James A. McConnell

New. Baltimore

New. York

THE

# BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

# PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1859.

EDITED BY THE

REV. CHARLES HODGE, D.D.

VOL. XXXI.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY

PETER WALKER, 821 CHESTNUT STREET;

AND SOLD BY

CROSBY, NICHOLS & CO., Boston; R. CARTER & BROTHERS, New York;

WILLIAM S. & ALFRED MARTIEN, Philadelphia;

AND TRÜBNER & CO., London.

# CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXI.

## No. I.



## No. II.

## No. III.



---

## No. IV.

THE

# PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1859.

No. I.

ARTICLE I.—*The Service of the House of God, according to the practice of the Church of Scotland.* By the Rev. WILLIAM LISTON, Minister of Redgorton. Edinburgh: 1858. Pp. 411. 12mo.

*Presbyterian Liturgies, with specimens of Forms of Prayer for Worship, as used in the Continental Reformed and American Churches: with the Directory for the Public Worship of God, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster: and Forms of Prayer for Ordinary and Communion Sabbaths, and for other Services of the Church.* By a Minister of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh: 1858. Pp. 120. 8vo.

IN taking a survey of existing churches, it is curious to observe how far their maturity and strength are from bearing any uniform proportion to their age. While the largest division of the Christian world professes to have come down, almost in its actual condition, from the time of the Apostles, and the "Orthodox Oriental Church" lays claim, with equal justice, to a like antiquity; while the Vaudois place themselves as high upon the scale, and are never placed by others lower than the close of the twelfth century; while all the reformed national churches of Europe—German, Swiss, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, Scotch, and English—owe their birth to the great moral revolution of the sixteenth century, and the *Unitas Fratrum* to the

Hussite movement in the one before it; it is nevertheless true that some of the religious bodies now most flourishing and widespread, in America especially, are still comparatively young, and several of the most robust and thriving not yet past the period of infancy. The Independents and the Baptists, as distinct organizations, reach no further back than the seventeenth century; our own church to the beginning of the eighteenth; Wesleyan Methodism to its first half, and American Methodist Episcopacy to its middle; while our New-school sister, although scarcely out of her teens, is already the young mother of at least one hopeful child; and the Free Church of Scotland, one of the most vigorous and fruitful of the same great family, has not yet seen the close of its sixteenth year.

This last allusion vividly recalls that interesting juncture, when the hearts of thousands, even in this country, were absorbed in the exciting movements which preceded and accompanied and followed the Disruption of our fathers' church in Scotland; when our own pages were for some time filled with news and arguments respecting it; and when, with all our cordial sympathy and interest in that most majestic exodus, we could not but lament what seemed to be an irreparable breach, not merely in external bonds and organizations, but in spirit and affection, between these two rival representatives of that united body, which our own church loves to call its mother.

We rejoice to say that these forebodings have been mainly disappointed; that the worst divisions of a later date have been within the bosom of the Free Church, although such as, we sincerely hope, will yet be overruled to her increased prosperity and active usefulness; while on the other hand, so far as we can judge or ascertain at this great distance, the asperity of feeling between that church and the one from which it went out has been gradually softened; and although the points of difference remain unaltered, we no longer hear the charge of Judas-like treachery, and utter destitution of all godliness, alleged against the old kirk, and we do hear very gratifying testimony to the piety, ability, fidelity, and usefulness of some among its ministers, not only from their own communion, but from the two great Presbyterian bodies which have sprung up

by its side, as witnesses against it and co-workers with it. We mean of course the Free and the United Presbyterian churches, out of both which we have heard but one voice in relation to the merits of such men as Caird, Macduff, and McLeod.

Those whom we have just named are already favourably known to many of our readers as religious writers; but the two books placed at the beginning of this article, the latest which have reached us from the Church of Scotland, represent another phase of its religious literature, and one of them at least is symptomatic of a movement more important in itself, and far more interesting here, than either of the books themselves. To what is thus suggested, rather than expressed, we shall advert at some length, after a brief notice of the volumes now before us.

It is a fact, often noted upon both sides of the controversy as to Forms of Prayer, that their existence does not really depend upon their being written, but that even in the absence of liturgical prescription, the devotional performances of every church assume a form peculiar to itself, if not in individual expressions, yet in general tone and character, indefinitely modified of course by personal and local causes, and exhibiting a sensible, though almost indefinable mutation, corresponding to the general change in modes of thought and forms of speech, from generation to generation, and from age to age.

Of no church is this more true than the Church of Scotland, and in no religious body has there been, from the beginning, a more settled inclination to a rigid uniformity, within much wider limits, it is true, and with a far more scriptural and apostolic liberty, than in the Church of England. The tendency of which we speak is even more observable in some of the affiliated churches, both in Scotland and America, for instance, with respect to Psalmody, the use of tables at the Lord's Supper, and especially the multiplied and solemn services by which that ordinance is introduced, accompanied, and followed. But the uniformity to which we now especially refer is that belonging to the ordinary acts of worship, and particularly that of prayer. It is an interesting study to observe how far the Presbyterian worship has remained unchanged for ages, and

throughout the world, without the aid, and with a positive repudiation, of all rubrics and obligatory forms. Of this remarkable phenomenon all travellers are sensible, who visit Scotland for the first time, and attend upon its worship, as established both by law and custom; and who sometimes have expressed the wish, that the impression could be reproduced, however faintly, on the minds of Presbyterians at home.

This end may be promoted, in a limited degree, by such a work as that of Mr. Liston, which was written for the kindred, although very different purpose, of enabling those who are detained from public worship, to go through its customary forms in private, thus affording them, as far as possible, the same advantage that belongs to the members of the Church of England, who have all the prayers of that church in a single volume. (Preface, p. viii.) The only difference, and that a vast one, but arising from the nature of the systems, is that the Presbyterian worshipper, in such a case, can only have a specimen or specimens of what he hears in church, and those dependent on the piety and judgment and devotional experience of the writer who affords them. Still, regarded even as mere samples, they are interesting, both as proofs of the essential uniformity of Presbyterian worship, and as indications of the differences which it does exhibit.

It is only from a prefatory notice to this volume, that we learn the fact of its being a republication of another, which has been "long out of print, and in great demand" (p. xv), and also that it was the first book of the kind prepared in Scotland, with the single exception of a small work published in 1802, as "The Scotch Minister's Assistant," and again in 1822, as "The Presbyterian Minister's Assistant," after the death of its reputed author, the late Rev. Dr. Ross. This adds still further to the interest of the volume, as a specimen of what is going on from Sabbath to Sabbath in the Church of Scotland, and of which we now propose to give our readers a condensed account.

The author's plan is to exemplify the usual service in the country churches during the winter season, when the two discourses are delivered at a single "diet" or meeting for worship;

whereas in the summer, and throughout the year in large towns, the two services are separate, as among ourselves.

For the sake of some variety and interchange, the author gives a service for three Sabbaths, perfectly alike as to the parts and order, although different of course in form and substance. Under each, the first place is assigned to the morning prayer, which in all three cases—and the same indeed may be affirmed of all the prayers here given—is of reasonable length, devout and reverential, and distinguished by that copious use of Scripture phrases, which is characteristic of all genuine Scotch prayers, but which is never so impressive upon paper as when uttered *viva voce* and *ex animo*, especially when void, as in the present case, of all extraordinary warmth or unction in the prayers themselves.

This is followed by a "Lecture," or expository sermon on a passage of some length, (here the parable of the virgins, Matt. xxv. 1–13,) which is also a fixed feature of the Scottish worship, almost rubrical in constancy and uniformity, but eminently useful in making the whole service scriptural, and giving to the people their extraordinary knowledge of the Bible, not in scraps and patches merely, but in its original connection. As our purpose is rather to describe the service than to criticise the specimens here given, we shall merely say of this, and of the other sermons in the volume, that they are correct in style, and suited to be practically useful, though without pretensions to originality or eloquence, or even that experimental light and heat which may accomplish more than either. This homiletical deficiency, however, though a literary blemish, really enhances the value of the work, considered not as a mere personal performance, but an average example of a large and most important class. The lecture is followed by the "intermediate prayer," so called as separating the discourses and the two parts of the double service. This prayer, according to the rule propounded in the Preface (p. ix.) is not, like the morning prayer, a general supplication, but has reference to the subject of the preceding lecture or discourse, pressing it home, in the form of a direct address to God, on the hearts of the audience, and concluding with a glance at the subject to be treated in the subsequent sermon. That subject, on the first

of the three Sabbaths, is the omniscience of our Saviour, as a proof of his divine commission (John i. 48, 49.) The "public or concluding prayer," which follows, is described by the author as containing "public prayers or supplications for public blessings" (Preface, p. x.) This completes one Sabbath, and the other two presenting only different examples of precisely the same service, we shall merely mention that the subjects of the second and third lectures are the parable of the talents (Matt. xxv. 14–30,) and our Lord's description of the judgment (Matt. xxv. 31–46,) the three thus forming a continued exposition of the chapter. The subjects of the second and third sermons are the sempiternal existence of Christ (Rev. i. 18,) and his ascension (Mark xvi. 19.) This choice of subjects shows at least an orthodox belief in the divinity of Christ, and a correct appreciation of his true position as the centre of the Christian system.

Having thus exemplified the ordinary Sabbath service, Mr. Liston does the same with the communion-service, as conducted in the Church of Scotland, and including, in addition to the day of actual celebration, what is called the "Preparation Sabbath," and the "Fast Day," but omitting what takes place on the ensuing Monday, as to which there may have been a change of usage, although this was formerly by some regarded as the great day of the feast. For the Preparation Sabbath we have, first, an appropriate morning prayer; then a sermon on the character and office of John the Baptist (Luke i. 76); then a public or concluding prayer; and lastly, an address, announcing the Lord's Supper and a previous day of prayer and fasting. The services for this day are a general or morning prayer; a sermon on Christ's being sent to bless us by turning us from our iniquities (Acts iii. 26); an intermediate prayer; another sermon on the love of God in sending his Son to be a propitiation for our sins (1 John iv. 19); and a concluding prayer, as usual. For the actual communion we have, first, a morning prayer; then a sermon on the duty of washing our hands in innocency in preparing to approach God's altar (Ps. xxvi. 6); an intermediate or specific prayer; and then the "fencing of the tables." This, which is well-known as one of the most cherished usages of old Scotch Presbyterianism, con-

sists in an address to the communicants, stating the required qualifications, and excluding such as are without them, whence this part of the communion service takes its name. After this a psalm is sung, and while it is singing, the minister descends from the pulpit, and, the psalm being finished, reads the words of institution; the elements having in the mean time been set upon the table by the elders. Then comes the "first table service," which includes the "consecration prayer," and the first administration of the ordinance, and is followed by the 103d psalm, and four other "table services," including the administration to as many successive companies. In some churches each of these concludes with a psalm, in others, only the first and last, immediately before the "exhortation or concluding address," and the "prayer after the communion," which is here followed by a second sermon on the duty of bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus (2 Cor. iv. 10,) and the "public or concluding prayer."

The Ordination Service, as here given, opens with a morning prayer, followed by a sermon on the fear of the Lord as the only principle of a good life, (Ps. xix. 11,) and the act of ordination, which agrees precisely with our own familiar practice, except in what relates to patronage and presentation, and is therefore necessarily peculiar to established churches. The ordination prayer and the right-hand of fellowship, are followed by an address (or what we call a charge) to the minister, another to the people, and a public or concluding prayer. The service for the ordination of elders comprehends the questions to the candidates, the ordaining prayer, and two addresses to the "intrants" and the people.

