual vacillation and indecision. Half the time he does not seem to know his own mind, and the other half it is hard to resist the impression that he would go farther in his denials of received opinions than he does, if he thought it would be tolerated by those for whom he writes. He is very commonly in the attitude of those feeble folk, whose votes are always recorded as "*non liquet.*" He sides neither with one party nor the other, but after magnifying the difficulties in the way of making up a judgment, finally falls upon some medium course, which is apt to partake of the inconveniences of both and the advantages of neither.

Now we have nothing to object to the most thorough sifting of old opinions and of the grounds on which they rest. Venerable errors are not to be spared because they are venerable.

And opinions, however sacredly held, must be discarded if they can be shown to be unsound. But the edifice of Scripture must not be pulled down over our heads under pretence of examining whether the foundation be secure. A man, who comes before the public as its teacher, and who professes to have surveyed with care the whole ground on which he treads, is expected to have reached decided convictions. And he has no right to represent that as insecure, which he possesses or ought to possess the means of proving stable and firm. He has no right, under the name of impartiality, to attribute a weight to opposing arguments which they do not have. Nor may the fact that a thing has been disputed, though on flimsy grounds, (for in biblical criticism and interpretation, as elsewhere, names may be cited on behalf of any opinion however wild and extravagant) be received as an adequate apology for classing it as doubtful, or for parading those grounds as though they were really possessed of force. The natural result of all this is to make the reader feel as though the ground were sliding beneath his feet. And they who gather their views of the state of the controversy from this volume, may very naturally conclude, that if the commonly received opinions are capable of no better defence than this, they might as well be abandoned.

This disposition Dr. Davidson has in all likelihood borrowed from his German teachers, with whom it is a first principle in their hyper-criticism to eschew any historical basis. The long-accredited and unvarying tradition which settles the genuineness and integrity of the inspired foundations of our faith, more firmly than that of any relic of ancient literature, is cast aside as worthless, on the first breath of suspicion from some modern innovator. A passage, whose genuineness is authenticated by every accessible external authority, the whole array of manuscripts, versions, and early references or citations, is treated as suspected on the first vague conjecture being started of a spurious origin. The presumption is not even allowed to rest with the old until the new is proved, but the reverse. The rule is to depart from whatever is generally received as often as possible. It is unfortunate for a writer of so little independence, and who is so controlled by those to whose leadership he has addicted himself, that he has fallen precisely into such

company as this. It is De Wette, Hupfeld, Gesenius, Ewald & Co., who are his masters in criticism. And he stands as much aloof from "Hengstenberg and his party," as if he thought that their notions, being too similar to what was currently believed at home, were not worth the going to Germany to obtain.

With this is too frequently connected, we are sorry to observe, a want of becoming reverence in his treatment of the Holy Scriptures. Not that their divine origin is denied, disputed or disbelieved, but it seems to be sometimes practically overlooked, and they are dealt with as coolly and familiarly as if they were an ordinary human production. The principles of textual criticism and the laws of taste and of interpretation, are indeed to a great extent the same as applied to the sacred volume and to works merely human. But because a diamond and a lump of clay are both matter and possessed of its essential properties in common, it does not follow that a natural philosopher must handle the one with the same easy carelessness that he would the other. And we confess that the flippant readiness with which the scalpel of an unsparing criticism is applied to what has been held most sacred, and criticisms and censures are passed upon the various styles of the inspired writers, grate harshly upon us.

Saddest of all, we are constrained to add, that Dr. Davidson has given up his faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, in the ordinary and orthodox sense, as well as in some of the doctrines which they are commonly held to teach. <The Bible is not, in his esteem, a revelation from God, but merely contains such a revelation.> There is a divine and eternal essence, but this is conveyed in a human form, which is necessarily imperfect, and may therefore need correction or require to be wholly cast away. He says, pages 449, 450, "We have no reason to believe that the divine Spirit ordinarily acts upon the human mind in any other method than by uniting his influence with it, and elevating it to a higher and holier tone than it could otherwise reach. The divine Spirit does not supersede or set aside the use of the natural powers, but quickens and purifies them, so that they can see much farther and higher. This at least was commonly the case, though there are doubtless exceptions."

Page 633—"Some possessed a larger measure of the Spirit of God than others; the phenomena of the books themselves evince that inspiration had *degrees*." Page 766—"Inspiration does not exclude *individuality** or suppress the exercise of the human faculties; and therefore an unmerciful sentiment may find entrance into a canonical work. Inspiration admits of degrees and does not usually reach the extent of *absolute infallibility*. Admitting of degrees, it necessarily partakes of imperfection." Page 504—"There may be contradiction on matters of history and science without detriment to the correctness of the writers on religious and moral subjects. After an extended and careful survey of all the phenomena, we incline to this latter view. We believe that no contradiction can exist between the writers when treating of religious and moral truth. Whatever they inculcate respecting doctrine and duty is infallibly correct. So far they were under a high illumination of the Spirit, and could not err. . . . While thus maintaining the harmony of all such passages as belong to and constitute *the word of God*, we doubt if places of another kind can be every where reconciled. In regard to dates, numbers, names; historical, archæological, geographical and scientific points; we are inclined to believe that they were not infallible and may have erred." The region given up to error in this last passage, is altogether too narrow for the sweep of the principles advocated in those previously alleged. If they are once adopted, it will be found that no breast-work can be erected which will arrest them here. Pages 473, 474—"The principle of *individuality* . . . leads us while acknowledging in the apostles a real and certain inspiration whereby they become true guides to the church in respect to *general direction*, to conclude that they had a partial and incomplete inspiration. It was not full and universal, embracing all aspects and particulars of a subject; nor was it inclusive of all topics. In short, it was partial and so far imperfect. Hence their teaching was inferior to that of Jesus Christ. It was not erroneous; but it was less absolute, less free from all human ideas, less complete." On pages 476, 477, Dr. Davidson decides against a particular and in favour

* The italics in these quotations belong to Dr. Davidson.

of a universal atonement. Page 479—"Because it is said that *by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners*, (Rom. v. 19,) it does not follow that the sinfulness of that head was transferred to them or that his sin was imputed to them. They became sinners themselves from their connection with Adam. Not that Adam's sin was really reckoned theirs, and therefore they became guilty, but that Adam's sin led to *their sinning*, which personal sin rendered them guilty." Page 480—"Man is utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually.' This statement professes to be founded upon and deduced from Scripture. But it is exaggerated and partially incorrect." Page 485—"From Eph. ii. 3, Calvin deduces *this doctrine of original sin*, that 'we are born with sin as serpents bring their venom from the womb.' Such a view is contrary both to the analogy of faith and to reason. The general tenor of Scripture shows man to be accountable to God. Here his responsibility is destroyed. As man is commanded to repent and believe, he has the *physical* ability to do so; ability being commensurate *with* obligation. Besides reason teaches that *sin* can only be a voluntary transgression of known law. And with this the Bible coincides. Hence sin cannot properly be predicated of infants from their very birth."

We proceed to the views which he has expressed concerning individual books of the Old Testament. Of the first three chapters of Genesis, he says, p. 576: "In deciding between the mythic view and the purely historical one, there is not much proof or argument to rest upon." He is here in his usual cloud of doubt, but evidently inclines to regard the narrative as mythical, with an historical basis. Between the first and second chapters he says, p. 595, that there are discrepancies, which "do not probably amount to actual contradictions, for several attempts, more or less successful, have been made to remove such particulars as are absolutely irreconcilable; but they evince, at the least, very considerable deviations in the second narrative from the first." Jacob's purchasing Esau's birth-right, and subsequently obtaining his father's blessing by fraud, gives occasion to the remark, p. 596: "The fact that there are

two such accounts of one and the same transaction, presenting considerable diversities, to say the least, favours the assumption that they were derived from different sources, and so incorporated into one book." One more characteristic instance of indecision, weak defence, and positive abandonment of the historical truth of the sacred narrative will suffice for Genesis: p. 603, "The taking away of Sarah at Gerar, in Gen. xx. is similar to what happened in Egypt, as related in Gen. xii. 10-19, and to the case of Isaac and Rebekah, [the spelling is Dr. Davidson's] in Gen. xxvi. 1-11. Hence it has been assumed that one and the same fact lies at the basis of the three, which has been differently moulded by tradition. Here it is replied that the same thing may have readily happened more than once in that rude age, in different places, after intervals of time, especially as the similarities of the three occurrences are far surpassed by still greater dissimilarities, and each one bears all the marks of historic truth in itself, in certain circumstances peculiar to it. Whether this be a satisfactory answer it is difficult to affirm. We believe that the case of Isaac and Rebekah cannot be held, with any degree of probability, as identical with the other two, or with either of them. It seems to us distinct and different. But in regard to the other two, it is possible that they may be different forms of one and the same event, because both happened to Sarah at no great interval of time."

A great ado is made, p. 602, over the repeated formal imposition of the name of Joshua, while on p. 597 it is admitted that the precisely similar case of the renewal of the name of Israel, Gen. xxxv. 10, presents "no difficulty or discrepancy." His justification of the retention of Egyptian symbols in the Mosaic ritual sounds like the apologies of Spencer, on the same subject. P. 583, "The wisdom of not introducing new rites and customs is obvious. The people, rude and uncultivated as they were, would have been reluctant to observe strange regulations. They adhered with pertinacity to what they had learned and seen." On p. 585 we are told that the speaking of Balaam's ass was not a literal external act, but a vision. The testimony of 2 Pet. ii. 16 to its actual occurrence, which "would be all but decisive, could the authenticity of 2d Peter be relied upon," is ruled out. When Hengstenberg's authority is quoted

for the opinion that the prediction of the star and the sceptre, Num. xxiv. 17, does not refer to Christ, Dr. Davidson seems not to have been aware that that opinion had been repudiated, in his special treatise on Balaam's life and prophecies, fifteen years ago, as well as in the recent edition of his Christology. Whether this is what it professes to be, a real prophecy of Balaam, uttered on the occasion alleged by the sacred writer, or the product of a later age, prepared on some totally different occasion, he is unable or indisposed to express an opinion. "We can only refer to the chief writers on both sides."

The Pentateuch is utterly denied to be the work of Moses, pp. 631, 632, who only wrote Deuteronomy and a few other parts. To the rest he applies the documentary hypothesis, upon which so many and such idle changes have been rung by those infected with the German *hypothesen-sucht*. There was first, one document distinguished in its earlier portions by the use of the divine name Elohim, and throughout by sundry subtle criteria which the advocates of this view have found it so difficult to state, and scarcely any two are agreed upon: this was prepared perhaps in the time of Joshua. To this succeeded another from an independent source, employing the divine name Jehovah, and written about one hundred years later, in the time of the Judges. Lastly, these were compacted together in the time of the earlier kings, by "a final writer, who retouched, added to, and variously interpolated both. Not until his day was the Pentateuch in its present state." It is surprising that a writer who feels no difficulty in admitting such wholesale jumbling and interpolation as this, should be shocked at the assumption, as "a mere subterfuge," p. 623, that the few scattered verses found in the Pentateuch, which some persons hesitate about ascribing to Moses, might have been added by Ezra or some other inspired man to whom authority was given to make such a revision; especially as he makes this very assumption himself in the case of Daniel, where it chances to suit him, p. 924, "We believe that some of these expressions are not such as are suitable in the case of Daniel himself. He would scarcely have written them. But this does not affect the general authorship of the book, as we shall see hereafter."

Pentateuch
documentary
the 21

The grounds upon which this hypothesis are here supported, are the same which have been adduced and answered hundreds of times, from the days of Astruc down. Apparent discrepancies are magnified, and their solutions pronounced unsatisfactory. Different events bearing some mutual resemblance are declared to be discordant accounts of one and the same. Vague and not very intelligible declamation is indulged in, respecting differences of style and language to be found in the books imputed to Moses. Passages are picked out, which it is alleged Moses could not have written; though it is quite consistent with the arbitrary and vacillating mode of treatment pursued, that the most difficult of all, at least as it is usually regarded (the reference, Gen. xxxvi. 31, to a king reigning over the children of Israel) is, p. 621, admitted to be susceptible of easy solution. The abundant allusions to the books of Moses, in the subsequent writers of the Old Testament, are alleged to be irrelevant. And when the New Testament cites the earlier portions of the Pentateuch, under the title of "*the book of Moses,*" or, "the general expression is employed, *Moses describeth, writeth;*" even this is not allowed to be decisive; "the name stands for the book to which it was thus popularly given." After all this, he professes, p. 633, to be as great a stickler for the authority and credibility of these books as the advocates of their Mosaic origin. And he says, p. 622, that the question between them is barely one as to "the *extent* of Moses's authorship." No one alleges that the closing verses of Deuteronomy, which record his death and burial, were written by Moses. And he merely makes the unimportant addition that Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, were not written by him either!

That there are difficulties in the books of Moses, some of which are hard to solve, we do not pretend to deny. Dating as they do from so remote a period, and one from which no collateral accounts have reached us, to throw light upon circumstances here omitted, or but summarily recorded, it is not surprising that it should be so. But the denial of their Mosaic origin does not relieve the matter, as Dr. Davidson would have us suppose. For one difficulty so escaped we would encounter a dozen new ones of greater magnitude. There is scarcely

anything of the kind more instructive than the history of German opinion on this very subject. Ever since the hypothesis of different documents composing the books of Moses was first broached, each successive advocate has been trying to tinker it into some new and more available shape, in order to rid it of the difficulties and embarrassments with which it was felt to be clogged. Now it is two documents, now three, now half a dozen, now one grievously interpolated, now a bundle of brief and disconnected fragments. However confident each writer has been of his own results, he has not been able to satisfy those who have come after him. We have no reason to believe that this sample of imported Germanism will find any more permanent market than the same quality of article has done at home. The whole thing is, in any event, the merest conjecture from first to last; though it is an interesting and an important fact that it has been found so impossible even for those to whom historical evidence is a thing of naught, to conjecture a mode in which the Pentateuch might have been composed, if Moses did not write it.

The book of Joshua is dealt with after the pattern of the books of Moses. We are told, p. 640, that "parts do not well cohere here and there. Discrepancies cannot be denied. It is even difficult to withstand the view, that there are occasional contradictions. The contents and language are of a character to show diversity of materials—the use of different and distinguishable documents." P. 642, "It is probable that the book, as we now have it, was composed in the time of Saul. An unknown writer compiled it from the Elohim and Jehovah documents, using contemporary notices besides, and interspersing his own remarks here and there." The last five chapters of Judges, forming a kind of supplement or appendix to the book, are attributed to another and a later writer than the first sixteen chapters, on the ground, p. 648, of the different and "*untheocratic*" point of view, which is taken in them. Of the books of Samuel it is said, p. 664, "Contradictory statements have been adduced; but many of them are not contradictions." "Granting that some remain, neither the inspiration of the redactor, nor the credibility of the general history is ruinously affected." On p. 668 we read of "discordant statements, repetitions, and unsuitable intercalations" in the books of

Kings. After this it will not surprise any one who knows the direction in which the current upon which our author floats is wont to set, to find him fairly stranded on the books of Chronicles. They are, of course, sadly berated; though he is so kind as to apologize for the inaccuracies of the author, p. 685, by the assumption that the sources at his disposal were not accurate, and that his vagueness and exaggerations may be imputed to his having sometimes followed tradition. "The majority of the improbabilities and fictitious circumstances attributed to him have been successfully turned aside," p. 687, but there are others "which appear to be incapable of solution on any other ground than one unfavourable to the accuracy of the writer."

The denial of the genuineness of the titles to the Psalms, p. 745, etc., and to the prophecy of Hosea, p. 942, is in itself of small consequence, except as corroborative of a general tendency. The same may be said of his adoption of Hitzig's gratuitous emendation of the title of Prov. xxx. He strangely enough says, p. 752, "There can be little doubt that the collectors of the various books [the five books of Psalms, agreeably to the divisions of the Hebrew text] were guided by a religious aim." Are we to seek the meaning of this insinuation that there can be any doubt, in what he says of Psalm 45th, and of the so-called imprecatory Psalms? P. 754, "The 45th Psalm is considered by many to be of an entirely secular character. But * * it is probable that very few secular songs were composed. Almost all were of a religious nature." That he is himself one of the "many" who think this Psalm not religious but secular, is disclosed on p. 800. "It does not follow because the sixth verse of the Psalm is quoted in the New Testament, in favour of Christ's divinity, that the Psalm is *generally descriptive* of Messiah. There is no reason for holding that it has Christ for its subject, and must be allegorically explained of his love to the Church. Modern exegesis repudiates this interpretation." This unsupported dictum is announced as though it put an end to the common orthodox view.

Offence is taken at the language of the 55th, 69th, 109th and 137th Psalms, where the inspired writer, in denouncing the righteous judgments of God upon his foes, expresses his own concurrence in their propriety and the complete absorption of

his own will in that of God, by exchanging the simple future for the imperative. Davidson, however, says, p. 761, that these petitions were certainly not prompted by a regard to religion and hatred of iniquity. Page 762—"The imprecations to which we are referring are the ebullitions of natural and unsanctified feeling." Page 763—"It is not strange that persons whose *conduct* was not always right, should have occasionally uttered *language* of corresponding character. Under peculiar circumstances of exasperation and base ingratitude, is it not conceivable that holy men should sometimes express personal feelings inconsistent with their prevailing disposition and with the spirit of true religion?" That a partially sanctified man should say or do wrong is one thing. But that a man inspired to teach religious truth and duty should, in the delivery of his message, mingle its opposite, is a wholly different thing. This is not to be escaped by saying, p. 766, that "inspiration does not necessarily nor always imply suggestion by the Spirit. It does not exclude *individuality* or suppress the exercise of the human faculties." Of course it does not. Its simple function is to secure the delivery of the message with which a man is charged, be it what it may or howsoever learned, free from all admixture of error. What then becomes of his conclusion—"Therefore an unmerciful sentiment may find entrance into a canonical work?"

Solomon, we are farther told, did not compile any portion of the book of Proverbs, nor was he the author of Ecclesiastes nor of the song which goes by his name. Of the Proverbs it is said, p. 778, "the motives presented are not of the most elevated sort; because they arise out of prudence rather than love. . . . The encouragements offered to a life of virtue are prudential, being founded on an earthly retribution. Indeed the writers appear to have had no conceptions of a future state of rewards and punishments." This censure is in the first place untrue, for a future state is in more than one passage referred to in this book; and in the second place, it is founded upon ignorance or a culpable inattention to the design of the author. That design is to show, that in the ordinary course of God's providence in this world, men's welfare is promoted by right doing, and is obstructed by sin. If this line of discussion is adhered

to, and other topics are not introduced, it is simply because this was the theme proposed; and it is one altogether worthy of a place in the sacred oracles.

Of the author of Ecclesiastes we are told, p. 789, that he "lived in the later period of the Persian government, not long after the time of Malachi." On a subsequent page, p. 986, this appears to be forgotten, and we read that Malachi was "the latest writer in the Old Testament canon." Must we here imitate Dr. Davidson's treatment of the Pentateuch and apply the documentary hypothesis to his own book?

The Song of Solomon is, p. 804, declared to be a song of human love, the allegorical interpretation of which is foreign from its true intent, and "has been put into it by the imagination of the expositor." On page 798, it is admitted that this book owes its place in the canon to its supposed allegorical character; and that it would not otherwise have been dignified with such a position. "But all the probabilities of the case are against the idea that the collectors of the canon acted by infallible inspiration in placing and arranging the books. We hold, therefore, that while the collectors of the sacred books may have put the Canticles into the Hagiographa, believing them to have an allegorical sense, we may or may not adopt their opinion respecting the object and nature of the book." On page 808, he says that divine authority and inspiration are matters which it is scarcely proper to introduce in connection with the Song of Solomon. Its being an amatory effusion, however, does not prevent its being inspired and a part of the canon. If any are so wedded to antiquated ideas as to suspect this language of self-contradiction, it is because "they entertain very inadequate notions of what such important words as canonical authority and inspiration imply." Discarding thus the allegorical interpretation, the poem is not even one of chaste wedded love; but the shocking plot of Ewald is reproduced, of an innocent country maiden tempted to sin by the king, though her virtue is finally triumphant. And one of the reasons given, p. 806, why Solomon cannot have written this Song is, that "he could scarcely have been brought to expose his shame in this public manner."

His passion for finding corruptions in the text is allowed free

play in Jeremiah, p. 881, and Ezekiel, p. 897, the proof being found in the deviations of the Septuagint. And yet such deviations in the book of Daniel, though still greater, are admitted, p. 935, to be chargeable to the Greek translator. In the chronological mistake alleged in this book, p. 907, the credit of Daniel is saved by the assumption that it was not made by him, but by a later hand. But as this later hand is, p. 934, the one to whom we owe the present form of the book and its opening chapters, we do not see how this mends the matter. The iron legs of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, p. 908, and the fourth beast of Daniel's vision, p. 909, represent not the Roman Empire, as they are usually expounded, but that of Alexander and his successors. The prophecy of the seventy weeks relates to the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, instead of the coming and work of Christ. The book of Jonah contains, p. 959, a groundwork of history, but embellished by a writer who lived about the time of the Babylonish exile. Zechariah's authorship of the last six chapters of his book is denied, p. 982; and in Matth. xxvii. 9, where his name might have been expected instead of Jeremiah, our author can think of no explanation so probable as a blunder of memory on the part of the evangelist, p. 983.

Our exhibit of the views maintained in this volume, and of the scholarship which it displays, has already been sufficiently extended. It is for the Christian public to say in what esteem a work devoted to the advocacy of such sentiments shall be held. Dr. Davidson, anticipating (Preface, p. vi.) "that prejudice and ignorance would be arrayed against him," and "that he should be confronted with traditional opinions," offers as his apology for the course he has pursued, that "religion concerns the emotions more than the intellect," and that "scientific criticism has its own field, in which it may freely range," and yet faith in God's word be left intact. But a "scientific criticism" which overturns the genuineness of a large portion of the Scriptures, and unsettles confidence in the exactness of its truth, is not so harmless a thing as he would have us imagine. And the emotions are not so separable from the intellect that the errors of the latter are without prejudice to piety. Besides, the principles avowed or covertly insinuated

in this volume, will legitimately lead much farther than the extent to which they are actually pursued. There is no logical consistency in going so far as Dr. Davidson does and stopping there. It is manifestly throughout a purely subjective reason, and not the objective state of the argument, which decides for him the length to which he shall go. Another less scrupulous would, with the same principles, make greater havoc with "traditional opinions" still.

By James C. Moffat

ART. III.—*Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien, nach den Zeichnungen der in den Jahren, 1842–1845, ausgeführten wissenschaftlichen Expedition,* VON RICHARD LEPSIUS. Imp. folio. Berlin: 1850–1852.

THE work, of which the title is here given, is still in process of publication. It is designed to consist of ten volumes, containing more than eight hundred lithographed plates, many of them coloured, with about twenty sheets of letter press to each volume. The first two volumes are topographical, geographical, and architectural, their object being to give a view of the monuments in Egypt and Ethiopia, according to their geographical position. In the third and fourth volumes are given the historical monuments of the old monarchy, that is, down to the thirteenth dynasty, or the Hyksos invasion; in the fifth, sixth, and seventh, those of the new monarchy, or from the seventeenth dynasty onward to the time of Alexander the Great. To the eighth, are assigned the monuments of the Ptolemies and Roman Emperors; to the ninth, the Ethiopian monuments; and to the tenth, the inscriptions, Hieratic, Phœnician, Sinaic, Greek and Roman. The hieroglyphic inscriptions are included in the previous volumes. The most valuable historical monuments of the editor's original discovery have been already issued.

It is truly a magnificent work, and in some respects, eclipses all its predecessors, in the field of Egyptian antiquities. With-

out derogating from the honour, which is their due, the collections made by the Republican Savans, by Champollion, Rosellini and others, are, in comparison with that of the Prussian expedition, imperfectly digested. Masses they are of invaluable materials, and to the mere antiquary, perhaps, satisfactory; but to the eye in search of history, tantalizing to a painful degree. It is a delightful relief to turn from them to the discriminating classification and chronological order of Lepsius. By persevering and well directed investigations among the actual monuments, many of which were never before laid bare to modern inspection, he has succeeded in determining relatively some of the most important epochs of Egyptian history. He has collected contemporaneous testimony to several dynasties of kings hitherto very scantily illustrated, and to such an amount and variety that although dates are still a matter of doubt, through the whole Pharaonic period, the epochs of which it consists and their relative order are settled beyond a doubt.

Monuments are presented of the fourth, fifth, sixth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and seventeenth dynasties, and uninterruptedly onward to the Roman emperors. To the elucidation of the preceding and intervening dynasties little or nothing has been added by the expedition. Among those of the old monarchy, the richest in monumental remains are the fourth, sixth, and twelfth; and of the revived monarchy the eighteenth and nineteenth. The period assigned to the shepherds, between the thirteenth and seventeenth, is almost a blank.

Another excellence of the work is its scrupulous accuracy, a matter which we determine by an effect upon the mind difficult to be described, but in itself not the less conclusive to him who carefully compares it with preceding publications of the kind. At the same time it is not a reproduction of the preceding, but a genuine addition to knowledge, and gives nothing previously published except in cases where the former copies were so inaccurate that the corrections could not be otherwise marked.

Thus, through the graves of an ancient people have we received the delineation of their lives from their own hands. And, at least in reference to the older dynasties, we may truly say that a lost civilization has been restored to history. For so brief is the only extant narrative pertaining to that time,

and so much aside from the channel of art and politics, that we could never have suspected from it the progress which they had made. Though making mention of great nations, and clear, nay, graphic, in its pictures, it contains, singularly, little touching government and the organization of society. At first sight, indeed, one might have suspected that it had been written in lack of a true historical subject.

When the cloud, which rests upon the progress of our race for so long a period after the dispersion, begins to clear away, the first object brought to view is a single nomade family among the highlands of Mesopotamia. Why did the historian make such a choice? The family was neither royal nor sacerdotal, nor do we learn that any member of it had distinguished himself by either wealth or talent. Was the world so destitute of historical material that narrative could find nothing to dwell upon for so many centuries, and at the end of them, had to recommence with so humble a subject? So we might suppose, did we not, in pursuing the history of that family, find it incidentally brought in contact with several populous and highly civilized states. Another and greater consideration guided the hand of the sacred penman. His narrative had a view to a civilization a thousand years in the future, and a fairer light than even civilization, which should rest upon the later ages of mankind. The actual state of the world in his own time it was not his purpose to record. Terah and his family, obscure as they otherwise were, occupied a relation to the future, in comparison with which the greatest nations of that time were as nothing. From the more fully recorded epoch of Noah down to that of Abraham, the narrative runs by a very narrow channel. A bare genealogical list joins the one to the other, containing no more information of the intervening ages, than did the chain which connected two islands of the Ægean, of the mysteries of the deep which rolled between. Happily the original settlements of post-diluvian man are stated with admirable precision. The tenth chapter of Genesis, though brief, is the most valuable ethnological treatise bequeathed us by antiquity. Scientifically considered, it is not to be estimated in gold. By throwing upon it the light of recent discovery, and applying the lens of a careful and minute criticism, its every word is found to be a

history. And the life of Abraham, though less expansive, when treated in the same manner, yields results of a kindred value.

The primitive patriarchs long survived the first period of dispersion, and were, undoubtedly, the princes of their respective posterity and leaders of emigration. Japhet, with his descendants, had emigrated to the north, northeast, and northwest, and was entirely out of view. The day of his distinction was yet far in the future.

The sons of Shem occupied, primarily, the land of the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, Asshur settling on the latter river, above the Zab, Aram on the hills and table-land lying between the rivers north of Babylonia, while Lud went northward and westward of Aram, entering thereby upon the occupancy of the country now called Asia Minor. Elam planted his family on the southeast of Asshur, in a region afterwards embraced by Persia, and Arphaxad immediately to the north of Asshur. In the earlier ages the Shemites were comparatively few, and long remained in the nomadic state. Their most ancient cities and centres of civilization were founded, not by themselves, but by Hamite invaders, who domineered over the residents on the Tigris, and under the command of Nimrod laid the foundation of their cities. Beyond those compulsory effects of conquest, the Shemites present no other evidence of civilization pertaining to that time.

It was among the sons of Ham that the first heroes of the world arose. The writer of the tenth chapter of Genesis gives as much room to his account of their settlements as he does to all the rest of mankind together. Most obviously, when that document was penned, they were the dominant race. It was the offspring of Cush who retained possession of Babylonia; and the same branch of the race spread in various colonies along the southern portion of Arabia, and to the opposite shores of the Red Sea; whence further migration occupied the upper Nile, and penetrated southward and westward into the interior of Africa.

From some facts connected with it, we suspect that the elder patriarch himself accompanied or led the migration of his second son. In this instance, without any intervention of

a nomadic state, the movement must have proceeded directly across the desert, westward from Babylonia. It seems probable that upon reaching the valleys of Arabia Petraea, some had been content to remain; but the greater number went on until they came to the banks of the Nile, where the character of the country, in so many respects like that which they had left, at once determined their choice—a choice that was never revoked. It was due perhaps to the presence of the elder patriarch with them that this branch of his descendants so carefully cherished his name. Both in Arabia and Egypt they called their country Ham, and so was one of their principal deities denominated. The real name of their more immediate progenitor suffered comparative obscurity, and to other nations he was known only by that which they gave to the land he settled. Mizer, or Mestre, as he is called by Josephus, was known in the times of Moses and onward by the dual of his name; Mizraim, or the two Mizers, being reflected from the then two-fold country back to its founder. More recent usage again presents the singular, and *Musr* is now the common Oriental name of that country. From Egypt some extended into the adjoining parts of northern Africa, while others turned eastward along the coast of the Mediterranean, into the borders of Canaan. The Philistines were an offshoot of an Egyptian colony.

Canaan, with his descendants, had also moved westward, but more to the north, and early settled in that rich and beautiful land which so long retained his name, comprehending both what was afterwards Palestine and Phenicia. An obscurer portion fell to the lot of Phut. Having passed on beyond Canaan and Mizraim far into northwestern Africa, his posterity hardly furnish facts enough to justify conjecture of their history. It is not improbable that they ultimately reached the Atlantic, planting a belt of settlements along the northern coast. From these, secondary colonies pressing southward, penetrated by gradual nomadic process to the rich lands south of the great desert. In a migration which led them over such a breadth of wilderness, and detained them so long in a wandering state, they were lost to the rest of mankind, and themselves gradually lost their primitive civilization, and became utter barbarians.

The degeneracy attendant upon such a life extends not to the arts of refinement alone. It impairs and deforms the physical man. Every original trait of feature pertaining to the stock becomes exaggerated and debased. Such a change must have passed upon more than one variety of mankind, as early, or nearly as early, as the time of Abraham.

Thus the children of Ham possessed, at the same time, the broad plains of Babylonia, the whole extent of the Nile, that land flowing with milk and honey on the banks of the Jordan, the whole of Arabia, and those great outlets of commerce, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the Mediterranean. Upon the settlement of Africa they had entered in broad phalanx, without a rival, and preoccupied all the then available approaches thereto. Nor had the freedom of untrodden lands contented their ambition. Setting that example, in all succeeding ages so abundantly followed by the strong, they had invaded the claims of their neighbours, and founded the first dominion of conquest among the Shemites of Assyria. There cannot be a doubt, that if full records had been preserved of the first thousand years after the flood, we should have found them occupying a place relatively as prominent then as the sons of Japhet do now. To them belonged the nations of farmers, manufacturers and traders, the scholars, the artists and mechanics of the time, and the world's first empires were erected by their hands.

When Abraham was called to leave the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees, the most prominent nations before the eye of history were those who claimed descent from Canaan and Mizraim. They were contemporaries in national progress, leaders in the civilization of the time.

Damascus was already a city of note. And though no records remain to testify to the earlier period of Sidon's commercial career, it must have opened prior to the days of Abraham; because, at a period antecedent to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Sidon was a prominent point in the borders of the Canaanites; and a city was certainly not built on the place where it stood, without a view to commerce by sea, from the beginning.

Upon the unimpaired civilization brought with them from Babylonia, the Egyptians had, in the many intervening cen-

turies, built up a great national system, had accumulated unprecedented wealth and power and knowledge of the arts, and in all the elements of internal prosperity had already reached their youthful prime. The illustrious twelfth dynasty of their kings had already achieved its renown. Under long-continued care and science, the land was cultivated like a garden, and studded with large and flourishing cities, and filled with a population, which, for learning and industry, was without a rival in the world. The pyramids already looked down upon the broad plains of the lower country, and the monumental records of Sesostris, and other great Diospolitan kings, adorned the temples and cavern tombs of the Thebaid, and marked the progress of their conquests in Ethiopia. The ancient labyrinth of Amenemes was then in use for the purposes of its erection, and its numerous halls were crowded with the great public functionaries from the different nomes of the united kingdom. Memphis, the primitive seat of Egyptian art and royalty, was even then ancient, though her glory had not yet begun to decline. There had the kings of the earlier dynasties held their court—the great pyramid builders—and left such monuments of their power and of the wealth and numbers of the nation whom they ruled, as even at the end of more than thirty-eight centuries to call forth the wonder of the world. Those sumptuous and colossal tombs still reminded the country of the oppression, at the expense of which they were erected. Egypt's early kings seem to have had the traditions of the flood before their eyes, and to have constructed their monuments with a view to the probability of another. And if any work of human hands can be conceived of as likely to withstand such a calamity it is the rock-built pyramid. But the compulsory labour by which these piles were raised, constrained the nation to revolt, and overthrew the royal house they were designed to honour. No subject of grateful contemplation were they to the Egyptian peasant. On their gigantic brows rested the frown of oppression. And ever as the people lifted their eyes towards them, the shadow of despotism fell upon their hearts. The merciless Cheops long seemed to threaten from his stupendous tomb. The physical force of the nation had been tasked beyond endurance. Succeeding kings

laboured to restore popular good will, by recurring to early efforts to encourage and improve agriculture, and re-establish the regularity of religious observances. Still, massive temples, inscribed with records of their history and symbols of their faith, were necessities of Egyptian society, and their views of futurity demanded permanent depositories for the bodies of their dead.

The monarchs of the sixth dynasty carried the labours of their art higher up the Nile, and executed the monuments, which yet tell of their reign, and ornament the place of their burial, at Nus, near the site of the modern town of Benihassan, and elsewhere towards Thebes. Other dynasties, intervening and contemporaneous, had also ruled, but what impression they made upon the nation's history fewer monuments remain to record.

With the eleventh dynasty a new regal family came to the throne, and the history of art in Thebes began. Slowly had art and sovereignty struggled up the Nile, and long after upper Egypt had set up a king of her own, the old capital maintained its rule over the lower country, and claimed a right to the whole. But from the close of the eighth dynasty, Memphis gave no more kings to Egypt. Heracleopolis had maintained two dynasties, known as the ninth and tenth, as contemporaries and rivals of the seventh and part of the eighth of Memphis. The first Theban dynasty inherited, or assumed the Heracleopolitan claim, and is counted the eleventh. It was this family which succeeded in finally transferring the sceptre of the united kingdom to the upper country. For as they rose to power, both the other rival families, for some cause or other, passed away. Their kinsmen and successors of the twelfth dynasty thereby inherited a peaceful and united kingdom, of greater extent and population than it had ever hitherto had. Prosperous at home, and of overflowing wealth, they carried their conquests far south into the heart of Ethiopia, where they met the settlements of the Cushites advancing in the opposite direction. Being themselves Thebans, they sumptuously adorned the capital of the upper country, but also erected several monuments of their victories and structures for defence, which remain to this day, far south of the boundaries of Egypt, leaving there-

in indisputable evidence that a large part of Ethiopia had been subjected to their rule. They also maintained or restored a connection with that branch of their common stock, who inhabited the peninsula of Mount Sinai. The kings who built the great pyramids, had sent colonies there to work the copper mines, and defended them with arms from Shemitic invasion. In this respect their example was followed by those who established the reunited throne in Thebes. Inscriptions to that purport and of both dates are found in that part of Arabia still.

Towards the west also had Egyptian enterprise gone beyond the valley of the Nile. Amencmes III., last of the twelfth dynasty, had executed, or at least finished the stupendous hydraulic works, whereby Lake Moeris was made a reservoir sufficient to irrigate a large extent of country, and the formerly barren Fayoom was converted into a rich and beautiful oasis. Sesostris, or more correctly, perhaps, Sesortosen III. of the same dynasty, had also carried his conquests in various directions, but apparently without much permanent addition to Egyptian territory. He seems to have overrun rather than subdued, but he had thereby published the superiority of Egypt.

A traveller up the Nile, at that epoch, beheld already the maturity of that type of civilization, and the same operations of art and industry which flourished there until the Persian invasion. All along the river, he found fishermen at their occupation, some with the hook and bait or fish-spear, and others with the net, while a third class were employed in preparing and curing the fish by drying them in the sun. Fowlers were busy among the reeds and bushes on the banks, both with the net and throwstick. The boat in which he sailed was of the same shape and rigging as that in which the subjects of Shishak navigated the stream—the same slender masts, the same white or yellow sails, and long-handled paddles. Upon the broad plains on either side, he saw the same agricultural labour as that of later times, ploughing with the two-handled plough, drawn by a pair of oxen, labourers turning the soil with the long wooden hoe, sowing the seed broadcast over the recently ploughed lands. Or, if in the harvest time, he found them reaping the whitening crop with the same kind of reaping-

hook as is still in use, binding up the sheaves, or treading out and garnering the grain. By the roads on either bank men and women passed with burthens on their heads, by the erectness of their attitude avoiding that appearance of servility and oppression, which is inseparable from the act of carrying upon the back. Heavier articles were slung from a yoke across the shoulders. He also saw, from time to time, companies of merchants with their goods packed for transportation upon the backs of asses, the driver walking and with one hand holding the bridle, while with the other he kept the high piled load steady in its place. A large class of people were engaged in attending to cattle, which constituted an important element of national wealth. For, although the persons whose lives were spent in the servile labour of that branch of business were degraded and held in low esteem, the owners of the cattle were the rich and the honoured in the land. Broad pastures were covered with grazing herds, which sufficiently evinced the herdsman's care, and lusty droves passed along the highways, urged forward by the long, flexible scourges, and shouts of the drovers.

In the numerous and populous towns and villages, which he sailed by, the traveller beheld a great variety of tradesmen at work, woodmen cutting down trees, carpenters shaping the wood into articles of household furniture or weapons of war, rough hewing with the axe and adz and saw, morticing with the chisel and mallet, or finishing with more delicate tools. He found stonecutters shaping blocks of sandstone, limestone and granite, or carving upon them the inscriptions already drawn on the polished surface, and masons building them into majestic temples and palaces. In the many brick fields he beheld thousands of compulsory labourers employed in that great government monopoly, Egyptians reduced to servitude, persons taken captive in war, or immigrants fallen under royal displeasure. There were men presenting the features of the bravest adjoining nations toiling almost naked under the burning sun, and watched over by Egyptian taskmasters, armed with the rod, which was not unfrequently laid on with little mercy. Could Abraham have foreseen, upon his visit to Egypt, that such was the oppressive service in store for his own posterity, he might

have experienced a trial too severe for the faith of a free nomadic prince. Of those workmen some were in the pits, mixing the clay with straw, others lifting it out in pots or baskets and carrying it to the place where it was moulded and stamped with the government mark; some were spreading out the bricks to dry in the sun, and others were taking up those now dry, and carrying them upon scales slung by each arm, from a yoke across the shoulders, to a place where they were piled up in order to be sold. The cheapness of that building material and its durability, in a climate where rain so seldom falls, recommended it to common use, and all buildings, except those designed for the public or the gods, or some of the wealthier nobility, were of those sun-dried bricks. They were frequently large, and walls built of them were thick and solid, and, in some cases, adorned both internally and externally with graceful mouldings, and the rooms which they enclosed furnished with great elegance.

Numbers of rural villas, surrounded by their gardens, of greater or less extent, beautified the landscape with their groups of trees and shrubbery and carefully irrigated grounds. Ascending the river from Zoan, the traveller thus found himself traversing a country thickly settled by an active people, far advanced in the arts of refinement, and busy in their prosecution. On every hand, and as far as the eye could reach, spread the evidences and results of industry and taste. And when he drew near to the head of the Delta, where the waters of the Nile divide, the stupendous tombs of Cheops, of Chephyren and Menkera, with the vast group of minor pyramids, rose upon his view far to the southwest, where the sky began to take the tinge of the desert. Soon after he sailed by the sacred city of On, with its temple of Ra, the oldest and most generally venerated in Egypt, and one at a later time to be pleasantly associated with some of the posterity of Abraham. For it was a high priest of this very temple who became the father-in-law of Joseph, and the grandfather of Ephraim and Manasseh. As he passed on, the towers of Memphis began to appear above the horizon; first the massive propylæa of the temple of Phtha, then the tall and slender obelisks, which adorned its entrance. Gradually other structures came to

view, until his boat sailed up over against the landing, and the ancient capital of Egypt lay before him in still undiminished glory.

Monopolizing a great part of the plain upon the west bank, with its long, narrow and crowded streets, the old imperial city threw out its far extended array of suburbs and suburban villas, up and down the river for many miles, and westward to the hills on the verge of the desert. Upon the rocky foundation furnished by those hills, arose the monumental structures of the necropolis, whose colossal dimensions were such as to strike every beholder with awe. And yet in most of them, except the pyramids, the wonders subterranean were greater than those presented to external view. Already they were very numerous, and their increase, in after times, extended that cemetery of wealthy Memphites to more than two-and-twenty miles in length, by half a mile in breadth. Memphis was no longer the chief residence of Egyptian kings, but was still the capital of the richer of the two divisions of the country, and kept up the national palace, which was, from time to time, occupied by the monarch, who found it prudent thus to propitiate an important class of his people.

If the traveller landed and walked through those busy streets, he had to struggle in the midst of a crowd of buyers and sellers of every kind of commodity pertaining to the then existing civilization. He passed by manufactories of linen goods of various kinds, of leather, of glass, of pottery, of articles of dress, of household furniture, of table service, of personal ornaments, of utensils and works of art in copper, in bronze, in gold, in silver, in wood, in ivory and alabaster. He looked upon vases of beautiful design. The operations of the sculptor attracted his attention, and he might observe the progress of works destined to adorn some sacred place and become objects of adoration; and everywhere he found the scribes, the ministers of government, taking account of the industry of the nation. In the market-place they were making record of weights and measures and commodities for sale. One stands before a herd of cattle, noting down the statements of the herdsman, his tablet in his left hand, his pallet, with a thick ink of different colours on it, slung over a finger of the same,

his pencil, wielded exactly in the style of a modern penman in the other, while two pencils for the other colours are stuck behind his ears. All public business was conducted in writing. Even litigation was denied the use of oratory and confined to the written pleadings. Not only the Memphites, but Egyptians, as a whole, were eminently literary; and an important item of their manufacture was writing-paper, made from the papyrus reed of the Nile, which at a later time was also exported to every civilized country. A visit to any of the temples brought before him the majesty and imposing solemnity of their religion. The magnitude of the building, its massive material and sombre style, the secret rites and long array of priests and pomp of their processions, were all calculated deeply to impress the observer. The walls were covered with hieroglyphics descriptive or laudatory of the exploits of earlier kings. The pyramids then presented a smooth surface of clear, sharp outline, tapering to a point. No foot had ever pressed their summit since the last work of the artist had begun the outward casing. In the cavern-tombs the sculpture and painting, though in many instances of several centuries old, were still in all their pristine beauty. Some of them were only recently finished, in some the artists were still at work, while in other places labourers were busy hewing out the rock for new depositories of the dead.

If entertained in one of the adjoining villas, the visitor, when he first entered the gate, which was flanked on both sides by a lofty tower, found himself in a spacious garden, laid out in lawns and flower beds, and shaded walks, and ponds of water, and groups of trees. A stately mansion rose before him, with another entrance similar to that through which he had passed; and this, again, led him to an interior court, also adorned with lawn and shrubbery and flowers, and from which doors admitted to different rooms of the house, which enclosed it. In the rear was another entrance scarcely less stately than that in front. And still further on, and beyond the stables and farm-yard, extended the same beautiful garden. The whole was enclosed by a solid wall or embankment, for upon the soft verdure and scrupulous neatness of the garden the waters of the inundation were not permitted to intrude. All the watering was

carefully done by hand, from tanks within the enclosure, or from a canal on the outside, connected with the river. Among the fruit-trees were to be found the palm, the peach, the fig, the olive, the almond, and the pomegranate; and the grape, cultivated largely, was trained upon arbours, or pruned down to self-supporting stems. In order to avoid injuring the trees, monkeys were employed to gather the fruit and hand it down to the gardener. A variety and profusion of flowers were raised; for Egyptian ladies considered bouquets indispensable to the comfort of the bath and toilet, as well as to the completeness of an evening dress. Nor was that part of the garden designed for supply of the kitchen neglected, nor the preserves for game, nor the fish in the ponds, nor the places assigned to the poultry and other animals kept for the table. Room after room in the lordly mansion itself was stored with various kinds of provisions, the greater part of the ground-floor being so occupied.

Servants, in great numbers, were busy in preparing the materiel of the entertainment. Everything was done within the villa, even to the killing and dressing of the meat. Servants of new guests were successively arriving to announce their masters. But in the midst of all that activity, so completely was each one acquainted with his place, and so scrupulously excluded from every other, that perfect order prevailed.

Within he heard the sound of music, and might distinguish the tones of the harp, the guitar, and the pipe. Upon entering he found the company, consisting of both ladies and gentlemen, for the seclusion of woman was yet unknown, assembled in an elegantly furnished and decorated apartment. The seats which they occupied were of various kinds, but each characterized by some beautiful device. Many of them were chairs like the best of modern manufacture, and some were large arm chairs of the most tasteful designs and carving, stuffed and lined with rich fabrics of various colours.

At dinner the guests did not recline on couches, but retained their chairs. And the repast was prolonged with conversation and music, and the exhibition of dancers. Afterwards, various amusements were introduced, among which the favourite was a game somewhat like that of chess, to which timekillers had

recourse in that day, as they now have to cards. They also used wine, and some of them with a freedom which the monuments have not shrunk from recording.

In the morning the owner of the villa and his friends were often astir before sunrise, and with a large retinue of servants with hunting apparatus, and dogs and trained lions, ready for the chase. The servants were hunters by trade, and assisted in the sport, but the nobleman reserved to himself and his friends the privilege of using the bow.

A similar scene of national prosperity and individual comfort spread before him, as he wended his way up the river, passing among many illustrious cities, the residence chosen by the kings of the sixth dynasty, and so much favoured by the artists of the twelfth, or turned aside into the valley of lake Moeris, and contemplated that isolated paradise and the wonders of the ancient labyrinth, or lingered among the still accumulating treasures of Chemmis and Abydos, or the antiquated walls of This, until he landed in Thebes, the new capital of the united kingdom.

Already some of the great architectural works which distinguished that city were finished, and others begun, which, though long suspended, were afterwards completed with augmented splendour, when the now declining power of the Pharaohs was restored. Especially were the designs of Sesortosen I. marked by that grandeur, which ultimately became a feature of the whole. The place was an object of national veneration as the residence of Ammon-Ra, the king of their gods, and its native name No-Ammon, or "The abode of Ammon," recognized its consecration to the tutelary deity, in whose honour several temples were then and subsequently built. Of these, a celebrated one, perhaps the most ancient, was that called *Ap*. By prefixing the feminine article *t*, and adding the plural termination *u*, the word became *Tapu*, and thus was often employed in the hieroglyphic writings for the city, meaning the temples, or, perhaps, the city of temples. In the Memphitic dialect it became *Thaba*, which the Greeks, in later times, represented in their *Thebai*. The whole history of Egypt, after the holy place of Ammon became the principal royal residence, was connected with this temple. All prosperous native dynasties contributed either to its enlargement, embellishment, or restoration. Its distinction began with

the first Sesortosen, and, in the time of Abraham, it stood in all the simple majesty of its primitive design. In its ultimate enlargement, under the Rameses, it became the most stupendous temple ever constructed by human hands, and even now, after more than three thousand years, the traveller still lingers in astonishment amid the ruins of Karnak.

The first settlement of Egypt having been made about the head of the Delta, Memphis naturally became the royal city, but as population advanced up and down the river, the presence of the government was needed also towards the extremities. The pressure was first experienced upon the south, from the opposite advance of the hardly less prosperous Cushites on the upper Nile. Royalty accordingly fixed its principal abode in Thebes. But the northeastern extremity also needed the care of him who commanded the defences of the nation, and hence the royal city of Zoan, or Tanis, rose beside the sea, constituting the stronghold from which the Egyptian kings guarded the eastward access to their kingdom. The adjoining district of Goshen lay in fertile fields along the Tanite branch of the Nile, and spread into fine pastures far eastward to the verge of the desert. It was there that Abraham pitched his tent and fed his herds, when the famine was sore in the land of Canaan, and there, more than two hundred years later, did Joseph plant his brethren, on a similar occasion. It was also there that Israel was afterwards oppressed, and the wonders of God were wrought by the hand of Moses and Aaron for their deliverance. The visit of the patriarch led him to the very scene of his posterity's humiliation. The royal residence to which Sarah was taken could be no other than Zoan. For the notion of a nomade chief being permitted to drive his flocks and herds through all the cultivated fields of Egypt to the very walls of Memphis is out of the question, and utterly inconsistent with the facts of the narrative. Moreover, Zoan was the only capital of Egypt recognized in Hebrew history until the times succeeding Solomon; and very naturally, for it was the point from which Egyptian princes conducted their affairs with Syria and the further East. The district to which Zoan was the capital, was all the land of Egypt to the Hebrews of the exode. It was the Tanite branch of the Nile that Moses struck with his rod in

the sight of Pharaoh, and the cities which the Hebrews built for Pharaoh were in the district to the eastward from it, on the line of the ancient Red Sea canal.

The exclusive policy of the early Egyptians, whereby they kept their knowledge of the arts to themselves, and repelled the attempts of foreigners to penetrate the mysteries of their country, except in the case of those who by express petition obtained leave to settle in it, also goes to account for the fact that a genuinely internal view of Egypt during her best days is not to be obtained from any other quarter than her own monuments.

Of this great and populous country, to whose borders the patriarch had now come down, the civil and social order was perhaps not the best, but certainly the most completely carried out and longest maintained of ancient times. The elements of every department in it were marked by perpetuity, and seem to have preceded the settlement on the Nile. Conservatism was the spirit of the nation and manifested itself in all their institutions, as if everything had been revealed directly from on High, or established by some other primeval authority, whom it would have been impious to disobey. Prescriptive order and authority were sacred in their eyes. No man presumed to step out of the routine to which his birth assigned him. Art, as well as the occupations of industry, belonged to hereditary orders, and aspirations after excellence were religiously confined within very narrow bounds, extending only to the style of execution. Possessing many features of a vast socialistic phalanx, Mizraim aimed at maintaining the well-being of all his people by extinguishing the individuality of each. The enterprise of a caste in their own appointed sphere was legitimate, that of its separate members must be repressed. With them civilization contemplated external results, and estimated only the work that was done. And though religion covered all and controlled all, yet their very religion was in its popular aspect entirely material and sensual. A vague but oppressive sense of spiritual domination pervading the whole life of society was the only apprehension entertained by the people of the unseen God. The order of their government was to them like that of nature, mysterious, sacred, and not to be reversed. Its authority was recognized as from above, of some supernatural source; but all

that reached their understandings was rites and ceremonies, and material things. Their notions of the future existence of the soul were confounded with the preservation of the body, and their ideas of a place of blessedness, with sepulture in an honoured tomb. In life and in death alike, their views were materialistic and objective.

And yet, upon a more intimate study of their religion at its depositories in the hands of the priests, it was found to be, at bottom, a pure and spiritual theism, exhibiting unmistakable marks of a divine origin. It was on this that the priests, who monopolized the learning of the nation, sustained their faith, and to them all the various gods, presented to the people, were but symbols of the attributes of the only living and true God, or parables instructive of his acts. Not the less, however, were they guilty of enjoining upon the people a low and degrading idolatry. For no idolatry is ever defended, as such, by its philosophers.

The source of authority over the Egyptian mind was only one. No distinction was made between the regal and the sacerdotal; for the king was also the high priest of the nation, and when not born of the sacerdotal caste, was solemnly initiated into it upon coming to the throne. And the idea of popular sovereignty was foreign to all their thoughts, perhaps never occurred, as an original conception, to any descendant of Ham. Alike, in Babel, in Canaan, in Ethiopia, in Arabia and in Egypt, whenever we obtain a glimpse of their government, it is found to be a monarchy, and in most cases, perhaps in all, a sacerdotal monarchy, at once sustained and regulated by a sacerdotal aristocracy, itself regulated by preëxisting institutions regarded with the profoundest veneration. And in the earlier times, undoubtedly, that hereditary faith was pure and true. Even in the days of Abraham, when degeneracy had already far progressed, a genuine piety and fear of the true God existed in some of those priestly kings, as exhibited in the cases of Abimelech of Gerar, Melchizedek of Salem, and the Pharaoh then resident at Zoan. But it was in Egypt that this, as well as most other elements of Hamite civilization reached its fullest development. The genuineness of the original basis of their religion, the careful instruction of the priesthood therein, and

their unfeigned faith in what their mysteries revealed to them, secured the permanence of all those institutions founded thereupon. In one sense, all Egypt was a sacerdotal system, inasmuch as all its institutions proceeded from and were controlled by the sacred statutes, which it was impiety to violate. To this cause was owing the long duration of the same form of government, extending, at the lowest computation, to little less than two thousand years, and the regularity of its working. Changes of dynasties and conflicts of rival dynasties occurred; but the order of society and the nature of government remained unchanged until the Persian conquest, and was not entirely subverted even by the Greek. The genius of the hierarchy was necessarily conservative of interests so completely its own; for the military caste was only a priesthood consecrated to the defence of the country in war. The farmers, mechanics and workmen of various kinds, were all sacredly set apart to their respective occupations, and all equally interested in preserving that order whereby they were protected therein, and secured in the monopoly of its profits; and the fertility of their soil and genialness of their climate, which rendered the wants of the poor few and easily supplied, removed the common cause of discontent from that class who enjoyed less benefit from the system, and who, under another state of things, might have been disposed to rebel. Moreover, the ramifications of that socialistic order, as it may fairly be called, were such as to provide for all classes of the true Egyptian people.

The whole population of the country was grouped into masses for the effecting of given ends, which were thereby achieved with a completeness and power unprecedented, and in many instances unparalleled. Hundreds of thousands labouring all their lives, and for long successive generations, upon the same work, and all submitting to the same authority, and following the same sacred model, necessarily produced external results of a magnitude and uniformity otherwise unattainable. And such are the works of Egypt. Nations, to whom such organization is unknown, look upon them with wonder. At the same time that all classes of the people were in their prescribed sphere provided for, to live in idleness was not permitted to any who were capable of work. In this respect every man was strictly

taken account of by the authorities of the district to which he belonged, and was bound under a penalty to report himself to them at certain periods, and state the way in which he spent his time. On the other hand, all original enterprise was practically forbidden, and the steps of improvement confined within such narrow limits, that their advance can scarcely be perceived in the course of centuries. The amount of work done increases, with some improvement or decline in the style of execution; but the style of art is the same, from beginning to end. Sculptures of the age of Cheops are of the same character as those of the Rameses; nor was there any essential improvement in their painting from the earliest to the latest. Writing was as well known, as well executed, and apparently as common in the fourth dynasty as in the eighteenth. Conventionality dominated over all. According to the institutions of their ancestors, a meaning was to be conveyed in every form and colour, which any change, no matter how great an improvement in itself considered, would have marred. With them art did not represent, but symbolized its subjects, and, in all its branches, partook more or less of the nature of writing.

In like manner all departments of industry were moulded by their respective conventionalities. In medicine, the treatment of diseases had been authoritatively prescribed by the founders of the profession. The laws forbade any other. If a physician pursued that method, he was exonerated from all blame, whatever was the result, but if he adopted any other, and the patient died, he was liable to a prosecution for murder. Under such a ban, of course, experiments were few. Yet physicians were less severely constrained than many others.

In short, the Egyptian system undervalued individual man, and compelled him to become a fraction of a professional body. Whoever rose to distinction in that country, did so, not by original enterprise, but as the head of his business.

Agriculture was the chief employment of the people. Though manufactures and commerce also flourished, and though much wealth consisted in cattle and in pastures, the foundation of their national prosperity was the produce of the farm. It also conspired to the same end with their sacerdotal conservatism. Of all types of civilization the agricultural is the most perma-

ment. Slow in progress, and tending to fixedness of customs, but the most reliable when left to the free action of its own laws; and even if interrupted for a time, the most vigorous in recovering from the injuries of invasion or bad government.

Until the time of Abraham such were the world's chief masters and leaders in refinement, and such the precedence among them, then and for centuries afterwards, due to Egypt.

But jealous eyes had looked upon the vast and beautiful possessions of the sons of Ham, while the vice, become prevalent in some of their states, had forfeited their right to hold them. The Shemites, who had already struggled successfully with their masters on the Euphrates and Tigris, were now, from their hitherto narrow territory and feebler resources, beginning to encroach upon the dominions of their more powerful neighbours. Chederlaomer, king of Elam, had even then obtained predominance over the original seat of empire, and, leading the neighbouring kings in his train, extended his conquests as far as the plain of Jordan. For the most part, however, the pressure of the Shemites down upon the territory of Ham proceeded peacefully. A large body of them crossing the whole breadth of the desert, had also penetrated to the land of Egypt, not at first, it would appear, in military array, nor with ostensible hostility, but as a peaceful nomadic immigration, gradually accumulating in numbers and moving further into the country. One of their advanced parties, a family group of thirty-seven, appears upon a monument of the twelfth dynasty. The scribe, who introduces them to the royal officer, presents a papyrus, upon which the date of their entrance is given as the sixth year of Sesortosen II. At first indulged, from their peaceful attitude and occupations, and apparent weakness, they acquired boldness with their increasing numbers, while an unfortunate schism in the government of Egypt paralyzed the means of resistance. Having made their appearance on the border towards Syria about the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth dynasty, they slowly pushed forward, followed up by more of their countrymen, until they secured possession of the whole district connected with Zoan and Bubastis. The Theban rulers, aroused by this aspect of things, attempted to drive them back but failed, and were themselves compelled to withdraw from

the lower country. Memphis, thereby, fell into the hands of the invaders, together with much, if not all, of that part of Egypt, which still looked to Memphis for its government. But only while the native monarchy was divided did the shepherds retain this partial dominion.

While the descendants of Scsortosen were enfeebled and embarrassed by the rivalry of the Choïte pretenders, it was impossible for them to repel the foreign enemy. Thus three rival monarchies divided the country; the invaders ruling in Memphis, the native pretenders in Choïs, while the heirs of the ancient kings still retained the palace of Thebes and the sovereignty of southern Egypt. We find no sufficient reason for believing that the rule of the shepherds ever extended to the upper country.

In process of time, the internal rivalry was settled in favour of the Theban race by the defeat or extinction of the Choïte dynasty. A more vigorous resistance was immediately organized against the shepherds. They were compelled to evacuate Memphis and retreat towards the eastern border, where, being reinforced by fresh arrivals of their countrymen, they made a vigorous resistance. Fortifying Abaris, a city on the edge of the desert, they successfully defended it for a number of years. In the meanwhile the reunited monarchy of Egypt recovered its hold upon the confidence of the people, and repaired its long divided and diminished resources. The kings of the eighteenth dynasty came to a throne, which, like that of Ferdinand and Isabella in Spain, hardly needed the expulsion of the enfeebled foreigners to secure its universal acknowledgment. It had become a point of honour rather than a necessity of self-preservation. Favourable terms were offered to the brave defenders of Abaris. Permitted to march out with the honours of war, on condition of leaving the country, they retired into Syria, and disappeared from Egyptian history. Such are the principal points of that invasion, as obtained through Josephus from Manetho, compared with the royal lists. And though the particulars of the affair and the shape in which they are presented may be questionable, the general fact is corroborated by the great ethnic movement of that time. As the notices of it appear in Manetho, they imply that the invasion was not one of an army

carrying everything before it by one great impulsion, but the slowly accumulating pressure of successive companies of immigrants continued through several generations, at first received with indulgence and perhaps even friendship.

That those invasions of Shem were early begun and long continued, because comparatively feeble, appears from the fact that while, according to the monuments of Wady Maghara, they entered the peninsula of Sinai as early as the fourth Egyptian dynasty, they did not reach Egypt in dangerous force until the middle of the thirteenth, and had not succeeded in obtaining possession of Sinai until the eighteenth. The father-in-law of Moses was prince and high priest of a Cushite people, then holding peaceful occupation of that very country. Commentators have debated whether he was priest or prince. He was both, according to the custom of his race. Nor must the similarity of the name lead us to confound his people with the Midian descended from Abraham. These latter lived in a far distant land to the east of Moab.

That the journey of Abraham and the removal of the family of Jacob into Egypt belonged to that great series of migrations admits not of a doubt, and that the descendants of Jacob afterwards suffered under the hatred which came to attach to the whole class of foreigners is also clear. Thus, we find that they are received with favour when they come down to Egypt. Shepherds being regarded as an abomination by the Egyptians is no argument for a previous rule of that class, arising, as it did, merely from the low caste of herdsmen in Egypt, which had existed long before, and which, though it caused that class of persons to be despised, did not amount to hostility. The later bitterness manifested towards the Hebrews finds no sufficient cause in anything recorded of them and their peaceful employments, but naturally arose from the long-continued enmity existing between the Theban princes and that foreign race with whom they were not unreasonably confounded. It is not to be wondered at that the Diospolitan kings, who had long warred with Shemitic invaders, should hate all who bore the common features of Shem, and, having driven their armed enemies from the country, should deem it necessary to crush this more peaceful branch of the same stock, lest they might

strengthen a recurring invasion. Of the particulars, however, of the synchronism it is impossible, in the present state of our knowledge, to speak with certainty.

Where the shepherds, who had acquired a military character in Egypt, afterwards settled is left in the dark. Manetho, as quoted by Josephus, says that they founded Jerusalem. Suspicion may rest upon that statement, but that they went into Syria does not appear liable to any objection; and together with this fact it may be proper to mention another belonging to the great ethnic change, though it would be rash to assume their identity, namely, that sometime during those ages, the Shemites had possessed themselves, whether peacefully or by force we know not, of the country and city of Sidon; for although the testimony to original Hamite settlement there is clear and indubitable, yet when the states of Sidon and Tyre come into the light of history, they are found to consist of a Shemite population. Although we have no direct testimony to the particular causes whereby that change was effected, yet the change itself is just what a student of the period should expect, being of a piece with the great change then going on—the gradual transfer of dominion from one race to the other.

At some point also within the same period, the Chaldees descended from the highlands of Mesopotamia, and reducing or expelling the Cushites of Shinar, possessed themselves of that rich plain, which afterwards bore their name, and which they continued to hold, with increasing dominion, until the invasion of Cyrus.

The emigration of Abraham clearly belonging to the earlier of these movements, though in its time apparently of very inferior importance, actually, in the end, eclipsed them all, and turned out to be the one containing the germ of the highest Shemitic civilization. Chedorlaomer spread devastation and enforced submission to his arms from Elam to Arabia Petræa and the Jordan, and no doubt filled the civilized world with his fame; but after his ignominious defeat near Damascus, he disappears from history, and whatever he may have retained elsewhere, all his dominion on the borders of Canaan came to an end. And though the shepherds held a partial sovereignty in Egypt even for the longest period claimed for them, it is cer-

tainly true that they were at last expelled. On the other hand, the family of Abraham, peaceful and unpretending, of great wealth indeed, but laying no claim to empire or reputation, eventually supplanted, destroyed or absorbed all the Hamite nations from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean and the borders of Egypt, and to the whole length and breadth of the peninsula of Arabia; in short, excluded them from all their territory in Asia, and erected there a higher and purer civilization.

In the mean while the materialistic tendencies of the previous inhabitants had proceeded to a degree of hopeless corruption. In Egypt the severity of national order and the moral restraints wielded by a highly intelligent class, who justly apprehended their interest therein, perpetuated civilization, long after the kindred race in Asia had perished. While Israel was in the wilderness and making the conquest of Canaan, and forming himself in adaptation to his new possession, under the judges, Egypt saw the summit of her grandeur, under the gifted princes of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. But long ere that time, the children of Lot had vanquished and supplanted the Emim and Zuzim, aborigines of the land anciently called Ham, to the east of the Dead Sea; Ishmael had spread over north-western Arabia, the sons of Abraham by Keturah had been sent out to the habitable parts of Arabia eastward, and had, in their turn, given forth colonies who ultimately seized upon the southern part of that peninsula, while Esau had subdued the Horim, and established himself in the fastnesses of their rocky land, and laid the foundations of Petra.

Consequently the victory of Israel in Canaan was the crowning act of Shemitic progress. All the preceding advantages had gone to prepare the way for it. States, which would naturally have been the allies of the Canaanites, had already been broken down or removed. Nations of giants, who in war by the sword would have been such formidable antagonists, had already fallen separately, and their places were occupied by kinsmen of Israel. And when, after the long tutelage of the judges, Israel attained the complete shape of his nationality under David and Solomon, the race to which he belonged had also reached its culmination.

The emigration of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees was,

therefore, an event relatively as important in history as it is in religion. It was the most effective step in a general ethnic movement, which brought about one of the grandest changes in the world's progress, whereby the leadership of civilization was transferred from one branch of mankind to another, at the juncture when the common interest of progressive humanity demanded it. When the Hebrews reached their highest distinction, Egypt was still great, but the splendour of the Ramesides—her golden age—had passed away. It was not to Israel that she was ordained to transmit the sceptre of political or military sway, and her duration in those respects did not cease until her true successor came; but a spiritual reformation, whereby the genuine elements of declining refinement should be taken up and further developed, with addition of others, had become an urgent necessity. And such was the work to which Hebrew culture was addressed, and in which it was at once the successor of Egypt and incomparably her superior.

Material and external effects and the refinement of symbolic art had been attained by the preceding race, in a degree peculiar to themselves. To this end had their powerful physical frames, their strongly sensuous propensities, and the mysterious and awful gloom of their religion converged. In some of their branches, as in Canaan, the sensuous element ultimately prevailed, and religion became only a system of bloody and revolting rites; in others, as in Egypt and Ethiopia, the sensuous nature was held in check by a religion associating itself mysteriously with almost every form of material things. That religion, however, though it long succeeded in attaching a mystic sanctity to the material, was itself finally lost therein. In this respect a reform was imperatively demanded, which the dominant race had incapacitated itself to make; and to this one end was the whole existence of the Hebrew people addressed. As Egypt accomplished stupendous material works, which even in their ruins are the wonder of the world, so the religious reformation, of which the Hebrews were constituted agents, is still the head and fountain of genuine religion and refinement.

Egypt, though broken by the Assyrian and Chaldean, did not yield up her sceptre until a more powerful successor appeared in the empire of the Medes and Persians. Then, at length, the

long declining sun of Hamite civilization went down in a night which gives no sign of a returning morrow.

The decline of a great nation is generally prolonged, and seldom reaches extinction until a successor has come to maturity; and occasionally, as in certain diseases of the individual body, brief flashes of energy beguile into a temporary hope that the better days are about to return, but it is only the flickering of the slowly dying flame. Again hope is overcast, despondency recurs, energy droops, and the doomed race bending to the earth plods on to obscurity and death. The pioneers of civilization maintained for a thousand years that slowly progressive decay, and finally became, not absorbed, but lost to view among the masses of population which crowded in to occupy their country and obliterate the labours of their predecessors. It is not into the condition from which it arose that a sinking nation returns; the weakness of childhood is very different from that of dotage. The Canaanites were destroyed before the face of Israel, and left no remnant; and all that now represents the seed of Mizraim, if the wanderers who claim that honour are to be rejected, are a few feeble and still diminishing families, who have lost even the language of their fathers, and are slaves where their fathers ruled.

In Ethiopia a similar degeneracy exists; otherwise the sons of Cush occupy their ancient African dominion. Among them dispersion early checked the progress of civilization, and successive ages have perpetuated that evil, while the more distant colonies have sunk the lowest. But they remain undesponding in barbarism, for they have no traditions of better times and no feeling of decline. Their condition is that of the yet untilled, not of the exhausted soil. From Abyssinia and the Gulf of Aden across the continent to the Bight of Biafra, and thence over its whole length and breadth southward, is still held by the kinsmen of the world's first master, but who never partook of either his dominion or his refinement.

In like manner Shemitish colonies early wrested the civilization of North Africa out of the hands of Phut, and these were followed by successive waves of Japhetic conquest, each obliterating the steps of its predecessor. As to the origin of those tribes, who, under the names of Tuaryk, Kabylic, Tibbo, and

others, claim to be descended from the primitive inhabitants, there is no positive information. It is not at all probable that they are unmixed. We naturally inquire what has come of the populous colonies, which succeeded each other there, within the period of history? Where are the posterity of the Phenicians, Romans, Greeks, Vandals? They certainly have not all merged into Arabs: and we know of nothing that could go to extinguish any of them, unless perhaps the Phenician. North Africa was too accessible to Europe and too inviting to be suffered to remain in the hands of its early settlers, on any other condition than that of their unqualified and continual superiority. At all events, there can be little doubt that the present inhabitants of that country are of Shemitic and Japhetic stock. The only people who now bear the name of Phut have their dwelling to the south of the great desert of Sahara.

If we are correct, therefore, in our understanding of the facts, the inhabitants of Africa south of the desert are the only remaining nations who can claim their descent from Ham—the uncivilized members of that race to whom the civilization of the world so long pertained. The civilized branches of it have perished. The barbarous remain. Whatever may be the hope or the fate of the latter, we are not justified in saying that the race, as a whole, has fared worse than their neighbours; for neither of the other two great stocks has ever been wholly civilized, and both have suffered, in some of their branches, all the evils to which it has been exposed. And if the surviving members of it have been helplessly shut up to their own barbarism, and subject to frequent deportation of individuals, they have been singularly exempted from the evils of foreign war. As little are we justified in undervaluing the capacities of that race on account of its existing representatives. Its day is past; but it was a long and a brilliant one. Hamite civilization, undivided and absolute, ere any other aspired to share its honours, covers all those ages which lie between the dispersion of mankind and the conquest of Canaan, and reached its culmination when the sons of Japhet were barbarians, or producing nothing that has left a trace upon the earth, and while the fathers of the Hebrew people were yet nomadic chiefs.

ART. IV.—*The Scope and Plan of the Book of Ecclesiastes.*

IN order to the proper understanding of any treatise, it is necessary to gain clear and correct ideas of its scope and plan. There is no book of the Old Testament to which this remark applies with greater force than *Ecclesiastes*, and none in which the neglect of it has been and must be attended with more serious injury to its exposition. Its proverbial dress creates a special need of taking comprehensive views of the writer's main design, and not being diverted from this by cleaving too anxiously to the tenor of each individual expression. The ill success of too many attempted expositions has shown, that if the clue thus furnished to all its intricacies and windings be not discovered or be lost sight of, the book becomes a labyrinth, within whose mazes the improvident adventurer is hopelessly entangled; and each verse becomes to him a new passage leading to fresh perplexity, however honestly and assiduously he may labour upon its interpretation. The general truths inculcated by proverbs of course admit either of being taken in their widest extent, or of receiving an indefinite number of particular applications. Which of these expresses the precise intent of the writer, in each individual case, can never be learned from the inspection of single sentences by themselves, but only from a discovery of the place which it holds in the discussion of his theme. And an erroneous view of this theme or of the method of its discussion, will necessarily involve attaching meanings to passages very different from those which they were intended to bear.

Another difficulty connected with that just spoken of, and of a like nature, arises from the absence of particles in every case to indicate the connection or the relation of dependence which the various sentences or paragraphs sustain to each other. This is partly due to the venerable simplicity of the Hebrew language, in which such particles do not abound, and with which it agrees better to suggest relations by the juxtaposition of related ideas, than formally and precisely to state them. It is also partly due to the proverbial style already referred to, which charac-

teristically delights to state truths in the general and the absolute, leaving their limitations and specific relations to be gathered from the connection in which they are adduced.

The inattentive and superficial reader might infer from the peculiarities now stated, and which would be among the first to attract his attention, that this book was composed of loose and detached sentences, without orderly consecution or intimate coherence. This mistaken view was in fact taken by Grotius, who supposed that *Ecclesiastes* contained no proper discussion of any one theme, but a miscellancous collection of the varying opinions of different sages upon topics connected with human happiness. He thus explained those contradictions or diversities of judgment which he imagined to be found in the book; and likewise escaped the necessity of regarding any sentiment as authoritative or inspired which he was disinclined to accept. It is but a slight modification of this opinion of Grotius to regard the book as a record of the various opinions maintained in a learned assembly or society presided over by Solomon.

Another view, which rises above this conception of a chaos of discordant materials, and yet assumes the existence of conflicting sentiments in the book, endeavours to reconcile these into a common unity by the hypothesis of a dialogue between two voices, one that of an earnest but rash inquirer, the other his sage and experienced teacher, who endeavours to curb the hasty impatience and inconsiderate views of the former, and to inculcate upon him the lessons of sobriety and heavenly wisdom. But the harmony of the sentiments here maintained can be vindicated without the necessity of this theory, which finds no support from any intimations in the text itself. The same may be said of the opinion which supposes instead of different speakers, different states of mind in the same speaker; who begins the discussion in a tumult of doubt between conflicting views, and speaks now under the influence of one, now of another, as they respectively obtrude themselves upon him, until at the close of the whole he ultimately reaches clear and settled convictions.

Among those who admit a single theme consistently discussed, there is still a divergence as to what that theme is, arising principally from an undue predominance being given to

some one part of the book or class of passages in it, instead of each being held in its just subordination and relations. Some have paid too exclusive attention to what is said of the vanity of earthly pursuits. So Jerome, and after him the commentators of the middle ages, generally made of it an argument for the renunciation of the world and a life of monasticism. So in modern times Umbreit thought it to be a treatise on the chief good, which the author tinged with scepticism and gloom endeavours to show is unattainable. Others, looking solely at such passages as declare that it is good for a man to eat and to drink and to enjoy life, have charged the author with Epicurean sentiments, as though worldly pleasure were in his esteem the highest form of good, and what men should chiefly strive after. This view, and that first stated are directly antagonistic and mutually destructive. The author cannot teach both that earthly pleasure is vanity and that it is the chief good. The book will be involved in endless complication and self-contradiction upon either of these views. The only way to harmonize it is to suffer one class of statements to modify and assist in explaining the other. To him whose heart is inordinately set on earthly things, and who fancies that by accumulating whatever affords gratification, he can fill and satisfy his soul, every thing will prove vanity as regards this impracticable end which he is seeking; for his desires invariably outrun his acquisitions, his feverish toil is incompatible with serene enjoyment; their continued possession in the future is uncertain and their loss at death inevitable. Still, he who knows how to use the world, who contentedly and thankfully receives the good things which God gives him, and without immoderate desires partakes of them rationally and in obedience to the will of God, will find in them much real satisfaction. This life has a positive value, which should not be overlooked; and it is a lesson of no small consequence, how it may be rendered most peaceful and happy. The enjoyment of life, which this book commends, is as far as possible from a wild and senseless revelry, which it denominates insane and profitless, ii. 1, 2; it is an enjoyment which is connected with doing good, iii. 12, and is indulged with a constant recollection of the judgment of God, xi. 9. Piety holds the key to the chamber of happiness. There is no entrance but by

her aid. He who would really extract from the world such enjoyment as it is capable of affording, can only do so by obedience to her injunctions. Otherwise, be a man's possessions what they may, they will end in vanity and emptiness. This is the aspect under which the happiness of men in the present life is here presented, and if this is Epicurean, the whole Bible is so too.

Others have given too exclusive prominence to such passages as i. 4—11, iii. 1—15, vii. 13, 14, ix. 11, in which the fixed and permanent order of things in the universe is insisted upon, and the regulation of everything is referred to the will of God; and they have hence drawn the conclusion that the book contains fatalistic sentiments, teaching the doctrine of an undeviating, inexorable fate, which leaves no room for human freedom, and allows no man to obtain profit from his labour. This fate it is vain to think of resisting; man must just submit and get whatever good his present circumstances put within his reach. But this is as much as the preceding a distortion of what is here taught. It is indeed asserted that man is not the uncontrolled arbiter of his own fortune; not, however, because he is a creature of fate, but because he is a subject of the wise and righteous government of God. The doctrine is not that of fate, but of Providence: and this, too, is intimately connected with the theme here discussed. As we look upon the world, everything seems to be moving at random, or to be directed by man's free will. Men act as they please, and the allotments distributed to each bear no manifest relation to their respective characters. There is much that, superficially viewed, has the appearance of disordered confusion. But that this is the real state of the case is here emphatically denied. The assertion is made and the proof given, that instead of confusion the most perfect and beautiful order prevails. Whether men see his hand or not, God is guiding and directing all; and everything is, as respects his consummate plan, just as it should be. He has dissociated sin and happiness; and no man can alter that arrangement so as to bring together what have been thus divinely separated. He who seeks for happiness in ways of worldliness and sin, seeks for what, by the very constitution of the universe, cannot be.

Too great prominence has again been sometimes given to such passages as iii. 17, v. 8, xi. 9, xii. 7, 14, and on the basis of these the future state and the coming judgment have been made the grand lesson here inculcated, as though it were the intention of the writer to turn the thoughts of his readers from the seeming inequalities of this world to the world to come, where all shall be rectified or explained. The error in this view is simply that of limiting the discussion within too narrow a range. The future judgment is explicitly asserted, and is one of the elements in the proper presentation of the subject. But this is not the sole view that is here taken, nor the sole answer which is returned to the perplexing problem of human life. It is most unaccountable how some writers have been able so utterly to misconceive the teachings of this book as to deny to its author any confident persuasion of the immortality of the soul, or anything more than a hesitating admission of its possibility. In basing this opinion upon iii. 19—21 and ix. 4—6, they not only interpret these passages incorrectly, even altering the text for this purpose, as will be seen hereafter, but bring them into irreconcilable conflict with such passages as those referred to above; a difficulty from which Knobel endeavours to escape by a German critic's ready weapon, the denial of the genuineness of xii. 9—14.

Attention has sometimes been directed to too great an extent to the seemingly miscellaneous character of the proverbs, in such passages as iv. 5, 6, 9—13, v. 1—7, vii. 1—9, 21, 22, x. 1—xi. 6, and the conclusion has hence been drawn that the design of the book is to give rules for the conduct of life, and to teach wisdom in general. This goes to the extreme of extending the theme too widely, as the preceding to that of unduly restricting it. Its aim becomes thus too vague and indefinite, and the main drift of the discussion is lost sight of. The writer does not spread his thoughts over the whole range of human action or the proprieties of life; but he has one definite subject before him, to which a proper treatment of the book will show that all his remarks are directed, and that with a closeness of argument and a clearness of presentation worthy of the wise king of Israel.