The Baptismal Service, after morning prayer, contains a sermon on the sacrament of baptism, (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19,) followed by an address to the parent, only one being mentioned, either here or in the preface, where the author speaks of it as interesting to the pious mother to peruse this service, "at the same moment that her husband is taking upon himself, in the house of God, the baptismal vows in behalf of her young infant" (p. xii.) This may refer, however, only to the case of unavoidable detention, which the author has in view throughout the volume. The address is followed by a prayer, in the midst

of which the act of baptism is performed, as with us, the only variation here observable being the use of the plural pronoun *you* in reference to a single subject. There is, however, one variation in the practice of the Scottish church itself, as to the unimportant question, whether the child shall continue to be held by the parent during the address, or returned to the nurse after presentation till the moment of actual baptism, which last is preferred by the author as more ancient and expedient, since the other may prove inconvenient "from the noise which the child sometimes makes," (p. 336.) The Marriage Service is extremely simple, consisting of a prayer and short address, with a few rubrical directions as to postures and certificates.

The remainder of Mr. Liston's volume contains three occasional sermons, which were not in the first edition, and appear to have been actually preached in the course of his official ministrations. The first is a funeral sermon, on the death of the Rev. Dr. Taylor of Tibbermore, (Ps. xc. 12;) the second a national fast-day sermon, on account of the Crimean war, (Isaiah i. 19, 20;) the third a national thanksgiving sermon for the peace which followed, (Ps. l. 17—23.)

The book which we have been describing, unpretending as it is, deserves the praise of being one and homogeneous, the simple unmixed product of respectable old-fashioned Presbyterianism, in its most sedate and least eccentric form, and therefore well entitled to be called, although not actually called, a "Presbyterian Liturgy." In this respect it differs greatly from the volume which does bear that name, and which we have associated with it. This is no less remarkable for want of unity, and the crude mixture of incongruous materials, implying a deficiency of clear and strong convictions on the part of the compiler. The comparison is easier and the contrast stronger from the fact, that the third division of the book, comprising the last ninety-four pages, is precisely on the plan of Mr. Liston's, and in execution so much like it, that it might have passed for a continuation, or a second series, but for its nearly simultaneous appearance, and a few points of difference in the arrangement. For example, it begins just where the other ends, with

Marriage, giving very much the same forms, or rather the same substance in another form, and then proceeds to the Baptismal service, with the same peculiarity of noticing the father only, but without the plural pronoun in the form of baptism. The Funeral Service is a single prayer, to be offered at the house, either before or after "the distribution by attendants of the customary refreshment handed round to those who are inclined to partake of it." Although we are reporting not reforming, we venture to suggest that this venerable usage is at least as dangerous as that of praying at the grave, which all Scotch Presbyterians seem to hold in such abhorrence as a Popish superstition. The "Sabbath Service," in this book, is only for a single day, and gives no samples of the lecture or sermon, merely indicating their position in relation to the prayers, which are exemplified, and strike us, on a hasty glance, as very similar, in tone and sentiment, to those of Mr. Liston, but with somewhat less of the accustomed Scripture phraseology, and somewhat more that tastes like rinsings of the Litany and Collects, which are never less acceptable to us than when they are diluted or acidulated by too weak or too strong an infusion from written or unwritten "Presbyterian Liturgies."

The Communion Service differs in this book from that of Liston in a very significant and symptomatic manner, by omitting the Preparatory Sabbath and the Fast Day, as belonging to a system of observance, of which "some there are who think that there is a spirit of formalism in these preliminary arrangements;" which may all be very true, but not the less suggestive of this writer's own position in comparison with Liston's. A communion-sermon is inserted on the Death of Christ (John xix. 30), followed by the "Fencing of the Tables," and four "Table Services," with prayers annexed or interspersed, and an afternoon communion-sermon on the "House of many Mansions" (John xiv. 2 3), with a general Concluding Prayer.

Besides forms for the Ordination both of Ministers and Elders, very similar to those in Liston, this book gives us one for the Licensing of *Probationers*, a term which we should like to see revived in our own usage, as exactly descriptive of the thing, and suited to correct the growing disposition to con-

found probation and possession, or the preliminary trial of a man's gifts with their permanent official exercise.*

We have now described the last part of this book, corresponding to the whole of Liston's, with a few slight variations, some of which, however, seem to indicate the author's stand-point, as a little doubtful between strict and liberal Presbyterianism. This impression is confirmed by his introducing, in the middle of his volume, the entire Directory for Public Worship, as prepared by the Westminster Assembly, and adopted by the Church of Scotland in 1645. There is, of course, nothing unpresbyterian in this, except the want of any reason for its publication, and the vague suspicion thence arising, that the writer thought it an approximation to those "Presbyterian Liturgies," which seem to have unsettled his convictions and associations, without absolutely doing them away. This doubtful state of mind is still more visible in the first division of the book, which we have now reached in our backward march, and which seems to be the reprint of an article on Mr. Baird's volume, as edited in England by the Rev. Thomas Binney, and contains large extracts both from that work and the Mercersburg Review, in the shape of liturgical attempts and samples; while the Scotch Reviewer seems to halt between the Old and New Light, denying the primitive use of written prayers, and the expediency of their coercive or exclusive use, and yet apparently distracted by a vague desire to get at them, though he knows not how. His state of mind, and no doubt that of many others, in relation to this matter, may be shadowed forth or symbolized by an occurrence in the Church of Scotland, which we now learn for the first time from the book before us, and which seems to have a sort of typical significance. We refer to the fact, that the old Greyfriars Church in Edinburgh, where the National Covenant was signed in 1638, and which has ever since been visited by strangers, as the monument of that event and those connected with it, has been lately turned into a modern gothic structure, full of

* In both these volumes we observe the inexact expression, *concio ad cleros*, as if *clerus* meant a *clergyman* (confounding it with *clericus*) and not the *clergy*. The correct form (*concio ad clerum*) is still current, both in Old and New England.

painted windows, without gallery or pulpit, with a platform something like an altar, written prayers, responses, kneeling at prayer, and standing up at praise, *the service in the forenoon almost wholly devotional, the sermon, which has hitherto occupied so prominent a place in Scottish worship, being reserved for the afternoon;* all which is understood by Dr. Robert Lee, the pastor, to be strictly in accordance with "the spirit of the Westminster Directory"! Not one of these things is unlawful; but how pitiful they look just there, among the graves of the Scotch martyrs, with the old ungainly outside of the church which, we are glad to hear, is insusceptible of renovation. If there is anything on earth that is lawful but not expedient, it is such a violation of historical congruity as this, the utter disregard of what a nation or a church has been becoming through a course of ages, and the effort all at once to make it something else, no matter how much finer or more beautiful. Such taste is really as barbarous as its opposite, the old iconoclastic vandalism which defaced and demolished, but for conscience' sake. Let old Greyfriars, with its new interior, still remain a witness of what was, and a prophetic sign of what is yet to be, within the bosom of the Scottish Kirk. Our nameless author does not praise this revolution; he begins as if he meant to blame it; but before he gets so far, his courage fails him, and he begs to be excused from saying what he thinks, but owns that some reform is needed. "The '*preaching*,' the '*hearing*' of so and so—the manner in which the worship of the Almighty, which ought ever to be gravely and decently conducted, is too frequently compressed into a corner, that greater scope may be afforded for a sermon of extreme length, too often places the instruction, nay even the pandering to a false and vicious taste on the part of the hearers,—in the foreground; while in many congregations, from want of proper training and help, the only portion of the service in which the congregation can as yet take part, is miserably ill-conducted" (p. 5.) This inelegant and only half-intelligible sentence is entitled to attention solely as a poor translation into words of the idea more effectively expressed by Dr. Lee's removal of the sermon from the morning service at old Greyfriars, namely, that the Pulpit is a movable appendage to the Altar and the

Reading Desk, which has become too prominent, and must be pushed aside or back into its proper place. This is the plain Scotch or English both of this and of a dozen other tentative approaches to the same point from as many different directions upon both sides of the water; and we therefore think it no unseasonable process to examine it with some deliberation and attention, both in the light of history and argument, both as a question of experience and principle. We do not mean at present to reopen the discussion as to Forms of Prayer; we do not ask attention to the quality and method either of our Prayers or Preachings, but to their mutual relation as integral parts of Public Worship, and to the truth or falsehood of the dogma which would make the one exclude the other.

If it be true, as some affirm and more believe, that Preaching is a foreign and intrusive element in Public Worship, which may well be tolerated for the sake of some advantages attending it, but when it seems to interfere with our Devotions, must be checked as an excess, if not abated as a nuisance; we may naturally look for some expression of this mutual relation in the early history of our religion. We may certainly expect, at least, to find the solemn public service of the church, from the beginning, represented either by express description, or, if that be wanting, by the incidental use of names, implying that its character and purpose are essentially Devotional, and not Didactic. But is this the case?

We shall not push our inquiry back into the old economy, the ceremonial character of which might be not unjustly thought to detract from its authority as an example for our spiritual worship. It may not be useless to observe, however, even in passing, that among the most peculiar features of the Mosaic ritual, is the almost total absence of liturgical forms of speech, and indeed its almost unbroken silence with respect to prayer, as forming any part, or even a required accompaniment of the ceremonial service. But as this is no less true of preaching, it affords us no aid in our present inquisition.

In the Gospel History, or Life of Christ, we find the Synagogue extremely prominent, both as a Jewish institution, and a means used by our Lord himself for gaining access to the peo-

ple. We are far from being satisfied with what has now become the stereotyped doctrine in relation to the origin of the Synagogue, to wit, that it arose in the Babylonish Exile, as a succedaneum for the temple worship, and was afterwards maintained by the restored Jews in the Holy Land. We cannot see how a purely spiritual service could replace one purely ceremonial, nor believe that the older Jews, when not in actual attendance at Jerusalem, were wholly without public worship. We are strongly inclined to the opinion, that the Synagogue was originally nothing but the ordinary *meeting* (συναγωγή) of the people for this purpose, in their several neighbourhoods, and under the direction of their local elders; that this obvious and almost indispensable arrangement was a part of their religious system *ab initio;* that it was carried with them into exile, and there, of course, assumed somewhat more of a distinct organization, which perhaps continued after their return; but that the minute and complicated system of government and discipline, now found in Jewish books, and regarded by some Presbyterian writers, more especially since the days of Vitringa, as the model of our own organization, is of later date than the destruction of Jerusalem, and had its birth in the exclusion of the Jews from Palestine by that event and those which followed in the reign of Adrian. If this be so, the present Synagogue arrangements furnish no conclusive proof of what existed in the time of Christ; and yet it is only from these later Jewish customs and traditions that we know anything of public prayer as forming part of the old Synagogue Service. We have not the least doubt of the fact, or of the truth of the tradition as to this point; but we think it a remarkable and interesting circumstance, though purely negative and therefore not at all subversive of the proof just cited, that although our Saviour is so often represented in the Gospels as attending at the Synagogue, and although the reading of the Scriptures is distinctly mentioned upon one occasion, and his preaching upon many, there is not the least allusion to the act of prayer, as forming part of the accustomed service.* We are sure, as we have said

* See Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, xii. 9, xiii. 54; Mark i. 21, iii. 1, vi. 2; Luke iv. 15, 16, vi. 6, xiii. 10; John vi. 59, xviii. 20.

already, that it did so; but this omission in the record, even if it be entirely fortuitous, is very far from showing, that in the worship of the Jews at that time, Prayer was every thing and Preaching nothing.