The problem really discussed is the seeming inequalities of

divine providence. These are here reconciled with the justice of God, as they are in the book of Job reconciled with his mercy and goodness. In other words, while Job had especially to do with the sufferings of the pious, Ecclesiastes contemplates the same subject chiefly from the side of the prosperity of the wicked. The difficulty to be explained is thus stated by the writer, vii. 15, "There is a just man that perisheth in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man that prolongeth his life in his wickedness." And viii. 14, "There is a vanity which is done upon the earth; that there be just men unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked; again, there be wicked men to whom it happeneth according to the work of the righteous." This apparent anomaly is shown not to be inconsistent with the righteousness of God's government. The position taken and established is, viii. 12, 13, "Though a sinner do evil an hundred times and his days be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God, which fear before him; but it shall not be well with the wicked, neither shall he prolong his days, which are as a shadow; because he feareth not before God." The solution which is furnished is twofold:—1. A proper estimate of men's fortunes and of their characters will show these inequalities to be much fewer than they appear to be. 2. There is a righteous government to rectify whatever inequalities may temporarily exist.

It is most interesting to observe the harmony of the grand lessons inculcated by Job and by Ecclesiastes. No two books could well be more unlike in their style and method of discussion. The problem upon which they are engaged is one of the most perplexing of human life. They approach it, too, from quarters the most diverse. And yet the principles which underlie their solutions are identical. The book of Job reconciles the sufferings of the pious by saying, (a) Their afflictions though a seeming evil are a real good. (b) The perfections of God are an ample security for the rectitude and goodness of his dispensations. Ecclesiastes says of the prosperity of the wicked, (a) It yields no real good, but vanity and vexation of spirit. (b) The justice of God secures that all is and shall be right under his holy government.

That the main design of this book has been correctly stated,

shall be shown hereafter in detail. Before proceeding to this, however, it may be readily established in a general way by the testimony of the author himself. This is in the first place given in a formal manner at the close of the book, xii. 13, 14, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man," *i. e.*, the whole of his duty and destiny, his entire welfare, all that concerns him is centered here and depends on this single thing. "For God shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." In other words, man's true welfare is only to be secured by fearing God and obeying his will; for in spite of any present appearances to the contrary, every good deed, open or secret, shall be divinely rewarded, and every evil deed divinely punished. This is given by the author as the final result of the experience, observations, and reasonings recorded in his book. And this is precisely what has been already represented to be its aim.

A second mode in which the writer declares himself as to this point, is by certain forms of statement which recur again and again from the beginning to the close. We cannot be mistaken in deducing from these the topic which is ever in his thoughts, and to whose illustration his whole argument is directed. There are two series of these statements; one of which contains the negative, and the other the positive view of his subject. Their combination will give a just conception of his idea. The first consists of those in which it is repeatedly declared of all those accumulations and sources of gratification which men so eagerly covet, and after which they so unceasingly toil, that they are vanity and pursuit of wind, (Eng. ver., vexation of spirit.) They are no real good, but constantly disappoint their possessors of the satisfaction which they had hoped by this means to obtain. The second series consists of those, in which it is declared that there is nothing better for a man than to eat and to drink, and to enjoy the fruit of his labour; and this is the gift of God to them that please him. That this is not an Epicurean sentiment, has been already seen. The eating and drinking which Solomon commends, is not the gratification of sensual appetite. To eat and to drink, by a common figure in all languages, denotes to partake of what may be either pleasurable or painful. Comp.

Ps. xxxiv. 8, xxxvi. 8; Heb. vi. 4, 5; Job xxi. 20; Matt. xx. 23. Here the connection determines it to refer to what is pleasurable. In ii. 24, iii. 13, v. 18, "to eat and to drink" is explained by the parallel phrase, "to enjoy good," and in iii. 22, "to rejoice," stands as its equivalent. In ii. 25, "Who can eat more than I?" certainly does not mean who is a greater glutton, but who has more sources of gratification at his command? And in v. 19, vi. 2, to eat riches, wealth, and honour, can only mean to enjoy them. The meaning of this class of passages then is, that enjoyment, pleasure, happiness is a greater good than all these vain acquisitions which are attended with so little satisfaction. And enjoyment is God's gift to them that are pleasing in his sight. We thus reach once more the theme before propounded. Outward prosperity may be in possession of the wicked; but this is empty and unsubstantial. It does not necessarily confer happiness. This is only for the good.

The scope of the book being thus settled, we proceed to consider its plan. It is of course conceivable that the writer might discuss his theme without any orderly arrangement or methodical disposition of parts. He might merely give expression to his reflections upon it as they spontaneously occurred to him or were suggested by accidental association, without aiming to govern himself by any strict logical sequence. Some have maintained that this is the case with the book of Ecclesiastes. It is so with another book of Solomon's, the Proverbs. It is to some extent the case with other books of the Old Testament as well as with admired productions of uninspired genius. And it would cast no reflection upon the ability or excellence of this book to admit the same thing here.

Others have been of the opinion that the writer had a general plan in his mind, which he followed in the main, yet not so strictly but that he has indulged upon occasion in considerable digressions. Others have thought that there was a plan originally, but it has been obscured by negligent transcription and derangement of the text; and attempts have been made by transpositions and re-arrangement to restore it to its supposed original form and thus bring to light its proper plan; but the results have been as unsatisfactory as the procedure was unauthorized and the premises groundless. We must take the text

as we find it, which there is no reason to believe has been corrupted. The deficiency of arrangement which has been alleged, does not exist; and the alterations which have been proposed are not improvements. There is a clear and consistent plan in the book of Ecclesiastes, which needs no changes nor mutilations in order to its discovery; one in fact of the most strictly logical and methodical kind. Not only is the argument well conducted, conclusive and complete, but its various points are so admirably disposed, its divisions so regular, and its different parts so conformed in structure, as to give evidence that the whole was carefully considered and well digested before it was put together. This differs perhaps from the prevalent opinion, but we are convinced that they who complain of a want of method, *hærent in cortice*.

It would be tedious and confusing to enumerate in all their details the various divisions proposed by different commentators. Very many of them, however diverse in their minor subdivisions, will be found to rest ultimately upon the same essential scheme, the division of the book into two parts or grand leading sections. These are sometimes made unequal by assigning four chapters to the first and eight to the second; at other times equal, so that each contains six chapters. The principle assumed as the basis of the division is in either case the same, that the first contains the theoretical and the second the practical portion of the subject; the first establishes the vanity of earthly things, and the second the duties and obligations which this involves, and how man should demean himself in this vain world. There is so far a foundation for these schemes, that the tone of the book does become more hortatory and practical as it approaches its close; but the line of separation between its doctrine and exhortation is not so sharply defined as to render such a division between them practicable, as is shown in fact by the divided sentiment of those who undertake it. Hitzig's division into three parts of four chapters each, appears to be a lame attempt to mediate between the views already recited.

The most satisfactory division is, in our judgment, that into four parts, which was proposed by Vaihinger in the "Studien und Kritiken," for 1848, and has since been adopted by Keil and others. It is a modification of that of Ewald, (whom Heilig-

stedt follows,) which is itself an improvement upon that of Köster, all of whom assume the same number of sections. His scheme is the following, viz.

- I. i. 2—ii. 26.
- II. iii. 1—v. 20.
- III. vi. 1—viii. 15.
- IV. viii. 16—xii. 14.

It has a sanction of an external kind, inasmuch as it seems to be indicated by the writer himself, winding up each part by a formal statement of the conclusion of his argument, which in the first three is given in almost identical terms. This is the more worthy of note, as Solomon has indicated the divisions of his Song in a precisely similar way by the recurrence of a refrain. Its full justification depends upon its being shown that it is coincident with the actual course of the discussion, and that every part, without forcing or the assumption of arbitrary senses, fits into the scheme thus presented. Vaihinger was prevented from exhibiting this in a satisfactory manner by his predilection for strophes of equal length, into which he fancied the whole to be in the most precise manner subdivided. This encumbered his view and rendered it too artificial; while his too zealous pursuit of a merely mechanical regularity led him to lose sight of the proper divisions of the thought and of that regular structure which actually does exist. Each section contains, in addition to a brief conclusion, three subdivisions, not counted off into precisely the same number of verses, but with entire freedom as to length, and arising out of the nature of the subject discussed. Of the four principal sections the first and second are preliminary, the third contains the main body of the argument, and the fourth is supplementary.

The first and second sections are intended to pave the way for the discussion proper, by presenting facts and reasonings, upon which the considerations alleged for the settlement of the question at issue are then based. The first section, chaps. i. and ii., contains a preliminary argument from Solomon's own experience, designed to show that happiness is not in man's own power; that all his striving and toiling, though it may surround him with every source of gratification his heart can desire, is powerless to give that gratification itself. After

announcing, i. 1, the author, he proceeds to state his theme, i. 2, 3, the vanity of men's toil and acquisitions; they cannot yield the happiness so confidently expected from them. To the illustration of this theme he now proceeds. He first, i. 4—11, lays down the postulate essential to the validity of any general deductions from an individual experience of the uniformity of sequences in the world, where the same phenomena are constantly repeating themselves. The earth, with its established laws, abides through every shifting generation. The sun, the wind, the rivers in their constant motions, maintain their uniformity. The same is true, ver. 8, of every thing; one would never have done telling, seeing, hearing the numberless examples of like purport. The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be. There is nothing new. Things will happen in all time to come just as they have done in the past; though there is too little disposition to remember and profit by the lessons of experience.

Having thus established the universality and permanence of uniform sequences in the world, he proceeds to state his own experience with its results. The same results must, from the principle just laid down, follow in every like case; whence he is warranted in drawing from these premises the universal conclusion at which he is aiming. His experience is given first in general, i. 12—18, and then with more detail, ii. 1—11. The general account of it is rendered more emphatic by its repetition in precisely the same form, vs. 12—15, vs. 16—18. He describes first his favourable situation for trying a satisfactory experiment, ver. 12, ver. 16, he was a king, and superior to all former dwellers in Jerusalem; the experiment itself, vs. 13, 14 *a*, ver. 17 *a*, he tested everything, whether wise or foolish; the result, vs. 14 *b*, 15, vs. 17 *b*, 18, it was all empty and unsatisfactory. There was in everything he attempted something crooked that could not be made straight, or deficient that could not be rendered complete. There was always something to render the unalloyed happiness that he sought, unattainable; and that something could not be got rid of, for it arose from a vice inherent in earthly things. He then goes on, ii. 1—11, to specify more particularly some of the methods in which he sought happiness but failed to find it; merriment, conviviality,

splendid buildings, fine grounds, retinues, wealth, music. In fine, he surrounded himself with everything his heart desired; and yet surveying it all while still in the secure possession of it, he found it emptiness and vanity. It did not yield him happiness.

In addition to the unsatisfactory nature of these things in themselves, the brevity of their possession, and the uncertainty of what shall become of that which has been accumulated with so much pains and toil, are alleged, ii. 12—23, as fresh reasons for disappointment and vexation. Solomon had tried his experiment under circumstances as favourable as any man could have, ver. 12, and yet he found that whatever might be the intrinsic superiority of wisdom over folly, it could not preserve from death, which would consign him to oblivion, vs. 13—17, and hand over all his acquisitions, so painfully accumulated, to no one knows whom, vs. 18—23. And yet, for such a good as this, so unsatisfactory, so fleeting, and so precarious, men will toil and make themselves miserable all their days.

The conclusion from this experience of his own is drawn, vs. 24—26. Translated as it is in the common version, ver. 24 yields a good sense, and is conformed to iii. 12, 13, 22, v. 18, viii. 15. The meaning would be, that enjoyment or happiness is a better thing than all these unsatisfying accumulations which have been described, and which men toil so to obtain. The precise form of the conclusion in the original Hebrew is, however, slightly different. The word rendered "better," is not properly in the comparative degree. It should be read, "Good is not in man (*i. e.* within his power or control) that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy good in his labour." Man has not the ability in himself to extract enjoyment from his acquisitions. The ability to enjoy, which is quite distinct from the possession of things to be enjoyed, is the gift of God. Solomon's experience is conclusive upon this point; for no man could go beyond what he did. As enjoyment is the gift of God, he assigns it only to the good; but to the wicked he gives the empty and vexatious toil of accumulating what shall afterwards be converted to the uses of the good.

This point thus proved from Solomon's personal experience is in the second section, chaps. iii.—v., proved again from current

facts of observation. He here passes from what he had himself done and felt to what he had seen. The structure of the argument is precisely the same as before. There is first a postulate essential to its validity, iii. 1—15, then the facts observed, iii. 16—iv. 16, then reasonings upon them, v. 1—17, and finally the conclusion, v. 18—20. The uniform sequences of the first postulate are in the second, to meet the exigencies of this new argument, traced to their source in the all-embracing and admirable plan of God. He has a scheme in which every event, and all the multifarious actions of men, with the time of their occurrence, are definitely arranged. This scheme is, ver. 11, a beautiful one, though from their prevailing worldliness men do not comprehend it. (So the English version. It is probable, however, that this verse ought to be translated, "He hath set eternity in their heart, because no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end;" *i. e.*, He gives men an idea of the vastness and eternity of his plan from their very incapacity to comprehend the whole of it.) Human welfare consisting, ver. 12, in happiness and goodness is, ver. 13, constituted the gift of God by this, ver. 14, permanent and unalterable plan, whose aim is to lead to piety, and which, v. 15, embraces within itself that uniformity of sequence before insisted on.

He next proceeds to allege various facts, of constant occurrence in the world, upon which his argument is to be constructed. The first is, iii. 16, unrighteousness in halls of justice. It is so grievous an anomaly, that tribunals which are looked to for the rectifying of abuses existing elsewhere, should themselves originate injustice from which there appears to be no appeal; and this seems to be so serious an exception to his grand doctrine, that justice rules in the world and happiness attends right-doing, that he pauses to give its explanation before adducing the other facts which he has to allege. His postulate ensures, ver. 17, that this seeming inequality shall be rectified by God's future judgment, though meanwhile its existence is temporarily permitted, vs. 18—21, to prove men and to exhibit to them their frailty; for, however they may tyrannize over each other, death shall level them with the brutes. And yet how few consider their immortal nature, in which their real eminency lies? The

conclusion previously drawn is valid, therefore, even in this case, ver. 22, happiness, which requires no crime in order to its attainment, is better than the gains of the unjust judge, which he can no longer enjoy (רָאָה ב) after death.

We are certainly not disposed to yield to those who would alter the text of iii. 21, so as to change its assertion of man's immortality into an expression of doubt, "Who knoweth whether the spirit of man goeth upward, etc.," for the mere sake of making the writer contradict himself, and express a sentiment unworthy of his inspiration.

The remaining facts alleged are, iv. 1—3, oppressions so grievous as to make life a burden; vs. 4—6, the envy attendant upon success, which is an argument not for idleness but for moderation; vs. 7—12, the selfish toil of the solitary, unmindful of the advantages to be derived from society; vs. 13—16, the temporary nature of the most brilliant rewards of wisdom, illustrated by the case of one who raised himself by wise conduct from poverty to a throne, and yet who, after all, formed one in the endless procession of mankind unremembered and unpraised.

In proceeding to reason upon the facts now stated, he first, v. 1—7, utters a caution against being seduced to irreligion, to a neglect of religious duty, or to inconsiderate language reflecting upon God's providence by such contemplations. In regard to the case of oppression, which was the first that had been alleged, he appeals, ver. 8, to the fact that there is always a tribunal higher than those by whom it is perpetrated, to which appeal may be made, and ultimately, as the highest of all, there is the tribunal of God. Ver. 9 continues the same thought, and should be rendered, "Moreover a profit to the land in all is a king served by the field," (*i. e.*, land. Comp., field of Zoan, Ps. lxx. 12, 43.) Good government by a supreme officer, to whom respect and obedience are yielded, is a great blessing to a country. It is a source of the rectification of abuses such as those described. These wrongs, which are acknowledged to exist, find redress therefore in a superior government, human or divine.

In respect to the other cases alleged, considerations are adduced, vs. 10—17, freshly confirming the truth to which they point, of the unsatisfying nature of human toil and accumu-

lations. The first is, ver. 10, to the insatiable character of human desire, which always outruns acquisition, however great that may be. The second, ver. 11, that wealth is consumed by others more than by its owners. The third, ver. 12, that it occasions disquiet of mind. The fourth, vs. 13—16, that its possession is uncertain and brief. Its owner may lose it by "evil travail," by some unfortunate enterprise. He will certainly be stripped of the whole at death, and leave the world as naked as he entered it. And yet for so empty a good as this he will, ver. 17, spend all his days in painful and distressing toil.

The conclusion is, vs. 18—20, that not riches but enjoyment is the thing to be desired. The capacity to enjoy is independent of, and additional to worldly accumulations, and is the gift of God. He to whom God gives it, shall not distress himself with frequent recollections of past sorrows, or anxious solicitude for the future. The condition of this gift has been stated before, ii. 26, and is not here repeated. Men may be striving after it all their days and never attain it, if they do not seek it in that way in which, according to his uniform plan, he chooses to bestow it. Happiness and goodness are by him linked together. And only they who possess the latter can gain the former.

Having settled this preliminary point, both by his own experience and observation, he is now prepared in the third section, vi. 1, viii. 15, to grapple with the main question. He has shown, but without stating as yet to what he means to apply it, that enjoyment is preferable to worldly accumulations, that it does not necessarily result from them, but is the gift of God, and its bestowment is regulated by his grand and beautiful plan. The next step, and this constitutes the central portion of the whole book, is to apply this to the explanation of the inequalities of divine providence. Three considerations are adduced as furnishing the solution of this perplexing problem, so that we have, as in the preceding sections, three divisions and a conclusion. The inequalities in question may be explained,

1. vi. 1—vii. 15, by a just estimate of men's outward fortunes.
2. vii. 16—29, by a just estimate of their characters.
3. viii. 1—14, by a reference to government, human and divine, which will sooner or later distribute evenhanded justice.

In relation to the fortunes of men it is shown, chap. vi., that prosperity may not be a good. For a man may have wealth and honour and everything he wishes, and yet never have any enjoyment of them. The same is true of other forms of outward good, numerous children and long life, which even putting the case in the most extravagant and exaggerated form, may yield no pleasure. Human desires are insatiable. The advantage of the wise over the fool is, that he knows that the sight of the eyes is better than the wandering of the desire; he contents himself with what he has in actual possession, instead of allowing his desires to rove unsatisfied after unattained good. This incapacity of worldly things to yield enjoyment is, ver. 10, a permanent and unalterable fact, because resting upon the ordinance of God. As man is mere man, he cannot contend with nor set aside that connection between earthly things and dissatisfaction which the Almighty has established. Hence, vs. 11, 12, if external prosperity in so many cases only increases what is empty and unsatisfying, what real good or intrinsic advantage is there in it? In point of fact, no man knows in his ignorance of the future, whether outward prosperity will be an actual good to him or not.

Having thus presented one side of the subject, that prosperity is not always nor necessarily a good, he goes on, vii. 1—14, to state the converse, that adversity or affliction is not necessarily an evil, but may be, and often is, a greater good than prosperity itself. This is expressed by bringing together a number of proverbs, showing, vs. 1—4, that scenes of sadness, and, vs. 5, 6, what may occasion present pain, may prove more salutary in their effect than festivity and mirth. Ver. 7, "Oppression maketh a wise man mad;" the opportunity or the habit of oppressing others will turn the head of the best of men. Such elevation so abused will be no advantage, but the most serious spiritual injury. "And a gift," i. e. one received as a bribe by a person exercising judicial functions, "destroyeth the heart," blinds or corrupts the understanding. It is better, vs. 8, 9, to wait the issue of God's dispensations than impatiently to fret and find fault with them, or, ver. 10, to contrast the real or imaginary discomforts of the present with the pleasures of the past, as though a condition less agreeable were therefore worse.

This is not a wise view of the case, for, vs. 11, (marg.) 12, there is something better than outward good, and which may be furthered by affliction. Besides, vs. 13, 14, affliction is the appointment of God, which man cannot alter; and it and prosperity are distributed in the manner that they are "to the end that man should find nothing after him," that he may not anticipate the future, but may be kept in a state of constant dependence and trust in God for whatever lies beyond the present; which would not be so much the case if there were some evident rules for the distribution of good and evil. Whence it is, ver. 15, that men often seem in the divine allotments to be treated irrespective of their characters, the just man perishing in his righteousness, and the wicked prolonging his life in his wickedness. This, then, is the first consideration adduced for the settlement of this difficult enigma. The perishing of the one may not be in reality the evil that it is supposed to be, nor the prolongation of the life of the other the good that it is imagined. So that while their fortunes, viewed externally, appear to be in contrast with their characters, if we but penetrate beneath the surface the opposition will disappear.

The second consideration is drawn, vii. 16—29, from the character of men. Those whom we suppose to be suffering unjustly, may not be so good as we think they are. Conformity to the preceding might lead us to expect a converse to this argument also, but it does not admit of one. When bad men prosper, it is not because they are inwardly better than they outwardly appear. There is, ver. 16, an excess of seeming righteousness, or of what passes for it in the estimate of its possessor and of others, which will as surely and as justly be visited with destruction as, ver. 17, the opposite extreme of wickedness. That the caution, not to be "righteous overmuch," cannot mean that there is danger of possessing too much real piety, is apparent not only from the absurdity of such a sentiment in itself, its opposition to other passages in this book where piety is inculcated without any such limit, and the incongruity of such an utterance from an inspired writer; but also, from ver. 18, where the fear of God is declared to be an effectual preservative against this extreme, as well as its opposite. What precise form of religious excess Solomon had in his mind, it

may not be easy to determine, as he does not more precisely define it. It may have been purposely left indefinite, with the view of covering all such pseudo-religious manifestations, as Pharisaical ostentation, sanctimoniousness and self-righteous conceit, censoriousness of others, multiplied acts of uncommanded will-worship, &c. Wisdom will, ver. 19, be a surer protection against all such errors and excesses than ten valiant captains with their armies would be to a city.

Besides the fact already stated, that much which passes under the guise of piety is not really such, but is as punishable as grosser acts of sin; it is added, vs. 20—22, that none are faultless in deed and word, as every man's heart must assure him with regard to himself; and, vs. 23—29, notwithstanding the original uprightness of man's nature, the truly virtuous and good are as one in a thousand. Whether the abandoned woman, ver. 26, is spoken of with the view of instancing a particular sin of great enormity, or whether she is, as some suppose, the personification of folly or sin in general, ensnaring men by its meretricious charms, the sense of the entire passage is not affected.

A right application of the considerations already urged will doubtless remove a large proportion of the apparent inequalities of providence. Those which still remain are provided for by the third consideration, viii. 1—14, of the existence of a righteous government. After bestowing, ver. 1, a passing commendation on the wisdom which can solve such perplexing enigmas as this, and can dissipate the gloom which they occasion, he proceeds, vs. 2—5, to refer to the righteous awards of human government. The obligation of obedience to its authority is attended with a divine sanction. Persistence in evil provokes its penalties, good conduct escapes them. The doctrine is precisely that of Rom. xiii. 1—5. It is not that human governments are never unjust and oppressive; the contrary is admitted and provided for, ver. 9. But the administration of justice is the design for which they are ordained of God and instituted amongst men; this is the professed end of those who conduct them; and in spite of every perversion this is to a considerable degree really accomplished.

From human government, considered as rectifying disorders,

he passes in the last clause of ver. 5, to God's supreme control, employing language similar to that used, iii. 1, of the same subject, only adding to his previous announcement that God has a time for everything in his admirable plan, the fact which is of equal consequence here, that he has "judgment" likewise. Everything is harmoniously disposed precisely at the right time, and all is equitably administered upon principles of justice. The meaning of ver. 6 is obscured by an improper rendering of its particles. Instead of "because . . . therefore," it should read "for . . . for." God's harmonious and equitable administration is not productive of misery to men. But the greatness of human misery, man's utter ignorance of the future, his inability to resist the assaults of death or to escape from peril by his wickedness, are so many proofs that the sovereign control of all things is vested not in his hands, but in those of God, whose sway must be well-ordered and just. Rulers inflicting injury upon their subjects, ver. 9; the wicked honoured (with burial,) ver. 10; the righteous maltreated, (lit. they who have done right must go from the holy place and be forgotten in the city,) and such delays of justice, ver. 11, as encourage men in their transgression, do not prevent but that, vs. 12, 13, the most exact justice shall be meted out to all. This shall be the case notwithstanding the apparent contrariety of the fact, ver. 14, that the fate of the wicked sometimes seems to befall the just, and *vice versâ*. The enigma is now solved, as far at least as a solution is practicable. The considerations adduced embrace all that can be offered in its explanation. The section is accordingly brought to a close, ver. 15, by the standing formula which these reasonings have served freshly to confirm, that enjoyment is the best thing which earth affords. That serene enjoyment which is the portion only of the good, is to be preferred above all those accumulations which the wicked may possess, and which men are tempted to do wickedly in order to obtain.

The fourth section, viii. 16—xii. 14, is, as has been before said, supplementary to the preceding. It does not re-open the argument, which is not finished, but is occupied with the removal of discouragements and the enforcing of practical lessons. We have, as in former cases, three divisions and a conclusion. The

remaining mystery of this subject need be no obstacle to human joy, viii. 16—ix. 9, nor to the most strenuous activity, ix. 10—xi. 6, while in both their joy and their activity men should be mindful of death and judgment, xi. 7—xii. 8. The conclusion follows, xii. 9—14.

After all that can be said toward their explanation, there are yet, viii. 17, insolvable mysteries in divine providence. No one can tell, ix. 1, by God's treatment of particular individuals, whether they are objects of his love or hatred, ver. 2, the good and the bad appear to fare alike, vs. 3—6, the existence of sin and death involve the most perplexing mysteries. But this, vs. 7—9, should prevent no one from enjoying life with a constant sense of the divine favour.

Nor is it any obstacle to the most energetic action, ver. 10, but the reverse. When it is said that "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest," it is manifest that this is no denial of a future state of intelligent activity, any more than, vs. 5, 6, where the meaning is more fully explained by saying that the dead "have no more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun," *i. e.*, in this world. Men should labour with their might. It is true, vs. 11, 12, that the results attained do not always correspond with what might be expected from the means employed. And yet on the whole and as a general rule, ix. 13—x. 20, wisdom is advantageous and folly is ruinous. And, xi. 1—6, this general certainty, even though no positive assurance of a successful result can be attained in each individual case, is a sufficient warrant and incitement to vigorous exertion.

The advantages of wise action are first illustrated, ix. 13—16, by the case of a city delivered by a poor wise man from the siege of a powerful king. The same thought is then exhibited in a series of apothegms to the close of chap. x. This passage, it will be perceived, is directed to precisely the same point with the entire book of Proverbs. And it is observable to what an extent the style of the two books is here identical, possessing the same terse brevity and the same lack of connection between the individual sentences, while all conspire to teach the same general truth. The attempt to force a more intimate connection upon this passage than the writer designed or than its nature

will allow, has resulted in the strangest misinterpretations. Thus because rulers are referred to, vs. 4—7, and again, vs. 16, 17, and ver. 20, it has been quite common for interpreters to insist upon explaining all the intermediate verses in reference to the same subject. So vs. 8—10 are made to teach the evils resulting from premature or ill-concerted attempts to throw off the yoke of bad government; and ver. 18, the injury arising to the edifice of the state from negligent rulers, whose revels and avarice are supposed to be described, ver. 19. Upon the wretched government, under which it is thus (with the help of viii. 2—5, perverted to precisely its opposite sense, and ver. 17 being pronounced spurious, as inconsistent with the context) made out that the author must have lived, is based the conclusion that this could not have been written by Solomon. Our answer to which is, that the argumentation has about as much connection with the text as Geier's notion that the times spoken of, iii. 2—8, are the seven periods of the church militant.

The propriety and even necessity of acting upon a general presumption, without demanding particular certainties, is variously illustrated, xi. 1—6. Even where there seems so little antecedent likelihood of return as in casting bread upon the waters, it should be done in the hope of finding it after many days. The possibility of some time needing their assistance, is a reason for making friends everywhere by benevolent action. When the clouds are full, they empty themselves upon the earth, it may be sometimes uselessly on the rock or on barren land, yet on the whole the benefit is immense. So a tree may fall this way or that, on one man's land or another's, but it will be likely in any case to do somebody good. If a man were to insist on certainties, or even on having always the most favourable conditions prior to his acting, he would never do anything. "He that observeth the wind, shall not sow; and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap." As, therefore, we neither understand God's natural, nor his providential operations, the only proper course is to be diligent in right action; some of it will succeed, even if all does not.

After placing death and the coming judgment before its readers as a solemn fact which should never be lost sight of amid their pleasures, and which should influence all their con-

duct, the book is brought to a formal close. The conclusion of the entire discussion is stated to be: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole welfare of man; for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.

ART. V.—*The General Assembly of 1857.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, met in the First Presbyterian Church, Lexington, Kentucky, May 21st, 1857, and in the absence of Dr. McFarland, on account of sickness, was opened with a sermon by the Rev. James Hoge, of Columbus, Ohio, on the last clause of Matt. xxviii. 20, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

After the clerk had reported the roll, the Rev. CORTLANDT VAN RENSSELAER, D. D., was chosen Moderator, and the Rev. JAMES SLOAN, D. D., Temporary Clerk. On the motion of the Rev. D. Anderson, the first order of the day for the second day of the sessions, was made the hearing of the reports of the Theological Seminaries, and the second order, hearing the reports of the several Boards of the Church.

Place of Meeting of the next Assembly.

On motion of Judge Fine, the Assembly proceeded to determine on the next place of meeting. New Orleans, Philadelphia, Rochester, and Cincinnati, were nominated. The result of the vote was, for New Orleans, 137; for Philadelphia, 113; for Rochester, 13; for Cincinnati, 3. The First Church in New Orleans was therefore selected. The time of meeting was appointed to be the first, instead of the third, Thursday of May next.

The policy of changing the place of meeting of the Assembly from year to year, although attended by many disadvantages,

is recommended by so many considerations of expediency, that it may be considered as firmly established. There is no doubt, however, that prudence would dictate some limit to be put to this wandering propensity. Already some of our excitable brethren are predicting that a few years hence our Assembly will meet at St. Paul or San Francisco. Sensible men, however, will be disposed to ask *cui bono?* It may be admitted that a certain amount of good not otherwise attainable may be anticipated from meeting at so extreme a point as New Orleans. But is this good so certain and so great as to justify the increased expenditure of money, time, and health it will inevitably occasion. It will probably put the Church to an additional expense of fifty or sixty thousand dollars; and this burden will in a great measure fall on those who are least able to bear it. It will cost in time an additional two weeks to at least one hundred ministers; and it is by no means improbable, that it will involve the loss of more than one valuable life. Some very tangible good, something more than the gratification of the sentiment, that "the country and the whole country is our field," will be demanded, on sober second thought, to justify incurring losses so serious and so certain.

Theological Seminaries.

The Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary presented their forty-fifth annual report. They reported that the Seminary had received fifty new students within the past year. One was received from the Western Theological Seminary; one from Union Seminary at New York; one from the Associate Seminary at Xenia, Ohio; six are members of Baptist churches; two members of the German Reformed Church; one a member of the Associate Reformed Church; one a member of the Associate Church; and one a member of the Lutheran Church. The whole number of students during the year was one hundred and ten. One student has died. The examinations were highly satisfactory. Twenty-six had certificates of having completed the course of study. Twenty-one have already engaged as pastors, and two as foreign missionaries. The Trustees, reported the funds in a highly satisfactory condition. One benevolent individual, who wishes

his name withheld from the public, has given ten thousand dollars to be used as a sustentation fund for students. Several valuable additions to the library have been made by donations of benevolent individuals; and the condition of the Institution is reported to be every way prosperous and flourishing.

The Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary reported that in the past year thirty-one new students have been received. The whole number on the roll was eighty-one; regular graduates, thirteen; certificate irregular studies, four. Rev. R. W. Dickinson, D. D., has declined the professorship to which he was elected at last Assembly. They ask that the General Assembly alter the plan of the Seminary, so as to make the number of the Board consist of forty members, and that this Board be divided into two classes, one of which shall go out every year. The Trustees reported that the receipts have been \$20,020.17, and the expenditures \$20,020.17.

The Board of Directors of Danville Seminary made their fourth Annual Report, showing the whole number of students during the year to be thirty-six—twelve graduated at the end of the session and received diplomas. The students had been diligent in study, and consistent in their general deportment. The Professors suggest that all students should put themselves under the care of Presbytery at an early period of professional study, and should apply for licensure at the end of their second year's study. They also recommend that they should be required to be present at the beginning of the session and stay to its close. Rev. Stuart Robinson had accepted his appointment and taught during the year. Rev. Jos. G. Reaser had resigned his place as teacher, and the Board asked the Assembly to appoint a fourth Professor. They acknowledge the receipt of several valuable volumes for the library. The Trustees reported their whole productive funds at \$92,323.61, in addition to their real estate valued at \$10,000, and their library at \$7000, and \$1900 of unproductive funds. About twenty-five thousand dollars have been collected in cash and notes during the year, and about twenty thousand dollars in legacies, not yet paid in. They urge upon the Assembly to complete the endowment as soon as possible.

The Directors of the Union Seminary, Virginia, reported

that twenty-five students had been connected with the Seminary during the year, ten of whom were now students. Six have completed their course of study. Rev. Wm. J. Hoge had entered on his duties as Professor. The whole productive fund is \$82,300, the real estate is very valuable. They are prepared to accommodate from sixty to eighty students in their buildings. The library consists of 443 volumes. They have three scholarships completed, and a fourth in progress of completion. They are aiming to increase the fund to \$12,500, and have an agent in the field to accomplish that result. They have increased the salary of their Professors \$150 dollars each.

These reports were all referred to the Committee on Theological Seminaries.

The Rev. Dr. Moore, from the Committee on Theological Seminaries, presented a report, which was received and adopted, except the resolution referring to the Western Theological Seminary, which was put on the docket. The resolutions in the report are as follows:

Resolved, 1. That the churches be urged to complete the endowment of those Seminaries that are not yet fully endowed, to increase the number of scholarships, and to furnish funds for the repair and erection of suitable buildings, and the enlargement of the libraries.

Resolved, 2. That candidates should be required to put themselves under the care of Presbyteries as soon as possible, and receive careful supervision during their entire course, and that whatever arrangements the Presbyteries may deem expedient to facilitate their training, these arrangements should not be such as will tend to shorten the full term of study, or induce an absence from their classes, at either the opening or closing exercises of the Seminary's sessions.

Resolved, 3. That the following persons be appointed Directors of the Princeton Theological Seminary, until May, 1860, viz. *Ministers*—J. N. Campbell, D. D., George Potts, D. D., John McDowell, D. D., D. V. McLean, D. D., William Neill, D. D., H. A. Wilson, D. D., John Thompson, D. D. *Ruling Elders*—John Fine, Ebenezer Platt, Ira C. Whitehead.

Resolved, 4. That the Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, be enlarged to forty, and

divided into four equal classes, one of which shall go out of office annually.

Resolved, 5. That the following persons compose the class of Directors to serve for three years, viz. *Ministers*—Francis Herron, D. D., Elisha P. Swift, D. D., W. M. Paxton, W. B. McIlvaine, John Kerr, James Alexander, Cyrus Dickson. *Ruling Elders*—Luke Loomis, Alexander Johnston, James Carothers, M. D. To serve for four years, the following: *Ministers*—Thomas Creigh, D. D., James S. Woods, D. D., A. S. Hall, D. D., James Hoge, D. D., John P. Caldwell, James M. Platt, S. M. McClung. *Ruling Elders*—Lucas Flattery, Dr. H. A. True, A. Cameron.

Resolved, 6. That in the matter of the will and legacy of about twenty thousand dollars, of the late Judge Henry P. Broadnax, of Kentucky, the Assembly judge that the proper disposition of the funds bequeathed by him to the Trustees of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church, and by a codicil to his will, directed to be used at Danville, in Kentucky, in connection with the Theological Seminary there, is that the said funds ought to go into the hands of the Board of Trustees of said Seminary, to be appropriated by them under the discretion granted in the said will, according to the intentions of the generous testator; and that the Trustees of the Board of Education ought to perform any legal act, to which they are competent, and that may be necessary in effecting this disposition of the said funds. If the Board of Trustees of the Danville Seminary, in the exercise of their legal discretion, think proper to endow a Professorship with said funds, in that case the Professorship so endowed shall be the second on the list, and shall be called the Broadnax Professorship of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History.

Resolved, 7. That, considering the great liberality of Samuel Laird, Esq., of Kentucky, who has generously contributed to the funds belonging to the said Danville Seminary, the sum of twenty thousand dollars, it is hereby directed that the first Professorship on the list shall be called the Laird Professorship of Exegetic and Polemic Theology.

Resolved, 8. That, considering these two instances of munifi-

cent charity, by two members of the Church under their care, which have been reported during our present sessions, as bestowed on an institution which this body is endeavouring to erect to the glory of God, and their satisfaction in such great proofs of the approbation of good men; while we rejoice to be almoners of God's poor, in gratefully accepting and carefully using their humble contributions towards promoting every good work, upon which the Lord calls us to embark, we call earnestly upon those whom he has specially blessed with this world's goods, to remember that their charity should bear an exact proportion to his beneficence. How immense might be the impulse to every work of the Church, if the conduct of Samuel Laird and H. P. Broadnax were the rule, and not the exception, in the bestowment of charity by the followers of the Lord of glory.

Resolved, 9. That the following Directors of Danville Theological Seminary be appointed to serve until 1860, viz. *Ministers*—John T. Edgar, D.D., R. C. Grundy, D.D., John C. Young, D.D., L. W. Green, D.D., B. M. Hobson, James H. Brooks, John Montgomery, R. A. Lapsley, D.D., A. V. C. Schenck. *Ruling Elders*—William Richardson, John Watson, James S. Hopkins, John D. Thorpe, O. Beatty, William Prather, Glass Marshall, James Barbour, John McKeage. To serve until May, 1859: Ezekiel Forman, in place of James Coe, deceased, and Ben Monroe in place of T. E. West, deceased.

Resolved, 10. That inasmuch as the charter of Danville Seminary (Section 6) confers upon the General Assembly the right, when meeting in Kentucky, to change one-third of the Board of Trustees, and fill all vacancies then existing, it is expedient to exercise this right, that no advantage may ever accrue against it from non-use, and that the Board of Trustees of Danville Seminary be composed of the following persons, viz. John R. Ford, James S. Hopkins, John B. Temple, Mark Hardin, Robert A. Johnstone, R. J. Breckinridge, A. A. Hogue, W. L. Breckinridge, John Montgomery, J. T. Boyle, Charles Caldwell, W. J. Moberly, Stuart Robinson, J. P. Curtis, E. P. Humphrey, R. C. Grundy, W. M. Scott, James Barbour.

Resolved, 11. That the Assembly elect a fourth Professor in

Danville Seminary, to fill the chair of Oriental and Biblical Literature, and that this election be the order of the day for Monday morning at eleven o'clock.

According to the last resolution contemplating the election of a fourth Professor in the Danville Theological Seminary, the Rev. Dr. Steel nominated the Rev. Stephen Yerkes, Professor of Ancient Languages in Transylvania University, and sketched briefly his eminent qualifications for the Professorship.

Dr. Moore, as Chairman of the Committee on Seminaries, subsequently reported the following additional resolutions in reference to the Western Theological Seminary:

Resolved, 1. That agreeably to the unanimous request of the Board of Directors, this Assembly will proceed to elect a fourth Professor upon a salary to be graduated by the Trustees of the Seminary.