But the ministry of Christ himself, and by necessary consequence the history in which it is recorded, belong not to the new but to the old dispensation, of which they are indeed the winding up, and at the same time an immediate preparation for the new economy or Christian church, which dates from Pentecost. We have but one contemporary history of this church in its first stage of developement and progress; but happily for us, that one is not only authentic but inspired. Now, in this authoritative narrative (the Acts of the Apostles) we may naturally look for something to confirm the postulate, so hastily assumed by many in our own day, that the ordinance of Preaching forms no part of Christian worship, but is only an appendage to it, which may be contracted or dispensed with, at the pleasure or discretion of the church, without impairing the integrity of her divinely sanctioned institutions. In search of some such confirmation, we go back to the beginning of the history, and there find prayers not only mentioned as an every-day employment,* but in two instances formally recorded,† yet of such a character as shows that they formed no part of ordinary Christian worship, but had reference to special and unique occasions, which accounts for their insertion in the narrative. On the other hand, a much larger space is occupied with Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, and on several subsequent occasions,‡ besides incidental statements of a general kind, which show that this was one great function of the apostolical office, from and after the effusion of the Holy Ghost.§

Such is the tenor of the history in reference to Prayer and Preaching, till we reach the sixth of Acts, and the first recorded institution of a Christian office after that of an apostle, and as such affording promise of some welcome light upon the question now before us. In connection with this

* See Acts i. 14; ii. 42.

† See Acts i. 24, 25; iv. 24—30.

‡ See Acts ii. 14—36; iii. 12—26; iv. 8—12; xix. 20; v. 30—32.

§ See Acts ii. 40; iv. 31; v. 28, 42.

great transaction, it may not be wholly useless to observe, that although the principles on which the church and ministry were to be organized had been determined and revealed from the beginning of the new dispensation, the actual organization was effected by degrees, to meet emergencies as they arose. The basis of the system was the Jewish Eldership, the only permanent essential office of the ancient church, which was tacitly transferred from it to the new, without express or formal institution, except in Gentile churches, where no such office had a previous existence.*

On the other hand, the office of a stated Pastor and official Preacher seems to have been gradually introduced during the itinerant ministry of the Apostles, and of the Prophets and Evangelists, who under their direction did the work of preaching for the first generation of believers, but whose places, as they died off one by one, appear to have been filled by that ministry which still continues, and which really existed from the first in the bosom of the local eldership, though not developed as a distinct office until rendered necessary by the disappearance of the inspired preachers, who began the great work of enforcing and diffusing the new doctrine.

So too the Diaconate, or permanent provision for the charitable functions of the church as a society, appears to have been instituted in an emergency, arising from the jealousy between the two antagonistic races of Hebrews and Hellenists, or native and foreign Jews, a jealousy not wholly left behind by those of either class who were converted to the Christian faith and helped to constitute the primitive or mother church. When this spirit found expression in relation to the daily distribution of assistance to the widows of the new society, the Twelve, in the exercise of their authority as organizers of the church, directed the selection of seven persons by and from the body of believers, who should take charge of this delicate and interesting business, while the Twelve themselves should be exclusively employed in more essential functions. "But we," as distinguished from the Seven to be designated under

* Compare Acts xi. 30 with Acts xiv. 23.

their direction, "will give ourselves (literally, stick fast, constantly adhere) to prayer, and to the ministry (or dispensation) of the word,"* the Christian doctrine, or the gospel, in a wide sense, as denoting the whole system of divine and saving truth, contained in the New Testament or Christian Revelation.

The antithesis or contrast here implied, or rather expressed by the adversative conjunction (*ἀλλά,*) settles an important question as to the priority or relative importance of teaching and alms-giving, or bodily and spiritual nourishment, as functions of the church and ministry, and thus prospectively determines a dispute which has been needlessly revived in later times by some who, not contented or perhaps imperfectly acquainted with the apostolical decision, would if possible reverse it, and at least by implication cast a censure on the Twelve themselves for not leaving praying and preaching to their helpers, and devoting their own time to the more urgent task of "serving tables," or supplying men's temporal necessities.

But what do we here learn as to the other question of precedence which has been suggested, namely, that respecting the comparative importance of the two great functions, which the Twelve put in opposition to the ministry of tables, and to which they express their resolution to devote themselves, as something more incumbent upon them than charitable distribution? These functions are described as "Prayer" and the "Ministry of the Word." The former cannot mean mere personal devotion, secret prayer, any more than the latter can mean private study of the Scriptures, or even a less public exposition of them, but must necessarily denote the work of preaching in the highest and the widest sense, as appears not only from the nature and the circumstances of the case, but from the use of the word "ministry" or "ministration" (*διακονία*), which originally signifies the service of the table, or the furnishing and distributing of food, and in its figurative application to religious duties, necessarily implies both public and official action, which by parity of reasoning must extend to the other act or function

* Acts vi. 4.

here in question, and determine it to be the conduct of the Common Prayer or joint worship of the people; so that both together are descriptive of that worship in its two great parts or aspects, the DIDACTIC and DEVOTIONAL, the latter comprehending Praise, whatever may have been the form in which it was presented.

But while it is thus evident that the Prayer and Ministration of the Word, to which the Twelve so solemnly devote themselves, were public functions of their office, it by no means follows that the corresponding private duties are excluded, as less urgently required or less morally incumbent, but rather, on the contrary, that these are presupposed, as the invisible or less apparent springs from which the others were to flow as constant and abundant streams; in other words, that they must meditate and search the Scriptures, and commune with God in secret, that they might in public give themselves, with more effect, to Prayer and to the Ministration of the Word. This appears again, not only from the nature of the case, and from the necessary mutual relation of the private and the public duties here in question, but from the recorded practice and example of the apostles who, like their Master, sought for opportunities of personal devotion, and whose preaching was not only in the great congregation, but from house to house.*

Let it also be observed that this expressed determination of the Twelve has reference, not to extraordinary temporary functions of their office, not to miracle or inspiration, not to that immediate attestation of Christ's life and death and resurrection, which could only be afforded by that single generation,† but precisely to those duties which are common to the apostolic body with the permanent and uninspired ministry, of whom the terms employed are no less predicable, and who are equally entitled and required, in their place and in their measure, to repeat them.

This consideration makes it not a curious speculation, or a mere historical inquiry, but a practical question of some interest and moment, what is the mutual relation of these two great

* Compare Acts x. 9, xx. 20, xxii. 17, &c.

† Compare Acts i. 8, 21, 22, ii. 32, iii. 15, iv. 33, v. 32, x. 41, 42, &c.

ministerial duties? Is it one of absolute equality, or one of primary and secondary rank? And if the latter, upon which side is the dependence or inferiority? There is nothing, as we have already mentioned, in the words which we have quoted (Acts vi. 4), or their context to resolve this doubt. The question of precedence there is not between Praying and Preaching, but between these, viewed as one, and the sacred but more secular employment of relieving the necessitous. We are clearly taught by apostolical example, that the latter must not take precedence of the former; but we are not here taught to discriminate at all between the two great parts of worship, the Didactic and Devotional. That the question is not settled by the order of the words, or by the fact that Prayer is mentioned first, is clear from Paul's inversion of that order, when he speaks of every creature being "sanctified by the word of God and prayer" (1 Tim. iv. 5).

If then we would make this invidious distinction, we must find its ground and warrant elsewhere. But how are we to find it, even elsewhere, in the Word of God? The Apostolical Epistles make perpetual allusion both to Prayer and Preaching, but with this distinction, that the latter, *ex vi termini*, invariably implies some measure of publicity, whereas the former, with a very few exceptions, may be understood, in all these passages, of private prayer or personal devotion, and even in the few referred to as exceptions, there is no limitation of the public act to any class or order, as its proper and exclusive function.*

When we turn from the Epistles once more to the Acts, we find the two things either joined, as in the case already cited (Acts vi. 4), so as to seem one and indivisible; or one is evidently put for both, as if they must of course suggest each other. The only deviation from our own familiar usage in the dialect of this book is, that whereas we are accustomed to describe the assembling of ourselves together (Heb. x. 25) by the name of Public Worship, the Scripture usually makes the act of Preaching, or Religious Teaching, or the Word, consi-

* See 1 Cor. xi. 4, 5, xiv. 14, 15; 1 Tim. ii. 8. The other cases are too numerous for citation, but may be collected by the aid of a Concordance.

dered as its source and subject, the more prominent idea. It would be easy to evince this by a copious induction of particulars; but want of room, and some regard to the patience of our readers, will constrain us simply to refer in a foot-note to a number of the most important passages, which go to prove the general proposition, that although the Sacred History mentions a multitude of Christian assemblies, and although there can be no doubt that every one of these was sanctified by prayer as well as by the word of God, there is perhaps not more than one case of the many now referred to (viz. Acts xx. 36,)* in which prayer is even casually mentioned, whereas preaching is invariably represented as the prominent transaction.† This may prove, what we have no doubt is the truth, that Prayer was so essential an ingredient in Christian worship as to need no formal record; but it cannot prove that Preaching was a mere subordinate or incidental service, which might or might not have been added to the more important service of Devotion.

Such, so far as we know, is the sum and substance of the information which the Word of God affords us, with respect to the priority of Prayer and Preaching in the primitive assemblies, namely, that the first is scarcely ever mentioned, while the other is continually used to designate the whole of what we now call Public Worship. That this usage long survived the Apostolic Age, and even lasted through the first six centuries, is a proposition which we verily believe, and could easily establish from original as well as second-hand authorities; but hampered as we are by want of time and space, we must again content ourselves with a general reference to the best books upon Christian Antiquities, and with a summary assertion, that from Justin Martyr and Tertullian to Origen and Cyprian, from these to Chrysostom and Augustine, and from these to Leo and Gregory, both called the Great, Preaching continued to give name and character to Christian Worship;‡ that the first two writers

* Acts iv. 24 may be added, although scarcely a specimen of ordinary public worship.

† Compare Acts viii. 25, 35, ix. 20, x. 42, xi. 19, 20, 26, xiv. 1, 7, 21, 25, xv. 35, xvi. 6, 10, xvii. 2, 17, xviii. 4, 11, xix. 8, xx. 7, 20, 31, xxviii. 31.