Resolved, 2. That in accordance with the same request, Samuel J. Wilson, who has been an assistant Teacher in this Seminary for two years past, be nominated to fill this Professorship.

Resolved, 3. That if any changes in the division of labour in the Seminary be found expedient, it may be made by the Board of Directors for the next session, provided it be reported to the next Assembly.

The Rev. Mr. McClung said he came here under instructions from his Presbytery (Saltsburg) to oppose the election of a fourth Professor. He then read a resolution of his Presbytery, stating that in their opinion too many valuable ministers are occupied in teaching our theological students in proportion to the number of the latter, and that the corps of able Professors at Allegheny is sufficient for the number of students there. He inquired whether there were funds for the support of this fourth Professor.

Some of the other members joined for a time in this objection to the election of a fourth Professor, but it was not very seriously urged. The second resolution was withdrawn, and Mr. Wilson was orally nominated according to the usual mode of proceeding. Mr. Yerkes was elected unanimously as Professor in Danville, and Mr. Wilson, by a vote very nearly unanimous, was chosen Professor in Allegheny.

In the multiplication of our Theological Seminaries, it seems

to be more and more the settled policy of the Assembly to accede to the wishes of their respective directors and supporters. The Assembly at Buffalo sanctioned the whole plan of the Seminary at Danville proposed by the Directors of that institution, without even hearing it read. It is certainly reasonable that the wishes and judgment of those charged with the care of a particular institution and responsible for its success, should be deferred to by those not so directly interested, unless in their judgment the welfare of the Church forbids such acquiescence. We presume the Assembly would not hesitate to elect any man, or to grant any reasonable number of Professors for either Danville or Allegheny, to meet the wishes of the guardians and supporters of those Seminaries. We sincerely rejoice that these important institutions have with so little difficulty succeeded in having their faculties filled up in a way agreeable to their own wishes.

Board of Domestic Missions.

The following is an abstract of the Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, as presented by the Rev. Dr. Musgrave:

The number of missionaries in commission March 1, 1856, was 387, to which have been added, to March 1, 1857, 203, making the whole number 590, and more by 24 than the year previous. Number of churches and missionary stations, wholly or in part supplied (as far as reported) by our missionaries, 904. Number of newly organized churches, 59. The number of admissions on examination is 1940, and on certificate 2054, making a total of admissions of 3994. Number in communion with churches connected with the Board, 21,863. Number of Sabbath-schools, 326; of teachers, 2610; and of scholars, 16,409. Number of baptisms, 2144.

Of the 590 missionaries who have been in commission during the year, 188 have sent in no special report to the Assembly—nearly one-third of the whole number; consequently we must increase all the returns nearly one-third to make them correct.

Appropriations.—The appropriations made to missionaries from March 1, 1856, to March 1, 1857, have been, at the office in Philadelphia, \$58,885.17, and at the office in Louisville, \$37,219.75; making a total of \$96,104.92. Appropriations

from March 1, 1855, to March 1, 1856, were, at the office in Philadelphia, \$52,548.34, and at the office in Louisville, \$34,645.83, making a total of \$87,194.17.

From this statement it appears that the appropriations made at the office in Philadelphia *exceeded* those made the year before \$6336.83, and at the office in Louisville they were more by \$2573.92; thus making the total appropriations this year more than the year preceding, by \$8910.75.

For the purpose of further comparison, we may state that the *average* appropriations made during the preceding four years, from 1852 to 1856, were, at the office in Philadelphia, \$44,776.21, and at the office in Louisville, \$28,729.19, making a total average of \$73,505.40. From this statement it appears that the appropriations made from March 1, 1856, to March 1, 1857, at the office in Philadelphia, exceeded the average of those made during the four previous years, \$14,108.96, and at the office in Louisville, \$8490.56; thus making the total excess of appropriations this year above the average appropriations of the four preceding years, \$22,599.52.

Receipts.—The total amount of receipts from all sources, from March 1, 1856, to March 1, 1857, is \$93,248.99, to which add balances on hand in the different treasuries, March 1, 1856, \$21,133.17; making the available resources of the Board during the year, \$114,382.16. The amount paid for the same time is \$95,121.76, leaving an available balance in all the treasuries, on the 1st of March, 1857, of \$19,260.40. The amount due the missionaries at the same date was \$12,964.86, leaving an unexpended balance of \$6295.54. The aggregate receipts from March 1, 1856, to March 1, 1857, have been *less*, as compared with the receipts from March 1, 1855, to March 1, 1856, \$3995.63. The falling off has been in individual or special donations and legacies, \$2191.33, and in the contributions of the churches, \$1804.30. The receipts at the office in Philadelphia, including the Presbyterial treasuries, were *greater* by \$2333.20, and the receipts at the office in Louisville were *less* by \$6328.83.

Our Missions.—During the year the Board have established new missions in various sections of our country. They have also, to the extent of their ability, re-enforced our missionaries

in the newer States and Territories. Two additional missionaries have been sent to California, three to Minnesota, one, in addition to those already there, has been employed in the Territory of Oregon, and one in the Territory of Washington. We have also commissioned one in the State of New Hampshire. Seven additional missionaries have been employed in the State of Missouri. Ten new men have been commissioned in Wisconsin, and seventeen in Iowa, which, with the changes that have taken place, make an increase of fifteen in those two States. We have also added two to the number of our missionaries in the Territory of Kansas, and the same number in the Territory of Nebraska. The Board have also continued to employ a number of missionaries among our foreign population. During the past year, one has laboured among the French, one among the Bohemians, one among the Welch, and thirteen among the Germans. Six of our missionaries have laboured chiefly among the colored people.

Clothing.—Clothing valued at \$9131.81 has been received during the year, and distributed among the missionaries who needed it. Of this amount \$4949.72 was received at the office in Philadelphia; \$2488.45 at the office in Louisville; and \$1693.64 at the depot in Pittsburgh.

Itinerants.—Thirty-three of the Missionaries have been commissioned and employed as itinerants. The greater part of the missionaries perform more or less of such service, but the number above mentioned are either wholly, or almost entirely employed as itinerants. The Board again strongly urges the importance of placing a number of *weak and feeble churches* under the charge of itinerant missionaries, in order to economize both the men and the means of the Church. They state, however, the impracticability of employing any very large number of itinerants in wholly destitute districts, where there are no organized churches, and from which they could derive no pecuniary support, without reducing the amount now appropriated to the missionary churches.

Progress made by our Church in the Missionary work.—In 1828, the year of the reorganization of the Board, there were but 31 missionaries, and an income of \$2400 only. In 1840, two years after the division of the Church, and when the parts

were fairly separated, there were 256 missionaries, and an income of \$40,734. In 1856-57, the number of missionaries employed was 590, and the income \$93,248.99.

Since the re-organization of the Board, we have increased 14 Synods, 58 Presbyteries, 1035 ministers, 1178 churches, and 87,447 members. Since 1840, two years after the division of the Church, we have increased 13 Synods, 53 Presbyteries, 705 ministers, 1473 churches, and 107,172 communicants. These results may well excite our gratitude to God, and ought to stimulate us to greater activity, liberality, and prayer.

Salaries of Missionaries.—During the past year the Board have increased their average appropriation to the missionaries \$17.48. The average appropriation by the Board to the missionaries last year, was \$191.20. During the last *four* years the Board have increased their average appropriation to the missionaries \$59.38, which is a little over 45 per cent. By this advance, the annual liabilities of the Board with the present number of missionaries have been augmented more than \$35,000. If the people whom they serve had advanced proportionably, our missionaries would now be comfortably sustained. But while the Board have increased their appropriations over 45 per cent., their people have advanced only about 30 per cent. The total average salary paid by the Board and the people to the missionaries last year, was \$503.60.

Need of Funds.—The receipts of the Board from all sources as compared with the year preceding, *fell short* nearly \$4000, while the appropriations exceeded those of the previous year nearly \$9000.

The receipts *from the churches fell short* of the payments last year *upwards of twenty-three thousand dollars!* (\$23,282.70,) and but for the balance on hand at the commencement of the year, and the large amount received from individual donations and legacies, we would have been largely in debt to our missionaries at the close of the year.

Non-contributing Churches.—The Board of Domestic Missions, like the other Boards of the Church, is trying the experiment of what is called the "Systematic Benevolence Plan," and has dispensed with collecting Agents altogether. This experi-

ment has, perhaps, thus far, worked as well as could be reasonably expected. It is encouraging to find that the number of contributing churches is increasing, though very slowly, from year to year. In 1855—6, the increase over the previous year was about one hundred—and last year, 1856—7, the increase over the former year was about one hundred and fifty-three. This result, although encouraging, is far from being satisfactory, while the number of non-contributing churches continues to be so large. The number of non-contributing churches last year was considerably over sixteen hundred! The Board earnestly urges the presentation of the cause by every minister, and a collection by every church, however small it may be, and respectfully insists upon the importance of greater attention to this matter on the part of all our Presbyteries. Without more effective measures to carry out the Systematic Benevolence Plan, it will undoubtedly prove a failure. The Board express their special regret that many missionary churches—churches receiving aid from the missionary fund, take up no collection for the Board.

This report having been referred to the appropriate committee, Dr. C. C. Jones its chairman presented a series of resolutions which were sustained by himself, by Dr. Musgrave and several other speakers. Dr. Breckinridge, Dr. Adger, and Mr. C. D. Drake objected to that portion of the Committee's report which seemed to imply a censure on those churches which had not contributed to the funds of the Board. It was contended by those gentlemen that such failure did not necessarily imply a want of piety or of zeal. Some Presbyteries preferred conducting their own missionary operations, and some of the churches were so situated that they were called upon to expend more than their portion of contributions to the missionary work, in their immediate vicinity. Others again were unable even to meet their own necessities. All this, it was urged on the other side, may be admitted, and yet it remain true that there was on the part of many congregations great remissness in this matter. The report having been slightly modified to obviate the objections above referred to, was unanimously adopted, and is, so far as the resolutions are concerned, as follows.

1. The Assembly would humbly and gratefully render thanks to Almighty God and our Saviour for the large measure of health granted to our missionaries during the past year, and for the degree of success with which he has been pleased to crown their labours.

2. While it is encouraging to find that the number of contributing churches to the Board is increasing slowly from year to year, yet the Assembly mourn over the fact that the number of non-contributing churches continues so large.

3. The Assembly recommends to Presbyteries to adopt such measures as they may deem necessary to bring every minister and church session to the faithful performance of this duty in such manner as they may deem best.

4. That the Assembly recommend to the Board great prudence in the application of the funds of the Church, and request the Presbyteries to do all in their power to relieve the Board as fast and as far as possible of appropriations to feeble churches and missionary fields.

5. That the Assembly approves the action of the Board in effecting a change in the legal form of the title of the Board from "the Board of Missions" to "the Board of Domestic Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."

Foreign Missions.

The Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, one of the Secretaries of the Board, addressed the Assembly at length on this subject. He said among the discouragements of the past year, were the failure of health of missionaries, and their consequent return; the suspension of missionary labour at Canton; and the want of funds. On the other hand, however, the work had been energetically carried forward; one hundred and fifty members had been added to the Church; and although the Board had incurred a debt of eleven thousand dollars, the contributions of the churches had increased some six or seven thousand dollars. A pastor of an important church has relinquished his charge, and gone into the field as a missionary; and a ruling elder of high standing has gone and taken five of the members of his church with him; and from another church in the same neighbourhood,

one ruling elder and two members have gone, and these churches have been blessed as never before. The first mentioned has more than trebled its contributions the last year, and God has poured out his Spirit and added to their numbers three times as many as they have given up for foreign missionary work. Among the Indian tribes we have as many as ten stations east of the Rocky Mountains; four are of recent origin; but of the others there is not one that has not received signal proofs of the divine favour. The Chippewas were formerly one of the worst of all the Indian tribes, but since the establishment of the mission among them the whole aspect of things is changed, and they are now a well-behaved population. Amongst the Creeks there was at the outset a great prejudice against missionaries. They drew a line around the missionaries, beyond which they were not allowed to preach the gospel. This is all removed; many are church members, and some preparing for the ministry. Among the Seminoles about fifty or sixty have been lately received into the church. A chief, who used to distinguish himself by summoning his people with his stentorian voice to desecrate the Sabbath, has now become a follower of Christ, and has sent to the Board for the largest conch-shell they can find, that he may make his voice heard as far as possible in calling them to hear the gospel. Of the Choctaws, the Rev. Dr. Kingsbury, a venerable member of this Assembly, will be able to speak more particularly.

South America is now a field of promise to the Board. In Buenos Ayres there are 35,000 people and 30,000 Romish church members, with an army of priests; but our young missionary, single-handed and alone, not even encouraged by Americans and English, went there, learned the Spanish language, published in a liberal paper an article on the question whether Peter had ever been to Rome, and also on the rights of the people to the Bible, and in other ways carried on his work. This occasioned much excitement, but led to the sale of an entire edition of the Bible, and large numbers of New Testaments. Among the interesting fruits is one of the most distinguished lawyers in that country, who has some thirty law students, into whose minds he will inculcate the same sentiments.

As to Africa, one of the chiefs not long since made a voyage in a boat in the open sea to ask for a missionary. A messenger

from the interior was sent to the coast by another chief for a missionary, but had to return without one. He was immediately sent back with the command that he must not show his face without one. At the last accounts he was still on the coast, waiting to obtain one. Mr. Wilson fancied him sitting on the rocks, sweeping the sea with his eager eyes for a sail, hoping it might bring the longed-for missionary.

In India the results have never been more cheering than during the last year; and the cloud which overhung Siam has passed away. A cloud now hangs over China, but doubtless, in a short time, instead of five we shall have ten ports open to us, and 300,000,000 open to the gospel.

The Board are constrained, however, to say that they have reached a limit beyond which they cannot go without action from the Assembly. The Assembly had encouraged the Board to go on in enlarging its operations, but the result was a debt of eleven thousand dollars. The immediate causes of this was the increased expense of remitting funds to China, building new houses at some of the Indian stations, but more from the expansion of the work. He would ask the Assembly and the Church, what is to be done? Are we to imitate the self-denial and world-wide benevolence of the Apostolic churches, or have we some other standard? Is it doing enough for this Church when her members are not giving on an average more than forty cents apiece? when not more than one of thirty-five of her ministers devotes himself to labours among the heathen; and not more than one out of one thousand private members go into the same work? There are three things which may be done—1. Incur a larger debt; 2. Curtail the missions; or, what is better, 3. Stir up the Church to a greater liberality and efficiency. The venerable senior Secretary, at the outset, entered upon his office with the express stipulation that the Board should not go in debt, and he stands by this, and as with a drawn sword, resists operations for which we have not the means. As to curtailment, where could we begin? What should we, what could we cut off? None can satisfactorily answer that question. There is a venerable father in this Assembly, who could tell with what infinite toil the first one thousand dollars was raised for this Board; now its annual receipts are one hundred and

sixty-six thousand dollars! If we only do what we should do, many of us shall live till this Board receives five hundred thousand dollars, and its influence is felt all over the globe.

Dr. Adger then presented a report, in which the following means of increasing the interest in the work of Foreign Missions were recommended:

1. That our Sunday-schools be enlisted by pastors in the good work of contributing for Foreign Missions. The aggregation of many particles is always a mighty thing, and in this case the many small streams would, by flowing together, make a great river. But far more than this; the children of the Church would thus be receiving an education in benevolence and in beneficence.

2. That our ministers preach systematically and frequently on the subject of Foreign Missions, teaching the people that it is their duty to give more money to this cause, in order that the work may grow and spread, and in proportion as it does grow and spread, because the knowledge of the Lord must fill the earth even as the waters fill the sea; that our ministers also teach that it is needful to increase greatly the number of missionaries in heathen lands, and that to this end more of our young men must willingly offer themselves for this work, being thereto moved by the Holy Ghost, and therein honoured by the great Head of the Church; that our ministers also teach that it is the joyful privilege of pious parents, filled with faith and the Holy Ghost, to dedicate their children to this most glorious, exalted, and happy service. Moreover, on the first Sabbath evening of every month, or on other occasions, and from to time, let the people hear from their ministers a detailed account of our various Foreign Missions in succession, with a description of the religious condition of the people, and the beginning and progress of the Church's work amongst them.

3. That to this end our ministers take pains themselves carefully to read the *Home and Foreign Record*, and the *Foreign Missionary*, so as to know what is being done by our missionaries; and that they also further the circulation, and encourage the reading of these publications in their congregations.

Dr. Adger said, that in presenting this report he must add a few words. He contended that the individual duty of every

minister and ruling elder was to hold up to every member of our churches their obligation to engage in this work. He had felt once that it was a reproach to us that our General Assembly met from year to year and carried on its operations by passing resolutions; but he had come to the firm belief, that for a Church of Christ, or for even one man, to get possession of an idea or a doctrine, they had not received before, and to set it forth in distinct announcement, was doing a great thing. When we meet here, too, it is as rulers, and for such a body of rulers to announce an idea, is to give to it the force of authority. He thought we were, therefore, doing much, when in this report we again declare the doctrine of Christian benevolence announced four years ago.

Then the Committee also recommended some modes for training our people in the grace of giving. As to Sunday-school constitutions, it was a most important thing to train the rising generation to the duty and grace of giving. Let us take those just coming on the stage, and make a strong impression of this matter, so that when we are gone from the stage, they may do far more than we ever have even thought of. We can accomplish nothing of lasting value by temporary expedients; but when the Church is once thoroughly trained, the foundation is laid for permanent results. With the generation already on the stage we must do the best we can by requiring the ministers to preach to the people to give, and to give more and more. He was reminded of what Dr. Schaffer once said to the Jews, who were persecuting the converts he had made: "You think that you can stop this work; but let me tell you there are thousands of Christians in England, America, &c., and they are determined to fill the world with this doctrine; and if you don't like this doctrine you must go out of the world." We must fill the world with the doctrine of Christ crucified. He had himself been thirteen years a missionary, and the happiest men he had ever seen were missionaries, and the happiest portion of his life was when he was a missionary; and if he had time he could give six reasons why it must be so. We must get rid of that wretched notion, that it is a great privation to go on a foreign mission, and that none ought to be expected to go except the few young men who are willing to be martyrs. No

man, in his opinion, is so honoured, as such, as his brother Wilson, who had gone to Africa, and given the poor heathen a written language, and taught them the arts of life, as well as the gospel—taught them that civilization that men talk so much about, but which, after all, is nothing without the knowledge of eternal life, which the missionaries carry to the perishing heathen.

As to this debt of the Board. In every way the Board must be supplied unless they have means in hand. The churches ought immediately to give *more*; and those which had done nothing, should give. What do *you* say, brethren; will you go home and strive to get your own churches to do more? We can do more if we will. He had felt his heart bound when the venerable father who opened this Assembly said he had come to the conclusion that this is a day of preparation. O! when he thought what this Church would be in one hundred years from this time, he was almost melted to tears of joy. In less than half that time he should not be surprised if this Old-school Church should give a million of dollars to Foreign Missions. Eleven thousand dollars of debt for such a Church! Why, sir, it is nothing. Let the Board go forward.

Rev. Dr. Kingsbury, the venerable missionary from the Choctaw Mission, said that when he went among that people they had no written language. They were an immoral and degraded people. An intelligent Indian informed him that he knew of but one man that would not get drunk when he had the opportunity. Infanticide prevailed, and vice stalked abroad. Now there are fifteen churches connected with this Assembly, and sixteen hundred and sixty members, mostly full Choctaws. We have twelve ordained missionaries, four licentiates, and one candidate. Two of the ordained ministers are full Choctaws, liberally educated; three licentiates, also natives, and doing a good work. They have also six boarding-schools and three hundred and thirty pupils, who are taught not only ordinary branches of education, but habits of industry. There is an increasing interest in education. There are twelve boarding-schools in all the Nation, among the Choctaws and Chickasaws, who live together. There are also a large number of Saturday and Sabbath-schools taught by natives. The New Testa-

ment, and portions of the Old, have been published in that language. Altogether they had published twenty-five thousand bound volumes, besides tracts and other small works. The Choctaws are pious, and give encouraging evidence of civilization. There is probably no part of this country where the Sabbath is more generally honoured than among them. They are also vigorously striving to exterminate whiskey from among them. He had seen large numbers assembled together for days to receive their government annuities, and not one drunken Indian. The gospel is preached among them at about sixty places. They are much scattered. The missionaries cannot preach at each of them more than once in four weeks, but meetings are held at each of them every Sabbath by one of the ruling elders. Last year they contributed \$2300. At one collection \$125 was taken up, and one plain homespun clad Indian gave \$20. One of them said, "when we commenced these collections we raised but \$3; and now that we give \$125, we are none the poorer, but the richer, for all that we have given." He hoped the Presbyterian Church would hold up the hands of their missionaries there. They are most excellent brethren, and some are fainting for want of help. We need both male and female assistants to carry on our schools and other operations. Many who would fain come are prevented by friends from coming, as he knew from facts. With Dr. Adger he could say, though a toilsome work, it was a blessed work. Forty years ago last January, he had gone among the Indians to bear to them the gospel, and he had never regretted it. There are other denominations labouring among the Choctaws—Methodists, Baptists, and Cumberland Presbyterians—but he would say that the Old-school Presbyterian Church stands fair in all its operations.

The Rev. Loyal Young, Rev. Mr. Venable, and the Rev. Dr. Hoge continued the discussion with much earnestness and interest.

The Rev. Mr. Rankin, missionary from China, followed with a fervent appeal to the Assembly to come up to the work God is calling the Church to, through the doors everywhere opening. Not more than four per cent. of the money given by our Church, and not more than three per cent. of her ministers, go to the heathen. Is this the way the Presbyterian Church car-

ries forward the work it professes to long for so earnestly? The province in which he laboured was about the size of Kentucky, and yet it contained a larger population than the whole United States and the West India Islands combined. Not long since he and a companion had traversed fifteen cities and numberless villages in their own foreign costumes, and preached the gospel, and no one interfered with them. In Africa, India, Siam, South America—everywhere there is now an open door.

Rev. Mr. Bannard dwelt upon the financial condition of the Board. The churches had not come up to what the Board were encouraged to expect when they entered on their enlarged operations. The Church must look the fact in the face, that this work is going to require more and more funds every year, and make provision accordingly, if she would do what the work demands.

Rev. Mr. Castleton also made an animated address.

The Rev. Dr. Thornwell said he had designed simply to make some remarks suggested by the progress of the discussion. His design was simply to stir up the mind of the Assembly and his own mind. It has been said that the Church is in a posture of preparation for great events; but yet no one had mentioned the precise circumstances which caused this preparatory movement. We should understand them more accurately in order that we might know our duty. He accepted the idea that there were movements of promise, and he mentioned one as indicating this preparation—the recognition by the Church of the work of Foreign Missions in its true relations and just proportions. The time has past when the cause of Foreign Missions is regarded as a mere romantic enterprise. We are looking upon it as a part of the organized life of the Church. It is not something to which we must be excited or wrought up, and we should consider it just as inconsistent now for a man to feel no interest in Foreign Missions as for him to neglect to pray. It comes as a part of the worship of God. Whatever agency we put forth in any cause of benevolence, is a part of the homage that we pay to God. When he saw this Assembly, representing our entire Church in these United States, discussing this subject, he felt as if it were one great act of worship—one grand doxology. Is it not a great matter when this much is attained? Is it not a

great revival when we are no longer to look upon Foreign Missions as something outside of the Church, but something intrinsic and of herself?

Another note that indicates a preparation, is heard in the provision God is making both in men and means for some great event. He had not been an indifferent spectator of things in the last few years, and he had often wondered what could be the meaning of the amazing concentrative interest which had been witnessed in regard to candidates for the ministry. Does it not mean that God intends to raise up men for a great era in the world and in the Church? Ascribe it to what you will—rivalry between seminaries, if you choose—the fact is still there, and a most cheering one it is.

Again, there appears to be in the revival of certain important principles, long obscured, evidence that God is preparing the means to sustain the men he is raising up. That principle which is announced in these resolutions, as to giving, will be an abundant preparation for all the work the Church has before her.

You lay down the principle that giving is a part of worship, but the question arises, How much shall we give? He would state first, that this must be regulated by the great law of demand and supply in the Church of God. Bear this in mind, and you will see how signally God is preparing us for great events. A demand is never held to exist at all, until the desire is so intense as to induce those who make the demand to meet all the costs its supply may require. He holds that to be true in the kingdom of God. There is really no demand for an increase of labourers unless the desire for them is so great as to make us ready to meet all the expenses which may be necessary to provide them. It follows that there never can be an actual, spiritual demand for ministers, until we are willing to furnish the materials to educate them, to support them, and to sustain them at home and abroad. The demand is not, indeed, here the moving cause, for both the demand and the means to meet it are the joint productions of that same grace that contemplates great and glorious things in the Church. Once admit this principle to be true, and you will see that our contributions are to be regulated by the demand, and that they are to be an

expression of the desire of the Church. This state of things God is now producing in our Zion.

Another principle. In political economy saving is one means of increasing capital. The more a man saves the more he has. But in God's workings you see that he introduces a natural improbability to contradict our natural convictions, in order to excite our faith. Thus it was in the case of Abraham, Isaac, and the whole Jewish economy. The scriptural idea is, not that "he that saveth shall increase;" but "the liberal soul shall be made rich." This is to be explained by the fact that God is the Governor of the natural and the spiritual world, and he can so arrange his dealings as to most effectually try our faith, and so that this being done, we shall find that giving has not impoverished us. He found the explanation in the same supremacy of the order which proceeds immediately from God, making all mediate things subordinate.

Now, is it so that in the work of Foreign Missions the Church is glorifying God? Do we feel that we are actually rendering our homage to the name of our God every time the cross is reared in a heathen land? There are different grounds on which men are attached to this work, but for himself, his strongest ground of attachment is that Jesus Christ is the very glory of the Lord that shall fill all the world. It is because he feels God is a great God, and deserves to be adored everywhere, that he wants to see the cross planted. The cross proclaims God's glory more than did the fiery cloudy pillar and the whole system of the Jewish economy.

Is it so, that this whole doctrine of systematic benevolence is a fixed law of the Church, and a part of her organization? Is it so, that if we bring our tithes into the store-house, God will infuse blessings everywhere in our incoming and our outgoing, and that there is a moral atmosphere that subserves the natural government? And can we then withhold our contributions from the Lord? These principles seem to him to be preparing the Church for the great work that is before her.

What should be the effect of this? He hears the notes of God's trumpet summoning the Church to a far intenser energy and devotion than ever before. It is not enough to announce these principles; we must live them and act them out. The

world is to be converted; we may have a part in it, or we may not; but if we do not, we shall have to stand aside and see the crown put upon the head of others. There is a beautiful passage in Milton's celebrated defence of the liberty of the Press. He sees England, just become a commonwealth, purging her eyes at the fountain of celestial truth, preparing to run a race of glory. So it is with our Presbyterian Church. She is in her youth, but she is purging her vision for a high and noble service in Christ's cause. For himself, he wished to have a part in her work. Wherever he sees the cross of Christ, that is enough for him. Where Jesus leads and breaks the way, it is enough for him to follow. Let us return to our churches, and labour to see that the whole body is united and compacted in these noble undertakings.

As to the debt. In one aspect it is painful, in another, encouraging. He was not frightened by it, nor afraid of the Presbyterian Church in these United States. Just make it plain to them that a claim is from God, and they will answer it. But he thought that this debt should be removed not in the way of regular contribution, but by a special collection in the churches. Dr. Thornwell then moved to amend the report by a resolution calling for a special collection to remove the debt.

The Rev. Dr. C. C. Jones thought we had now reached a point in which we could pass this report in its true spirit. He hoped there was no heart in this Assembly that had not been warmed by the course of remark we have listened to here to-day. He expressed but what he knew must be the common feeling, when he said we ought to give God thanks for this day's doings. We have received a new impulse here to-day. We have a new call upon us for entire consecration of ourselves, our possessions and all, to God. We profess to have made this consecration; but in view of these great principles we have here had pressed upon us, he for one felt that he had come far, far short of what became him. He hoped and trusted such an impression might be deepened in his own soul and the souls of others. This thought had oppressed his heart during the delivery of the remarks of the last respected speaker; and with great pleasure he seconded the resolution just offered by him. That debt belongs to the past. Let it be wiped off, and let the Board not

be hampered with it in its new year's operations. It is a small matter to our Church. Let us close these services by this practical exhibition of our interest.

One of the most pleasing indications of the presence of God in the late Assembly, was the unanimity and zeal manifested during the discussion relative to foreign missions. All the objections, that our organs for benevolent operations are Boards and not Committees; that our machinery is too complex; that presbyteries are the divinely constituted organs of the Church, and Boards excrescences; that churches and presbyteries are not to be impliedly censured when they fail to coöperate with the Boards, were all forgotten, dissipated into thin air, before the majesty and glory of the work which God had called our Church to do. The brethren all felt that they wished to be partakers in that work. The idea that God was in and with his Church only in the beginning, and then gave it all the forms and agencies he intended it should ever assume or exercise, is giving way to the consciousness of his presence, and to the ever increasing evidence that the Spirit of God dwelling in his Church, gives it forms and appliances suited to its emergencies, and therefore, that to refuse to avail ourselves of those forms, and to coöperate in those agencies, when thus plainly evoked and sanctioned by the Spirit, is to refuse to submit to the guidance of God and to the fellowship of his people. This shows that although we all have our crotchets, some on one subject and some on another, yet we are all ready to forget them when the real interests of the Church and the glory of our Redeemer are concerned. Dr. Thornwell said, "Wherever he sees the cross of Christ, it is enough for him. Where Jesus leads and breaks the way, it is enough for him to follow." This is the true principle of union and coöperation. Where Jesus leads, his people will follow, let their previous theories as to whether the path he takes is right or wrong, be what they may. There could hardly be a more decisive indication that God had hid his face from us and withdrawn his Spirit, than his allowing us to fall out, and hold back, and refuse to coöperate with each other in his work, because some thought that work should be done in one way, and some in another. And on the other hand, it is a clear manifestation of his presence and favour when our zeal for his work

is so great that we are ready and anxious to agree as to one way of doing it.

Board of Education.

Dr. A. T. McGill being called to the chair, Dr. Van Rensselaer addressed the Assembly in reference to the Report of the Board of Education.

There have been three hundred and eighty-three candidates aided by the Board, one more than during the past year. Since 1849, the time of the organization of the Board, two thousand five hundred and fifty-three young men have been educated. Only one person has been disciplined during the year. The Board has no agency in the collection of money, yet in no year past, even before the separation, when there were five to six hundred candidates, has there been so large an amount.

But yet how few the number of candidates in proportion to the great value of the harvest, one not of the grains of the earth, but of immortal souls, in comparison to which, all riches of the earth are nothing; how few in comparison to the great *extent* of the field, not of one latitude or longitude, but of the world! Even in our own Church there are some seven to eight hundred vacancies. How few, too, in consideration that the Lord of the harvest is the Lord Jesus Christ! To him should be addressed fervent prayer. He can create ministers. He did create Samuel in answer to a mother's prayer; so Davies, McMillan, and others. The call to the ministry comes from God; he is the author of the desire in the heart. We have a clear warrant to pray; yea, a special injunction to pray for the increase of labourers. Prayer gives energy to action, and ministers should bring the matter before the people, that they may know their duty.

There are in our connection sixty-two academies—four new ones established last year. There have been revivals in some of them; in one, during seven years past, two hundred persons have been converted. The Doctor then sketched a pleasant view of the prospects of the Presbyterian Colleges over the land, at different points—from Nassau Hall, New Jersey, to Austin College, Texas; and from Rome, Georgia, to Richmond, Missouri.

The connection between Colleges and Foreign Missions is very

intimate. The spirit of missions is nurtured there. There it sprang up in the hearts of Mills, Williams, and others. There is the museum of curiosities and the repository of information. There the missionaries all are educated, for they must of necessity be educated men. When Carey concluded to go to India as a missionary, he left the shoe-bench, not for the pulpit, but for the college, ere he went to teach the heathen and translate the Bible.

Dr. Leland, Chairman of the committee, then read the report of the committee, which is as follows :

The committee to whom was referred the Annual Report of the Board of Education, have read with great care and high satisfaction the full and various statements of the extensive operations of that active and energetic Board during the past year. It must be regarded as a matter of devout gratitude to God, by the Assembly, that this great work of training up the rising ministry, so essential to the vital interests of the Church and to the hopes of the world, has been prosecuted with undiminished ardour and success; that the number of candidates, in the various stages of their preparatory course, is as great as heretofore; and that the means and agencies employed by the Board to call forth and prepare efficient labourers for the ripening harvest, have received manifest tokens of divine approbation. Your committee take pleasure in calling attention to the encouraging fact that the number of schools, academies, and colleges, engaged in the great work of Christian education, has considerably increased, and that the activity and efficiency of these institutions are more signally manifested than ever before. This Report of the Board of Education is regarded by your committee as not only exceedingly valuable as a record of most interesting facts as to the progress of the great work of training young men for the ministry; but also as containing results of experience, and views of practical duty, which eminently deserve the special regard of all whose hearts are alive to the interests of Zion. All such hearts will be cheered and delighted by the elaborate discussion of the motives and encouragements to earnest, persevering prayer for the sending forth labourers into the harvest.

Your committee also take pleasure in directing the attention

of the Assembly, and of the Church at large, to the animating views embodied in the Report, as to the mighty influence exerted by religious colleges, not only at home, but in pagan lands, upon the great work of Foreign Missions.

In conclusion, your committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, viz.

1. *Resolved*, That the Assembly acknowledge with devout gratitude the manifest favours of God in the continued prosperity of the Assembly's measures of education, especially in the number of pious, promising young men, who have devoted themselves to the ministry; in the increasing liberality of the churches in sustaining this important department of Christian benevolence, and in the increased number and efficiency of the literary institutions, which are cordially engaged in promoting this sacred cause.

2. *Resolved*, That the great work of ministerial education, involving such large expenditure, presents the most urgent claims upon the liberality of our churches.

3. *Resolved*, That the Assembly acknowledge, with lively gratitude, the blessings so graciously bestowed by our divine Redeemer, in answer to the united prayers of the friends of Zion, for the conversion of the young men of our colleges, and earnestly recommend to all our churches the interesting concert of united prayer for the colleges in our land, on the last Thursday in February.

Board of Publication.

Rev. W. E. Schenck, Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Publication, presented their report. It shows very highly encouraging progress during the year.

The Publishing Agent reports that there have been issued sixty new works, viz. forty-five new books, and fourteen new tracts. Of these there have been issued 73,000 volumes, and 27,000 copies of new tracts, besides 25,000 copies of the Presbyterian Almanac for 1857. This is an increase of 47,500 copies of new books over last year.

The *reprints* of former publications have been 677,500 copies, exclusive of 18,000 copies of selections from Rouse's Version of the Psalms.

The total number of copies of old and new publications issued during the year, has been 802,500 copies, being an increase over last year of 212,250 copies.

The total number of copies published since the organization of the Board to March 1, 1857, has been 6,353,438.

1. The regular sales from the publishing house have amounted during the past year to 193,578 volumes, and 477,441 pages of tracts. This is an increase of 22,062 volumes over the sales of the previous year, exclusive of pamphlets and periodicals.

2. Distribution by Colportage. In this department there has been great enlargement, and peculiar encouragement during the past year.

The number of colporteurs in commission within the year has been two hundred and fifty-four, being an increase of forty-four over the last report. These have been distributed into thirty-two States and Territories, besides the entire range of the British provinces, from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Lake Superior.

These colporteurs have *sold* 124,579 volumes; *distributed gratuitously* 2,140,379 pages of tracts; have *given away* 14,802 volumes; and have visited 114,182 families. In every one of those items there has been a large increase over the results of former years.

In regard to the receipts of the Board, there has been a most gratifying increase this year from every source. The total receipts for the year have been from all sources, \$119,321.03, being an increase of \$17,227.79 over the preceding twelve months. The total of expenditures of all kinds has been \$118,808.42.

The colportage fund has been increased more than \$9000 over that of last year. This Board seems to be extending its operations in every direction.

Dr. Brown, from the committee on the Report of the Board of Publication, read their report, which was as follows.

After glancing at the encouraging facts in the Report, the committee offered for the adoption of the Assembly the following resolutions, viz.

1. That in view of the facts presented in the Annual Report, the Assembly hereby expresses its gratification at the progress made by the Board during the past year, in every department

of its operations, and would cheer onward the Board in the highly important and responsible work entrusted to its hands.

2. That the Assembly is particularly pleased that in accordance with its resolution of last year, the Board has gone forward in the publication of so many works adapted to Sabbath-school libraries and juvenile reading, and hopes this branch of the work of the Board may continue to be judiciously prosecuted. And the Assembly would recommend to all its ministers and churches, in procuring their supplies of reading for Sabbath-schools, to give particular attention to the books issued by our Board for this purpose.

3. That while the Assembly is highly gratified at the increasing patronage extended from every part of the Church to the *Home and Foreign Record* and *Sabbath-School Visitor*, yet it regrets to learn that there is still a large proportion of its families and members who do not receive these periodicals. The Assembly would therefore earnestly recommend to its ministers and sessions to use all practicable means to extend the circulation of these important papers in their respective vicinities.

4. That the Assembly rejoices in the expanding extent and usefulness of its colportage enterprise, as conducted by the Board. It is peculiarly gratifying to learn that there has been so large an increase during the past year in the number of churches contributing to the colportage fund, in the aggregate amount of church contributions furnished, without the employment of any collecting agency. And the Assembly hereby reiterates its earnest recommendation, to all the churches, to contribute regularly in aid of this highly important part of the Church's benevolent schemes.

5. That in view of the greatly increased cost of living, and consequently advanced prices of labour in everything, it is hereby recommended to the Board to make such an advance in the remuneration offered to colporteurs as, in its judgment, the circumstances may demand, and the resources of the Board may justify.

The committee would further report that they have had the subject of German literature before them, and they find that there are but few works published by the Board in the German language, and of these only one is a book, viz. Dr. Alexander's

Christian Experience; five others are five and ten cent tracts, and the remaining two are only one cent tracts. This paucity of Evangelical works in German, is deeply to be deplored, in view of the following facts: 1st, That vast numbers of German Lutherans, and other denominations, into which the German people have been divided, are coming among us every year, and are very accessible to Christian effort. 2d, That they have but little, and some of them, in fact, no Evangelical literature. 3d, Other parties are prevailing to a fearful extent among them in many places to insinuate into their minds deep and bitter prejudice against our Church, by distorting and sometimes misrepresenting our doctrines and polity. For all this we can apply no antidote but the living missionary or colporteur, and a vigorous press. But when the missionary or colporteur goes among them, he has no supply of books, and much of the personal labour is lost for the lack of these permanent forms of truth, the printed sheet.

The committee would therefore recommend the passage of the following resolutions:

1. That the Board of Publication be instructed to take into their earnest consideration this whole question of supplying suitable books in the German language, and to publish, from time to time, such notices of any new issue thereof as will enable those interested to supply themselves.

2. That the Board of Publication be and hereby is instructed to take into their earnest consideration the whole subject of supplying a vigorous Evangelical literature in the German language, fitted for the objects contemplated by the Board.

The committee further suggests that the Board be encouraged to grant small libraries to Sabbath-schools established on missionary ground, and that it be authorized to elect three vice-presidents. This report was adopted.

Church Extension.

Rev. H. I. Coe, Corresponding Secretary of the Church Extension Committee, laid their report before the Assembly. It shows an unparalleled advance in its receipts—rising from \$9,751 31 last year, to \$23,265 60 this year, or an increase of one hundred and thirty-eight per cent. The number of churches

contributing to its fund has risen from one hundred and sixty-seven that year, to five hundred and two this year. No church applying for aid, and complying with the rules of the Board, has been refused. The number of churches assisted is seventy-eight. The report shows many gratifying, and some mournful facts, in reference to the supply of churches with houses of worship. This Committee has had no collecting agent in the field.

Dr. Greenleaf, Chairman, then presented the report of the committee, as follows.

The committee to whom was referred the Report of the Church Extension Committee, have attended to that service and carefully examined that Report and all the other papers committed to their hands, and as the result of their investigations, they beg leave to offer the following resolutions for the adoption of the Assembly, viz.

1. *Resolved*, That the Report of the Church Extension Committee be adopted and published.

2. *Resolved*, That the Assembly are highly gratified by the great prosperity of this part of the Church's work, the receipts having arisen during the past year from \$9,751 31 to \$23,265 60; the number of contributing churches having been trebled in the same time, and these results having been accomplished without any salaried collecting agent.

3. *Resolved*, That it affords them pleasure to commend the prudent, enterprising, economical and yet liberal manner in which the affairs of the Committee have been managed.

4. *Resolved*, That the Assembly approve of the further condition annexed to all appropriations, viz. that churches aided should not directly nor indirectly apply for aid to any church, or member of our denomination outside of its own community, without the consent of the Committee.

5. *Resolved*, That, in view of the facts that at least one-fifth of our churches are without any house of worship, and that more than one-twelfth of the remainder need larger houses—that many churches are burdened with debt in their edifices—that our churches are increasing at the rate of about one hundred a year—and that the aid afforded by the Church Extension Committee, in many instances, proved a powerful encouragement to the people to exert themselves, the Assembly would

recommend the subject of Church Extension to the confidence, prayers, and continued and increased liberality of all our churches.

6. *Resolved*, That this Assembly heartily approve of the views expressed by the Committee in their Report concerning the cost of church edifices, views which they have hitherto acted upon, and with the most encouraging results.

7. *Resolved*, That the Assembly rejoice in the evidence furnished by the Report of the Committee, that the churches they have been called upon to aid have not overpassed the limits of expenditure which a judicious regard to their circumstances would suggest; and they would most earnestly advise those churches which may hereafter build houses of worship, to avoid erecting edifices so large and costly as to involve them in heavy debts.

The fourth in the above series of resolutions, gave rise to considerable debate, and was finally stricken out, and the following substituted in its place.

Resolved, That the churches applying for aid, be required to make a full report of all moneys either raised by themselves, or received from other sources.

Relative powers of Elders and Deacons.

Dr. Breckinridge reported the following Overture. Has a church session any control over the funds in the hands of the deacons for the poor of the church? or does the control belong to the deacons? Or what power has the session in the premises? The first of these questions the Committee recommend should be answered in the negative; the second in the affirmative; and the third, by saying that the session may advise as to the use of the funds in the hands of the deacons.

This subject occasioned some little debate, perhaps from the fact that the limitations of the question were not at first perceived. The question was not, which was the governing power, deacons or elders? Nor which had the right to raise and to control the general contributions of the church? Nor even which body had control over the contributions made specifically for the poor? But simply which had the right to determine on the distribution of money designed for the poor, and already in

the hands of the deacons? That is, to decide who should receive it, and how much should be given to A., and how much to B. The question was thus reduced to a very small point. As soon as the Assembly discovered this, they cut short the debate, and adopted the report of the committee.

American Bible Society.

On motion of Dr. Thornwell, the report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, on the Overture regarding the alterations of the English Bible by the American Bible Society, was taken up from the docket. Dr. Breckinridge, from the Committee of Bills and Overtures, presented the following Overture concerning the American Bible Society, and the publication of the Bible, without any expression of opinion of the Committee in reference to it:

1. The American Bible Society has, by the terms of its Constitution, no legitimate right to alter in any way the common and accepted standard English Scriptures, as they stood at the period of the creation of that Society.

2. Concerning the said English Scriptures, the American Bible Society has full power to print and circulate them, and to collect and manage funds for those purposes; but it has no power to edit them in any other sense than to keep them in the exact condition in which the standard English Bible stood at the formation of said Society.

3. This General Assembly and the Church it represents, are, and from the beginning have been, warm and unanimous supporters and friends of the American Bible Society. And it is in this sense we feel called on to say that we neither do nor can allow on our part of any, even the smallest, departure from the original principles on which that Society was founded, and to express the settled conviction that the continued support of that Society by the Presbyterian Church, depends upon the strict adherence of the Society to those clear and simple principles.

4. The Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church will consider and report to the next General Assembly a plan for the preparation and permanent publication by it of the common English Bible, in a form suitable for pulpit use, with the stand-

ard text unchanged, and the usual accessories to the text commonly found in Pulpit English Bibles from 1611 to 1847.

The Rev. Dr. Breckinridge said—He had never been called to perform any duty with more regret, and none that he would sooner have avoided. It is well known to his friends that from the first he had felt that the Church of the living God was a very different thing from what Christians of our day and our own body considered it. He had always been jealous as to the assumption of any of the powers of the Church by voluntary societies. These societies were a class of Christians, he thought, who were predestinated only to mischief. He had, however, regarded the Bible Society as an exception. It seemed that the work of publishing and circulating the Scriptures was peculiarly appropriate to an organization in which all denominations could unite. From the beginning he had been an earnest, and is to this day an unfailling, friend of that Society. If he had ever laboured zealously for any one thing, it was for this Society; and even should that Society put itself into a position to compel us to withdraw our support from it, he did not see what we are to do next.

There are other considerations which could have no effect on him; but he had seen the day when to fall under the frown of one of these great voluntary societies was a serious matter, and he could conceive that there are many on this floor who would gladly avoid having this great Bible Society brought with all its power down upon them.

This overture contains two ideas as regards the Bible Society. It asserts that the Society is the printer of the Bible, and not its editor, and recommends that our Board of Publication just publish one impression of the Bible as a standard text, as in all governments you keep a standard of weights and measures. We do not want to enter into any competition with the Bible Society. He would further say, that a corrupt copy of the Bible was better than no Bible. All the truths necessary to salvation are so often repeated in the Bible, that it must require a diabolical ingenuity to obliterate them wholly. The American Bible Society perhaps will say, that in point of fact the statements in this overture are true, and that they have never done anything else. If that was true, he had nothing further to

say. Whether they had or not, was a matter that must be discussed sooner or later.

As to the publishing a Bible by the Board of Publication, he would say that when that Board was organized he had some apprehension of danger from the Bible Society, and he had offered, and Dr. Alexander had seconded, the proposition that that Board should publish the Bible, and he believed the Board did publish an edition of the New Testament. The language of the overture is more favourable to the Bible Society than their own constitution—that constitution specifying that the “sole object of the Society is to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment.” In regard to the power over the sacred text, the sole power granted to them is to circulate and print the English Scriptures in common use—for by “circulating” he conceded might be meant also “printing.” He utterly denied that the Society has any right to do an earthly thing in *editing* the English text. The duty of an editor and that of a printer were widely diverse.

He wished to point out the grounds on which he held that the Bible Society has edited the Bible. It is easy to ascertain what is the standard Bible. It is near five hundred years since Wickliffe first translated the Bible into English. Under the reign of King James, fifty-four gentlemen were appointed to translate or rather collate the then present English edition of the Bible and publish it. All we have to do then, is just to get the text of 1611, and print it, and the British and Foreign Bible Society not long since actually republished the 1611 edition, to show that the Bible as they published it now was the genuine version. In 1767, Dr. Blaney, under the authorities of the Oxford and London Authorized Presses, made a revision and edited, and brought out an edition in 1769, that was adopted as the English standard text, which is the standard to this day. The Bible Society’s explanatory pamphlet does not allude to Blaney, but his text had never been authoritatively altered, and had long stood as the standard; all the Bible Society had to do was just to take the Blaney Bible, or that of 1611, and publish. These had been accepted by the English speaking people, and their Protestant churches throughout the world.

Dr. Breckinridge quoted from the Explanatory Report of the

Society, and would not go beyond that. In 1847, a superintendent of printing found certain errors in the text. Here is a question of the *purity* of the English text arising within a Society organized solely for *printing and circulating* the Bible, and not from any call from any church, or any call whatever from without; a question which may ultimately rend Protestantism in pieces, is taken up and carried through on the movement of *an anonymous printer!* There was no call for this thing. They go on and stereotype and publish the version they have for a long time been thus carrying through, and the first the public hears of this completed revision is in 1851, when the public are informed that the work is already stereotyped. The Christian public had no knowledge of what was doing until it was too late. He would now lift up his voice against this thing, whether any here concurred with him or not. The Christian conscience must answer whether a voluntary Society, on the suggestion of a printer, and under the control of one New-school man, one Old-school, &c., should be justified in making all these alterations. The Society say they have not done anything. We say they have. They say they had power to do all they did. We say they had not. They were never appointed for that. The thing establishes a precedent that the text is under their control, which we will not allow.

What is this Bible? The gift of the Lamb to his wife, the next greatest gift to that of Christ and his Spirit! Are we to stand by and see a voluntary society establish the precedent that it may do what it likes with this blessed gift? Is that a power that ought to be committed to such a Society? Never. What do we now ask of them? Nothing but that they shall stand on the pedestal where they were originally placed.

One of the strongest and most tender ties that binds together the English speaking people of the world and the two greatest kingdoms of the earth, is the English Bible; what are you to gain by making a few changes of capitals, italics, headings, spelling, &c.—and these gentlemen say this is all they have done—when you imperil the longer union of these Christians in this blessed book? What is there in this to justify an anonymous printer and a New-school preacher to tinker up the long-honoured English Bible? Especially why should this have been

done just at the very time when a portion of a large denomination is employing itself, with all its energies, to disparage our English Bible? This Bible, too, is the standard of our English tongue. What are this printer, preacher, and their colleagues, that they should take it upon themselves to amend this standard of our English tongue? We do not hold them competent for that work. When that is to be done we must go higher than they.

Dr. Breckinridge examined in detail the explanatory pamphlet of the Society, contending that however unimportant any of these changes might be, they had no right to make them; and that some of them do involve the matter of glosses and comments, and are therefore important; and that at any rate they had no right to make the changes, great or little. He had a great reverence for New England English, but we had a better English before New England was born, and he had no doubt we would still have when New England English had run out. He did not know whether either of the seven of the version Committee knew much about Greek, unless it was Dr. Robinson, and he did not know whether he was sound in the faith. Dr. Spring understood Greek, but unfortunately he was nearly blind. As to what they say about following the Greek in their punctuation, that is all humbug. We all know that the Greeks did not have all these commas, and periods, and capitals; they were a sort of people that went dead ahead; and the Hebrews were just like them, except that they went straight backward. The Society itself says, they "believe" there are five cases in which they alter the sense. Others might "believe" that this was true of most of the other changes. One of their alterations, they admit, was never found "in any edition before" —it is bran span new! As to the headings of chapters, it is true that they were no part of the text, but was what the Society put in place of them a part of the text? Why discard these captions that had been acquiesced in for two hundred years? He was firm in his conviction that this movement, if persisted in, will ruin the Society. He was ready, if the Assembly wished it, to take the specimens of their alterations they have given, and show that the bulk of them was for the worse; but after all, it is the principle of the thing which gives the subject its importance. The Society had for a long series of years

printed the Bible to the entire satisfaction of the Christian public, but they have now entered on a course which excites a general anxiety. All that the Society has to do is just to go back to where they were before. This Assembly is not a voluntary Society, but a Church of God, and as such, if we regard the word of God as in danger, we are bound to rise up in its defence.

The Rev. Mr. McNeill, one of the Secretaries of the Bible Society, was permitted to address the Assembly. His business of explaining the course of the American Bible Society is made much easier by the introductory remarks of the distinguished gentleman who had presented this overture, to the effect that whilst he had opposed voluntary societies in general, he had made this Society an exception. The Presbyterian Church is intimately connected with this Institution, not having undertaken to publish the Bible itself. This Society has sent out already three times as many copies of the word of God as were in the whole world forty years ago.

What has the Society done that it should be now arraigned? A strong case has been presented. He would only say, that if the statements made were correct, the Society has done wrong, and he could give a pledge for the Board of Managers that they would recede. The Society has no right to touch King James's version. The Board do not think they have done so. It is difficult, perhaps, satisfactorily to explain this matter, especially in the time and circumstances he was now placed in. The first edition of King James's Bible contained numerous errors. Many of these were corrected in the second edition, and then in the third edition, which last became the standard in the churches. That edition, however, would hardly be very intelligible to the body of the people now. The spelling is so different from ours, that with a dictionary's aid an unlearned man could not read it. The editions, hence, had often required corrections of spelling, &c., so as to adapt them to general use. Dr. Blancy acted only under authority of the Syndics of the Clarendon press, and resorted to the original languages when versions differed; he had altered headings, italics, &c., exclusively. This had continued to be the standard version chiefly until now. In 1813 it was adopted as the standard of the

American Bible Society. The Society's Constitution requires them to publish "the version now in common use." This does not mean any one particular edition. This would have been a dangerous assumption of power. They ought not to have fixed the Society for ever to any one edition. The object of the Board had been to get the best standard edition they can find of King James's Bible. They could not go back to that of 1611. They took Blaney's, and the Oxford, London, and other editions, and after collation, adopted one they considered as the best. But variations in spelling, punctuation, capitals, &c., gradually crept in. These crept even into the Society's own Bibles. These variations did not affect any doctrine; but it did not seem desirable that they should be publishing editions differing from each other. It was this which attracted the attention of the superintendent of printing, and led to what had been done. They intended no alterations or new version. There is no publishing house in the world which has so eminent a Superintending Committee as that of the Society, named here yesterday. They are charged to see that the Society do not deviate from the standard.

Dr. Breekinridge—On the fifteenth page of the Explanatory Pamphlet of the Society, it is said that the "Superintendent of Printing" did certain things. Does the gentleman mean that it was this Committee that is here referred to as the superintendent of printing?

Mr. McNeill—By no means. But the superintendent of printing, though an humble individual, understands thoroughly his work, and he is under the control of this Committee of Versions. This Version Committee reported the variations to the Managers. Mr. McNeill then read to the Assembly the rules adopted by the Managers and Committee for guidance in the collation they were led to enter upon. The four most perfect English editions were selected to be used as authority in making corrections. He mentioned these things to show that simply a collation was aimed at. Their object was not to destroy the unity of English readers in the Scriptures, but rather to secure it, by making their standard correspond, as far as practicable, with the authorized English editions. The specimens given in in the Explanatory Pamphlet were of *variations*, and not "alter-

ations." He granted that there were apparent instances of alterations. The headings, references, &c., are not inspired; it is the "text" alone that has that sacred character. If the Society sees that public sentiment in this country condemns the work of a collation, it will certainly abandon it. It will not set itself against the Presbyterian or any other Church. He was not taking the position that these things are to be adhered to, right or wrong. But have they done wrong? He hoped to show that there was no ground for alienation of confidence.

The Society, he said, found so many variations in their different editions, that they were forced to make an effort to get the edition of 1611 as far as possible. The Committee on Versions, composed of seven, referred the matter to a sub-committee of three—Dr. Robinson, Dr. Vermilye, and Dr. McLain—as collators. The latter gentleman undertook the collation, having a book with six columns, putting down all the variations of the different editions in the columns. Once a week he met the Committee and read the results of his labours, and they passed upon them. In case of difference among them, they referred it to the larger Committee. They had some difficult points to decide between the different editions. Where the editions differed, the Committee referred to the original language to see which was right. Mr. McNeill cited several passages where this was done. He contended that, in every case, they went according to the edition of 1611, except where it was a printer's error. There were four cases, he admitted, where they had corrected manifest errors. This may have been editing, but he thought not. They thought that these must have been errors of the press, and that they had a right to correct them. This, however, has been re-committed to the Committee, with instructions to re-examine it, more than a month since. He supposed the changes would be restored when the Committee came to make their report. He was not authorized to anticipate their report. He only expressed an opinion on the subject. He then took up all the other changes the Committee had made in regard to orthoepy, proper names, punctuation, &c., &c., and defended them on the same general principles. Mr. McNeill's speech in the afternoon occupied an hour and a half. He concluded by asserting that the present edition of the American Bible Society,

with the exception of the spelling, conforms more nearly to the edition of 1611 than any other edition now extant. The few small changes shall not stand in the way of the coöperation of this Assembly or any other Christian body. Do not, I beseech you, he said, lay violent hands upon, or cripple in any way, a Society which is doing so much to spread the word of God through the world.

Judge Fine remarked that these resolutions before us are of very great importance, and great care should be taken that we come to no conclusion hastily, and as our time is rapidly hastening to a close, he therefore moved that the resolutions be committed to a committee of five, to report to the next General Assembly.

Dr. Breckinridge disliked to claim again the indulgence of the house, but did not like to see the matter thus passed over *sub silentio*. The next Assembly will be composed of different persons from the present; we will not be there, and he did not feel like shrinking from a present duty. The matter, even if we postponed it, will not sleep in the minds of the Christian people of our land. And it will be agitated everywhere, and the fewer the agitations, the better for that Society. If the Society wishes to know our mind on this subject, how can they ever find out by our delay? It is of great importance that we speak our mind on the great principles that should guide their work; for the circulation must go on during the year, and if a wrong principle be adopted, the sooner it be changed the better. The question is not, whether the changes alluded to are right or not, but it is a question of right, and he regretted to hear the Secretary say they were few, when the Report says the examples specified are but specimens of many more; that it was a very small matter in a small place.

The thing that the motion contemplates is not one that the Assembly can decide. It contemplates a work for scholars, and that for years. The brother had spoken, for example, of the use of the capital letters; of them, he would confine himself to the letter "S." He would not speak of the propriety of putting a little "s" or a large one. The word "Spirit" occurs, perhaps, from one to two thousand times in the Bible. It is of infinite importance that it be applied rightly. And to do so

involves a question of exegesis, of translation, and of commentary.

If we have an agent appointed to a particular purpose, he only has a right to act within his instructions, and he would not make them offenders for a word; yet if the Assembly deem the Society to have departed from its instructions—from the great principles on which it was founded, you are bound to make a deliverance; if you think the matter a trifling one, say so, if you have your minds made up.

Here the Moderator announced that the hour of adjournment had arrived, but from all parts of the house were heard cries of "Go on, go on!" The Doctor proceeded, when Dr. Scott interposed a question to Dr. Breckinridge, if he had not seen the pamphlet alluded to, if he could vote on the matter; to which Dr. Breckinridge replied that he thought not, but he heard that there were several copies in the house. All that he would say would be as the friend of the Society. Our Church ever has been the friend of the Society. But we are not called on to decide on a question of fact; there is hence no need of an examination into details, we ought to make a deliverance of principle. We can do that now; let us not put it out of the house for ever. If it must be referred to the next Assembly, let it be done *simpliciter*, and not through Committee.

The Rev. Dr. Adger having the floor, said—What do we gain by reference to the next General Assembly? We have spent now a part of three days in this discussion already, and no one here will wish to avoid a duty, and have the time of the next Assembly taken up in the same way in going over the same ground.

The question is a simple, a plain one; is the Bible Society organized to print and circulate the Bible, or to edit it—not whether the Society has transcended its powers or not. That would be a question of difficulty to decide upon. If it be asked, why make a deliverance *now* in the matter? What call is there for it? Were not the admissions of the Secretary on yesterday a sufficient cause? Mr. McNeill acknowledged that there had been changes made by the Society, as specified in page 19 of the Report of the Bible Society, in regard to its emendations. It had been remarked by the Secretary that the

important changes were few, and all mentioned in the Report; the Report itself, on the contrary, mentions them only as specimens of many things. The word "O," whether it should be written "O" or "Oh," as has been said, causes a reference to the original; whence the necessity of the Society's employing an eminent scholar, so as to know what the Hebrew and Greek decide. So in regard to parentheses. In some places, the Society say, they have left out the parentheses, for they give a wrong meaning. Is not that an exposition?

The Doctor thought it far the best for the Society for us to act now; if we postpone action the public mind will imagine a thousand things of evil against the Society that do not exist. Let us pass this resolution and settle the matter; the Society then can recede, if they see proper; or if not, we can take action as we may think best.

Judge Allen was in favour of referring to the next Assembly, for we have not *time* for its discussion, and he was afraid that if we went through with the docket, even Kentucky hospitality would be greatly tried. Again, we would, if we passed this resolution, sit in judgment upon the Constitution of the Society, which we did not make, and perhaps did not all understand, as to its exact powers to collate; but if we did make a deliverance, it should be so carefully worded as not to be capable of misconstruction. It would, of course, be an implied censure on the Society. He had not had the opportunity of learning from the pamphlet alluded to, save as read by the parties in the discussion, hence he would not enter into that line of argument. He was glad that the Overture had been brought in, and that the discussion had taken place; it would do good. It would show the Society how sensitive the American people were in regard to the purity of the sacred text.

Before we touch a Society that for forty years has furnished us with the standard of sacred truth, we should be careful to know that it has a foundation; for a censure is a censure, though implied, and he would as leave pass a direct as an indirect censure.

While he did not desire to avoid any duty, yet he did not desire needlessly to rush into any responsibility, and he desired to be clearly satisfied of its propriety, before he voted for a

resolution which he thought would be fraught with evil and injury to the Bible Society.

He thought that if the matter were referred, the debate need not again take place; the press all over the country will take it up and carry it on. He wished for more light.

Dr. Hoge did not wish to vote at all for the resolutions as they now stand. He could not vote for them, for they are based on assumed facts, facts not proved, that there has been a violation of the Constitution of the Bible Society, for it is a very nice point to determine what it is to edit and what to collate. Again, he could not vote against the resolutions, for the drift of the emendations is unquestionably right—the intention is correct; and thereby the expression of opinion by any public body, on any question, when only a part of the case is known, is a dangerous thing, and we do not know what the Society has done; and he was unwilling, by innuendo, to censure the Society unless he knew certainly that it was deserved. The doctor was unwilling to vote for the resolutions, for he, so far as he knew of the changes made by the Bible Society, approved of them. We further will place ourselves in a false position if we pass a censure on the Society, for he did not believe the great Christian public would sustain us in it; and lastly, he would ask, where is the standard Bible from which the Society should copy? In what year was it printed, and where? He was in favour of referring to the next Assembly.

Dr. McGill said he approved the general principles of the resolutions, but the standard Bible has been changed in England since 1816. If this is so, the Bible in England and this country would differ. Our Bible, if the last resolution is adopted, will be different from that which we require, by the other resolutions, of the American Bible Society.

The discussion was continued by the Rev. Mr. Hamersly of Virginia, but he could not be heard by the reporter.

Dr. Aikin said the Assembly is not prepared to vote for the overture, or against it, simply because they had not the facts before them. With all the kind words used, it will be a thrust at the Bible Society. Let it go over to next year. Falschood travels faster than truth. The object is the purity of the Bible, but will these resolutions secure it? They will pave the way

for a great number of denominational Bibles. If Presbyterians publish a Bible, others may do it.

Dr. Breckinridge moved to lay this resolution, to refer to the next Assembly, on the table. The vote was counted on this resolution, and stood for it 117, and against it 127, the vote being taken by tellers. The vote then recurred upon Judge Fine's resolution to commit to the next General Assembly. The vote was taken by calling the roll. The vote stood for committing to the next Assembly 128, against it 114.

The overture was referred to the next Assembly, and the Assembly adjourned with prayer.

Disabled Ministers.

The Committee of the Trustees in the case of disabled ministers, made their report through Dr. Jones, of Philadelphia. They report that they have, during the year, on application of fifteen Presbyteries, given aid to twenty-one persons, to whom they have distributed seventeen hundred and eighty dollars, being about an average of eighty-five dollars to each. The action of the last Assembly has increased the contributions to this cause, whilst the applications are about as great as they were before. This arises from the fact that but little is known of this fund throughout the Church. They recite cases of great suffering, which have been brought to their notice, which have been effectually relieved. They say that, should not the applications increase greatly, they will be able to enlarge their appropriations in future. It has come to their knowledge that a number of wealthy persons have it in mind to contribute to this cause by legacies, to be paid after their deaths. The Trustees call upon the Assembly to take measures to increase this fund.

Judge Leavitt, from the special committee appointed by the last Assembly to report to this Assembly on the same subject, then read the report of the committee. The committee, in their report, in substance say:

That they addressed a circular to the Presbyteries, containing several points of inquiry relating to the subject, to which replies from sixty-two only have been received. Within these sixty-two Presbyteries, there are eleven ministers disabled from

age or disease, twenty-one widows and thirty-six children of deceased ministers, in need of pecuniary aid. Supposing the same destitution to exist in the Presbyteries not reporting, the result would be that the whole number of disabled ministers is twenty-six; of widows about fifty; of children not less than eighty. It is supposed that this estimate approximates the truth, though it may not be wholly accurate.

The report shows several cases of extreme penury and positive suffering; and that, with very few exceptions, it does not appear that the Presbyteries and Synods have made any provision for supplying the wants of the classes referred to.

The committee say that they do not propose to prove by argument the obligation of the Church to provide the means of comfortable support for the destitute classes whose relief is contemplated by the former action of the Assembly. It is demanded, not only by considerations of Church policy, but of clear Christian duty. The committee refer to the action of the Assembly of 1849 and 1856, as affirmatory of this obligation. They also state that the Presbyteries which have reported evince a deep interest in this subject, and give cordial pledges of coöperation in any plan of action that may receive the approbation of the Assembly. They express the confident opinion that the whole Church is now prepared for efficient action on this subject.

As to the plan of future operations, there is not an entire agreement among the members of the committee; and they have been unable to concur in any specific plan, as having the concurrence of a majority of the committee. They, therefore, suggest the several plans that have been proposed, leaving it to the Assembly to select such as they may approve. The plans are in substance the following: 1. Leaving the whole subject to the Presbyteries, simply enjoining on each to make provision for disabled ministers, widows, and children. 2. Referring it to the Presbyteries and Synods to raise such amount annually as may be necessary, and reporting any deficiency to the Assembly, to be made up from a fund to be raised by individual contributions, and placed in charge of the Trustees of the Assembly. 3. The raising of a large, permanent fund, by an annual assessment and payment by every minister of one per cent.

for five years, on the amount of his salary, and an assessment of double that amount on the church of which he is the pastor. In addition to this, the plan contemplates donations from individuals, in aid of the general fund. 4. The fourth plan proposed is substantially that adopted by the Assembly of 1849, and now in operation, which is in substance, that the churches be called on annually for such contributions as the current demands of the destitute may require, soliciting, in addition, contributions from individuals, and legacies, &c., in aid of the cause.

Without stating it as the opinion of the majority of the committee, the chairman strongly indicates it as his opinion, that it is expedient to continue the present plan, especially as it appears the sum contributed for the past year has been considerably increased, and justifies the expectation that, with the further earnest recommendation of the Assembly, the churches will provide by their voluntary contributions a sum sufficient to meet the demands of the destitute, upon a liberal scale. The committee suggest several strong objections to the policy of an attempt now to create a permanent fund so large as that the proceeds will supply these wants: They think it most judicious, at least for the present, to continue the plan now in operation, and not substitute for it another, the success of which is doubtful. The committee further estimate that the annual amount needed for the purpose stated, will be not less than \$10,000, and may amount to \$15,000.

The committee earnestly commend the whole subject to the notice and consideration of the Assembly, and express the hope that such action will be adopted as will bring the Church to the discharge of their whole duty in connection with this important subject.

Judge Fine moved the adoption of this report. This subject was fully discussed by the last Assembly. It was adopted.

Centennial Celebration.

On the memorial of the Presbyterian Historical Society, asking the General Assembly to commemorate next year, in an appropriate manner, the re-union of the Synods of New York

and Philadelphia, which occurred in 1758, the Committee on Bills and Overtures reported as follows, viz.

That the celebration of important historical events has always been considered by the Church as an appropriate, interesting, and edifying testimony to the grace and power of divine providence. Among the great events of the past, the re-union of the two Synods of New and Philadelphia is among the most remarkable incidents which have occurred in our Presbyterian Church history, and seems to come within that class of events whose celebration may be undertaken by the Church for the public benefit; therefore,

Resolved, That this General Assembly, as an expression of gratitude to God for his providential mercy, in the re-union of the Synods of New York and Philadelphia, will engage in a centennial commemoration of that event on the 22d of May, 1858.

Resolved, That Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer, as principal, and Dr. Humphrey, as alternate, be appointed to deliver an historical address before the General Assembly.

This report was adopted.

The right of Elders to exhort and to expound the Scriptures.

Dr. Waddel said he desired to bring up a paper from the Tombeckbee Presbytery, which he had been requested by the delegate from that Presbytery to bring before the Assembly, as the delegate himself had failed to arrive. It could not legally come before the Assembly he knew, but might do so in an informal way, by consent of the Assembly. It was a request of the Presbytery to the Assembly to review its former deliverance on the subject of Ruling Elders conducting religious service and expounding the Scriptures. Dr. Waddel moved that the paper be received by the Assembly. Dr. Adger seconded this resolution in order to offer an amendment to it, as follows: "Whereas, the last Assembly, near the close of its meetings, and probably therefore, with some degree of haste in adopting the report of their Committee on the Records of the Synod of Mississippi, did sanction the principle that a ruling elder, in the absence of the pastor, may read the Scriptures and explain them, and endeavour to enforce the truth by suitable exhorta-

tions; and whereas the notice of this body has been called to the subject by representations on the part of a Presbytery of that Synod, therefore, be it resolved by this Assembly, that explaining the Scriptures, and enforcing the truth by exhortation, form no part of the official duty of ruling elders as elders. At the same time it is earnestly recommended by this Assembly, in the language of the twenty-first chapter of our Form of Government, that every vacant congregation meet together, on the Lord's day, at one or more places, for the purposes of prayer, singing praises, and reading the Holy Scriptures, together with the works of such approved divines as the Presbytery in whose bounds they are may recommend, and they may be able to procure: and that the elders or deacons be the persons who shall preside, and select the portions of Scriptures and of the other books to be read, and to see that the whole be conducted in a becoming and orderly way."

Dr. Steele moved that the whole subject be laid on the table. This motion was carried.

Dr. Adger gave notice that he would protest against this action of Assembly, but subsequently withdrew his notice of protest, on condition that his motion should be entered on the Minutes.

The decision of the Assembly is certainly in accordance with the usage of the Church in all parts of our country with which we are acquainted. In Dr. Green's congregation, in Philadelphia, the elders held weekly meetings in different parts of the city, in which they read the Scriptures and exhorted the people, explaining and applying the portion read. In the French Protestant churches, where the same pastor serves several congregations, it is customary for him to set one of his elders to supply his place when he is engaged in some other part of his charge. Every head of a Christian family and almost every private member of the church does more or less of the duty here enjoined. It is hard to see why the elders alone should be debarred the privilege. It would require very stringent laws, and more power than any Assembly possesses, to prevent zealous elders from exhorting sinners to repent and turn unto God and live.

Independent Presbyterian Church.

Overture No. 21, from the Bethel Presbytery, was taken up, in reference to a proposed union between the Bethel Presbytery and the Independent Presbyterian Church, once known as the followers of the late Rev. W. C. Davis. Upon which the Committee made the following report.

While the General Assembly is greatly gratified with the spirit of charity and brotherly love which the Overture indicates as subsisting between the Presbytery of Bethel and the Independent Church, and would sincerely rejoice at the consummation of the proposed union, it yet cannot sanction the precise terms of the covenant which has actually been made. The privilege claimed by the Independent ministers of holding and teaching doctrines not in harmony with the Confession of Faith, is a privilege, which, even if harmless in this particular case, might be abused as a precedent, and lead in other quarters and relations to serious mischief. The Assembly expresses the desire that these ministers may soon be able to embrace our standards without reservation, and in that case, the Presbytery of Bethel is hereby authorized to ratify the union without further application to this body, but in the event that the Independent ministers and churches cannot relinquish their peculiarities with a good conscience, this Assembly will cherish them in the bonds of Christian love, but cannot see its way clear to embrace them in the same denomination.

Dr. Leland regarded this matter as important, and he would be brief. In the range of the Bethel Presbytery are some nine or ten churches of Independents, and some four ministers holding about the same views as ourselves, and they are desirous to unite with us.

When W. C. Davis's book was examined by the Assembly, it was condemned for holding certain errors: *e. g.* that the active obedience of Christ has no justifying efficacy; that the first act of faith has no holiness in it; that man, by nature, is not a subject of moral law, etc. Mr. Davis was arraigned by his Presbytery, and saw that he was likely to be condemned, and all at once he discovered that Presbyterianism was all wrong, and Independency right. He took no preachers with him, yet, in a

short time, he was surrounded by ministers and licentiates. For a considerable time there has been a strong desire to unite with us, yet their ministers wish to make a proviso, that while they receive our standards, they have leave to preach Davis's peculiar doctrines; it was not so with the people. He hoped the report would pass. The Overture was adopted.

Foreign Correspondence.

Dr. McGill, from the Committee on Foreign Correspondence, made a report which was received and is as follows:

1. In relation to the report of Rev. Edward Cater, from the committee appointed by the last General Assembly, to open a correspondence, and confer about a closer union with the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, they recommend that the same committee be continued with the assurance that this General Assembly is gratified with the progress already made in their good work; and desires, that even if a closer union with that evangelical body be not consummated, the interchange of delegates, and expressions of fraternal love so pleasantly begun may be perpetual.

2. The Committee recommend that no delegate be sent, for the present, to any of the Congregational bodies of New England. One of them has expressly informed us that the correspondence is discontinued by its own act. Others have so far entertained the same design as to refer the question of discontinuance to their distinct Associations for ultimate decision; and none of them is, in fact, represented at this Assembly, except the Evangelical Convention of Vermont. And although it is due to Rev. F. Butler to record our great satisfaction, with the eminent courtesy and fraternal spirit, with which he has represented his brethren here; yet the Committee have been grieved to find in the published Minutes of that Consociation, at their last meeting, a very offensive resolution, as well as proceedings of a secular and political bearing, which the sense of our Ecclesiastical Assemblies seeks to avoid.

3. In relation to the Reformed Presbyterian Church, from which a letter has been received of remonstrance against our settled principles of discipline, on the subject of slavery, the committee

would remind the Assembly that, thirty years ago that body declined to sanction the arrangement of any correspondence with the General Assembly, although unanimously agreed to by this body; and we do not deem it our duty in this case to send them a letter in reply, especially, as the position of our Church on the subject referred to needs no further explanation.

But we fully reciprocate the expressions of fraternal regard, and of confidence in our order, and the steadfastness of our faith which the letter conveys, and would rejoice to have the bonds of Christian fellowship with that body made closer, if it could be done consistently with the claims of truth and peace. The report was adopted with a single dissenting voice, that of J. A. I. Lowes, who gave notice that he would enter a protest to it.

Revision of the Book of Discipline.

Two overtures were read, one from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, proposing a revision of forms of judicial proceedings, and the other from Dr. Breckinridge, proposing a change in representation from Presbyterial to Synodical, and making the General Assembly consist of fifty ministers and fifty ruling elders permanently.

The Rev. Dr. Breckinridge said that every experienced minister and ruling elder must be aware that upon each of the subjects presented in these overtures, there were constantly increasing difficulties. As the Church increases, our business increases and our numbers grow larger. Before we undertake to apply any remedy, we should understand precisely what we are to do. We cannot invent new principles of government, more especially in regard to Presbyterian Church government, since our fundamental principle is, that the Church has no right to make new laws, but that our legislative authority is the Bible. We have, therefore, no legislative power. All that is left to us, is to declare and execute the will of God as contained in his holy word. We are an expository power. It is a government by tribunals, not by individuals—executed by elders of two classes. Nine times out of ten, when you get an English or American lawyer into a Church court, he is lost. The Scotch law is derived from the Roman law, with a Scotch stamp. Our dis-

cipline was made by Scotchmen, and mixes up their law ideas with their scriptural and Presbyterian tenets. Dr. Breckinridge then went into an explanation of the difference between our laws and the common law, and contended that in our Church courts we cannot decide cases in the higher courts as to the law merely, without the facts. Decide upon that principle, and you will be settling questions of law, which, as soon as they go down to be applied, will cause difficulty.

As to the other overture before us, the real difficulty is in the size of your body. You must reduce the representation and size of the Assembly; and you ought to have a commission. By adopting a ratio changing always as your numbers change, you keep down for ever the size of the Assembly. Let every Synod, however small, have a representation, and let the others have a representation which shall always be proportioned to the fixed size of the Assembly, which he thought should never exceed one hundred members.

Objection is made to destroying Presbyterian representation, and transferring it to the Synods; but there are practical difficulties as to continuing the Presbyterian representation. You cannot enlarge the number of ministers in a Presbytery necessary for a representative, for obvious reasons. Unless you do something, you will, ere long, have a General Assembly of some five or six hundred members. As to the right to have a Synodical representation, he held that every church court is a Presbytery. All our courts are made up of Presbyteries. Your specific Presbytery differs from your Synod in no particular except that one is larger than the other. And what is this General Assembly? It is the whole Church met here by its two classes of officers bearing rule. Historically, it is the same as dogmatically. Dr. Breckinridge then rapidly ran over the various steps from the advent of Makemie to the organization of the General Assembly.

As to the appointment of commissions. A committee is a body appointed to examine and *report*, a commission to examine and *conclude*. You already have commissions; your Boards are all commissions. Dr. Breckinridge was opposed, therefore, to undertaking any changes in our mode of judicial proceedings. We must go to the root of the evil, and reduce the Assembly to

a proper size for a working body; and in order to do this you must resort to Synodical representation. As to present evils, they are undoubted. All who have been accustomed to sit in our Assembly must know that our present mode of conducting judicial cases—in scraps of time, scraps of testimony, and scraps of speeches, &c., whilst other things were in the meanwhile discussed, is a mere sham. He would rather come blindfolded into the house, and take the first ten members he happens to touch, to try a case, than to take the whole three hundred of you as at present. The evils are unendurable. As to what we can now do, you can, if you choose, appoint men in whom you have confidence to consider the matter, and report to a future Assembly.

The Rev. Dr. J. H. Jones said he was from the Presbytery that sent up the overture as to judicial proceedings. The last gentleman has expounded the very difficulties they had felt with great force. He was pleased with the course indicated by Dr. Breckinridge. Select the proper committee and entrust this matter to them to examine and digest. He had felt these evils for a long time. He hoped that by this course, and by light from above, we should arrive at a happy deliverance.

The Rev. Dr. Scott said he desired the proposition before us to be so modified as to read, that the Assembly appoint a committee to examine and revise our Book of Discipline, and report on any modifications which may seem to be necessary. We need to facilitate our methods of proceeding. It will disembarass our system as now constituted, and we shall be able to go on for a series of years, even though our Church and this body should continue to grow. The constitution of the higher courts, the whole process of conducting judicial cases, and various matters, need to be reëxamined and adjusted. Our discipline should be rendered harmonious with itself, and with the fundamental principles of the government as laid down in our Book. He moved, therefore, that a committee be appointed to revise the Book of Discipline.

Judge Allen said he would prefer that the resolution should be, that they inquire whether any or what changes are necessary, and report. His experience was unfavourable to changing codes. He would not like to commit this Assembly

to a revision. It is sometimes better to bear the acknowledged evils of an old code than run the risk of greater ones, or at any rate, the inconvenience occasioned in forming what would be virtually a new one.