‡ The Greek verb from which *liturgy* is derived, and which occurs in Acts xiii. 2, is there explained by Chrysostom to mean *preaching*.

just named, in their description of that worship, make it prominent; that all the others practised it incessantly; that Ambrose represents it as the great office of a bishop; that the church at Rome was censured in the East at one time for appearing to neglect it; that so far from being generally slighted, every possible variety of preaching which has since been known, expository, textual, doctrinal, rhetorical, and practical (except perhaps political, or preaching to the times) was constantly familiar to the ancient church, and carried to a high degree of relative perfection; that this great engine of instruction and conversion, far from being a mere adjunct or appendage to the Prayers, was rather treated as an independent and coequal part of Worship, with appropriate and brief prayers of its own, distinct from the more formal Liturgy, when this had once been introduced; and lastly, that the same surprising disproportion in the frequency with which the two are mentioned in the Scriptures may be traced in the writings of the most illustrious Fathers, so that even in Augustine's days, when liturgies had so increased, the Psalms and Lessons, from which Preaching was inseparable, are mentioned perhaps fifty times in his *Sermones*, where the public prayers are mentioned once.*

The turning point or critical transition in this matter must be sought in the pontificate of Gregory the Great, who, though himself a powerful and constant preacher, represents that juncture in Church History, when doctrinal discussion gave way to liturgical observance, and when much of the attention which had previously been given to the settlement of great theological disputes, began to be expended on Gregorian Chants and Canons of the Mass. It is not perhaps till then, and as a necessary consequence of this great revolution, that we find the Pulpit severed from the Altar, or removed to one side as a species of incumbrance, and retaining that position through the Middle Ages. But even in that period of prevailing darkness, the remaining representatives of earnest zeal and Augustinian

* We refer the reader, for the proof of these assertions, to that rich storehouse of information on this subject, the fourth chapter of the fourteenth book of Bingham; to Augusti's rearrangement of the same matter both in his larger and his smaller work; and to a clear resumé of the whole in the eighteenth chapter of Dr. Lyman Coleman's "Ancient Christianity."

doctrine were precisely those who, like Bernard of Clairvaux, notwithstanding their gross errors and ascetic superstitions, still maintained the honour of the Pulpit, not only as the great appointed means of propagating truth, but as the central part of Christian worship; so that it may be said of all the earlier reformers, such as Wickliffe, Huss, Savonarola, and a multitude of others, that the Pulpit was their *ΠΟΥ ΣΤΩ* when they moved the world; and that what is written of the first missionaries sent forth from Jerusalem, might be equally applied to them, that in person or by proxy, they "went everywhere preaching the Word" (Acts viii. 3). On the other hand, the disuse or undue depreciation of the Pulpit, as compared not only with the Bench, the Bar, and the Chair of academical instruction, but also with the Altar and the Reading Desk, became one of the surest signs, because one of the most efficient causes, of the general and growing corruption; so that towards the close of the dark ages, preaching had in many parts of Europe been almost forgotten, as a duty which the lower clergy could not and the higher clergy would not undertake;* while in due proportion grew the zeal and the punctilious care, with which the same men went through what was now called the Liturgical part of divine service.

From the very beginning of the great Reformation in the sixteenth century, the restoration of the pulpit to its proper place in Christian worship was a breaking point, a shibboleth, an issue, which divided the two parties. It was by what some would call excessive preaching, it was by what some would call a disproportionate protrusion of the pulpit, so as often to eclipse the fald-stool and the lectern, that the church was under God reformed, and when she needed it, reformed again. This is perfectly consistent with the fact that since the Reformation, Rome, instructed by experience, has stolen an arrow from the quiver of her enemies, and that in some parts of that church, but chiefly in the freer and the more enlightened Gallican communion of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the art of pulpit eloquence was not only practised, but advanced almost to the acme of artistical perfection, and that

* See McCrie's Life of Knox, p. 15 (American edition).

even in our own day, the same engine has been used with mighty and destructive force by such men as Lacordaire and others, in defence of Romish error, as well as of the truth still mingled with it. But it nevertheless remains true that the Pulpit, the Didactic part of Worship, is less dear than the Devotional, or rather the Liturgical, to the inmost affections of that church, in whose practice, if not in her theory, ignorance is the mother of devotion, and of those in other churches who still breathe her spirit, and whose tendencies in this respect are marked by nothing more distinctly—for example, in the Romanizing party of the Church of England—than by this unprotestant, unscriptural, and anti-apostolical depreciation of that very part of worship, which throughout the New Testament, and the early ages, and the Reformation, was habitually used to designate the whole. Even this, however, might be still a lesser evil, if confined within the definite, and well-known lines of real or mock Popery. But there is ground at least for serious reflection, when we find the same morbid tendencies developed in the purest churches; when even from the bosom, or at least from some remoter members, of the unritual and austere Presbyterian body, there is now and then a voice raised in complaint of the excessive prominence allowed to Preaching in our common worship, and the deficient quantity and quality of what is more immediately and formally devotional. As this is sometimes if not always, the expression of a conscientious and sincere conviction, it may not be useless to inquire for a moment upon what foundation that conviction rests.

So far as we know, all the reasons ever urged in its behalf may be reduced to one, to wit, that that part of a religious service which is addressed to God is, from its very nature and the necessary circumstances of the case, more solemn, more essential, and should therefore be more prominent and more attended to, than that which is intended to communicate instruction, and excite religious feeling, and induce right action on the part of human worshippers.

To that part of the argument derived from the comparative "solemnity" of this or that religious service, we may answer, in the first place, that the word is vague and dubious, conveying more to one mind than to another; in the next place, that the

thing itself, according to the usual acceptation of the term, is a subjective exercise, affection, or impression, and as such unfit to be the measure of our duty; in the third place, that "solemnity," depending as it does upon imagination, taste, and sensibility, if made the rule or standard of religious duty, would infallibly conduct us far beyond what any Presbyterians now contend for; not only to the dim religious light, dramatic forms, and artificial music of the Romish and some other rituals, but also to the fearful scenes presented to the trembling neophyte in ancient mysteries and modern lodges; in a word, to every artificial means by which "solemnity" can be promoted. Nothing indeed can be more clearly symptomatic of erroneous judgment and diseased affection with respect to public worship, than the disposition to approve of any innovation or revived corruption, on the simple ground that it is "solemn." So far as this means any thing susceptible of definition, it is something intrinsically neither good nor evil, something not religious in itself, but owing its religious character, if any such it has, to its association with divine truth, or to an express divine command. We admit, indeed, that both these conditions are complied with in the case of Public Prayer. It is associated with divine truth. It is commanded by divine authority. It has been practised in the church from the beginning. It is known by the experience of ages to be necessary to the life of all religion. It is therefore every way entitled to the epithet of "solemn," in the best and highest sense of that equivocal expression. The only question to be answered is, not whether it is solemn, or whether its solemnity entitles it to be performed with reverential awe, but whether its solemnity is so much greater than that belonging to the act of preaching, or the didactic part of public worship, as to make the latter an inferior appendage or a mere convenience, added by usage or authority to our devotions.

The only ground on which this can be even plausibly alleged is, that our prayers are addressed to God, and our preachings to man. But in the first place, we must take into account not only to but from whom these respective acts proceed. If our prayers are dignified by being uttered at the throne of grace, to Him who sits upon it, are they not degraded, in the same

proportion, by coming from a company of miserable sinners, whose infirmities are aided by the Holy Spirit, it is true, for otherwise they could not pray at all, but whose petitions need another intercession to render them acceptable, that of Him who offers them to God, perfumed and sweetened by the incense of his own exhaustless merit. On the other hand, if Preaching is subordinate to Prayer, because addressed to sinful mortals, is it not dignified in turn, and clothed with a solemnity which may be looked upon as awful, by the circumstance, that all lawfully commissioned preachers are, in a real and important sense, the mouth of God, of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, to sinful, ignorant, and ruined souls, or at the best to souls renewed, but only partially sanctified and made acquainted with the truth? This fearful trust may be neglected or abused; but that cannot change its character or meaning as an Embassy from God to man (2 Cor. v. 20), or make it any the less solemn as a part of worship, even in comparison with Prayer addressed to God himself.

In the next place, let it be observed that solemn as Prayer is, and absolutely necessary both as a duty which we owe to God, and as a means of spiritual progress to ourselves, there is a sense in which it may be said that Public Prayer is not so indispensable, on either of these grounds, as Preaching. In our own experience they are happily inseparable, both as privileges and as duties; but we can easily conceive of their divorce, and no less easily perceive that, although written forms of prayer have sometimes, as in Germany and England, kept alive the popular religion, even after the defection of the clergy, yet apart from these exceptional and temporary cases, and supposing both to be dependent, as they are with us, upon the piety and knowledge of the very same persons, the devotion of our churches could not long survive the silence of our pulpits, for the simple but unanswerable reason, that the truth is indispensable to pure devotion, and that although private prayer might, for a time, and in a case of great emergency, preserve the spirit of devotion, though our public service were didactic only, private study could not long supply the place of public teaching—unless the ministry be quite superfluous. If, on the contrary, it is essential, as a part of the Divine plan for pre-

serving and diffusing and enforcing truth, its place can never be supplied by mere liturgical performances, nor even by genuine devotional approaches to the throne of grace, however humbly made, however graciously accepted. In a word, the want of public prayer could be more easily supplied in private than the want of preaching.

But in the third place, even granting that the act of Public Prayer is in itself more solemn, and in the true sense of our Directory for Worship (chap. vi. 4), "more important" than the act of Preaching, it does not follow that in practice, in experience, it is more incumbent or more indispensable. Nothing can well be more fallacious than to measure the immediate claims of different duties by their relative intrinsic moment, irrespectively of circumstances. No one doubts that what we owe to God is higher in its claims than what we owe to man. Yet who would hesitate to interrupt, or even to forego, an act of worship, for the sake of rescuing a human life, or even of allaying human sorrow? The intellectual employments of a public institution, such as a theological seminary, are *per se* inferior in dignity and obligation to its spiritual exercises. Yet the necessary absence of the person who conducts the latter creates less confusion and does less harm than the necessary absence of the person who conducts the former. Why? Because his place may be more easily supplied; because there is a greater number qualified, by previous training or immediate preparation, to perform the higher act of leading men's devotions, than the lower act of giving them instruction. Now what is true of such an institution or society is true, and for precisely the same reason, in the great congregation and the church at large. In other words, that part of worship which is commonly regarded as intrinsically more important and more solemn, may be also more within the reach and the capacity of ordinary Christians than the part which, although less imposing in its form and its pretensions, presupposes a less usual and general preparation. The fact which we have here assumed as true, to wit, that the capacity for public prayer is more diffused than the capacity for preaching, we shall not attempt to argue, but appeal to the experience of multitudes of ministers, who often feel how much their most

elaborate and really successful efforts to expound the truth would be enforced and carried home by the prayers of some among their humblest hearers, rich in faith and practised in devotion. Yet the same men would not for a moment think of yielding their responsible position as expounders of divine truth, even to the most intelligent and eloquent of those committed to their care. These are the rational considerations upon which, in their connection with the previous arguments from history, we venture to dispute the popular idea that the Pulpit, the Didactic and the Hortatory part of worship, is a mere appendage, much less an incumbrance, to the part too commonly regarded as exclusively Devotional.

Having thus theoretically stated what we honestly believe to be the only true corrective of a prevalent and hurtful error, it remains to be considered how it may be usefully applied in practice. As to this point, we appeal to our younger ministers and students of theology. We earnestly advise them to regard the "Ministry of the Word" as the grand distinctive office which they hold or seek; the Ministry of the Word, not in the narrow sense of speaking from the pulpit, but in the noble, comprehensive sense of all official and authoritative teaching on religious subjects. Let the truth of God lie back of all their efforts to promote God's glory and to save men's souls. From this untainted and perennial spring let all the streams of their religion and their influence for ever flow. But while they make this the foundation and the centre of their public ministrations, let it never be divorced, in theory or practice, from its natural concomitant, the work of Prayer. Whatever might be lawful or incumbent in the case of some conceivable emergency, not likely to occur in our experience, and therefore not requiring forethought and provision, the public duty of the working minister is one and indivisible. Prayer and Preaching must accompany and supplement each other; the one must have its root or fountain in the other; the one requires training no less than the other; and he who would conform to apostolical example must give himself to both with equal diligence and equal zeal.

But while all this is true of public ministerial service, it implies and presupposes one more private, and exactly corres-

ponding in its necessary functions. As public teaching will be absolutely worthless without private study, public prayer will be unedifying without prayer in secret. Out of this, if we may here resume and carry out a thought before suggested, as from a hidden but abundant source, the stream of public ministrations must be fed, or it will soon be dry or noxious. Not in public only, therefore, but in private also, ministers must "give themselves to prayer and to the ministry of the word."