The Rev. Dr. Hoge said, it is now nearly forty years since any alteration of consequence has been made in our Book of Discipline, and but little if any has been made in our Form of Government. With the lapse of time changes take place, and whilst he would not advocate any change of principle, he thought it would be well to have both the Form of Government and Book of Discipline put into the hands of a suitable committee, to inquire and report necessary amendments. Such a committee, he felt assured, would not propose any material alteration; and if we can secure any modifications which would facilitate justice and judgment, he thought we should be well repaid for the labour which might be required. Dr. Hoge moved to amend the resolution by inserting also the "Form of Government." The remarks this afternoon, he said, as to the constitution of the General Assembly, all had reference to the Form of Government. The last two sections of the 13th chapter, in regard to ruling elders, had also occasioned much difficulty. Our newspapers have also not unfrequently suggested other amendments needed.

The Rev. Mr. Love said the chapter in reference to the dissolution of pastoral relations needed attention. It has become a common practice to arrange these dissolutions without proceeding according to the steps proposed in the Book.

The Rev. Dr. Swift would not object wholly to this proposal, though he would have the terms of it such that it should embrace only minor matters. We ought not to attempt such changes as would materially alter our system.

The Rev. Mr. Woodbridge said we might learn some things from the children of this world. Their forms of criminal proceeding certainly seem to be far in advance of ours. He could not understand the argument of Dr. Breckinridge as intended to show that our system was not susceptible of such improvements as would give us the advantage of the processes in civil courts. The case before us this morning is an illustration of the defectiveness of our system. We could not tell whether

that was a judicial case or not, nor what were the province and limitations of a committee of investigation. Mr. Woodbridge then suggested a system for carrying on judicial cases, which he thought would be an approximation to what we want.

The Rev. Mr. McIlvaine said he was opposed to this whole thing. He feared we were to be carried away by the spirit of change around us. Our Church has prospered under the present system; we get through our business, and are not unduly burdened. Let us go on as we have done—let well enough alone. He thought we should find in the end that we had made a mistake.

The Rev. Dr. Thornwell was opposed to including the Form of Government in the revision. He did not think we were now prepared for that. The Book of Discipline has been discussed in the Church, and we may therefore undertake modifications in it. His own mind was clear that no revision will suffice which does not embrace the principle of commissions. Yet he apprehended the Church had not sufficiently discussed that subject, and until it is fully examined, and the mind of the Church settled about it, he did not think we were prepared to attempt amendments. Let us begin with the Book of Discipline; and by the time we have finished that we shall be ready for going further. The doctrine "*Festina lente*" is more applicable to Church than to State and common affairs. He thought Dr. Hoge's motion premature.

Dr. Hoge's amendment was put and lost.

The question was then put on Dr. Scott's resolution, to appoint a committee to revise the Book of Discipline, and report whether any, and what changes are necessary, which was carried—108 in the affirmative and 76 in the negative.

The Moderator appointed as the Committee to revise the Book of Discipline, the Rev. Drs. Thornwell, Breckinridge, Hodge, Hoge, McGill, Swift, and Judges Sharswood, Allen, and Leavitt. The Committee is to report to the next General Assembly.

The Rev. Dr. Thornwell moved that the thanks of the General Assembly be returned to the pastors of the churches and to the citizens of Lexington for their generous hospitalities. Dr. Thornwell said he could not trust himself to speak on this sub-

ject. He trusted the people of Lexington may be rewarded for the kindness, generosity, and cordiality with which we have been treated; and he earnestly prayed that the blessing of God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, might rest upon them and their churches, now, henceforth and for ever, Amen. The motion was unanimously carried, and with great heartiness.

The Rev. Mr. McIlvaine moved that the Seminaries of Princeton and Allegheny be authorized to close their sessions two weeks earlier than usual, on account of the General Assembly meeting before the usual time next year. Agreed to.

Rev. Dr. J. H. Jones notified the Assembly that there were some funds in the Treasury for the relief of disabled ministers, and that applications must be made through Presbyteries or their Stated Clerks.

There being now no further business before the Assembly the Minutes were read and approved, and a vote passed that the Assembly be dissolved. The Moderator then made a very appropriate and impressive closing address, the substance of which is as follows.

FATHERS AND BRETHREN:—Our deliberations have been characterized by a most wonderful degree of harmony. We feel truly thankful to God for this result. May Heaven's richest blessings rest upon your families and flocks, to which you are now about to return. We now must part—many of us to meet no more in this world. Even now one of our number (the Rev. James H. Brooks of Dayton, Ohio,) is prostrated on a bed of sickness, and it may be, of death. We know not what a day may bring forth to us. How thankful should we be that we can leave all such issues in the hands of our loving and faithful Saviour! We have enjoyed a most munificent hospitality. We have met in the centre of a great and noble commonwealth—great in the fertility of its soil, in the nobleness and generosity of its men, in its churches, its College and Theological Seminary. May God's blessing rest upon them! We are now about to sing our last hymn and utter the last prayer. Our hearts beat in Christian unity and sympathy. May we each one return to the bosoms of our families and friends, and find them in the enjoyment of health and the favour of God; and when we have done with earth, may we all

join the General Assembly and Church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven! Amen and amen.

The Moderator won the highest respect and admiration for the manner in which he filled the chair, and his words fell with tenderness and effect, when he commended his brethren to God, and bade them farewell, to meet them all no more until the re-union in the General Assembly on high. The Moderator then pronounced the Assembly dissolved, and directed that another, called in like manner, meet in the First Presbyterian Church, New Orleans, on the first Thursday in May, 1858. After singing, prayer, and the benediction, was closed the largest and one of the most delightful General Assemblies ever held.

ART. VI.—*On the Action of our Church Courts in Judicial Cases, and Suggestions in reference to them.*

IT is the testing proof that a community is orderly, that it has few occasions for the execution of its laws. Such a condition shows a virtuous people, where morals and manners are regulated by intelligence and a right spirit, so that the laws execute themselves, produce a peaceful obedience, and call seldom for the office of the judge.

It is worthy of remark as to the Presbyterian Church, extending so widely in territory, embracing men of every class in life, of every diversity of education, and of great variety of origin, that its church jurisdiction is so little invoked. Through its wide domain seldom do more than eight or ten causes come up to the General Assembly in a year, and of these many are settled or disposed of satisfactorily without any final hearing.

But few as the cases are, and harmonious as is the body of the General Assembly, they greatly embarrass and perplex it. No part of its business is done with less general approval and satisfaction. Questions of form, involving substance, are frequent. The position of the tribunal to be reviewed is awkward

and anomalous, being treated as a judge for the purpose of review, but as a party for the purpose of excluding it from decision. The grave question is constantly agitated, whether the members of the subordinate court are to be excluded from the house, meaning the place, or from the house, meaning the body permitted to vote.

The debates and discussions, too, of so large a body, if not irregular, certainly are often very crude, discursive, and loose, instead of being merely deliberative or decisive. Indeed to constitute so large a body as the General Assembly, with its three hundred members, a judicial body is unprecedented, except in the lawless democracies of ancient history.

The inconvenience, indeed the impracticability of our present system, is a matter seemingly conceded on all parts, sometimes directly, but more often by proposals of change. Some propose a commission of the Assembly, placing its judicial business in the hands of a selected body; some propose limitations of the right to appeal; some propose one remedy, some another; but no one seems to approve the system as one which can be long retained, as it now is.

Indeed this could hardly be otherwise. Our system of church law had its origin at a time when our body had scarcely ceased a connection with the State. The Ecclesiastical systems of Protestant France, Holland, Scotland, and England, were all more or less connected with the civil government. They were reformations from the Canon Law of the Romish Church. Our forefathers had learned in these schools; and when they formed a system for themselves, while it is wonderful how much they did reform and improve, it would be miraculous if they had at once risen above all the faults of their age. The judicial system of our Church also was adopted when it was small, and mainly wielded and managed by the vigour of a few men. They were of high merit, generally known, and almost universally deferred to. Our Church has gloriously outgrown the system, and it needs to modify it.

It may also be truly said, that great improvements in political science, especially in jurisprudence, have been developed in the general march of society. The municipal law has undergone great improvements. The principles of law and of its

administration have received great light from the discussions which have been moved in the establishment of the free governments of modern times: and while the doctrines of religion and the principles of accountability are unchangeable, yet the modes of administration, in the policy of the Church and in its government, cannot but partake of the general progress in the march of political advancement. We may, therefore, without fear of offence, suggest that a modification of our system for the better is not an impossibility, and there seems a general consent that the attempt to improve it should be made.

To enter upon this profitably, it is useful to have clear views of the object of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of our Church; the persons on whom it is to be exercised; the mode in which its investigations are to be pursued; and also the mode by which errors are to be corrected and reviewed when made: the latter subject embracing a view of our church courts, original and revisory.

The Church, according to our views, has no strictly legislative power. It finds in the Scriptures all the principles which it is willing to enforce. Its standards, so called, are but united expressions of the sense in which we receive the principles declared in the Scriptures. The judicial power of the Church is limited in the same way; with this qualification, that in the application of plans of order and of organization, they must partake of and adapt themselves to the condition of the persons and things to whom they are to be applied.

The objects of Church jurisprudence or discipline, in general terms are, to protect the Church in purity of doctrine and in holiness of life. What relates to purity of doctrine comprehends the various forms of heresy: what relates to holiness of life comprehends the various moral delinquencies and violations of ecclesiastical relations. Slander and drunkenness are instances of the former; non-attendance at the ordinances of the Lord's house, disorder in the demeanour between the people, the officers and the pastors, are instances of the latter. In reference to all these objects, the purpose of church jurisdiction is not vindictive. Its object is not retribution; not the visiting of misconduct with pain and distress. Its purpose is to preserve untarnished the doctrines and the honour of Jesus Christ in his

people; to reclaim, to reform, and to lead back the erring; not to inflict pain, but to induce repentance; and at the last, when the extreme measure of church discipline is adopted, it is rather to show the excised member that he can no longer be deemed as a member of Christ's kingdom, and that he needs to repent and believe, that he may be saved.

It will be readily observed how different, in all these particulars, is the church jurisdiction from the municipal jurisdiction of ordinary courts of justice. With the latter, the wrong is to be redressed, the wrong-doer made to suffer; with the former, the wrong is to be confessed and repented of, the wrong-doer to be led back as one wandering from the fold. In the former repentance cannot be looked at; in the latter it is the end of the sentence. It therefore must be obvious, that principles of jurisdiction from the municipal law have few or no analogies in the law of the church; and it will, on reflection, readily be seen that the attempt to assimilate the two could not be successful, and would, if successful, be undesirable.

The persons on whom the church jurisdiction is to be exercised are members and officers of the Church; men and women who profess to accept Christ as their king; who profess to be governed by love to him, to have abjured the world as the object of supreme affection, and to look to things spiritual and unseen as of paramount and permanent consideration. However much of human infirmity, of sin, may remain with them, such nevertheless is the general character of those upon whom the jurisdiction of the Church is to be exercised. When the Church ascertains that they are not such, she does not admit them to be members of her body. While such, however, they are to be dealt with accordingly. They are not to be assumed as capable of falsehood, nor of other crimes, which in the world at large are less exceptional and remarkable. Surely the administration of the law of the Church among such subjects to it, needs to be very different from that of the common law upon those who are without any professions.

These considerations become directly important when we come, as next we do, to see what mode of investigation should be pursued in dealing with charges against them. In the first place, there are no private interests involved as such. When

one is charged with an offence against doctrine or practice, no other Christian is to gain or lose by the result otherwise than as he is a member of the great body of the Church. A prosecution is never in order to gain to any individual anything personal; it is always to clear the honour of the Church, or to save the offender himself; therefore, it would seem contrary to a first principle to hold any one disqualified by interest from being either witness or judge; for no one as witness or judge can, as a Christian man, have any private interest of his own to serve by any result of a Church process.

So, in respect to allowing the party accusing or accused to make his own statement evidence in the manner in judgment; they are to be treated as acting in reference to a Christian man. He may be guilty of many errors, of even crimes, and yet incapable of deliberate falsehood, why then require that two witnesses should testify in order to produce a judgment? Why not let the number of witnesses stand, like the character of their statements, to be judged by an enlightened common sense and love of justice, in aid of which the influence of the spirit of truth may always be expected? The like remarks apply to the exclusion of the evidence of near friends or connections, excepting only that most intimate relation, the marital. In that, the necessity of absolute confidence, the temptation also so irresistible to give its pressure a paramount effect on the human heart, and the importance of preserving unapproachable that element of all social union, prevent the allowance of testimony by one against or for the other.

As to the institution of proceedings for offences, the attempt at conciliation, as an indispensable preliminary, deserves more notice than it has received. Supposing the offender a professed Christian, and the jurisdiction of the Church embraces no other, why should he not always be approached with tenderness, either for explanation or exculpation, before any process should be allowed against him? He may explain: he may confess and repent. Why should he be brought to any trial unless with this as a prerequisite?

In our system, every accused is tried by his session, except he be a pastor, when he is tried by his Presbytery: in all cases he is tried by his peers. Now why should it not be invariably

required before a process, that the session should appoint one member of the Church to approach the party of whom there is suspicion, that the suspected should name another, and the two should make report to the session before any other proceedings should be taken. Who can say how much this would diminish the cases of discipline?

And when after every such endeavour has failed and charges are to be produced, would it not be well that these two should produce on each side the facts and evidence? The session ought not to be diminished by having one of its members made a prosecutor, especially when he can have no more interest than any member of the whole Church. It is suggested that much good might result from making this preliminary attempt at wiping away the offence an indispensable condition to any church process.

The charge in a church process ought always to refer to some scripture or to some article of our standards, to warrant the precise charge: and to confine the proof, the charge should give a true specification of names, days, and circumstances, so that the matter may be distinctly understood by those who are to judge either primarily or in review. The accused ought to make his answer with corresponding distinctness as to the matter charged.

The admitting of charges upon common fame is a loose and unnecessary practice. Whatever common fame may say, there can be no conviction or sentence rendered on its voice. Charges must be specifically made and proved by witnesses. These particulars are to be obtained, and proofs made, before any decision. Why then should they not be first ascertained and presented, without relying upon so vague a thing as common fame? Especially might this be dispensed with, should the introducing of a preliminary committee of conciliation and conference with the suspected be made indispensable.

The parties themselves, if they choose, should be permitted to give their own testimony, and the other evidence would then limit itself to that which is found to be either unexplained or contradictory. This would greatly lessen the volume of the proceedings on trials.

So, too, the sentence, should always first state the facts found

to be true, then declare what is adjudged to be the offence, and last, the thing to be done for the object of the suit, as an acquittal, or a sentence of suspension, or whatever it may be. It would seem wise that the sentence, when practicable, should not be executed until after some moderate delay and notice to the party. He may, after time is allowed for the heat of opposition and controversy to cool off, view the matter differently after an adjudication by his Christian friends and brethren.

When a sentence however is rendered, and the time elapsed, it should not be executed if stayed by an appeal. As the effect of church censures depends greatly on the opinion of the church, they are to some extent executed, when it is known that they are adjudged, and before they are formally carried out. Discipline, therefore, suffers little by the suspensive effect given to an appeal; whereas, executing the sentence makes its effect almost unchangeable.

When, however, an appeal is taken, the appellant should always specify what it is in particular, in process, in fact, or in law or doctrine, in which the sentence is erroneous, and to that he should be afterwards confined. And unless it be clearly shown that some substantial fault in the taking of testimony has been committed, the revising of the proceedings should always be upon the testimony and admission of the parties before the first court holding the trial.

As the object of every church sentence is not personal and particular to any but the accused, but general, and equally interesting every member of the Church, an appeal should be allowed as well to a minority of the session or court, as to a majority, or to the accused. Provision, however, would be needed to limit this right (new appeal or complaint) to cases where some real and important principle is involved.

The distinction in our present discipline between appeal and complaint, when adopted by others than the accused, is of no substance in principle. It is only for the principle that any party proceeds against another in our discipline. It ought to be allowed to all, having the same end in view. And the modes of proceeding should in each case be the same.

In revising the sentences of inferior courts, our system has one feature anomalous, inconvenient, and contrary to every

principle: we allude to making the court pronouncing the sentence a party to the appeal for its revision, excluding its members, when members of the revising court, from taking any part in its further decision. Excepting that they may be considered as having prejudged, (which will be presently considered,) this is altogether wrong in principle. The sentencing court in coming to its conclusions has acted judicially and as a public body, not volunteering, but as doing an official duty. How can it be treated as a party to the controversy, to the offence? The offence is against the Church at large, not against the judges who try it; they therefore do not begin by being a party. When do they become so? By their yielding to the effect of evidence before them? Surely this is too much, to make the judge an adversary merely because he is a judge, and as to whose judgment the presumption must be that it was honest. This peculiarity in our system has no analogy elsewhere.

It may be thought that judges who have once come to a conclusion will not be candid in reviewing it. But this is by no means sound. A judge without partiality, with no private ends to gain, comes to his conclusion always with a feeling of deep responsibility; not as a matter of choice or pleasure, but of necessity, of intellectual constraint. As a general rule, it is not true that he is unwilling that his judgment should be aided by that of others, should be examined and reconsidered. To impute to Christian judges that, having honestly come to a conclusion, they are not to be trusted to assist in the review of it, is contrary to probability, and would be a reproach to religion. In the civil tribunals, where passion, pride of character, and the various conflicting motives of worldly men have their ordinary force, no such objection is made. It is not found to be necessary; whereas, on the contrary, the greater familiarity with a cause which an earlier connection with it always gives, renders the aid of the members of the court of first or earlier action highly useful.

If, however, the notion that those who have once formed a judgment cannot change it on further examination and better conference with others, should induce the retaining of this exclusion, a provision should be introduced, that the reviewing court should not reverse upon a mere majority of votes. In the

reviewing court, the judgment below should not be held to go for nothing. The votes there should at least stand equal to the same number of votes in the reviewing court; and the sentence should not be varied unless, taking the votes in both courts, the sentence should be disapproved. It is always to be remembered, that all our courts are composed of judges of precisely the same grade, ministers and elders; and their votes in the sentencing court should not be of less esteem than the votes of their equals in the revising courts.

It may be added, that it is sound policy to give to every judgment some decisive weight; not to allow a matter on which conscientious and honest men have once given a judgment to be treated as if it were a mere blank. It ought not to be made easy, by any special endeavour, to overthrow a judgment. Appeals, while they are to be always permitted as a necessity, and to be fairly treated, are never to be encouraged.

The number of the members of our judicial bodies is an inconvenience, and in one sense an evil. The considering of a matter judicially differs in its character from an ordinary debating. Opinions should not be hastily expressed. They should be formed, not in isolation but on consultation, on suggestions made, considered, withdrawn, modified. In all judicial bodies the judges confer and reason together privately, before they express opinions publicly. How different their process is from the judicial debates even in the General Assembly, will be very manifest to all who have ever witnessed them. The judicial proceedings of our Church courts certainly are not objects of boasting.

And yet, upon matters of principle in doctrine or church policy, the action of the whole representative body of the church is important. It gives force to the declaration of principles. It adds to the unity of the Church. It secures it from local parties or peculiar views of things, which so often appertain to smaller divisions of men or of territory. It is not impossible perhaps to introduce both features into the business of the revising courts.

Whenever a case comes up for review, either into a Presbytery or Synod, or into the General Assembly, the judicial committee might ascertain whether the case involved a principle of doctrine,

or discipline, or policy, and they should state it; or, they might report, that it merely involved the facts of a case, or the application of principles to those facts. The former cases might remain to be decided, as now, by the whole body. The other cases might be referred to a committee of a certain number, no two to be from the same Presbytery, and they should hear and try the case, and report their judgment to the Assembly; and, unless upon a vote without debate it should be voted down by two-thirds, it should stand as the judgment of the Assembly.

In some manner, by a commission or by some wiser device, our higher church courts must be relieved from the embarrassments growing out of their great number of members, from the hazards of the impulses which always prevail in large numbers acting together. The judgments will be contradictory also, as well as ill considered and unjust, unless they be made more the result of judicial deliberation than is now practicable, even if it be possible.

The whole subject of our article we conceive to be of great importance. We have, it is true, been as yet slightly injured by the imperfections above noticed, for which we are devoutly to thank the great Head of the Church. And moreover, the difficulty itself arises out of our great increase and prosperity. But the law of the Church should be a law of wisdom, justice, and Christian knowledge. Its administration should show like a well ordered government. Every error committed and not redressed by reason of our own arrangements, is a spot and a blot on our fair fame. Our Church is now sensible of what it needs to do; and we have attempted to discharge a duty in submitting for the consideration of our fathers and brethren what has seemed to us useful. We have no other wish than that what we have said may lead to suggestions from wiser men; and we rely on that Light which, in all the concerns of the Church, is the Light of the world.

By Charles Hodge

ART. VII.—*Report on the History and Recent Collation of the English Version of the Bible:* presented by the Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, and adopted May 1, 1851. Printed at the American Bible Society's Press, Astor Place, New York, 1857.

As there is nothing in this world so sacred as the word of God, and nothing so precious to all who use the English language as the English version of the Bible, it is the instinct, as well as the duty of the Church (i. e. of the people of God) to guard its integrity with the greatest vigilance, and to watch with a solicitude, amounting even to jealousy, the conduct of those who are charged with its publication and distribution. It is, therefore, neither to be wondered nor regretted, that the new standard edition of the English version, issued by the American Bible Society, has excited so much attention. The opposition to the course pursued by the Society in this matter has proceeded from very different quarters. There is, as every one knows, both in this country and in England, a class of Semi-Romish Protestants, who stand aloof from the Bible Society, either because they have no faith in the Scriptures as a means of salvation without an authorized interpreter, or because they distrust its influence when unattended by the Prayer Book, or because they dread all voluntary Societies, or fear to compromise themselves by association with other denominations of Christians. Some of the prominent members of this class have assailed the American Bible Society with a recklessness and exaggeration of assertion, and with a bitterness of spirit, which clearly reveal the animus of their assaults. With such a spirit and measures we are persuaded no Presbyterian has any fellowship. There are doubtless others who have been alarmed by exaggerated statements, or who are constitutionally opposed to everything that has the appearance of change, and who are ever ready to sacrifice a great good to prevent a less evil. Such persons are opposed to locomotives and railroads because they make a noise, and are for reviving the old post-coaches to abate so great a nuisance. There are men who would destroy the Bible Society, or arrest it in the great work in which it is

engaged, for the slightest error of judgment in the execution of its plans. The debate on this subject in our General Assembly at its recent sessions, showed that, while great dissatisfaction existed among many of its members at the course the Society had pursued, there was the greatest cordiality and unanimity in the desire to sustain that venerable institution, and to coöperate with it in surmounting the difficulties in which it has become involved.

There is a large class of persons who feel a deep interest in the welfare of the Bible Society, and who are disposed to make every allowance for the difficulty of the task it has been called upon to perform, who are nevertheless constrained to think that a very serious mistake has been committed, which it is imperative should be corrected. These persons freely admit the purity of the motives which influenced the Society and its committee, in their late revision of the Scriptures. They concede to that committee and to their collator, fidelity, diligence, accuracy and learning. They feel that it would be most ungracious to criticise in a captious spirit the results of years of disinterested, unrequited labour. They have no wish to embarrass the operations of the Society, or to set up any rival institution. They earnestly desire that the Society may continue to command the confidence, and to secure the coöperation of all denominations of Christians. They would consider it a great calamity to the Church and to the world, if this bond of Christian fellowship should be loosed, which is found in the union of all denominations in the circulation of the word of God.

There is an obvious and important distinction to be made between what the Society had a right to do, and what it was wise or expedient to do. Even if it should be conceded that the principles which guided the collation and revision of the text, and the changes introduced, were all sound, and that the changes themselves could all be justified, still, if they produce alienation and distrust, it was unwise to make them. If cordial coöperation and confidence could be secured by continuing to print and circulate the Scriptures as they were before this revision, or as they appear in the issues of the British and Foreign Bible Society, then the changes introduced, even if in themselves desirable, have cost far more than they are worth. The fact

unquestionably is, that this revised edition of the Bible, which the Society has adopted as a standard, has occasioned a widespread and serious dissatisfaction. An emergency has therefore arisen which calls for the combined wisdom, piety and good feeling of all the friends of the Society to meet.

There are three questions which must present themselves to every one who takes an interest in this subject. First, what the Bible Society has a right to do in the matter of revision and alteration of its standard edition of the authorized version of the English Bible; second, what it has done; and, thirdly, what it ought now to do under the actual circumstances of the case.

As to the first of these questions, it is very obvious that the prerogatives of the Bible Society are restricted by its constitution and by the object for which it was instituted. Any individual or company of men has the right to publish a new translation of the Scriptures into English; or to revise the common version to bring it into nearer conformity to the original text, or to restore that version to the precise condition in which it was when it issued from the hands of the translators. But the Bible Society, being instituted for the purpose, not of improving the English version, nor even of restoring its text, but simply of printing and circulating that text with its accessories, as it was received and recognized when the Society was organized, its powers are of necessity limited to the accomplishment of that object. Still, the question recurs, what is the Society to print? Where is the authorized version to be found? From inaccuracies in printing, from changes in orthography, in punctuation, and in the use of capitals, italics and parentheses, gradually introduced; from the introduction of new headings to the chapters or the modification of the old ones, the fact is, that the English version appears in different forms in different editions. It appears from the collation of the editions of 1611 with those of Oxford, Cambridge, London, Edinburgh and the standard American edition, that there are no less than twenty-four thousand discrepancies; that is, twenty-four thousand cases in which these standard editions fail to concur. These discrepancies are indeed for the most part very minute, relating in the main to the particulars just referred to. Under these cir-

cumstances what was the Society to do? It was its duty to print the authorized version, and it was its duty to print that version correctly. But where was the standard? No such universally recognized standard edition existed. The Oxford Bibles differ from those of Cambridge, and both from those of London and Edinburgh, and all from the former standard American edition. What then was to be done? What had the Society the right to do? It seems to us that there were only two proper courses between which to choose. Either to do as the British and Foreign Bible Society has ever done—give up entirely all idea of producing a standard text; reproduce and circulate some one or other of the standard editions, either that of Oxford, or that of Cambridge, or that of London. The differences between these are so slight, as to be unnoticed by the mass of readers, and the circulation of either or of all of these would give offence to no one. The British and Foreign Bible Society orders, as we understand, its supply of Bibles from one or the other of these licensed presses as suits its convenience. If for any reason such a course was deemed inadvisable for the American Society, then the only other plan was to take these standard editions and collate them, and determine the true text from this comparison. In prosecuting this work, however, the Society would have no right to exercise its own discretion in selecting the readings or the punctuation which it should adopt. The legitimate object of the Society is not to form a new text, but simply to reproduce that which is authorized. Its decision or selection must be determined by the evidence as to what the true text is, and not by its judgment what it ought to be. The case is analogous to that of preparing a critical edition of the Greek Testament. The only legitimate object of the editor is to determine what was written, not what ought to have been written. In deciding what reading to adopt, he must be determined by authority, and not by his taste. If three or more authorities of equal weight give one reading, and a fourth gives another, the fact that he thinks the latter affords a better sense or would be more appropriate, is no sufficient reason why he should adopt it. If in 1 Tim. iii. 16, the majority of authorities of equal weight are in favour of $\vartheta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, no such editor would be justified in reading $\acute{o}\varsigma$ on the authority of inferior witnesses, because

he did not believe that "*God* was manifested in the flesh," or because he believed that Paul does not use *θεός* in reference to our Lord. In like manner, in collating the several standard editions of the English version, it would not be competent for the Society to select from them the readings which it deemed best suited to the original. It must take those which have the most authority in their favour; for example, as a general rule, the word *spirit*, if used in reference to the Holy Spirit, is printed with a capital S; if it is used figuratively, or in reference to a created spirit, it is printed with a small s. Now if in a given instance the majority of the standard editions have it one way, and a minority of them the other, (supposing them to be of equal authority,) it would not be competent for the Society to adopt the latter, because it was deemed the better. This principle is sustained by two obvious considerations, first, because the only legitimate object of the Society is to determine what the authorized text is, not to amend it; not to choose among the various alterations which accident or design may have introduced into the text, the reading which is supposed to give the best sense; and, secondly, because by going contrary to authority, or the testimony of their own witnesses of the true text, they assume the office of expounders. In a multitude of cases the whole sense of a passage depends on the way in which the word *spirit* is printed, and in many of these cases the decision of this point is a matter of great doubt and of great importance. See, for example, Rom. viii. 10, and 1 Peter iii. 18. It is certainly not the province of a Bible Society to decide for all English readers questions of interpretation. If the authorized version makes the word "spirit" in a given passage refer to the Holy Spirit, no Bible society has the right to make it refer to the human soul. It is a plain violation of principle to go counter, in any case affecting the sense of Scripture, to the received text of the authorized version as ascertained by the majority of standard editions. The simple question to be determined is, what that text is. If any man were to undertake to edit the Greek Testament on the principle of introducing, at discretion, any reading found in any manuscript, he would produce a text destitute of all authority. He might present the Epistles of Paul in a form in which the apostle himself

would hardly recognize them. In like manner, if a Bible society undertakes to edit the English Bible on the principle of selecting at discretion any reading found in any current, or even standard copy, of that book, the text produced would not be that of the authorized version. If the same principle were applied to the German translation of Luther, which has suffered far more from accidental and intentional changes than the English version, it might be entirely perverted and corrupted. It must be borne in mind that we are speaking of a principle, not of the extent to which, in the case before us, it has been applied. It may be granted that the American Bible Society has, in very few instances, departed from the reading of the greater number of standard editions. It may be granted that in every case in which they have thus departed, they have exercised a wise discretion. The point is, that the Society had no discretion in the case; that it has no more right to alter the received version in a single passage, than it has to make a new translation. It is the principle that no changes affecting the sense shall be made that is fundamental and essential.

But if it is a violation of the right principle for the Society to form a text by exercising its discretion in the choice of readings furnished by the standard editions, much more would it be a violation of such principle to adopt a reading unsustained by any one of those editions. This would be an open assumption of the right to alter the English version. About this there can be no debate. No matter how confident the Society or its committee may be, that the version does not, in a given case, express the true sense of the original; no matter whether their judgment in the matter be correct or incorrect, it is most obvious that they have no right to alter the translation. If, for example, in Matt. xii. 41, all the copies read, (as is the fact,) "shall rise in judgment," to insert the article on the authority of the Greek, and read "in the judgment," is to alter the version. If in Can. iii. 5 and viii. 4, all the copies read, "till he please," to adopt the reading, "till she please," on the authority of the Hebrew, is again to alter the version. Where is this to end? If the learned, the orthodox, pious, and conscientious Committee of Revision have a right to alter the version in such cases as these, what is to prevent some future committee of an opposite charac-

ter, sustained it may be by a perverted public sentiment, from altering the text *ad libitum*, and giving us a rationalistic version, to be scattered by millions over the world. It is too plain to admit of doubt, that it is a grave error, a very dangerous and reprehensible precedent in any Bible Society to alter at its discretion the text of the authorized version. The fact that this has been done cautiously, only in a few instances, in matters of minor importance, and that the alterations are for the better, does not alter the case at all. The simple point is, that the American Bible Society is under the most solemn obligations of contract and duty not to alter the authorized English translation of the Scriptures.

This principle, of course, applies in all its force to all changes in punctuation, italics, parentheses, &c., affecting the sense. In Rom. iv. 1, the words, "according to the flesh," if pointed in one way, qualify the word "father," and Abraham is said to be our "father according to the flesh;" if pointed in another way, they qualify the word "hath found," and the question asked in the text is, what hath Abraham found according to the flesh? To alter the punctuation, therefore, is to alter the sense. As the latter mode of pointing is found in no previous edition, to adopt it is to give a new interpretation to the passage. The interpretation is probably correct; but the change is none the less the assumption of the office of interpreter. In Rev. xiii. 8, the words, "from the foundation of the world," may refer to the word "slain," and the sense would then be, "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Or they may refer to the word "written," and the sense be, "written from the foundation of the world." To alter the punctuation here is to change the sense of the passage. To alter at discretion, therefore, the punctuation of the Bible, is to assume the office of an expounder, which, of course, does not belong to a Bible Society.

In all copies of the English Bible, certain words are printed in italics, to indicate that there is nothing in the original to correspond to them. They are added to express what is conceived to be the sense of the original, which a literal translation would fail to bring out. To alter these italics is, therefore, to alter the version. The same remark applies to the insertion or omission of the marks of a parenthesis. It is the work of the inter-

preter to determine whether a given passage is parenthetical. This is one of the points in which expositors most frequently differ, and upon its decision the whole sense of the context, in many cases, depends. If the Bible Society has no right to interpret the Scriptures, it has no right to exercise its discretion in this matter. It must follow the received text; and if the copies differ, it must follow those which have the most authority. That in certain cases, &c., the introduction of a parenthesis, in the opinion of the committee, mars the beauty of the passage or obscures the sense, is no justification of any change. For the business of the committee is not to improve the beauty or to increase the perspicuity of the version, but simply to reproduce it, with all its excellencies and defects.

Considering, therefore, that the copies of the English Bible differ in so many points; considering that it is the duty of the Bible Society to print the authorized version in as correct a form as possible, it seems clear that the only course for it to pursue was either to take some one edition of the text which had already secured the sanction of the Christian public, and to follow it, *verbatim, literatim, et punctuatim*; or, by a careful collation of the different standard editions, to form a text which has the support of the majority of those editions.

As to orthography, the right principle would seem to be, to make the Bible conform to the established usage of the language. The mere spelling of words is not a part of the version, and therefore is not invested with the sacredness of the text. We have discarded the old black letter; and in a multitude of cases the standard editions of Oxford and Cambridge differ as to orthography from the edition of 1611. It is obvious that the Bible ought not to initiate any changes in orthography, but follow slowly after the usage of the English-writing community. It is not enough that a change is justified by the etymology of a word, or by analogy, or by the usage of certain writers. It should be universally diffused and firmly established to justify its introduction into the Bible. Much less should any sweeping changes be introduced. It would be a just cause of protest if any Bible society in this country were to introduce all the peculiarities of Dr. Webster's spelling into their reprint of the Scriptures. We would also venture to say that it is not the

province either of the British and Foreign Bible Society, nor of its American contemporary, to introduce even those changes in orthography which the changing usage of the language may demand. It is their business to follow, and not to lead. If the licensed presses of England, i. e., those presses authorized to print the Scriptures and responsible for their correctness, introduce any orthographical change, these Societies may adopt it. As to the British Society this is a matter of course, as they do not print their own Bibles; and as to the American Society, there is surely nothing derogatory in its following the lead of the mother country, from whom we have derived our language and our version of the Scriptures. The advantages to be gained by these changes in orthography are not such as to make their introduction a duty; and the disadvantages of having the Bibles which the great Anglo-Saxon race is called upon to use, differ even in these minor points, are so great, that we believe that the vast majority of the Christian public would concur in the rule above suggested. We do not want a Bible in American-English. Let it continue to represent the *lingua communis* of the race.

As to the accessories of the text, viz. the headings of the running titles over the columns, marginal readings, and references to parallel passages, these are all justly included under the category of "notes and comments." They are designed to facilitate the understanding of the text. They do in fact explain it. The heading of the second Psalm tells us that it relates to Christ; the heading of Isaiah liii. tells us that the sufferer there spoken of is the Messiah, and that his sufferings were vicarious. The headings in the Canticles teach that that book is not an epithalamium, but an exhibition of the mutual love of Christ and his Church.

It is the cardinal principle of all Bible societies, that on which their national or catholic existence depends, that they are bound to publish the Scriptures "without note or comment." To this they are pledged by the most solemn compacts and promises. It enters into their constitutions. It is reiterated almost annually in the reports and in the official publications of their managers. No one point is rendered more conspicuous, or is regarded as more important than this. The American

Bible Society in their report for 1823, say that any departure from this principle, "when known, would be a death blow to the Society." And we fully believe it. No Bible society could adopt a course more certainly suicidal than to violate this solemn, fundamental compact. Every contract is, however, to be interpreted according to the sense in which it was understood by the contracting parties. And as the standard edition of the Scriptures printed in 1611 was furnished with a certain array of headings and marginal notes and references, which have been continued with slight alterations to the present day, those headings and references form a part of the book designated and known as the authorized English version, which the Bible Societies of England and America agreed and promised to publish and circulate. The contract, therefore, to circulate the Scriptures "without note or comment," must be understood to mean, without any other "notes or comments" than those already incorporated in the standard editions of the English Bible. In this sense the contract was originally intended; this was the obligation which the one party intended to impose and the other to assume. And so it has ever been understood and acted upon. No man, whether Episcopalian, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, or Quaker, has ever charged either the British and Foreign, or the American Bible Society with a breach of faith for circulating the Scriptures with "the notes and comments" attached to the text in the standard editions, before those Societies were instituted. Now as these headings are beyond controversy comments, and of the most authoritative controlling power; coming in the name, not of this or that individual interpreter, but uttered as it were by the united voices of all churches which adopt the English version, it is too obvious, as it seems to us, to admit of question, that to alter these headings is a violation of the fundamental pledge of those societies. They may publish if they please the nude text; for that is literally without note or comment; or they may publish the text with those explanatory headings which were attached to the standard copies of the Bible when these Societies were formed; for that was the understanding when the pledge was given and received; but to discard those headings and to introduce others, whether better or worse, is to set forth the Scriptures with an array of "notes and comments,"

the most effective the wit of man or angel could devise. As just intimated, it matters not, so far as the present point is concerned, what the character of the new headings may be. They may be greatly better than the old; more concise, perspicuous, and appropriate; still it is just as much beyond the prerogative of the Society to attach them to the text, as it would be to publish the Bible with Calvin's Commentary, or with the notes of the Rhemish Testament. We can hardly persuade ourselves that there can be any diversity of opinion on this point. Suppose the Bible Society should publish the Scriptures with such headings as a Romanist or Rationalist would dictate or prescribe. Would this be tolerated? Would it not be regarded as a breach of faith? Would it not be universally considered as publishing the Scriptures with "notes and comments"? What are "notes and comments" but brief declarations of what the Scriptures mean? If then Romish or Rationalistic headings would be rejected by one spontaneous burst of indignation, as involving a breach of contract on the part of the Society, how can it be denied that even good, orthodox headings supplied by the Society would be a breach of faith? The only difference between the supposed cases would be, that in the one instance, the comments were bad, and in the other, good. But in both alike they would be comments.

If these points were presented *in thesi*; if the question were asked, whether the Bible Society has the right to alter the authorized version in any point affecting its sense, it would unquestionably be answered in the negative. If it be asked whether the sense of a passage may be affected by altering its punctuation, or introducing or omitting a parenthesis, the answer would be in the affirmative. If it be asked whether the headings attached to the several chapters are designed to state their contents, and to inform the reader of the meaning, the answer must unavoidably be in the affirmative. The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable, that the Bible Society, pledged to print the authorized version without note or comment, cannot rightfully alter that version in any of the particulars above indicated. It cannot change the words, the capitals, the pointing, the italics, the parentheses, or the accessories of the text, in any way affecting the sense, without a manifest breach of faith.

Though such changes may be in themselves desirable, or of minor importance, or comparatively few in number, or made with the best intentions, it does not affect the principle involved. It remains plain that the Society introducing such changes have departed from their compact, and have opened a door to further alterations which no man can shut. It may be said that the Society will always be restrained in the changes which it may introduce, by public opinion. But, in the first place, there is no certainty that such will be the fact. A powerful Society may go in advance of public opinion, and do much to form or to control it. And, in the second place, this is the very evil to be guarded against. We do not want a translation of the Bible varied from time to time to suit the changing aspects of public feeling. If the English Bible had been altered to suit the public opinion of the first half of the last century, it would have been thoroughly pelagianized; if altered to suit the dominant sentiments of the Church of England during the last decennium, it would have been semi-romanized. Our only security is in placing that version above the reach, and out of the power, of any of those great Societies, whose business it is to flood the land with copies of the Bible.