This recurrence to the words of the apostles on a memorable occasion, and to their concise description of the permanent and spiritual part of their great office, necessarily suggests the thought, that he who does these two things, with their necessary adjuncts, faithfully and fully, both in public and in private, will have no need of additional employment. None of us, without presumption, can expect to do more than was done by the Apostles. And if they could not combine the tasks of serving tables and of preaching Christ; if they devolved the blessed work of charity on others, that they might be wholly given to their spiritual labours; we have small encouragement to hope that our versatility and busy zeal will ever solve the problem which to them remained insoluble, the problem, old but ever new, of doing everything at once, which is continually tempting the ambition and the vanity of Christians and of Christian ministers, and under the delusive hope of doing more for God, and for the church, and for the souls of men, too often leaving them to the disgrace of doing little or the guilt of doing nothing. From a prospect so discouraging the best relief is that afforded by the language and the conduct of the Twelve on the occasion so repeatedly referred to (Acts vi. 4.) The example there held forth is admirably suited both to kindle hope and regulate exertion. On the one hand, the great business of the ministry is here presented; on the other, it is shown to be sufficient to engross their highest powers and their best affections, and to occupy their whole time till the end of life. Let this then be their principle, their maxim, and their watchword. Let them be prepared to say, without a murmur or misgiving, If others can combine this work with secular employments, or with intellectual and literary labour not directly bearing on it, let them do so. If some can conscientiously prefer the secular or cha-

ritable aspects of the work itself, without impugning their sincerity, or sitting for a moment in censorious judgment on their acts or motives, we say, let them do so. To their own Master let them stand or fall. Let others, better than ourselves, do as they will, or as they can, or as they must. But we (let those whom we are now advising say) but we, knowing our own infirmities, would rather cling to apostolical example, and on that ground, if no other, "we will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word."*

---

ART. II.—*Three Discourses upon the Religious History of Bowdoin College, during the administrations of Presidents McKeen, Appleton, and Allen.* By EGBERT C. SMYTH, Collins Professor of Natural and Revealed Religion. Brunswick: published by J. Griffin. 1858.

IN these judicious and timely discourses Professor Smyth has made a valuable contribution to our means of understanding what has hitherto been very imperfectly understood by the public—Religion in Colleges. In our last, we noticed the discourse of Professor Fisher on the History of the church in Yale College, chiefly, however, with reference to its theological bearings. We shall now have occasion to refer to it, along with

* Since this article was in type, we have met with the following illustration of the quarter from which, and the spirit in which, Preaching was depreciated two hundred years ago. It is from a charge by Bishop Leslie, a noted persecutor of our Presbyterian fathers in Ulster. "Preaching amongst you is grown to that esteem that it hath shuffled out of the church both the public prayers which is the immediate worship of God, and the duty of catechizing, and is now accounted the sole and only service of God, the very *consummatum est* of all Christianity, as if all religion consisted in the hearing of a sermon. Unto whom I may say in the words of the apostle, 'What? is all hearing? is the whole body an ear?' or tell you in the words of a most reverend prelate [Laud?], that if you be the sheep of Christ, you have no mark of his sheep but the ear-mark." (See Reid's History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 3d ed. vol. i. p. 229.) This witticism, poor at best, is rendered poorer still by the absurd implication, that the ear is used only in hearing sermons.

those of Professor Smyth, in treating the subject which we here propose to consider. We invite the attention of our readers to some considerations which we shall offer on the subject of religion in the Christian colleges of our country.

An impression widely prevails that colleges, however indispensable to intellectual discipline and culture, are dangerous to the morals of young men. This impression arises in part from causes, which render them, in comparison with other spheres of youthful training, quite the reverse. The fall of a young man in college is a fall from a high elevation. His peculiar pursuits, associations, opportunities, surroundings, are high and ennobling. Usually too, the class of families from which students come, is such as to create a presumption of superior early training and privilege, fitted to refine and purify the mind, and kindle high aspirations and hopes. Not only so. The fall of such an one is made conspicuous by the discipline of the college, administered for his own recovery and the protection of his associates. From all these causes, the fall of a student at college is notable and conspicuous, as compared with that of youth in other spheres of life. But it is no less evident that they all combine to environ the student with influences, not elsewhere found, favourable to the development of his better nature, and constantly counter-working the tendency to vice and debasement, which is so generally active at this critical and volatile period of life. The same tendency to dissipation and worthlessness in a single student, which, in a dozen apprentices or merchants' clerks, would awaken slight remark, will turn a wide circle of friends into lamentations over the perils of college life, or of some particular college. Another circumstance which renders college irregularities noticeable and obtrusive, is the fact that the wayward members of the institution living together often act in concert, and make the impression upon the uninformed and undiscriminating, that the vices of a few taint the whole body of students. In point of fact, however, if we compare those who enter our colleges, with those who leave home at the same period of life to be trained for mercantile or mechanical employments, we shall find, 1. That a far larger proportion of the latter than of the former become wrecks in society. 2. That by far the larger proportion of those sup-

posed to be spoiled in college, had started in their downward career before they entered its precincts. A somewhat long and careful observation enables us to give this statement all the authority of a valid induction. Among the reasons of this superiority in the moral results of college training, we specify the following.

1. We may say negatively, that there are no temptations of any account, in colleges, which are not everywhere incident to youth withdrawn from the influence of home, and from the immediate oversight of their own parents. Place them where we will at this susceptible age, unless we withdraw them from the society of men, and from the great spheres of human occupation, they come into speedy contact with those of their own age and social rank, who are vicious in their tastes, debased in their habits, and yet fascinating in their personal traits and manners. Such as are inclined to make this class their boon companions, or are not fortified by principle and habit against their seductions, will find them everywhere, preëminently in all the large cities and centres of mechanical or mercantile activity. They will find them in larger numbers, in greater abandonment to their lusts, than are ever tolerated within the precincts of a college, and with far more copious and alluring means of gratification than can exist in convenient nearness to the great mass of our American colleges. What are the facilities and allurements to dissipation within reach at Amherst, Williams, Princeton, Cannonsburg, in comparison with those which obtrude themselves upon the unwary youth on every street of our large cities?

Most of the dangers of college life arise from nothing peculiar to colleges as such. They pertain to the period of life of the student. It is with most students the period of transition from boyhood to manhood; when the self-control and liberty of the latter begin to be assumed, while as yet the levity and inconsiderateness of the former have not been put away; when the passions peculiar to approaching manhood begin to fire the soul, while the regulative principles that should curb and guide them, and which mature with riper growth and fuller experience, are but feebly developed. It is the period when, emerging from and impatient of the control of others, man is gene-

rally unfit to govern himself. It is the period of self-esteem and self-assurance, of urgent appetitite for self-indulgence, and indifference or contempt for the counsels of mature wisdom and experience. Of course it is besieged with peculiar perils, against which wholesome Christian nurture and the grace of God are the only sure defence—perils, however, against which a well-ordered Christian college offers more safeguards than almost any sphere of life, and to which we think fewer students proportionally, unless possibly agriculturists, fall victims, than any other class of young men.

2. Among the counter-agents which colleges furnish to perilous temptations of this period of life we mention first, the character of the student's pursuits and occupations. The culture of the mind, its advancement in knowledge, its constant contact and occupation with the sublimest truths, beget a taste for intellectual pleasures, a capacity for supersensual delights. So of academic excitements, contests, emulations; however exceptionable in some aspects, they still have an elevation about them that belongs not to commerce, manufactures, or other material and money-making pursuits. All these, as far as they go, counterwork lustful and animalizing tendencies, as no other sphere of youthful occupation does. This is no mere theory. Experience constantly brings to view the influence of the high intellectuality of academic life in stimulating the higher and reproving the grovelling propensities of our nature.

3. The class of youth sent to our colleges gives the student access to the most select and elevated class of associates in our land. It is obvious, that whatever bad elements may steal into our colleges, the class of youth who aspire to a liberal education, are, as a whole, among the most elevated, the very flower of American young men. This appears not only from the very nature of the case, but from various collateral circumstances. The large majority of students in our Christian colleges are sons of pious parents, and have received careful Christian training. Beyond any other class, Christian parents seek a liberal education for their children. Very many send them to college in the hope that they will become ministers. This is eminently true of ministers themselves, who almost without exception put their sons upon a liberal course of education, unless

hindered by insurmountable obstacles. The number of ministers' sons in the College of New Jersey is usually not less than thirty, or from one-eighth to one-tenth of the entire number. A large number besides are the sons of elders; and of both these classes a large number are pious, or become so during their college course. All who are preparing for the ministry become members of our colleges. Few classes now graduate of which from one-fifth to two-fifths of their members do not ultimately find their way to our Theological Seminaries, while they include in their ranks many other pious members destined to other spheres of life. More than half of the last graduating class of the College of New Jersey were or soon expected to be professors of religion. Besides, these colleges always contain a large number of young men of moral and blameless deportment, many of whom are seeking an education as a means of livelihood, and are far enough from exercising any corrupting influence. Where else can a youth find so large a body of pure associates from which to select safe and congenial intimates? What but his own corrupt bias can prevent his availing himself of these high and ennobling social resources? What other sphere is so surrounded and pervaded with them? There are, indeed, other and corrupt social currents in colleges. Where are they not? But it is the student's own inexcusable fault if he place himself in their sweep. It is not because those of a very different character are wanting, or difficult of access. They are always at hand, inviting and alluring him to their bosom. Nothing but his own sin, his own determinate bias towards the "baser sort," can separate him from these high and blessed influences.

4. The discipline of our well-ordered colleges is powerful in checking and narrowing the corrupting social tendencies to which all large bodies of youth, promiscuously gathered, are liable. The intent and tendency of it is to reclaim the wayward, and remove the incorrigible. It is a force constantly operating to expel moral poison from the social veins of the institution. It indeed brings the disorders or vices which find place there into prominence and notoriety. When a youth is suspended or dismissed from college, he excites a sensation in the town, neighbourhood, or circle to which he belongs, and frequently awakes loud clamours in regard to the moral dan-

gers of colleges. Yet that which excites these clamours is the very means employed to deliver them from such dangers—which are by no means peculiar to them, but prevail wherever large numbers of growing youth, of all shades of character, have free and constant access to each other. The difference is, that other communities have less power to check or purge out these noxious influences. There are few villages, and no cities, where the proportion of vicious, corrupting, ensnaring youth to all others, is not far greater than in college, and where it is not far more difficult to counteract their influence. Many students are restrained by dread of the discipline, or fear of exclusion from the privileges of college, from vices which they practise without fear and without restraint in their native villages. Thus by excluding the incorrigible, and restraining or reforming such as remain, the whole standard of practical morality is toned up. Much as we could wish otherwise among youth in colleges, yet, considering the proportion of moral and pious students, and the disciplinary influence, gentle, persuasive, severe, or decisive, as emergencies require, which bear upon all others, we unhesitatingly assert that no other sphere affords so bracing a moral atmosphere.

5. Positive Christian agencies and means of grace are brought to bear upon youth in colleges in greater abundance, variety, and certainty, than in any other sphere of life. They are required to attend public prayers twice daily, together with public worship on the Sabbath. Is not this more than can be ensured with regard to many of them any where else? Is it not more than is accomplished with regard to many sons of Christian parents, as they approach the age of self-control, even while they dwell at their own homes? How many of these largely shun family and public worship, and cannot be regularly drawn to either by parental authority or influence! But if they are in college, they *must* attend these exercises as a condition of continuance in the institution. Many are thus put in constant contact with the truths and services of religion in college, in a degree unknown to them at home, and unattainable elsewhere. It may be said indeed, that this attendance on religious services is forced, and therefore formal and unedifying. Let every reasonable concession be made on this score. After

all, will any one contend, that there is not greater hope for a body of youth who attend daily worship and the weekly preaching of the gospel, than for those who are strangers to public worship, who are seen only occasionally and irregularly in a Christian assembly; or who live like heathens in the very bosom of Christian families, and under the shadow of the sanctuary? It is doubtless true, that the means of grace in whatever form, by perversion become to many a savour of death. This, however, is no argument against their use, and beneficial efficacy. It is in and through the word of grace and prayer for grace, especially in the great congregation, that this grace is borne by the life-giving Spirit to the souls of men. And how many of those who regularly attend public worship, whether in colleges or elsewhere, from considerations other than their own taste and inclination, from time to time catch heavenward impulses, and inhale a divine breath which proves to be the upspring of a divine life! This is so in all, and remarkably so in academic communities, notwithstanding any levity and indecorum which some, alas, at times manifest, and which not infrequently become the arrows afterwards rankling with that remorse which the blood of Christ alone can assuage.

To this must be added the Christian instruction which, in various degrees, forms a part of the academic curriculum in Christian colleges. In nearly all, Natural Theology, Moral Philosophy, and the Evidences of Christianity, form a part of the course. All these tend to radicate religious and Christian beliefs in the soul. The same is true, in a high degree, of intellectual science, and of all the physical sciences. Indeed, all truth culminates in God. All the rays of light which emanate from nature, providence and grace, converge in Him in whom all things are headed up—Head of the church, Head over all things to the church, the way, the truth, and the life. Much indeed depends on the faith, zeal and tact of the instructor as to the extent to which his department is made auxiliary to religion. But in some of our colleges all the sciences, physical and metaphysical, are so taught as to corroborate and enforce the claims of experimental religion. Nor are these studies ineffective for practical religious purposes. We have now in mind, students

in Princeton College, who had been trained up among sceptics, and whose scepticism was not only undermined by the study of the Evidences of Christianity, but was supplanted by a living faith in Christ. Besides the foregoing exercises which have a religious bearing, in Princeton regular study and recitation of the Scriptures are required every Sabbath, of all the students, while the Freshmen recite once a week in Coleman's "Christian Antiquities," and the Sophomores in "Hodge's Way of Life."

Beyond all this, those less formal services, attendance on which is optional, prevail in our colleges. Meetings for conference and prayer, conducted by members of the Faculty which usually comprises a large clerical force, and often by the students themselves, abound. Personal and private persuasions are also abundantly employed according to the zeal and skill in this delicate work, which God distributeth to each one severally as he will. So by manifold appliances, which for abundance and variety have no parallel in other spheres of life, religion is taught, enforced, and applied. By cogent argument and gentle insinuation, in private and in public, it is brought into contact with the springs of the student's intellectual and moral being.

6. The intense social interaction of an academic community conduces to the rapid and effective propagation of religious feeling. We have already observed that the social influence in these institutions, supposed by many to be propitious only to vice and immorality, is no less efficient for good than for evil. Nay, we are of opinion that it is productive of much more good than evil. The whole body of youth in a college are in such constant and immediate contact, that what is felt by one member is quickly felt by all, and transmits itself with electric rapidity. If one or a few who have been heedless or wicked, show themselves wrought upon by the powers of the world to come, all are more or less awed. Vice and frivolity are checked by the sense of God's presence. Often the sacred fire kindles from one to another almost instantaneously, until the fear of God has come upon every soul. In circles where one week recklessness and profaneness reigned, the next, a solemn stillness reigns, broken only by the question, uttered

in fear and trembling, What shall I do to be saved? We know of no community so susceptible to quick, powerful, and all-pervading religious impression as that composing a Christian college. And in truth, there are none in which revivals have been as frequent, powerful, or universal. We well remember how a state of prevailing thoughtlessness and irreligion, scarcely disturbed by the few professors of religion among the students of Yale College in the year 1831, was quickly supplanted by a seriousnes so profound and universal, that, for days, the hum of conversation was hushed at the meals in the commons at which from two to three hundred were present. And no articulate exhortations impressed us like this voiceless eloquence.

The following account of what transpired in Princeton College nearly a century ago, is from the pen of the late Dr. John Woodhull, of Freehold, New Jersey, then a member of the institution. It will be found in Dr. Green's historical sketches of the college. We transcribe it, because, aside from its circumstantial details, it is substantially an account of what has often occurred in this and other Christian colleges of our country; because it shows that revivals in this college have been coeval with its existence; and because it forcibly illustrates the rapid transfusion, through the power of the Holy Ghost, of religious concern from one or a few to the mass of the students. Says Dr. Woodhull:

"As to revivals of religion, there were some partial ones in college before Dr. Finley's time; but in his time there was something general. It began in 1762, in the Freshman Class, to which I then belonged. It was a pretty large class, containing between twenty-five and thirty members. Almost as soon as the session commenced, this class met once in the week for prayer. *One of the members became deeply impressed, and this affected the whole class. The other classes, and the whole college, soon became much impressed.* Every class became a praying society; and the whole college met once a week for prayer. There was, likewise, a private select society. Societies were also held by the students in the town and in the country. I suppose there was not one that belonged to college but was affected more or less. There were two members of

the Senior Class who were considered as opposers of the good work at first, yet both these persons were afterwards preachers of the gospel. The work continued about one year. Fifteen, or about half of my class, were supposed to be pious; and in the college about fifty, or nearly one half of the whole number of students."

This simple recital unfolds better than any argumentation the relation of the intense social influence in colleges to revivals of religion. It may indeed be rejoined that an instrument so powerful for good may be powerful for evil. So it may, and, alas, often is; yet there is a difference. For the morality and piety of college are always counter-working, often too feebly indeed, yet always to some extent, corrupt and demoralizing excitements. Even if the moral and pious succumb too far, as they often do, to the overbearing pressure of a momentary phrensy, still their morality and piety fetter and weaken, if they do not utterly prevent their coöperation with the perverse and insubordinate. They for the most part erect a formidable barrier against the incursion and spread of evil. But when the impulses of their fellow-students are heavenward, all their sympathies, efforts, and prayers, enter into such a current to increase its volume and momentum. The conscience of the college acts not, as in the former case, as a brake to check, but as a propelling force, to accelerate the movement.

7. Youth cannot be trained in any other sphere which so largely enlists in their behalf those "effectual fervent prayers of the righteous which avail much" to ensure the blessing of God, in the copious effusion of his Spirit. Christian colleges are the creatures of the church. They are established by it for the purpose of christianizing education, supplying a learned and able ministry, and replenishing all the spheres of life with competent and upright leaders. These institutions have been founded and reared by sacrifices and prayers of holy men, for the glory of God, and the advancement of his kingdom. They were consecrated from the very beginning *Christo et ecclesiæ*. From this cause they have always shared largely in the prayers of the ministry and church. There is another reason which largely enlists for them the intercessions of those who have power with God and prevail. As we have already seen, the

vast majority of the youth in them are sons of ministers, elders, and pious parents. No earthly objects so engross their affections and solicitudes as these sons at this critical and formative period of life. If any are regarded as the hope, and pride, and flower of the family, they are those on whom is bestowed a liberal education. Removed from the restraints and refinements of home, parents and friends have but one resource for influencing them beyond epistolary correspondence. That is prayer. That is always available. They can always betake themselves to Him who is their refuge and strength, and present help in trouble. Thus there is at all times a mighty current of prayer ascending from closets and firesides all over the land, for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon colleges and their members. That these prayers have power, all Christians must believe. To those who believe otherwise, we do not address ourselves. We quote in confirmation and illustration of these views, the following from Professor Tyler's premium essay on Prayer for Colleges.

"But the chief reliance of pious friends at a distance must be on the power of prayer. However separated by distance, they can meet their sons, if pious, every morning and evening at a common mercy-seat; and if not pious, they can reach them at any time through a presence which they cannot escape, and a power which they cannot resist; not only meet or reach them, but lay their hands, as it were, upon them, and leave a blessing on their heads! What a blessed medium of approach and influence over those far away! Nor is this fancy or enthusiasm. Facts go beyond imagination in regard to this very power, as it has been exerted on members of college, especially in times of revival. After one of these happy seasons, of which there have been so many at Amherst College, President Hitchcock addressed a letter to the parents of the converts, and found to his surprise, (no, we will not say to his *surprise*, for he seems to have expected it, but to his wonder and delight,) that in a majority of cases, parents and friends at home had felt an unusual solicitude for these very youth. Even though they had heard nothing of their state of mind, and knew nothing of the state of religious feeling in the college, still they were waiting

with unutterable longings, or with confident expectations, to hear of the conversion of their impenitent children.

"Another very interesting fact, which was developed in this revival, and which has been found to be equally true of many others, is, that a very large proportion of the converts were children of the covenant; a fact full of encouragement to those who dedicate their children from infancy to the Lord in the ordinance of baptism, but which also illustrates forcibly the responsibility of parents for the salvation of their children. Of sixty-three who were admitted to the church in Yale College, as fruits of the revival of 1802, all but eight were children of the covenant. Of twenty-two who were received to the communion as fruits of that of 1808, every individual had been baptized in infancy; and of seventy who professed religion after the revival of 1831, all but ten were children of pious parents. If pious parents would but watch for the souls of their sons in college, as they care and toil for their worldly prosperity; if the church would but do her duty to the *baptized children* of the church, who are members of college, what a redeeming and sanctifying element would, by this means alone, be infused into our literary institutions!"

The efficacy of prayer for the furtherance of religion in these institutions, and the inestimable importance of such a blessing, have been so deeply felt by the church, that with great unanimity it has set apart the last Thursday in February for special and extraordinary prayer, public and private, in this behalf. The wonderful increase of religion in our academic institutions, in connection with and evident response to this special prayer of the church, will be brought more distinctly to view, as we proceed to test the position we have taken, by a reference to the actual facts in the case. We appeal, therefore,

8. To the Christian results accomplished through grace in our colleges. To this test all theories must come at last. By their fruits ye shall know them. It must be observed, however, in regard to the older colleges of our country, that they not only shared in the religious decline which the convulsions of the Revolution brought upon the American church, but they suffered in ways peculiar to themselves, far beyond most other Christian communities. They were disorganized, and nearly

or quite disbanded. Nassau Hall was turned into barracks for the soldiery, and her President, Dr. Witherspoon, was for years mostly withdrawn from his academic duties to the councils of the nation, where he exerted a powerful and benignant influence in moulding our nascent civil institutions. Dr. Daggett, Professor of Divinity and Pastor of Yale College, was seriously damaged in health by the abuse he received from the British soldiery, in his intrepid endeavour to intercept their approach to New Haven. The students of our colleges largely enlisted in the army, and did not escape the taint of the camp. These institutions required years to become re-organized and regain their former position, as to numbers and discipline. The great body of the young and middle-aged men in the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, which were the great centres of patriotic and revolutionary zeal, entered the army, and were subject to its vitiating influence. The heart of the people, including their ministers, was absorbed in the exhausting and eventful struggle for their altars and firesides. All was at stake. They waited each returning post for the news which would determine their independence or their perpetual vassalage. Civil institutions were unsettled, families broken up, Christian ordinances irregularly administered, the whole social organism in an abnormal and chaotic state. In this precarious state of things, the mind of the whole people was of course diverted for the time from the eternal to the temporal. Few young men made a profession of religion in this country from the period of the Revolution till after the beginning of the present century. The downward religious tendency induced by the war, was greatly aggravated by the flood of French infidelity which swept over the land at this period. Few pious youth entered the colleges, because there were few pious youth in the country. The scepticism of the time found a ready welcome among the irreligious minds in college, who, before fathoming the depths of true knowledge, which genders humility, must first experience the self-conceit incident to the first awakening of intellectual activity and insight. The colleges, therefore, as the centres of youthful intelligence, were the strategic centres in which this infidelity entrenched itself, and in which it was first vanquished, by the Christian eloquence of

the Smiths and Dwights who presided over them, and confronted this malign foe with the weapons of Christian learning and oratory, in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. In the colleges preëminently those revivals of religion appeared in the early part of this century, and have reappeared with increasing frequency since, which have resuscitated the American church, and have given it an expansion and growth almost commensurate with the immense increase of our population by birth and by immigration.