On the other hand, as the Bible Society has to print the authorized version, it must have the right to determine what that version is. It is not bound to take the first copy of the English Bible which comes to hand, and reprint it without regard to its accuracy. If it finds that even what are recognized as standard editions differ from each other, it has the right to collate them, and determine on evidence what is the true text. In this sense it has the right not only to print, but also to edit the authorized version. One man may edit the Greek Testament, and introduce as many changes as Griesbach did; another may edit it and reproduce the common text exactly as it issued from the press of the Elzevirs. No Bible Society has the right to alter the English version, either in the text or its accessories, in any way affecting the sense; but it has a right, by collation and otherwise, to determine what that version is. We would respectfully submit to our readers the above exhibition, as a fair statement of what the Bible Society may, and of what it may not, do in the revision of the English version.

We come now to the second point proposed for consideration. What has the American Bible Society done in the preparation of the new edition of the English Bible? We shall derive the answer to this question from the Report of the Committee on Versions, adopted by the Board of Managers. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the subject of the revision of the text, at their meeting, October 6th, 1847. "At that time Mr. Secretary Brigham communicated to them, that the superintendent of printing found frequent discrepancies still existing between our different editions of the English Bible; also between our editions and those issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Several specimens of such discrepancies were submitted to the Committee, relating mostly to use of *italic words*, *capital letters*, and *the article a or an*. After consideration the Committee referred the matter to the Board of Managers for counsel and decision. At the meeting of the Board of Managers on the next day, October 7th, 1847, the matter was taken up and considered; and referred back to the Committee on Versions, with directions to have the necessary collation made, and report the result to the Board."

This Committee on Versions, whose names are appended to this Report, consisted of Gardiner Spring, Thomas Cock, Samuel H. Turner, Edward Robinson, Thomas E. Vermilye, John McClintock, Richard S. Storrs, Jr.

"No further action was had in the Committee until February 1st, 1848, when it was resolved that a suitable person be employed to collate the principal editions of the English Bible published by this Society, with the latest British editions, and report from time to time to the Committee.

"A week later, February 8th, 1848, it was resolved that the Rev. James W. McLane, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Williamsburgh, N. Y., be employed to commence the collation of the English Bible, as directed by the Board, beginning with the New Testament.

"The work of collation was immediately begun; and the collator made his first report to the Committee on the 26th of the same month. After several further meetings, the Committee having convened on the 25th of March, 1848, the Rev. Dr. Robinson submitted the following series of resolutions, which

were adopted, as expressing the general views to which the Committee had been led by their examination and experience hitherto, and to serve as rules for their further guidance:

“1. That the royal octavo edition of the English Bible, issued by this Society, be adopted as the basis for corrections.

“2. That the said American copy be compared with recent copies of the four leading British editions, viz. those of London, Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh; and also with the original edition of 1611.

“3. That the comparison include the *orthography, capital letters, words in italic, and punctuation*. (To these were added in practice the *contents* of the chapters, and the running *heads* of the columns.)

“4. That so far as the four English copies are *uniform*, the American copy be conformed to them, unless otherwise specially ordered by the committee.

“5. That the collator be instructed, in his further labours, to apply the principles and cases previously adopted and decided by this committee; and that hereafter he lay before the committee only such cases as have not before been acted upon, or such as may seem to need further consideration.

“6. That in respect to the indefinite article, the form *an* be used before all vowels and diphthongs not pronounced as consonants, and also before *h* silent or unaccented; and that the form *a* be employed in all other cases.”

“After further examination and experience, at a meeting of the committee, September 22d, 1848, the following additional rules were adopted:

“7. That in cases where the four recent British copies, and also the original edition and our own copy, vary in *punctuation*, the uniform usage of any *three* of the copies shall be followed.

“8. That when the London, Oxford, and Cambridge editions agree in the use or omission of the *hyphen* in compound words, the same usage be adopted.

“9. That when the term *Scripture* or *Scriptures* refers to the whole volume of inspired truth, it begin with a capital letter; but when the reference is to some particular portion, it begin with a small letter.”

“A meeting of the Board of Managers was held on the 28th of September, 1848; at which the Secretary read the minutes of the Committee on Versions, and gave explanations in respect to the preceding rules. After consideration, the said minutes were approved; and the whole matter was referred back to the Committee *with powers*.

“The Committee met again October 2d, 1848. Having thus received the sanction of the Board of Managers upon their proceedings, and upon the rules already established; and it being found difficult for the whole Committee to convene so often, it was resolved, ‘that the Rev. Dr. Robinson, and the Rev. Dr. Vermilye, be a Sub-Committee to inspect the further alterations suggested by the Collator, and see that they are made according to the rules prescribed; and, if cases of peculiar importance arise, to convene the entire Committee.’

“The collation was now fairly in progress: The Sub-Committee met the Collator once in each week, and sometimes oftener; and were occasionally assisted by other members of the Committee, and by the Secretaries. Each sitting usually occupied several hours; and was devoted to a close examination of the variations and other cases presented by the Collator. In the vast majority of instances, the Sub-Committee were enabled to decide at once, and without any hesitation. Wherever a doubt existed, or might be supposed to exist, the case was reserved for the action of the whole Committee. These cases were disposed of by the Committee at various meetings called for the purpose.

“It may not be inappropriate to state here the method, in which the collation of the text was carried on. A book was prepared with columns for each of the six copies collated; and wherever a variation was found, the reading in each copy was entered in its own column. An additional column contained notes or remarks suggested by the particular case, or bearing upon a proper decision. In this way a single glance sufficed to ascertain, whether a case came under the prescribed rules, or was to be considered on its own merits. In an additional column was then entered the decision of the Sub-Committee; and in another, the cases referred to the whole Committee, with their decision. These entries form a complete record of the collation, and of the judgment of the Committee in every instance; and

as the book (or rather books) will be deposited in the archives of the Society, it will be possible at any future time, to determine, by reference to them in a particular case, what was the decision of the Committee, and in general the grounds on which it rested.

“It was not until after nineteen months, on the 28th of April, 1850, that the Sub-Committee were ready to report, that in connection with the collator they had now gone through the text of the entire Bible; and that new plates were in the process of preparation in conformity with the corrected copy. It was thereupon resolved, that the Rev. Mr. McLane be requested to read again with care the sheets of the corrected copy as made ready for the press; and also to collate the marginal readings and references, with a view to the preparation of another still more correct edition, which may be made the standard copy of the Society. The same Sub-Committee were charged with the further supervision of the work, to assist the collator in perfecting the proposed edition.

“In accordance with this resolution the plates then in progress have been finished, and editions from them carried through the press. The collation of the marginal readings and references has been quite recently completed; and the plates of a new Reference Bible in octavo, of beautiful form and type, are in the course of preparation. These will be finished under the care of the Collator and the Committee. When that time shall have arrived, the Committee will feel, that the important work entrusted to their charge, and in which some of them have spent so many pleasant hours, has been fully and successfully accomplished.”

We have quoted this extended statement that the reader may have the official exhibition of the object contemplated; of the principles adopted; and of the manner in which those principles were carried out and applied. From this statement it is apparent that the object avowedly contemplated in this official revision of the English version, was to remove the discrepancies found to exist between the different editions of the English Bible published by the Society, and between those editions and the standard British editions. This is a very laudable object, and one clearly within the province of the Society. They are bound to print the authorized version correctly, and are there-

fore not only authorized, but bound to use all legitimate means to ascertain what that version is. The Committee say on page 19 of their report, "that the great and leading object of the Committee has everywhere been *uniformity*. It is only where the British copies differ, that any question has been raised; except in a few instances to be noted in the sequel. It has been the wish and endeavour of the Committee to see the English restored, so far as possible, to its purity; saving the necessary changes of orthography and other like variations, which would assuredly be acceptable to the translators themselves, were they living at the present day. The Committee have had no authority and no desire to go behind the translators; nor in any respect to touch the original version of the text; unless in cases of evident inadvertence or inconsistency, open and manifest to all." Had the Committee confined themselves to the accomplishment of the object here avowed; had they laboured to restore the English version to its purity, and not attempted to correct or change either it or its accessories, no voice would have been raised to censure their proceedings. How far they adhered to their purpose the sequel will show.

Not only was the avowed object of the Committee laudable and legitimate, but it is also evident that much time and labour were consecrated to its attainment. The gentlemen, who devoted so much of their valuable time to the service of the Society in this enterprise, are entitled to the acknowledgments of the Christian public for their disinterested zeal.

As to the principles here laid down, there is little doubt that in most cases they will command the approbation of the public. The two great mistakes made in these rules, as we conceive, are, first, in not authoritatively restricting the collator and the Committee to the *avowed* object, viz. the restoration of the English version to its purity, instead of admitting of departures from that version and its accessories, at the discretion of the Committee. We do not use the word *avowed* here in opposition to secret. We do not desire to insinuate, for we do not believe, that the Committee had one object which they professed to follow, and another at which they secretly aimed; but we mean, that they avowed to themselves an object which was perfectly legitimate, viz. the restoration of the English version and con-

sequent uniformity between the American and standard British editions. This was the object which the Committee no doubt honestly contemplated; this they report to the Board of Managers, and for the accomplishment of this object they were appointed *with powers*. The discrepancies to be removed related to *orthogrāphy, capital letters, words in italics and punctuation*. Not a word is here said about altering the version itself, nor about the headings of the chapters. The object avowed was not the correction of the American edition in the matters above specified, so as to make it more perfectly correspond with the original Hebrew and Greek, but simply to produce uniformity by removing discrepancies. As this was the object contemplated, the great mistake in the rules laid down, was the omission of an authoritative direction to the Committee to limit themselves to this point. It is very obvious that they gradually, and perhaps unconsciously, lost sight of the prescribed limits, and undertook to amend or to alter the version in matters affecting the sense, pleading in every instance, "Is it not a little one?" and, Is not the change for the better? Would not the translators themselves, if now living, approve of the change? This omission has been the source of all the trouble.

The second great mistake in the rules, relates to the liberty allowed to the collators to exercise their own discretion in the choice of readings afforded by the British editions. The first mistake was, not limiting definitely and by authority the object to be aimed at; the second was the discretion allowed in securing that object. Suppose the restoration of the English version to its purity (leaving the headings untouched) had been steadily kept in view, yet it was a great mistake to allow the Committee to determine that text otherwise than by the testimony of the standard editions. The fourth of the above rules is, "That so far as the four English copies are *uniform* the American copy be conformed to them, *unless otherwise specially ordered by the Committee.*" The exception (indicated by the italics) vitiates this whole rule and opens the door to emendations *ad libitum*. The true principle is laid down in rule seventh, "That in cases where the four recent British copies, and also the original edition (that of 1611) and our own, vary in *punctuation*, the uniform usage of any three of the copies shall be followed."

Why should this rule be limited to *punctuation*? Even with this limitation the rule has not been adhered to. The Committee have, even in cases affecting materially the sense, as they themselves report, departed from all previous editions in matters of punctuation. But even if it had been faithfully carried out, why should it be restricted to punctuation? Why not extend it to all matters subject to change? If this rule had been thus extended, if no alteration in orthography, capital letters, words in italics, or punctuation had been made, except on the authority of at least three of the standard British editions, no legitimate complaint could have been brought against the Society. These rules then are defective in not confining the collators to the restoration of the text, (leaving the headings untouched;) and, secondly, in allowing them to exercise their discretion, instead of requiring them to follow, in all cases, right or wrong, the majority of the standard copies.

Let us now see how the Committee have carried out the principles which they laid down for their guidance, and the character and extent of the changes which they have introduced. The Report tells us that these changes concern,

“1. WORDS. Here, on the very threshold, we light upon an inconsistency in respect to the gender of a pronoun in the edition of 1611, which all the modern editions have only made worse. Thus in Ruth iii. 15, all the present copies read: ‘and she went into the city;’ but the Hebrew and the translators have it: ‘and he went into the city.’ Again, in Cant. ii. 7, all the present copies read: ‘nor awake *my* love, till he please;’ but the Hebrew and the translators: ‘till she please.’ Yet in Cant. iii. 5, and viii. 4, where the Hebrew is precisely the same, the translators and all the copies have: ‘till he please.’ All these instances have of course been corrected according to the Hebrew.

“In Isa. i. 16, the present copies read, ‘Wash you,’ where the translators put ‘Wash yc.’ This is according to the Hebrew, and has been restored.

“Another change of a word occurs in Josh. xix. 2, where the recent copies read: ‘and Sheba;’ but the translators have: ‘or Sheba.’ Here the Hebrew may in itself be taken either way; but the number of thirteen cities specified in v. 6, requires ‘or.’

“In Matt. xii. 41, which reads in all the copies: ‘shall rise up in judgment,’ the Committee have not hesitated to insert the definite article: ‘in the judgment.’ This is required by the Greek; and the same Greek phrase, in v. 42, is so rendered by the translators, and is so read in all the copies.”

With regard to these changes, we would remark, that as they are very few, of minor importance, and all for the better, the only grounds of objection to them are, first, that changes of this kind were not embraced in the commission granted to the Committee. The Committee was not appointed to correct the received version, even where it was obviously wrong. It was therefore a great error to assume this prerogative, though we are thankful that they exercised it so forbearingly. It appears from the Report, that the Committee did not, and we presume were not required to, report to the managers on the changes which were introduced before they were carried into effect. On the 28th of April, 1850, the Sub-Committee (Drs. Robinson and Vermilye) reported to the Committee that they had “gone through the text of the entire Bible; and that new plates were in the process of preparation, in conformity with the corrected copy. It was thereupon resolved, that the Rev. Mr. McLane be requested to read again with care the sheets of the corrected copy, as made ready for the press; and also to collate the marginal readings and references, with a view to the preparation of another still more correct edition, which may be made the standard copy of the Society. The same Sub-Committee were charged with the further supervision of the work, to assist the collator in perfecting the proposed edition. In accordance with this resolution, the plates then in progress have been finished, (this was said in 1851,) and editions from them carried through the press.” From this it appears that the managers having sanctioned a collation of the standard editions of the English Bible, with the view of removing discrepancies, and having approved of the rules by which that collation should be conducted, left the execution of the work to the Committee on Versions. That Committee appointed a collator to do the work under the guidance of a Sub-Committee, which latter referred to the full Committee in cases considered doubtful. Having accomplished the revision, the Committee order the preparation

of new stereotype plates, print and publish the corrected standard, without any further action of the managers. We do not believe that this method of proceeding will meet the approbation of the Christian public. Changes not only here and there in the words of the version, but most extensive changes in its accessories, have been introduced, without, so far as appears, the responsible managers of the Society knowing anything about them until they were stereotyped and issued with authority from the press. Few therefore as these changes in the words of the version are in number, and subordinate as they are in importance, yet as the Committee were not authorized to make them; as they transcend the object of its appointment, they are to be deeply regretted. The second ground of objection to these verbal changes is, that they entirely transcend the powers of the Society itself. It is of unspeakable importance that it should be considered a settled principle that no Bible Society has the right to change the authorized English version. This abstract principle no one will question. Yet it has been violated; violated, indeed, in unimportant matters, but still violated. It is not the importance of the changes, in this particular, but the importance of the principle, which is the ground of protest.

“2. ORTHOGRAPHY. The committee entertain a reverence for the antique forms of words and orthography in the Bible, where they do not conflict with a clear understanding of the sense. Indeed, it is such forms, in a measure, which impart an air of dignity and venerableness to our version. For this reason, phrases like, ‘hoised up the mainsail,’ Acts xxvii. 40; also words like ‘graff’ and ‘graffed,’ Rom. xi. 17, 19, 23, 24, have not been altered. But when these forms have become obsolete and unintelligible, or have already been changed in some places and not in others, or where in themselves they are of no importance, there seems to be no valid reason for longer retaining them. By far the greater portion of the readers of the English Bible are unlearned persons and children; and it is essential to remove everything in the mere form, which may become to any a stumbling-block in the way of the right and prompt understanding of God’s holy word.”

The Committee give numerous examples of orthographical

changes introduced. As these do not affect the sense of Scripture, they are altogether of minor importance. We have already in the preceding pages expressed what seems to us the principles which ought to govern the introduction of changes of this kind into the English Bible.

“3. COMPOUND WORDS. The eighth rule prescribes that the usage of the English copies be followed in respect to the insertion or omission of the hyphen in compound words. It was found, that the Edinburgh and American copies employ the hyphen in very many instances, where by the operation of the rule it has been dropped. In such cases, generally, the words have afterwards been written as *one* word, or as *two* words, according as the accent in pronunciation is placed upon the *first* word, or otherwise. Thus, *bedchamber, handmaid*; but *meat offering, burnt sacrifice*. This accords for the most part with the English copies.

“4. CAPITAL LETTERS. The ninth rule provides for the manner of writing the term *Scripture* or *Scriptures*, with or without a capital letter. A similar rule has been followed in practice in respect to the word “spirit;” which everywhere is made to begin with a capital when it refers to the Spirit of God as a divine agent, but not when it denotes other spiritual beings or the spirit of man. The following is a specimen of changes which have been made:

| | <i>English Copies.</i> | <i>Corrected.</i> |
|----------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Gen. vi. 3. | My spirit | My Spirit |
| | So too Gen. xli. 38. Num. xxiv. 2. | |
| Ps. xxi. 7. | most High | Most High |
| Is. lxiii. 10. | holy Spirit | Holy Spirit |
| Rev. iv. 5. | seven Spirits of God | seven spirits of God |

“5. WORDS IN ITALICS. These were inserted by the translators to fill out the English idiom, in cases where the Hebrew and Greek usage omits the copula or other connecting or dependent words. These insertions were carefully revised and compared with the original by Dr. Blaney; but notwithstanding his diligence, quite a number of errors have been detected, some of which belong to the translators.”

“6. PUNCTUATION. It was found that the three English copies have a general uniformity in respect to punctuation,

especially in the frequent use of the colon; while the Edinburgh and American often prefer the semicolon, and are in general more conformed to the edition of 1611. The seventh rule prescribes, that ‘the uniform usage of any *three* of the copies shall be followed.’ In the great majority of instances, the operation of the rule has produced conformity with the English copies. In cases where the rule was not applicable, the Committee have endeavoured to decide each according to its own merits.

“The following five changes made in the punctuation, are all, it is believed, which affect the sense :

- Rom. iv. 1. “That Abraham, our father, as pertaining to the flesh hath found.” Here, according to the order of the Greek, it should read: “hath found as pertaining to the flesh.” The true pointing, therefore, is a comma after Abraham, and another after father. This is found in no edition hitherto.
- 1 Cor. xvi. 22. “Let him be Anathema. Maran atha.” There should be a period after Anathema which no edition inserts. The two words “Maran atha” are simply an Aramæan formula signifying “The Lord cometh;” compare Phil. iv. 5.
- 2 Cor. x. 8—11. All the copies now have a colon after v. 8, and a period after v. 9, connecting the two verses in sense. The true pointing, however, is a period after v. 8, and then a colon after v. 9, and also v. 10; thus connecting v. 9 as protasis with v. 11 as apodosis. So Chrysostom, and so the Syriac and Latin versions; and this is required by the logical sequence.
- Heb. xiii. 7. Here should be a period at the end of the verse after “conversation.” So the translators, the Oxford, and other copies. The Edinburgh and American have sometimes a colon, and sometimes a comma.
- Rev. xiii. 8. Here a comma is inserted after “slain;” since the qualification “from the foundation of the world” refers not to “slain,” but to “written;” as is shown by the parallel verse, Rev. xvii. 8. The translators wrongly insert a comma after “Lamb;” others put no stop at all.

“7. PARENTHESES. Our collation has shown, that very many parentheses have been introduced into the text since the edition of 1611. Some of these are fit and proper; but in general they only mar the beauty of the page, without adding anything to perspicuity. In some instances, too, they have the force of commentary. For these reasons, those not inserted by the translators have been in great part omitted; as in Rom. v. 13—17; xi. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 2; Gal. i. 1; Rev. ii. 9, etc.

“8. BRACKETS. These are found but once, 1 John ii. 23,

enclosing the last clause of the verse, which the translators put in *Italic*. This was done, because that clause was not then contained in the received text of the Greek New Testament; although the sense requires it, and it was read in the best manuscripts and in the Versions. The clause is now inserted in all critical editions of the Greek Testament; and as there is no question of its genuineness, both the brackets and the *Italics* have been dropped."

The coolness with which these changes are announced, the conscious innocence which pervades this whole exhibition, render it perfectly manifest that the Committee viewed this matter in a very different light from that in which it is contemplated by the public. This simple page of their Report, harmless as it sounds, has aroused a feeling of alarm which has only begun to reveal itself. The alarming feature of the case is, not that these changes are essential, nor that they evince hostility to the truth, but that good and eminent men, men enjoying the confidence and high respect of the community, can thus coolly claim, exercise, and defend their right, as a Committee of the American Bible Society, to alter the received version in matters confessedly affecting the sense. If this right exists, where are its limits? Where is this work to stop? If this Committee can alter the version because the Greek or Hebrew requires it, (see p. 20;) if they may determine whether the word spirit refers in any given passage to the Holy Spirit, or to a created spirit, (a matter of great difficulty and importance,) if they may alter the sense by altering the punctuation at discretion, what may they not do? It is most manifest that no Bible Society has the right to make any such changes. It is manifest that it is most dangerous that any such right should be conceded. It is manifest, moreover, that all these changes, however innocently made, (and we doubt not the good intentions of the Committee,) are open violations of the plighted faith of the Society. They have been led by the desirableness or propriety of these changes in their estimation, or by their seeming unimportance, to overlook the magnitude of the principle involved, and of the interests at stake.

It must be maintained that the Bible Society has no right to alter the received version in any way so as to change the sense; and as the sense is expressed by words, they cannot alter the

words. So far as, or in those cases in which, the sense is expressed by capital letters, by italics, or by punctuation, they cannot change the authorized version in any of these respects. If it be said that the copies differ in all these points, then collate the standard copies, and follow the majority; but do not, we pray, let the Bible Society, on its own authority, designedly alter the sense of the version by changing the words, or the mode of printing or of pointing the text. This, however, the Bible Society has done. In several cases mentioned on pages 19 and 20 of the Report, they have altered the sense by altering the words; in five cases they have altered the sense by altering the punctuation; in several other passages by a change in the italics; and in one case, 1 John ii. 33, they have introduced a whole clause into the text, which in all previous copies is marked as not belonging to it. The Committee have thus assumed the powers of translators, expounders, and of emenders of the text. We repeat it over and over that the question is not, have they exercised these prerogatives; whether the changes which they have introduced are for the better or worse; but simply whether they had any right to make them. If they have a right to interpret Rom. iv. 1, by putting a comma after "father," they have the right to interpret Rom. ix. 5, by putting a period after "Christ." If, on the authority of the critical editions of the Greek Testament, they have the right to put the last clause of 1 John ii. 23 into the text, they have the right, on the same authority, to strike 1 John v. 7, out of the text. If the principle be once conceded that the Bible Society may alter the received version in words, letters, or points, so as to change its meaning, then we hold our Bibles at their discretion. We, for one, as every one has the right to do, enter our solemn protest against any such principle.

It is no justification or palliation of the course pursued, to urge that the same thing has been done by others; that Dr. Blaney revised the text, and altered the words in italics, the punctuation, &c. Dr. Blaney, or any other person, had a full right to do so. Any body may make a new translation, or alter the old one. But does it follow that the Bible Society, instituted for the purpose of printing and circulating the "received version," can do this? Dr. Blaney put out his edition of the

Bible for what it was. The late Dr. Webster, of our own country, more adventurous still, put out an expurgated edition of the English Scriptures, and no one had anything to say against it. But for the Bible Society to put out an edition of the English Bible, as the authorized version, which is changed in words, capitals, italics, and points, so as in many cases to alter the sense, is an entirely different matter.

It may be asked, whether the English version is never to be changed? Whether its acknowledged imperfections are never to be removed? Whether the world is always to remain at the point of knowledge reached in 1611? and whether admitted misrepresentations of the true sense of Scripture are to be rendered as permanent and as widely diffused as the English language? In answer to these questions we would say, first, that considering the unrivalled excellence of our version, this would be a far less evil than the mischief to be anticipated from any formal revision and correction; secondly, that as the English Bible in King James's version is the common heritage of the Anglo-Saxon race, in all parts of the world, no body of men, either in Europe or America, have a right to change it by a formal and authoritative revision; thirdly, that necessary changes will be effected imperceptibly, little by little, just as the language is gradually changed by usage. If any set of men should set to work to reform the English language, they would be about as successful as if they should attempt to change the climate of England or America. Yet both language and climate are changed by a slow and healthful process; a process which is healthful, because it is imperceptibly slow. In like manner our English version has undergone no slight modifications since the original edition of 1611, and will, in time to come, more and more adapt itself to the necessities of the race. The English Bible is not like the Vulgate, or any other book in a dead language, a thing apart, a fossil-like remain of a former life; but it is like a tree growing out of the soil of the race, and partaking of its life. Fourthly, if Dr. Turner, or any other good and competent man should do on his own authority what Dr. Blaney did, near a hundred years ago, revise the English version, correct with wise and sparing hand its blemishes, retaining its spirit and its precious aroma; and if these

corrections should commend themselves to the minds of English speaking Christians, and be gradually introduced, first in one edition then in another; first in Oxford, then in Cambridge, then in London and Edinburgh, then in New York, (or in the reversed order,) until it was universally adopted, then it would be the "received version," and our Bible Societies would be authorized to print and circulate it. But for any set of men, and especially for any Bible Society appointed for an entirely different purpose, and solemnly pledged to restrict themselves to the mere printing and circulation of the "received version," to undertake to change it, is a most reprehensible and dangerous assumption.

We come now to what, after all, seems to us by far the worst feature of this whole case. The alterations in the text affecting the sense of the version, are so few in number, so subordinate in importance, and so generally for the better, that, although alarming as involving a very dangerous assumption of power, yet they leave the English Bible substantially in its integrity. Not one reader in a thousand would notice them, unless they were pointed out. But the alterations introduced in the accessories of the text, and especially in the headings of the chapters, are so numerous, so radical, and, in general, so much for the worse, that we should regard the general introduction of this new edition of the English Bible as one of the greatest calamities that has ever come upon the American churches. With regard to these accessories of the text, the Committee say ;

"We here tread on different ground. The edition of 1611 contained indeed valuable accessories of the text; and these have been continued, and are greatly increased, in many of the editions at the present day. But it is the text, and strictly nothing but the text, that constitutes the Bible. Of the many editions published by this Society, and by the British and Foreign Bible Society, by far the greater number, and the great multitude of copies, comprise the text alone, with the briefest possible accessories.

"1. CONTENTS OF THE CHAPTERS. These, as found in the larger copies of the Bible, have mostly come down to us from the translators. Some of these summaries early gave rise to remark; especially that originally prefixed to Ps. cxlix: "The

prophet exhorteth to praise God for his love to the church, 5 and for that power which he hath given to the church to rule the consciences of men." In the later copies, the last clause, "to rule the consciences of men," is omitted. Many minor changes were also made in the edition of Dr. Blaney. In the editions without references, for common readers or for ordinary distribution, and particularly in the Edinburgh and American editions, these summaries have often been greatly abbreviated, and sometimes wholly omitted.

"Such a summary, in full, ought to comprise a reference to the main incidents or points in each chapter; expressed in the briefest form consistent with perspicuity; and, so far as possible, in words contained in the text. There should be no ambiguity and no prolixity; and, above all, there should be no comment. In all these particulars, the contents of chapters in the larger Bibles are very frequently deficient; and the Committee have endeavoured to apply the above principles, in making such alterations as seemed in each case to be required. Their attention has been mainly directed to the change of quaint, obsolete, ambiguous, or inappropriate words and expressions; to a greater condensation and conformity with the language of the text; and to the removal of comment."

A series of examples is then given of changes, mostly of the class of condensations, and improvement in the mode of expression. Of the more important class, the Committee say:

"In respect to *comment*, some instances are already given in the preceding paragraphs. It is most frequent in the prophetic books; and in some of them it occurs in the contents of almost every chapter. The following are also examples:

Ps. 49. An earnest persuasion to build the faith of resurrection, not on worldly power, but on God.

Corr. The psalmist calleth upon all men to hear. 6 He sheweth the vanity of trusting in wealth.

Is. 40. The promulgation of the gospel. 3 The preaching of John Baptist. 9 The preaching of the apostles. 12 The prophet by the omnipotency of God, 18 and his incomparableness, 26 comforteth the people.

Corr. God's command to comfort his people. 3 An exhortation to prepare the way of the Lord, 9 and to proclaim the glad tidings of his coming. 12 The power and wisdom of God. 18 The folly of likening him to anything. 26 His perfections a sure ground of trust in him.

Is. 49. Christ, being sent to the Jews, complaineth of them. 5 He is sent to the Gentiles with gracious promises. 13 God's love is perpetual to his church. 18 The ample restoration of the church. 24 The powerful deliverance out of captivity.

Corr. The Messiah and the object of his advent. 7 God promiseth him protection and success. 13 God's unchanging love to Zion. 18 Her glorious enlargement foretold. 23 The enemies of Zion shall be destroyed.

See, too, Is. 42, 43, 44, 50, 51, 52, 54, 60, 62, 63, 66, etc., etc.

“A special example of commentary is found in the contents of all the chapters in the Song of Solomon; which everywhere present, as the subject of the book, the mutual love of Christ and the Church. The Committee fully believe, that this poem is intended to symbolize the mystical union between God or Christ and the souls of believers on earth, either individually or collectively; but nothing of this is expressed in the literal language of the text. The two persons introduced as speaking are everywhere the spouse or bride (ch. iv. 8–12; v. 1) and her beloved. In accordance with this view, all the summaries of this book have been recast.”

In order to show what this recasting amounts to, we print in parallel columns the old and new headings of that book.

The old headings.

CHAP. I. The Church's love unto Christ. 5. She confesseth her deformity; 7, and prayeth to be directed to his flock. 8. Christ directeth her to the shepherds' tents; 9, and showeth his love to her; 11, giveth her gracious promises. 12. The Church and Christ congratulate one another.

CHAP. II. The mutual love of Christ and his Church. 8. The hope; 10, and calling of the Church. 14. Christ's care of his Church. 16. The profession of the Church, her faith and hope.

CHAP. III. The Church's fight and victory in temptation. 6. The Church glorieth in Christ.

CHAP. IV. Christ setteth forth the graces of the Church. 8. He showeth his love to it. 16. The Church prayeth to be fit for his presence.

CHAP. V. Christ awaketh his Church with his calling. 2. The Church having a taste of Christ's love, is sick of love. 9. A description of Christ by his graces.

The new headings.

CHAP. I. The bride commendeth her beloved; 7, and inquireth where he feedeth his flock. 8. His answer. 12. Their mutual love.

CHAP. II. The graces of the bride and her beloved, and their delight in each other. 8. He inviteth her to behold the beauties of spring. 14. His care of her. 16. Her trust in him.

CHAP. III. The bride's despondency. 6. The splendour of the beloved.

CHAP. IV. The beloved setteth forth the graces of the bride. 8. His love for her. 16. Her desire for his presence.

CHAP. V. The beloved in his garden. 2. The bride's love for him. 9. His graces described.

Old headings.

CHAP. VI. The Church professeth her faith in Christ. 4. Christ showeth the graces of the Church, and his love towards her.

CHAP. VII. A further description of the Church's graces. 10. The Church professeth her faith and desire.

CHAP. VIII. The love of the Church to Christ. 6. The vehemency of love. 8. The calling of the Gentiles. 14. The Church prayeth for Christ's coming.

ISAIAH.

CHAP. XLII. The office of Christ graced with meekness and constancy. 5. God's promise unto him. 10. An exhortation to praise God for his gospel. 17. He reproveth the people of incredulity.

CHAP. L. Christ showeth that the dereliction of the Jews is not to be imputed to him, by his ability to save, 5, by his obedience in that work; 7, and by his confidence in that assistance. 10. An exhortation to trust in God and not in ourselves.

CHAP. LI. An exhortation after the pattern of Abraham, to trust in Christ; 3, by reason of his comfortable promises; 4, of his righteous salvation; 7, and man's mortality. 9. Christ by his sanctified arm defendeth his from the fear of man. 17. He bewaileth the afflictions of Jerusalem, and promiseth deliverance.

New headings.

CHAP. VI. The bride's confidence in the beloved. 4. He setteth forth her graces; 10, and his love for her.

CHAP. VII. The bride's graces further described. 12. Her invitation to the beloved.

CHAP. VIII. The delight of the bride and her beloved in each other. 6. Love strong as death. 8. The bride's desire in behalf of her sister. 14. She longeth for the coming of her beloved.

ISAIAH.

CHAP. XLII. The servant of Jehovah. 2. His character. 5. God's promise unto him. 10. An exhortation to praise God for his salvation. 17. His rebuke of Israel for unbelief.

CHAP. L. The sins of Israel the cause of their sufferings, and not God's inability to save. 4. God's gifts to the Messiah. 6. His patient endurance of reproach. 10. An exhortation to trust in God, and not in ourselves.

CHAP. LI. Comfort promised to Zion. 4. God's salvation is near. 7. The destruction of Zion's enemies foretold. 9. The people pray for his aid as of old. 12. His promise to them. 17. The afflictions of Jerusalem bewailed; 21, and her deliverance promised.

Our limits forbid this comparison being carried any further. The examples cited are sufficient to give an idea of the character of the changes introduced, but not of the extent to which they have been carried. The words *Christ* and *Church* are banished from the Old Testament. Many passages which, in the old edition, were made to refer to Christ and his kingdom, are in the new referred to the "servant of the Lord," "the king," "the Psalmist."

In reference to all these changes, we maintain, first, that the Committee had no right to make them, that their introduction is a gross and most alarming assumption of power, which ought to be resisted by the whole Christian community; and, secondly,

that even if they had the right, it is most extraordinary, lamentable, and unaccountable, that evangelical headings, familiar and endeared to all readers of the English Bible, should be discarded, and others, such as Gesenius or De Wette would have preferred, adopted in their stead. However this may be accounted for, the fact is undeniable.

First, the Committee had no right to make these changes. They were not appointed for the purpose. They were appointed to collate the standard editions of the English Bible, with a view to produce uniformity in matters of orthography, capital letters, words in italics, and punctuation. This was the extent of their commission. What right then had they to remodel the headings of the chapters, from the beginning to the end of the Bible? If they had so far reviewed them as to produce uniformity in this as in other matters, between their own and the standard British editions, it would have been a stretch of power under their commission; but that they should undertake to remodel them, to act in the premises as though they were authorized, those seven men, (or two,) to expound the Scriptures by these pregnant statements for the whole American community, is perfectly unaccountable. The objection, however, is not simply that the Committee exceeded their powers, but that the Society itself had no right to change these headings. They constitute a most important part of the English Bible, which the Society was constituted to print and circulate, and not to change. These headings were attached to the original folio edition of 1611, and they have come down to the present day, and have gone into all the world, wherever the English Bible has gone. They have a sacredness and authority, not so much from the character of the translators, exalted as that was, as from their being sanctioned by all churches using the English version, for nearly two centuries and a half. Surely this ought to have protected them from the ruthless hand of innovation. We know that editions have been published without them; that Dr. Blaney modified them in matters of minor importance, and that other editors have made further changes; but still in the standard edition, even of the American Bible Society previous to this review, the old headings of 1611 were preserved in their integrity. We have compared the folio edition of 1611, with the royal octavo

edition of the American Bible Society, in more than one hundred chapters taken here and there at random, and the only difference we discovered was the casual omission in one instance of the article *the*.* The origin, the long continued sanction they have enjoyed, their wide diffusion, their excellence, and their inestimable value, placed these headings on a ground of authority which no Bible Society had a right to impugn.

Besides this, however, the fact that these headings are comments, and that the Bible Society is precluded by its constitution and its pledges from expounding the Bible, proves that they had no right to introduce new headings. They had the right, as remarked in the former part of this article, to publish the received version with the notes and comments attached to it when the Society was organized, and which had received the sanction of all denominations of Christians who used that version. This right the Society has exercised from the beginning without let or complaint. But they had no right to discard those comments and attach others of their own. That these headings are comments is self-evident. They give an analysis of each chapter, and tell what it is about. In a vast multitude of cases they are concise expositions of the chapters. This is not denied and cannot be questioned. Nay, the Committee say this was one of the great reasons why they altered them. Their desire and aim was "the removal of comment." Unfortunately, however, they have removed one set of comments which they had the right to print, and introduced another of their own, which they were most solemnly pledged not to do. From Genesis to Revelation they tell us the contents of the chapters, i. e. they analyze them, one of the most difficult and important functions of a commentator; they tell us that Ps. ii. relates to the kingdom of the Messiah; that Ps. xlv. treats of his majesty and grace; that Ps. cx. sets forth his kingdom, priesthood, and triumphs; that Isa. xlix. treats of the object of his advent; Isa. liii. of his sufferings on our behalf; Isa. lxi. of his office, and of the glorious results of his coming; that Rom. v. teaches that the fruits of justification by faith, are peace with

* The objectionable heading to the 149th Psalm, which the Committee makes so prominent, was changed long ago in the British editions.

God, joy, glorying in tribulation, and assurance of hope; that Rom. viii. teaches the security of believers; that Rom. x. treats of the difference between the righteousness of the law and that of faith, and so on to the end. If these are not comments, then no comments were ever written. As then by common consent the Bible Society has no right to publish the Scriptures with comments of their own, they had no right to publish these headings. The plea that they changed the headings in order to avoid comment is perfectly nugatory, for two reasons; first, because there was no call on them to exclude the comments which with a good conscience and without complaint they had been publishing for forty years; and secondly, because the new headings are just as much comments as the old ones. They have not carried out the principle of stating the contents of the chapters in the language of the chapters themselves, but in a multitude of cases give what they understand to be the true sense of the passage. We say nothing of the difficulty of this work; of the knowledge, ability and piety which it requires to prepare suitable headings for all the chapters in the Bible—a work which really presupposes the ability to expound the whole word of God—it is enough that the American Bible Society in its Committee had no right to undertake the work, and that it is a palpable violation of the pledge on which the very existence of the Society depends.

But admitting they had the right, how has it been executed? They have excluded pious, evangelical, orthodox headings, and in a great many cases, sometimes through whole books, introduced such as any Rationalist would have framed. They say they do this because they wished to avoid giving any interpretation at all. But, 1. If they felt bound to give no interpretation at all, why did they interpret Psalms ii. xlv. cx., Isaiah li. liii. and many other passages? 2. Having given a Messianic interpretation to some chapters, the avoiding to give such an interpretation to others of the same class is virtually and practically to deny their application to Christ. If they say that Psalm cx. relates to the Messiah, and that in Psalm lxxii. “the Psalmist prays for the king, and foretells his prosperous and glorious reign,” they make a clear distinction between the two cases, and assign a Messianic character to one Psalm which they do

not assign to another. If the old headings say that the Song of Solomon relates to the mutual love of Christ and his Church, and the Committee strike them all out, and thus make the book describe the mutual love of the king and his bride—is this nothing? Is it not tantamount to a denial of the religious character of the book? At any rate, if the Committee had wished to teach that the book of Canticles is a mere epithalamium—a secular song of love—they could not have done anything more than they have done. We make no imputation of bad motives. We believe they acted honestly. We believe they were captivated with the theory of giving the contents of the chapters in the words of the chapters, and thus avoiding all comment, without adverting to the fact, that by applying this rule in some cases, and not in others, they vitiate it entirely, and throw the whole weight of their edition against the evangelical interpretation of all those chapters which they fail to designate as referring to Christ and his Church.