Professor Smyth says of Bowdoin College, "during the first four years of Dr. McKeen's administration, (1802 to 1806,) though some of the students were thoughtful, upright, and possessed of fine intellectual abilities and social qualities, there was not one, it is believed, who was a member of any church, or believed and hoped in Christ as his Saviour! "Religion," writes one who was then a member of the college, "was connected with the college only in the person of President McKeen. He was a Christian, courteous, accessible, venerable, and universally beloved: but what could this avail, when, in each college room, there was a side-board sparkling with wines and stronger stimulants?" Again, in the year 1811, under President Appleton, during one term, there was not a student who was a professor of religion. "The greater part of the students appear to have been thoughtless. Not a few were reckless and openly immoral, some of whom formed habits of intemperance, which clung to them in later life, and brought them to a dishonoured grave."

But from this time, although not without alternations of great depression, the cause of religion has been steadily prospering in this institution. The Spirit was from time to time poured out, and has continued to be vouchsafed with increasing frequency and power, especially since the year 1825. Professor Stowe, who was there as a student in 1825, and as Professor in 1850, says, "if the religious character of the college gains as much from the year 1850 to 1875, as it did from 1825 to 1850, it will be all that the most ardent friends of the Lord Jesus can reasonably hope for before the millennium. There is indeed very much to be done, much that is deficient, much to mourn over, but I am merely bringing 1825, 1850, and 1875, into

immediate contiguity for the sake of comparison." The gain is sufficiently manifest in the fact that in 1850, 23.25 per cent. of all the graduates of this college had become ministers of the gospel.

In Yale College, a period of similar depression followed the Revolution. The number of professed Christians had dwindled to eight or ten, and at one communion, near the close of the last century, but a single undergraduate was present. Says Professor Fisher, "it was in this state of things that Dr. Dwight assumed the Presidency, and began to exert his commanding influence to stay the progress of error. He preached to the candidates for the Baccalaurate in 1797, his celebrated sermons on the Nature and Danger of Infidel Philosophy. These masterly discourses turned the tide of feeling against the opponents of Christianity, not only in college, but throughout the country, and in Great Britain, where they were soon republished, they greatly strengthened the cause of religion. . . . The spring of 1802 marked the commencement of a great revival in the college. . . . Of two hundred and thirty students then in college, about one-third were converted. Of these about one-half entered the ministry. Yet as soon as they left college, and their places were filled by new classes, the number of professing Christians again dwindled to twelve or fifteen. This circumstance shows how speedily the religious aspect of a college may be entirely altered by the departure of one company of students, and the arrival of another of a different character." Another revival, however, was enjoyed in 1808, and still another in 1813, and yet another in 1815. Since 1820 few classes have left the institution, who have not passed through seasons of religious attention of greater or less power.

We have referred to Bowdoin and Yale, because we find authentic data in the excellent historical discourses of Professors Smyth and Fisher, which we hope will be followed by similar historical accounts of religion in other leading colleges. For lack of this, we must refer to such sources of information as we can command. We find in Professor Tyler's Essay a statistical table of the total number of students, of professors of religion, and of candidates for the ministry in the New England colleges in 1853. In eleven colleges the whole number of

students was 2163, of professors of religion 745, of candidates for the ministry 343. The proportion who enter the ministry is usually increased, as the students come to determine their professions. Our observation convinces us, that of the professors of religion in our colleges full two-thirds enter the ministry. It is well ascertained, that of these full one quarter are hopefully brought to Christ during their collegiate course.

Passing now to the colleges of our own church, we are dependent on such scattered and fragmentary sources of information as Providence has put within reach. We know that in recent years, there are few of them that have not been blessed with frequent and powerful revivals of religion. This has been made familiar to all who read the religious journals. Many of them are of too recent an origin to have a history reaching further back. In regard to Jefferson, we have somewhere seen the statement, doubtless true, that a very large proportion of its graduates from the first have become ministers of the gospel. We believe the same substantially to be true of Washington College, in its immediate vicinity. Washington College, in Virginia, has its religious character and influence sufficiently attested in the constellation of Presbyterian ministers, whose names are enrolled among her alumni—scarcely less illustrious than any equal number whose memory is embalmed in Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit. To this august company of divines Hampden Sidney has also contributed its quota. Of our more recent institutions, it is well known that many of them have been largely blessed with revivals of religion, and have contributed materially to replenish the ranks of our ministry.

In regard to the oldest and largest of them all, we have had occasion already to mention some facts, in illustrating the position we have already taken. The College of New Jersey is but the development of the Log College, which was its germ. This was as much a school of piety as of learning, and was chiefly a nursery of Presbyterian ministers. The early classes of Princeton sent a large majority of their members into the ministry. Many of them also became eminent Christian statesmen, among whom we notice Oliver Ellsworth, Tapping Reeve, and Jesse Root, preëminent among the Christian jurists and civilians of Connecticut. Judge Root was the

leader in repelling the stealthy incursion of Massachusetts Unitarianism into Connecticut, in the person of his own pastor, the Rev. Abiel Abbot, of Coventry. His firmness, sagacity, and doctrinal insight were proof against the insinuating artifices and dexterous evasions of his Socinian pastor, and successfully counterworked them. The case was brought before the General Association of Connecticut, which, under the lead of Dr. Dwight, without splitting hairs about jurisdiction, or the want of judicial power, as in a recent case, vindicated the course of Judge Root and his coadjutors. This body uttered a decisive testimony in the premises, and, for the time, raised an impassable barrier against the soul-destroying heresy.

We have already seen that in Princeton, from the first, there were considerable awakenings from time to time, till in 1762, a profound concern in regard to religion pervaded the whole college. We have somewhere met with a statement that some student or students were awakened in consequence of an interview with President Finley on his death-bed, in 1766, and that thence an extensive attention to religion prevailed in the college. We are unable to find any authentic voucher for this, unless the following from Sprague's Annals be an allusion to it. In the notice of James Power, D. D., vol. iii., p. 326, it is said: "He was one of the students of the college, who visited Dr. Finley on his death-bed in Philadelphia; and the affecting scene left a powerful and enduring impression on his mind." However this may be, it appears that of the class of 1770, one-half, and of the class of 1772, fifteen out of twenty-two became ministers. The late Dr. McMillan, in an autobiographical letter to Dr. Carnahan,* says: "I entered college at Princeton, in the spring of 1770. I had not been long there, until a revival of religion took place among the students, and I believe, at one time, there were not more than two or three but what were under serious impressions." It is also related* that Rev. Lewis Feuilleteau Wilson "was first brought into sympathy with religious things, during a revival which took place in the college in 1772." To these delightful scenes the disorganizing effects of the Revolution soon succeeded, which

* Sprague's Annals, vol. iii. pp. 350–1. † Ib. p. 570.

were signally disastrous to this college. The heavy shadows of Infidelity and Deism, French and English, deepened and prolonged the eclipse of religion which followed. To other disasters was added the burning of the college in 1802. Under the brilliant administration of Samuel Stanhope Smith, its temporal losses were speedily retrieved, and it arose to unprecedented prosperity. But the few italicised names on the triennials for a long series of years, prove how deeply its religious condition suffered from that state of things in our country, in which, as Professor Smyth observes, "it was a rare spectacle if a young man confessed before men his Redeemer."

In due time, however, the Spirit of the Lord lifted up a standard against this enemy, which came in as a flood. The great revival of 1815, in the early part of Dr. Green's Presidency, raised religion to its due supremacy in the institution, and supplied to the American church some of her brightest luminaries. Since then, it is rare that any class (if any) has graduated, some of whose members have not passed from death to life during their academic course. In recent years revivals have increased in frequency and power. The memory of the great revival, some ten years ago, is still fresh. In the spring of 1856, and again in the spring of 1858, a large number were hopefully brought into the kingdom, many of whom are now looking forward to the ministry of the gospel, and have contributed to the present unexampled accessions to our theological seminaries. More than one-third of all the students, in some classes about one-half, are professors of religion. Of the last graduating class one-half were professors, and of these about one-half became so during their connection with the institution. Nor is the effect of the moral and religious influence in this and other colleges fully presented, without bringing to view the additional fact, that very many, who have not before seen their way clear, make a profession of religion shortly after leaving college. Some one has said that nearly all students who have been religiously trained, and do not become fatally apostate, make a profession of faith either before, or within a few years after leaving college.

It is quite obvious that there has been a great advance in the moral and religious condition of colleges, since the general

observance by the church of the annual day of Prayer for Colleges. It began to be partially observed as far back as 1820. Since that time its observance has been constantly extending through most branches of the American church. It has year by year enlisted the colleges and churches, until now it commands the earnest sympathies and hearty observance of the great mass of praying people. "It has been estimated that fifteen hundred students were made the hopeful subjects of grace in thirty-six different colleges, from 1820 to 1835 inclusive." Another noticeable fact is, that most of these revivals have occurred in immediate connection with this day of Prayer for Colleges. This has been so with the recent revivals in Nassau Hall. As far as we have been informed, it has been so with nearly all the memorable revivals in literary institutions during the past year. The period immediately following this concert has been the time of the spiritual renovation of multitudes of students who are now preaching the gospel, or propagating it as teachers, or in other spheres of professional and public life. And why should it not be so? Does not God hear prayer? Will he not be inquired of by the house of Israel to do these things for them? If the whole church is looking with intense anxiety upon these young men, and pleading with God for them, if pious friends are tenderly persuading them, and beseeching God in agony of desire for them, can they help thinking of their own souls, of God, of eternity? Can they avoid the conviction that it is high time for them to awake from their guilty slumbers, and flee from the wrath to come, or that, if they now neglect the great salvation, they have just cause to fear that God will leave them to despise and wonder and perish? We reckon nothing more important, than that the heart of the church should be still more thoroughly and warmly turned towards this day of united supplications for her educated youth. With larger faith, and more persevering and universal and importunate prayer for their conversion, what has not the great Head of the church encouraged us to expect? May we not look for their conversion on a scale beyond all precedent? Much as has been done for moral and religious advancement in our colleges, much, very much, remains to be done! And what blessing can be compared with that of ren-

dering the great body of educated youth, who are destined to be leaders and commanders of the people, holy and devout men? Surely every interest of the church and nation, temporal and eternal, is bound up in this. Surely, then, may we not say to all who pray, for this object pray without ceasing?