And now let us ask, What great good was to be attained by these changes? Did the old, orthodox, evangelical headings, announcing to the reader Christ and his Church, everywhere throughout the Old Testament, as the subject matter of the law and the prophets, do any harm? Were they not true? Did they not express the cherished faith of the Church? Have they not turned the thoughts of millions of readers to Christ and his cross? Have they not in thousands, yea, in ten thousand times ten thousand cases, answered the anxious question, “I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?” Why throw away this unspeakable advantage? Why refuse to answer, when we may, the earnest inquiry of those who seek to know what the Bible means? There was no evil, actual or apprehended, connected with retaining the old headings. It was lawful and right to retain them. They were of incalculable value. Then why discard them? Why substitute in their place headings which strike the mass of Christian readers as unevangelical, as banishing Christ from the place which he has always held in the Old Testament?

The third question which we proposed to consider is, What ought the Bible Society to do under existing circumstances? What they decided to do, was to adopt this octavo Reference

Bible, prepared under the direction of the Committee on Versions, as the standard copy of the Society; to which all future editions published by the Society shall be conformed. As the Society is the creature of the Christian community, it must obey its will when that will is clearly ascertained. If the Christian public in the United States are disposed to sanction the course taken by the Society, to receive at its hands, and adopt in their families, schools and churches, this revised edition of the Bible, the Society will doubtless continue to make it the standard; but if that public disapprove of the course adopted, and refuse to receive this as the standard of the English version, then the Society must give it up. It must either revert to their former standard, which was good enough, or they must omit all the alterations in this copy, whether in words, capitals, italics, or punctuation, which alter the sense, and they must restore the old headings. They must, in short, give us back our old Bibles. We are no prophets, we have less opportunity than many others to learn the state of the public mind upon this subject, but from what we hear, and from what we feel, we are fully persuaded, that unless the Society does retrace its steps and return substantially to its old standard, its national character is at an end. We are entirely misinformed if our late General Assembly were not withheld, by an imperfect knowledge of the facts in the case, and by the hope that the Society would thus recede, from adopting at once the overture presented by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge.

We cannot refrain from closing this article with the often-quoted tribute of an English Roman Catholic scholar to the superlative excellence and value of our English version. "Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Bible is not one of the great strong-holds of *heresy* in this country? It lives on the ear like music that can never be forgotten; like the sound of the church-bell, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is a part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the gifts and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It

is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of the English Bible. It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land, there is not a Protestant with one spark of righteousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible." Our only security for the preservation of this invaluable treasure, is to adhere steadfastly to the principle, that no Bible Society shall change this version, either in its text or its accessories, in words, letters, or points, in any way affecting its sense.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Central Idea of Christianity. By Jesse T. Peck, D.D. New York; Carlton & Porter. 1857.

THE central idea of this book, and, according to it, of Christianity itself, is what is commonly called Perfectionism, or the doctrine of sinless perfection in this life. Although this is the nucleus around which all else crystallizes, it by no means constitutes its chief strength. It deforms and weakens those earnest persuasives to a higher standard of holiness with which the work abounds, and which impart to it its chief value and power. This value is enhanced by the special adaptation of such appeals to the present state of the Church in all its branches.

The book acquires importance still further, as being the most vigorous and attractive exhibition of Methodist theology, practical and theoretical, which has been given to the public for a long time. It is hailed as such by all the accredited organs of the denomination. One declares, that "it will be held as a standard work in Arminian divinity;" another, that it is "genuinely Wesleyan," and that "after the confusions of opinion that have prevailed among us on this great doctrine, a work so lucid,

logical, and orthodox, is needed." Dr. Durbin says of the book, "It is on the subject of evangelical holiness or Christian perfection, a theme which has provoked much cloudy and intemperate discussion, so much so, indeed, that the moderate and reflecting had begun to lose interest in the subject. Such was the state of my own mind, until I read Dr. Peck's book, in which I find the subject discussed in a calm and clear manner, and subjected to the test of Scripture and experience, confirmed by the nature of the case." These, and a cloud of similar witnesses, prove that the book speaks with power, and is recognized as the best exponent of living Methodist divinity.

Entertaining the warmest sympathy with the author's persuasives to a high-toned piety, we are less fortunate than Dr. Durbin, in finding the "confusion" which has heretofore marred the reasonings of perfectionists, cleared away in this volume. Nowhere is this "confusion worse confounded" than in his formal definitions of this perfect sanctity, which he insists that all may have, and, if they succeed in reaching heaven, *must* have during this life. He tell us, (p. 28,) that "infirmities of body and mind, which constantly need the compassion of God, the merits of Christ, and the charity of men, will press upon us till our probation ends; but in spite of them all, the soul is in a state of perfect salvation." Again, (p. 44,) "the stern law of sinless perfection is in full force at this day in regard to man as man. But this is far from being the assumed or actual condition of man in his holiest earthly state. With his whole heart cleansed from sin, such are its susceptibilities of moral defilement, as that, left to itself for a moment, it would again receive the stains of sin." Again, (p. 45,) "Every Christian feels more or less of this feebleness, and marks with deep regret and humble penitence the failures which result from it. No one who is endowed with true humility, could think of comparison with the stern law of God, without shrinking in terror." No comment is needed to prove that the perfect holiness of the author is not "sinless perfection," even on his own showing: and what evangelical creed, or divine, or body of Christians sets forth any sort or grade of holiness different from that thus unfolded by Dr. Peck, to be sought, expected, and realized by all believers in this life? And why should Dr. Peck weary himself to build up a fabric which he thus sweeps away by a stroke of the pen? And why should his brethren exult over his success?

Because it is undeniable that many regenerate men are sanctified but in part, while the whole plausibility of Dr. Peck's scheme depends on his constantly assuming that the words holiness, sanctification, etc., as applied in Scripture to Christians,

mean perfect sanctity, he pronounces regeneration and sanctification as distinct from each other as "a thing and an accident of a thing can be." An accident of a thing is that which, though absent, leaves the essence of it entire. According to this, we may have the essence of regeneration without sanctification. And yet on the same page he tells us, "that with regeneration they (Christians) have received but an imperfect sanctification; or, in other words, that God has commenced to sanctify the souls he has regenerated, making the progression and completion of the work depend upon conditions which he has clearly revealed." Here we have the common evangelical view that regeneration is inchoate sanctification, and sanctification is the progressive growth of the life imparted in regeneration.

Not only does he constantly assume that the holiness and sanctification of the Scriptures mean sinless perfection in this life, but that such passages as "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin," which assert complete justification, also assert complete sanctification. Passages which assert sanctification in all our parts and faculties, body, soul and spirit, according to him, assert sinless perfection. Other passages which may be understood to assert it as the property of the spirits of the just made perfect, he refers, without argument, to saints in the flesh. Passages which warrant assurance of hope for the Christian here below, and set forth the possibility of a confiding love so perfect as to cast out the fear which hath torment, he relies on to sustain his theory of perfect sanctity here below. He also assumes that desires and labours to attain and diffuse that fervid zeal and unreserved consecration, which are the great want of the Church, depend upon the acceptance of his theory of "entire sanctification," "perfect purity" here below, as the only "preparation for heaven," (pp. 18, 21.) These assumptions appear not merely here and there, but they run through the whole book, like so much leaven.

For ourselves, we do not see, how any genuine assurance of hope is possible for those who do not believe in the perseverance of the saints; who believe with Dr. Peck and other Arminians, that "the liability to fall into sin, and deserve eternal death, cannot be less than that of Adam in paradise," even for the sanctified in Christ Jesus, (p. 42,) and that apostacy is possible in the highest state of Christian perfection.

As might be expected, he is emphatic in discarding the divine sovereignty, as a source of salvation, which he makes contingent on the rectitude and steadfastness of the human will.

Precarious trust! "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy."

We are sorry that a work, abounding in fervent persuasives to holiness, with which we warmly sympathize, should be made a vehicle for Arminian and Perfectionist errors from which we recoil. Though often counteracted by the truths mixed with them, their tendency is, and ever has been, to foster pride and self-righteousness; to unsettle faith and hope, to supplant humble reliance on and devotion to Christ, by that zeal for God which is not according to knowledge.

Little Talks for Little Folks. Written for the Board of Publication. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This is a series of conversations on religious topics, principally on the various parts of the Lord's Prayer, with a little child, in which these things are illustrated with a clearness and simplicity suited to the understandings of children.

What is Faith? By the Rev. R. H. Beattie. Published by Request of the Synod of New York. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Christian Faith is an inexhaustible theme. Although nothing essentially new can be said about it, yet it may be unfolded with endless variety of illustration and adaptation. In this little volume the nature of faith as such, then the nature and fruits of faith in God and his word, are exhibited with a freshness and aptness of illustration, and with a neatness and force of style, which fully justify the Synod and Board in securing its publication.

Priesthood and Clergy Unknown to Christianity; or the Church a Community of Co-equal Brethren. A Canto. By Campaginator. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

We find here a toilsome effort to prove what the Church, with scarcely a significant exception, has always rejected—that the New Testament authorizes no official teachers, rulers, or ministers, of any sort. All Christians are alike ministers, rulers, preachers. The Quakers have tried this system. Their utter failure to spread their principles, or even to perpetuate them, to any large extent, among their own descendants, furnishes a signal illustration of its impotence. In the face of such an example, our anonymous author will hardly succeed in persuading Christian people to violate their own gracious instincts, and disown the pastors and teachers given for their edification by the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls. The laborious dexterity with which he tortures the passages of the New Testament, which establish and recognize officers and pastors in the church, is only equalled by the extravagance of his state-

ments in regard to the mischief they cause. Those who seek to abolish the Christian ministry are really striking far deeper, whether they mean so or not. Christianity is always and every where as its ministers, and cannot long survive their loss.

Our Friends in Heaven; or the Mutual Recognition of the Redeemed in Glory demonstrated. By Rev. J. M. Killen, M. A. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This volume presents a mass of scriptural evidence in favour of the mutual recognition, in the future world, of those known to each other on earth, such as we have not seen elsewhere collected. All the scattered rays of suggestion and implication relative to this subject in the word of God, are industriously gathered and judiciously combined, so as to emit a focal light. The author clears the doctrine of those crudities which have sometimes encumbered it, and made it offensive to pious minds. He rejects the idea that any depraved or animal appetites, or carnal relationships and feelings of any sort, can have place in heaven. He holds that the communion of saints, and the recovery of our social nature to its primitive perfection and felicity, cannot be fully realized among the inhabitants of heaven, unless they know each other, and remember their past mutual relations. These views are presented with great clearness and force. Without adopting all his interpretations of scriptural passages, the work as a whole appears to us solid, sound, and edifying. We are especially pleased with the felicitous and impressive practical application of the doctrine, which he makes to different classes of men.

The Holy Life, and Triumphant Death of Mr. John Janeway, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. By the Rev. James Janeway. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

A signal example of the power of divine grace, displayed in a calm and assured faith, a lively hope, an intelligent zeal, and devoted activity in the service of Christ.

Hymns of Faith and Hope. By Horatius Bonar, D. D., Kelso, author of the *Night of Weeping*, the *Morning of Joy*, &c. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1857.

The Desert of Sinai. Notes of a Spring-Journey from Cairo to Beersheba. By Horatius Bonar, D. D., Kelso. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1857.

The first of these volumes is a collection of fugitive pieces that had been previously given to the public through various channels. They are all evangelical and devout. With various degrees of poetical and literary merit, they are generally attractive, readable, and adapted to do good.

The second is what its title indicates. Although it abounds in traces of hurried preparation, it is always graphic, and passes on from sketch to sketch with a rapidity which never suffers it to be tiresome. The author omits no opportunity to turn his observations to account in illustrating the Scriptures. He frequently makes use of them to expose the futility of neological perversions. Not the least valuable part of the work is found in the observations interspersed throughout the Index, of topics at the end of the volume, apparently in the way of supplement. We think the true place for a large portion of this matter was in the body of the volume. But however arranged, the matter is generally interesting and instructive.

The Christian Philosopher; or the Connection between Science and Philosophy with Religion. By Thomas Dick, LL.D., &c. Illustrated with over one hundred and fifty Engravings. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1857.

The twenty-first English edition of this work, which the Carters here republish, is revised so as to bring it up to the position which the various sciences have gained since the original first appeared. It is thus a great improvement on previous editions, the number of which shows how widely the work is appreciated. Works of this kind serve three purposes. 1. They diffuse much scientific information. Few persons could read this without acquiring some knowledge of the proper sphere and leading principles of the various physical sciences. 2. They enlarge and vivify our conceptions of the greatness and glory of God, by exhibiting the vastness and order of the material universe. They thus foster devout feeling. 3. They show that science in its great results vindicates faith, and destroys the very foundations of scepticism. These properties are conspicuous in this volume.

Expository Thoughts on the Gospels. For Family and Private Use; with the Text complete. By Rev. J. C. Ryle, B. A., Christ Church, Oxford; Rector of Helmingham, Suffolk, etc., St. Matthew. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1857.

Mr. Ryle, a zealous evangelical clergyman of the Church of England, has already become known to the public by several works, which have been republished by the Carters. They all have the same characteristics, some of which we have alluded to in previous notices. They are experimental, earnest, searching, pungent, fitted to awaken careless, and instruct inquiring souls. The "Expository Thoughts" are not critical. They shed little new light on difficult passages. Their method is to take a few verses at once, seize the strong doctrinal or practical truths

they contain, and apply them for "doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness." They thus make a volume valuable for "Family and Private Use."

The Science of Logic; or an Analysis of the Laws of Thought. By Rev. Asa Mahan. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1857.

This work, like all which the author has published on kindred topics, displays a good deal of ability, still greater pretension, with a large tincture of egotism. He offers us here what he calls a "reconstruction" of the science of logic. Logic has thus far been treated as the science of reasoning, inference, or deduction, i. e. of the laws by which we proceed from judgments given to judgments derived from them. In order that such conclusions be true, it is requisite not merely that they follow from the premises, but that the premises also be true. Hence, in order that we may have criteria for determining the validity of the conclusion, we must have criteria for testing the judgments and conceptions, or terms and propositions on which it is based. These criteria he undertakes to develop, before proceeding to the syllogism, as the first step in his "reconstruction" of the science. We find, however, the most material part of what he advances in regard to conceptions and judgments, set forth in common logical treatises, in a form more intelligible to the student who is untrained in mental philosophy, under the head of terms and propositions. As to the question, what are true and untrue intuitions, they are usually and more naturally treated in the ordinary hand-books of intellectual philosophy.

The principal matter of "reconstruction," however, lies in working into his development of the syllogism, the peculiarities of Sir W. Hamilton, many of which Mr. Mahan is careful to inform us he himself had discovered originally, before he found them elsewhere. These peculiarities have their origin mostly in a peculiar theory about the quantification of the predicate. This theory denies the great maxim of logicians, that all negative propositions and no affirmatives distribute the predicate. Hamilton and his school, however, assert that affirmative propositions often do, while negatives often do not, distribute the predicate. This is sometimes so accidentally, though not from the force of the expression, as all logicians admit. It is true, in fact, that all equilateral triangles are equiangular, and that all equiangular triangles are equilateral. But the latter proposition is not implied by the former. All reasoning which proceeds on the supposition that the predicate of affirmative propositions is distributed, is vitiated by a *non sequitur*. If all men are rational, it by no means follows that all rational beings are

men. But, says Mr. Mahan, "throughout the entire range of mathematics the predicate as well as the subject is distributed." Is this so? Because every figure of a hundred sides is a polygon, is every polygon a figure of a hundred sides? But is not this true where the relation of equality is asserted as our author claims and attempts to prove, by adducing the proposition, "The square of the hypotenuse of a right angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the sides"? Doubtless it is true in this case that the sum of the squares of the sides is equal to the square of the hypotenuse. But this apparent converse is not the real converse of the former. The terms here are not merely transposed. They are changed. The predicate in the former is "*equal to the sum of the squares of the sides.*" The subject in the latter is simply "the sum of the squares of the sides"—a totally different term. So the subject of the former is "the square of the hypotenuse." The predicate of the latter is "*equal to the square of the hypotenuse.*" Now suppose we take the real terms of the first proposition and attempt to convert it without limitation of quantity, and see whether it will prove true. Are *all surfaces* that are *equal* to the sum of the sides of a right angled triangle, the square of its hypotenuse? No—a thousand other figures may be equal to it. It would be easy to prove by a similar process that the same thing holds true in affirmative propositions affirming the relations of likeness or unlikeness, &c., in which Mr. Mahan maintains that the predicate is distributed. And it would be as easy to prove that in every normal use of language, negative propositions distribute the predicate. Our author's example, "money is not all things valuable," does not disprove it. As far as it has any plausibility, this arises from the old fallacy noted by the logicians, of confounding the collective and distributive sense of the word *all*. Here it means the *sum-total* of things valuable. Is not every such sum-total in this proposition excluded from the subject "money?" Is it not then distributed?

While we do not accept Mr. Mahan's "reconstruction" in its most material points, we do not, therefore, deny the value of the book. It is richly freighted with solid thinking. We agree with the author that the part on "Method" is the most valuable. We think, indeed, that the illustrations there given are better suited to proficients, than to beginners in philosophic studies. But this is in keeping with the whole book. He offers some very important discussions on the profoundest problems in philosophy, ethics, and theology, in illustration of the various points, in true logical method. Some of his views on the will, and the true method in natural theology, we repudiate; but his compact

and forcible exposure of Idealism, Pantheism, Utilitarianism, and of the frailty of the Prize Essays of Thompson and Tulloch in support of Theism, are luminous and weighty. The frequency with which he foists in his own writings, in illustration of logical principles, and especially his availing himself of a treatise on logic, to expose Mr. Finney's unfairness towards him in a past controversy on Utilitarianism, are out of taste. The book is undoubtedly a strong one. But it is weakened by the author's sensitive and obtrusive egotism, and by his futile attempt at an impracticable revolution in the science.

The Old Chest and its Treasures. By Aunt Elizabeth. New York. Published by M. W. Dodd. 1856.

This is a collection of striking incidents and anecdotes. They nearly all present some Christian truth, duty, or privilege, in a striking light. They will be read by vast numbers who would not attend to such truths presented abstractly and systematically. They will do good and not evil, as far as they are read.

The Two Sacraments. A Brief Examination of the views entertained by the Society of Friends respecting the Christian Ministry, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. By Henry A. Boardman, D. D. Philadelphia: Parry & McMillan. 1857.

This is the substance of a lecture of the author, which we are glad he has caused to be published in the form of a tract for general circulation. It is a clear, candid and convincing refutation of the Quaker theory in reference to the ministry and sacraments—a theory which, in the end, must prove fatal to the growth and perpetuity of any communion which adopts it. The courtesy and fairness with which the argument is presented, must add to its influence among those who most need it.

A History of the Presbyterian Church of America, from its beginning until the year 1760; with Biographical Sketches of its Early Ministers. By the Rev. Richard Webster, late Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Mauch Chunk, Pa. With a Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. C. Van Rensselaer, D. D., and an Historical Introduction, by the Rev. William Blackwood, D. D. Published by authority of the Presbyterian Historical Society. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson. 1857.

A work, especially of history, which, like this, is posthumous and unfinished, must of course be subject to serious disadvantages. It must be rather a collection of some of the materials out of which the author designed to construct his history, than the history itself. At the same time, in spite of these drawbacks, it may have a value which justifies its publication. The materials for Presbyterian history, in which this volume abounds, give it interest and value. It is also precious as a memorial of a saintly, devoted and able minister of our Church, whose character is worthily delineated in the Memoir by Dr. Van Rensselaer.

In Doors and out of Doors; or, Life among the Children. By Mary McCalla, author of "Pictorial Second Book. With Coloured Engravings. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

We rejoice in the attention which our Board of Publication is giving to the preparation of books for children, fitted to interest and benefit them. Amid the vast progeny of books, great and small, now published, which are adapted to enchant, unsettle and corrupt children and youth, Christian parents need all the aid which our Christian publishing societies and Boards can render them in the work of godly training. This little volume is a good contribution to the cause.

Marriage as it is, and as it should be. By Rev. John Bayley, of the Virginia Annual Conference, author of the "Confessions of a Converted Infidel. New York: published by M. W. Dodd. 1857.

No one can doubt the importance of diffusing sound Christian views on this subject, or the vast misery and corruption which result from the violation of the laws of God and nature, either in the formation of the marriage relation, or in the conduct of parties who have entered into it. We are glad to find in this volume an excellent manual on the subject. The more important points connected with it are treated in successive chapters with great judgment, delicacy and force. The Christian doctrine in regard to the sexes, marriage, and its duties, is enforced against all modern reformers and radicals. The principles of Christianity, which should govern in the choice of a husband or wife, in their mutual bearings and conduct after marriage, and in the pious nurture of children, are well set forth. The book is not only sound, but instructive and useful in its matter. In style, it is vivacious, readable, copiously enlivened with anecdote and concrete illustration, which will be likely to ensure attention from those most in need of its counsels.

The Life of Mrs. Sherwood; author of "Henry Milner," "Lady of the Manor," &c. &c. Abridged for the Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

We learn from the Preface, over the signature "J. H.," Trenton, N. J., (from which our readers can judge as well as we, who is the accomplished author of this abridged memoir,) that it brings to view "a rare example of devoted Christian usefulness, in more self-denying ways than authorship." He has done a good service in putting it within the reach of ordinary readers. As the work has reached us at the last moment, we are unable to say more of the manner in which it is executed, than to express an *a priori* probability, that what is done by so competent a hand, is doubtless well done.

Our Theology in its Developments. By E. P. Humphrey, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This is the celebrated discourse of Dr. Humphrey at the opening of the General Assembly in Charleston, S. C., in 1852. As a beautiful, vigorous and eloquent exhibition of the excellent fruits of Calvinism, it has been much and justly admired, and we think the Board have wisely undertaken to extend its circulation and usefulness.

Gothold's Emblems; or Invisible Things understood by Things that are Made. By Christian Scriver, Minister of Magdeburg in 1671. Translated from the twenty-eighth German edition, by Rev. Robert Menzies, Hoddam. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1857.

Scriver, a German preacher of præëminent popularity in his day, wrote this series of pious meditations, after recovery from perilous sickness, and the experience of other heavy afflictions. They were then greatly prized in Germany. Afterwards, however, owing to various causes, they fell into oblivion. Recently some copies, that had been preserved as heir-looms, came to the notice of some evangelical German ministers. Being republished, they won their way to the favour of evangelical German Christians in a remarkable degree. Hence their translation and publication in our own tongue. They consist of brief, fervid, pithy meditations on a vast number of objects and events in nature and providence, which are improved to suggest, by way of analogy, some devout aspiration, or holy maxim. A vein of clear, racy thinking, and quiet, yet deep spirituality, runs through them, which is rather characteristic of the best evangelical German literature. It presents a type of Christian feeling, not thinking, which the evangelical Anglo-Saxon mind may study with profit.

The American Biographical Dictionary; Containing the Lives, Characters, and Writings of the most eminent Persons deceased in North America, from its first settlement. By William Allen, D. D., late President of Bowdoin College, &c. Third Edition. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio: Henry P. P. Jewett. 1857. Royal 8vo. pp. 896.

The first edition of this work was published in 1809, the second in 1832, the third in 1857. The first contained an account of more than seven hundred deceased Americans; the second, of more than eighteen hundred; and the third, of nearly seven thousand. The venerable author presents his work in its present form as the fruits of nearly fifty years' labour. It is one of those books of reference which the scholar, and indeed every educated man, needs to have constantly at hand. The author does not content himself with the statement of the facts

connected with the subjects of his memoirs, but at times analyzes their writings, and attempts to refute their opinions. This leads him often astray, and makes his work, partially and imperfectly, indeed, a theological as well as a biographical dictionary.

Apples of Gold; or a Word in Season to Young Men and Young Women. By Rev. Thomas Brooks, author of the *Mute Christian*, &c. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

The name of Thomas Brooks is a sufficient guaranty for the substantial worth of the volume before us. His writings are marked by Christian truth, faithfulness, and zeal. In this volume we find persuasions to early piety joined with fit counsels and instructions to the young, set forth in a style which, though quaint, never flags as to life and force. We again express our gratification with the efforts of the Board to provide suitable reading for the young.

The Typology of Scripture viewed in Connection with the entire Scheme of the Divine Dispensations. By Patrick Fairbairn, D. D., Professor of Divinity, Free Church College, Glasgow. Third edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. 1857. 2 vols. 8vo.

The first edition of this valuable work appeared in 1845 and 1847; the second, considerably enlarged and improved, in 1853. This edition is in the main a reprint of the second. It is a work of established reputation and of great value.

The Words of the Lord Jesus. By Rudolph Stier, Doctor of Theology, Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Schkenditz. Vol. VI. Translated from the Second Revised and Enlarged German Edition. By Rev. William B. Pope, Hull. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. 1857. 8vo. pp. 522.

This volume makes the thirteenth of the new series of Clark's Foreign Theological Library, to which the attention of our readers has so often been called. The previous works of this series are Hengstenberg's *Christology*, Baumgarten's *Apostolic History*, and Ullmann's *Reformers before the Reformation*. These are sterling works known the world over.

A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimony of the Supreme Judiciary of the Presbyterian Church, from its origin in America to the present time. With Notes and Documents Explanatory and Historical: Constituting a complete illustration of her Polity, Faith, and History. Compiled for the Board of Publication, by the Rev. Samuel J. Baird. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1856. 8vo. pp. 856.

What a Concordance is to the Bible, this Digest is to our constitution and history. The one is as indispensable in its sphere as the other. It is divided into nine Books, subdivided into parts, chapters, and sections. It is not a chronological

arrangement of the acts and declarations of our highest Judiciary, but truly and properly a digest, a logical classification under appropriate heads of the vast mass of materials accumulated during a century and a half. Mr. Baird has executed his laborious task with great skill, and, as far as we know, to the entire satisfaction of the Church. The book is well printed, substantially bound, and sold for three dollars and fifty cents; to ministers and theological students for two dollars and eighty cents.

A Commentary, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, for the use of Ministers, Theological students, private Christians, Bible Classes, and Sabbath Schools. By John Owen, D. D. With a Map, Synoptical Index, &c. New York: Leavitt and Allen, 379 Broadway. 1857. pp. 501.

This work contains the English text, with marginal references, and the comments in double columns. The pressure of other engagements having prevented an examination of this book, we can only present our readers with the author's account of his plan and method. "The Series," he says, "to which the present volume belongs, is designed to embrace the four Gospels and the Acts, to be followed by a Greek edition of the same portion of the New Testament, for the use of those who are acquainted with that language." After referring to various works consulted in the preparation of this Commentary, the author continues: "But with all these helps, and others which might be named, I feel it due to myself to say, that my main dependence, under God, has been on the familiarity which the critical study of the Greek for nearly a quarter of a century has given me with the original language of the New Testament. Principles of interpretation, established and tested in the preparation of my editions of the Greek Classics, have been rigidly and faithfully applied to the elucidation of the sacred pages, and as I hope not without practical utility. Much attention has been given to the precise shades of thought, imparted by particular words and idiomatic phrases, which the definitions of the lexicon often fail to reach, in all their beauty and significancy." Dr. Owen has certainly enjoyed special advantages for the work of a commentator, and his high position and character are guaranties for the value of any production of his pen.

Common Sense applied to Religion; or, the Bible and the People. By Catharine E. Beecher. New York; Harper & Brothers. 1857. Pp. 357.

This book is dedicated "To the People as the safest and truest Interpreters of the Bible, and to Woman as the Heaven-appointed Educator of Mind." Miss Beecher says she has devoted thirty years to the training of the human mind, for the

great end for which it was created, and that early in that period she discovered that at the very foundation of such efforts were opposing theological theories, which seemed at war both with the common sense and moral sense of mankind. These theories she thinks it is the special province of woman to examine, and that they should be tested "by those principles of reason and common sense, and those laws of language which guide mankind in all other practical duties." Twenty-one of the thirty-two chapters included in the book, are devoted to subjects connected with mental and moral science; the residue principally to religious and theological points. The Christian world has, from the beginning, been divided into two classes, the one making "reason and common sense" their informant and guide in matters of religion, the other the Bible. Miss Beecher openly avows herself a champion of the former class; and she acts her part with signal courage and ability. Those who have less confidence in reason and common sense, and who would rather be led by God than guide themselves, will not expect much help from a book, however ably written, constructed on a principle which they know to be fallacious.

The Presbyterian Social Psalmodist; being an Abridgment of the Presbyterian Psalmodist. With a selection from the Assembly's Collection, adapted to the respective tunes. Designed for use in Family Worship, in the Social Prayer Meeting, and in the Lecture Room. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

The advantage of having the tune and hymns on the same page, renders this book a great convenience. In the earliest collection of Psalms and Hymns used among Protestants, the music and the words were printed together; and this is still the habit among many churches in Europe. There too the same hymn is always sung to the same melody, so that the two become inseparably associated; and the people in learning the one learn the other. This is one of the reasons why, in Germany especially, the congregation join so heartily in this part of public worship.

The Protestant Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia. A condensed Translation of Hertzog's Real Encyclopedia; with additions from other sources. By Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D. Part IV. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1857.

This number extends from 385 to page 512. We have already repeatedly called the attention of our readers to this important work as a storehouse of the results of German learning and research.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

B. M. Newton, *Thoughts on parts of Leviticus.* Vol. II. No. 3. *The Leprosy.* Pp. 136.

A. M. Stuart, *The Song of Songs, an Exposition of the Song of Solomon.* 8vo. pp. 640.

P. S. Desbrez, *The book of Jonah illustrated by Discoveries at Nineveh.* 12mo.

J. Cumming, *Sabbath Evening Readings on the New Testament; Romans.* 12mo. pp. 380.

T. Parry, *Expository Lectures on Romans, Hebrews and Philemon.* 12mo. pp. 635.

T. Alexander, *The Great High Priest within the Veil; an Exposition of John, chap. xvii.* 18mo. pp. 158.

J. W. Donaldson, *Christian Orthodoxy reconciled with the conclusions of modern Biblical learning.* 8vo. pp. 500. If it is allowable to infer the character of this production from that of its predecessor, "Jasher," by the same author, it will do little to advance the cause either of orthodoxy or of sound learning.

S. Davidson, *Facts, Statements and Explanations connected with the publication of Vol. II. of the 10th edition of Horne's Introduction.* 8vo. pp. 124.

R. Wardlaw, *Systematic Theology; edited by J. R. Campbell.* Vol. II. 8vo. pp. 790.

F. French, *Theological Works.* 3 vols. 8vo. pp. 1100.

G. Martin, *Extracts from eminent Anglican Divines from the Reformation to the present time, illustrating the sense of the Church of England as to the Real Presence in the Eucharist, worthy and unworthy Reception and Adoration.* 8vo. pp. 106.

T. T. Carter, *The Doctrine of the Priesthood.* 8vo. pp. 174.

W. Pollock, *Foundations; a series of Essays on Fundamental Truths.* 8vo. pp. 366.

Edinburgh Essays; by members of the University. 8vo. pp. 350.

H. B. Hall, *A Companion to the Authorized Version of the New Testament; being emendatory Notes, together with Explanatory Observations.* 12mo. pp. 200.

S. S. Hennel, *Christianity and Infidelity; an Exposition of the arguments on both sides..* A Prize Essay.

A. P. Stanley, *Three Introductory Lectures on the Study of Ecclesiastical History.* 8vo. pp. 86.

The Writings of the Christians of the Second Century, collected together and first translated, complete by Rev. Dr. Giles. 8vo. pp. 288.

L. A. Merivale, *Christian Records, a Short History of the Apostolic Age.* 12mo. pp. 440.

Brief Analysis of the Sects, Heresies and Writers of the first Three Centuries. 8vo. pp. 96.

J. Stoughton, *Ages of Christianity before the Reformation.* 8vo. pp. 478.

W. B. S. Mathias, *The Early British Church; its Foundation and Vicissitudes, its Apostolic Protestantism nine Centuries before Luther.* 18mo. pp. 208.

Jewish Literature from the 8th to the 18th Century; with an Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, from the German of M. Steinschneider. 8vo. pp. 362.

Hugh Miller, *The Testimony of the Rocks, or Geology in its Bearings on the Two Theologies, Natural and Revealed.* 8vo. pp. 450.

The Lectures of the late Sir William Hamilton, comprising his Metaphysical and Logical Courses, with the author's latest developments of his theory, are to be published shortly.

G. H. Lewes, *The Biographical History of Philosophy from its origin in Greece down to the present day; much enlarged and thoroughly revised.* 8vo. pp. 700.

A. Alison, *History of Europe from the fall of Napoleon in 1815 to the accession of Louis Napoleon in 1852.* Vol. 6, 8vo. pp. 680.

D. McPherson, *Antiquities of Kertch and Researches in the Crimerian Bosphorus, with Remarks on the Ethnological and Physical history of the Crimea.* Folio.

E. J. Jonas, *Recollections of Assyria and Palestine.* Pp. 208.

J. G. Wilkinson, *The Egyptians in the time of the Pharaohs; with an Introduction to the study of the Egyptian Hieroglyphs,* by S. Birch. 8vo. pp. 296.

J. Bowring, *The Kingdom and the People of Siam, with a narrative of the mission to that country in 1855.* 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 900.

An old and very curious map has been discovered in the British Museum in a manuscript bearing the name of Henricus Martellus Germanus, with the title of *Insularium Illustratum*, and which appears to date from the year 1489. The discoveries of Bartholomew Diaz are indicated upon it, but not those of Christopher Columbus. Several points are marked upon the

southwest coast of Africa, of which no mention is made in Barrow's accounts of the early Portuguese navigators, and which have given rise to the conjecture that between the expedition of Diaz and that of Vasco de Gama there may have been a voyage of discovery in these regions of which no record has been preserved. A copy of this map has been published in the *Zeitschrift für Erdkunde* in Berlin with descriptive notes. It presents an interesting view of the state of geographical knowledge among the best informed classes at the close of the fifteenth century.

FRANCE.

E. Renan, *Studies in religious History.* 8vo. pp. 433.

M. Huic, *Christianity in China, Tartary and Thibet.* 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 928.

A. Bernard, *Antoine Vitré and the Oriental Characters of the Polyglott Bible of Paris; the origin and changes of the first oriental characters introduced into France, with a specimen of those characters.* 8vo. pp. 64.

F. Hugonin, *Ontology, or Study of the Laws of Thought.* Vol. II. 8vo. pp. 526.

Thiers' *History of the Consulate and the Empire.* Vol. XV. 8vo. pp. 618, from May, 1812, to June, 1813. To be completed in 17 volumes.

E. Feydeau, *History of the funeral customs and sepultures of ancient nations, to form 2 vols. 4to., with a text of about pp. 800, with 130 wood-cuts, besides an atlas of about 80 plates lithographed in colours.*

A. C. Judas, *New Analysis of the Phœnician Inscription of Marseilles.* 4to. pp. 39.

Some new letters and unpublished manuscripts of Leibnitz have recently been discovered, containing a translation and annotations upon two dialogues of Plato, letters on Descartes, letters to Hobbes, Fradella and Arnauld, his life and his portrait by himself.

An entire edition of the works of Philip de Marnix, Baron de Sainte-Aldegonde, in 6 vols., under the superintendance of several eminent Belgians, and enriched with notes by E. Quinet, is announced. De Marnix, the intimate friend of Calvin, was Burgomaster of Antwerp at the time of the famous siege by the Spaniards in 1584, and after his retirement from public life, occupied himself in translating the Bible into Flemish. His works were held in great estimation by the Protestants of his day.

The distinguished Chinese scholar, Stanislaus Julien, has

translated into French, Hiuen Thsang's Memoranda of Western Countries; the first volume, 8vo. pp. lxxx. and 493, contains the larger half of the work. The life of this Buddhist traveller was published in 1853, and some extracts from his travels in India were published twenty years since. This work was not written by Hiuen Thsang himself, but drawn up from materials of his collection, by his scholar Pien-ki, probably about the year A. D. 648. The boundaries of the various kingdoms visited are given, and the fertility of the soil, productions, climate, the character of the inhabitants, the language, &c. are discussed. Great diversity already existed as to the time of Buddha's death, the accounts which he received varying from B. C. 252 to B. C. 852. Besides the endless quantity of teeth, foot-prints, etc. which he found preserved as relics, he mentions the shadow of Buddha. The serpent was worshipped in the north-west of India: in Hindostan proper, Siva. No mention is anywhere made of Krishna or Vishnu.

GERMANY.

A second edition is publishing of P. Schegg on the Psalms.

J. König, *The Theology of the Psalms.* 8vo. pp. 528.

W. van Hengel, *Interpretatio Epist. Pauli ad Romanos.* Vol. II. 8vo.

A. Hilgenfeld, *Jewish Apocalyptic in its historical development.* 8vo. pp. 308.

H. Ewald's *Annual of Biblical Science.* 8th vol. for 1856. 8vo. pp. 292.

C. Otto, *Investigations upon the Decalogue, with an Appendix upon the Baptism for the Dead in Corinth.* 8vo. pp. 206.

A. Menzel, *Traducianismus an Creatianismus?* 8vo. pp. 55.

A. Buttmann, *Grammar of the New Test. Idiom.* Part I. 8vo. pp. 68.

A specimen page of Bernstein's long promised Syriac Lexicon has appeared.

J. Goldenthal, *Arabic Grammar written in Hebrew, for the use of the Hebrews of the East.* 8vo. pp. 140.

A weekly political journal, called *הבגיר* or "The Intelligencer," is published in Hebrew at Johannesburg.

H. Kiepert has published a wall-map of Palestine.

The new edition of Passow's *Lexicon of the Greek language* is now completed, by the appearance of the second volume. 4to. pp. 2649.

G. Behagel, *De Vetere Comœdia deos irridente.* Part I. Aristophanes. 8vo. pp. 45.

R. Lepsius, *The 22d Dynasty of Egyptian Kings, with some remarks upon the 26th and other dynasties of the new kingdom.* 4to. pp. 64.

M. Uhlemann, *Handbook of Egyptian Antiquities. Part I. History of Egyptology.* 8vo. pp. 252.

A. Weber, *Sketches of India*, 8vo. pp. 150, contains four previously published Essays, *Modern Investigations on Ancient India, on Buddhism, the Relations of India with Lands in the West, and on the Semitic Origin of the Alphabet of India.*

T. Lau, *History of the Origin of Magna Charta.* 8vo. pp. 112.

ITALY.

The Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Lessons from the Prophets, as translated into the Aztec or Mexican language, by Bernard Sahagun, one of the followers of Cortez, are about to be published in Milan, accompanied by a Latin version, notes, and a glossary. The material of the manuscript is the leaves of the maguey, and it bears the date of 1532. Four hundred copies only of this work, so long supposed to be lost, are to be printed. It is to appear in five parts of 100 pages each; the price of each part will be twenty francs.

There are 68 political, literary, scientific, and industrial papers published at Turin.

F. Ximenez' *History of the Origin of the Indies of this Province of Guatemala*, translated from the Quiché language into Spanish, for the greater convenience of the ministers of the Holy Gospel. Exactly according to the Spanish text of the original manuscript, found in the library of the University of Guatemala, published for the first time, and enlarged by an introduction and notes, by C. Scherzer. 8vo. pp. 216. Vienna.