The decided advance of our colleges in religion has been marked by equal progress in order, diligence, and morality. Of students not professedly pious, the great majority are earnestly prosecuting their studies as a means of support and success in life. Although immoralities and disorders worm their way into academic precincts, they have place there only by stealth, and, for the most part, shrink away in an atmosphere of diligence and order, of high-toned intellectual activity and generous emulation. The Temperance Reformation has doubtless contributed much to the safety of young men in colleges, as well as elsewhere. While no community is exempt from those harpies that thrive on the vices of young men, the admitted fact that intoxicating beverages are noxious, and only noxious, to young men, warrants college authorities to prohibit all use of them, by the most stringent regulations and decisive penalties. The sketch given by Professor Smyth of the fashion as to drinking in Bowdoin College half a century ago, is but too true a picture of what was prevalent among all young men, and in all colleges at that time. We learn from Professor Fisher's discourse, that at an earlier period, the Corporation of Yale College, after a series of ineffectual enactments to arrest expensive drinking entertainments at Commencement, ordered that none of the candidates for Bachelor's degree, "shall have in their chambers, in college, or in the town, any kind of strong drink, besides one quart of wine and one pint of rum for each candidate in a chamber." Surely the world moves, and its movement is not all toward degeneracy.

We think it has been abundantly shown, that our Christian colleges are,—not free from all taint of corruption, or sources of contamination,—but that, compared with other spheres of youthful training, occupation, and exposure, they occupy an enviable position as to their moral and religious influence. This is shown to be so, whether we look at them *a priori* or *a posteriori*, whether we consider antecedent probabilities or

actual results. That some young men grow dissolute in college is undeniably true. Where is it otherwise? That the few wrecks of this sort have attracted the gaze of that class who think of colleges as moral cess-pools, while they overlook the vast body of students who become pillars and ornaments of the church and state, is equally true. That of these wrecks, the most had contracted the fatal taint before they set foot within college precincts, is also undeniable. But we ask with all confidence, where else does so much surround and penetrate a youth, fitted to purify, ennoble, refine, and christianize him? Where can he find access to such a body of intelligent, high-minded, moral, and pious associates? Where else has he such materials from which to select genial intimates and boon companions? Where else are looseness and depravity hedged in by more powerful restraints? Where do so large a proportion of young men, between the ages of fifteen and twenty-one, become hopefully pious? Where else have so large a proportion of the great lights of the American church first dedicated themselves to the Lord?

We admit that any youth may find and embrace polluting associates in college. Where may he not? If he takes these in preference to the good and worthy, that is his responsibility. It cannot always be prevented in college or elsewhere by any vigilance of parents, teachers, pastors, or other guardians. But it is his own preference. It is not any fault of colleges, much less any special or peculiar fault of colleges, as compared with other communities. We are convinced that few pass through such colleges as we are familiar with, whatever may be the issue, who do not in their course feel the pressure of influences for good, such as they rarely have the opportunity of obeying or resisting in any other sphere of life. If, despite all this, they will sow to the flesh, of course, they must of the flesh reap corruption. But let not such an one or his friends charge his ruin to the college. He has committed moral suicide, notwithstanding the mighty agencies employed to prevent it. As well might the profligate in any Christian community, charge his ruin upon the church and pastor who have done their utmost to arrest his mad career.

A college is not the place to which vicious young men should

be sent for correction and reformation. The risk is too great for others, the chances too slight for themselves, in any large body of susceptible youth they may enter. They are more likely to deepen and disseminate the poison than to be purged of it. We have indeed known miracles of grace in some cases of this sort. We call to mind those who entered college dissolute, and after subjection to the severest discipline short of final dismission, became new creatures in Christ, and leaders in powerful revivals. Such cases, however, are exceptional. We cordially adopt the language of Professor Smyth: "Let youth never be sent here to be won from evil courses. A college is not a school of reform, nor a house of correction." It cannot afford to be. The probable evil is too great—the youth thus exposed to contamination too precious. One of its prime duties is, as far as possible, to keep itself clear of corrupt and corrupting inmates.

The most serious moral evil, in itself and its fruits, which still infests our colleges, is the feeling so largely prevalent among students, that their interests are in conflict with those of the Faculty. Out of this arise the evasion, duplicity, and equivocation which characterize many of their communications with their instructors, and which sometimes entrench themselves in the execrable Jesuitical maxim, that lying to the Faculty is justifiable. Of course, only the most unprincipled go this length. But very large numbers go greater or less lengths in this direction. They flatter themselves that they may go thus far and stop, preserving their general character for veracity and uprightness unharmed. This is a deplorable error. It fixes a taint upon character which will always defile it, unless purged away by future tears of bitter repentance. It is implicated with the most serious perplexities of college governments. If these views were once eradicated, the regimen of these communities would differ little from that of the best regulated Christian families. Thus would be obviated the necessity of all those regulations which are rendered necessary by the disposition of the student to offer feigned pretexts, or to do acts which annoy the Faculty indeed—but only because they are injurious to the real interests of the students. We are persuaded that this subject demands the earnest attention

of the friends and guardians of colleges. He who should discover an effectual remedy for it, would confer upon society an inestimable boon, and be one of the greatest of public benefactors. We cordially endorse Professor Fisher, in the following remarks quoted from him, and enforced with emphasis by Professor Smyth.

"There is another class of sins, which, it is to be hoped, the good sense of young men will before long entirely banish from American colleges. They are the sins—duplicity and direct falsehood being the worst—which spring from a fancied diversity of interest between the pupil and his instructor. A little reflection in after life commonly exposes the plea on which these immoralities are justified. But the effect of them on the conscience and character is not so easily escaped. He who would respect himself, and claim respect from others, must make sincerity, integrity—open and upright dealing with all men—his first virtue."

---

ART. III.—*The New Testament, Translated from the Original Greek; with Chronological arrangement of the Sacred Books, and improved divisions of Chapters and Verses.* By LEICESTER AMBROSE SAWYER. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1858. 12mo. pp. 423.

MOST of our readers have already some acquaintance with this book, if not by personal inspection, yet by means of the critiques which have been published, and which very fully reproduce the first impression made on various minds by the salient features of this bold experiment, but not without an undue prominence of oddities and startling innovations, and an undue stress upon the simple violation of our old associations, which is after all a secondary ground of judgment. On the whole, however, very ample justice has been done by contemporary journals to the faults of this translation in detail, and we feel neither called by duty nor disposed by inclination to

pursue that process any further. But as all translations of the Bible have an interest for us, and some degree of influence on others, we propose, now that the first storm of derision and exposure has blown over, to supply our readers with a perfectly dispassionate and fair description of the book, with its pretensions and performances, by this means enabling and allowing all who choose to draw their own conclusions.

It is no disparagement of this or any other book, to say that it claims nothing upon any ground but that of its own merit. No appeal is made to any previous performance of the author, or the least light thrown upon his antecedents. We refer, of course, to what appears upon the face of the work itself; for we know the practice of "the trade" too well to hold the author responsible for Mr. Jewett's advertised description of the volume as "the greatest work of this age, or of any age, since King James, 1610," and as "a labour of twenty years, by one of the best Hebrew and Greek scholars in our country, an indefatigable worker and a true man." We can readily suppose that Mr. Sawyer never heard of this description till he saw it in print, and are willing to believe that he considers it as fulsome and absurd as we do. But apart from this professional fanfaronade, the public is acquainted with the author only as a writer on church-government and moral science, and perhaps some other topics of inferior importance, all which he has treated, it may be, respectably enough, but not in such a way as to bespeak for this last effort any confidence beforehand, which he therefore very prudently foregoes, and lets his new tub stand upon its own bottom. Not only is the title-page entirely free from all pretensions founded on the past, but even in the Preface, the demand for approbation rests exclusively on what has been accomplished in the case before us.

As the Preface, just referred to, has attracted much attention, and is really, though not so meant, a curious piece of self-description, we begin our notice of the book with some account of it. The first paragraph defines the author's intellectual position, and affords the key-note of the whole performance, by explaining what a good translation ought to be, and stating what this new translation actually is. The author speaks of *aiming*, it is true, but without the slightest intimation of a fear

that he has missed the mark. "This is not a work of compromises, or of conjectural interpretations of the Sacred Scriptures, neither is it a paraphrase, but a strict literal rendering. It neither adds nor takes away; but aims to express the original with the utmost clearness and force, and with the utmost precision," (p. i.) These are high pretensions—strictness, clearness, force, precision, and the uttermost degree of each—and fully justify the use of the severest tests in ascertaining their validity.

The Preface then proceeds to represent the book as being not a mere "contribution to biblical science," but "a still more important contribution to practical religion." Here again, what is formally described is the "design"; but the tone of the whole passage irresistibly applies the language to the execution. We do not question the sincerity and earnestness with which the author here anticipates a better moral and religious influence from his translation than from all before it.

The Preface then repudiates the common practice of apologizing for such efforts, and defies beforehand all attempts at opposition and resistance, very clearly showing, although in the form of a historical allusion, that the writer is prepared to brave the ordeal of "fire and sword," and even to accept the "crown of martyrdom," though not without a brave hope that his version, like those of Wiclif and Tyndale, shall live to see its persecutors in the dust, and laugh them to scorn. We regret this waste of moral heroism on so slight an occasion. We have not the least belief that Mr. Sawyer will encounter any persecution worse than that of laughter, which may possibly be unjust and malignant, but will only be promoted by these prefatory demonstrations.

After some instructive statements, clearly and concisely given, as to the dates and authors of the older English versions, with an obvious view to the conclusion, that it is high time to provide another, Mr. Sawyer, with unnecessary violence, attacks the supposed prepossession of the public mind in favour of collective and against individual labour. "Councils did not make the Bible at first." . . . . . "A council did not make Paradise Lost, and could not; nor has a council ever produced any immortal work of genius or learning, unless it is the

English Bible of King James." "As individuals, therefore, have been eminently successful . . . . . heretofore, . . . . . let it be hoped that they may be so again." (P. vii.) However just all this may be, we fear that it will only serve to point the weapons of sarcastic warfare against the book thus tacitly, if not expressly, classed with Paradise Lost and the English Bible, as an "immortal work of genius and learning."

Having shown that a new version is required to make available the vast accumulations in biblical learning since King James's times, the Preface notifies the reader, that the text assumed in this translation is the text of Tischendorf, not merely the critical principles and general conclusions of that justly celebrated writer, but all his emendations of the text, with only two exceptions, which are specified (p. ix.) This entire renunciation of all private judgment, and this wholesale adoption of a single critic's labours, without any reference to those of others, and without distinguishing between the clearest and most doubtful cases, even those in which the critic hesitates himself, and varies in his different editions—this is something so unusual in our age of critical scepticism, that we think the author is entitled to a clear recognition of it, in defining his position and determining his literary standing. It is rendered still more striking by the fact that, while he does not think the work of criticism finished, but believes that future writers will make great advances upon Tischendorf himself, he allows no such advances to be now attempted, but practically treats the text of Tischendorf as perfect. "Readers will be able by this to see what is the Bible, and what is not." (P. ix.)

The re-arrangement of the books, announced upon the title-page, and represented in the Preface as a great improvement on the old one, claims to be "chronological." This might be understood as referring to the subjects of the several books; but as the dates of some are given in the Preface (p. x.), and as Paul's epistles are arranged in what is now very commonly regarded as the order of their origin, this would seem to determine the true sense of "chronological," as having reference to the date of composition. And yet the four historical books, though long posterior in date to most of the epistles, are placed first, as in the old arrangement.

Another "great improvement," mentioned both on the title-page and in the Preface (p. ix.), is the new division into chapters and verses. It is well known that the old divisions are entirely without authority, comparatively recent, and of no use, except as mechanical facilities for reference, precisely like the pages of a printed book. In this respect they are invaluable aids; but their value depends, not upon the skill with which they were originally made, but wholly on their long familiarity and general reception. The loss of this advantage would be dearly purchased even by the most artistical or scientific distribution of the matter, such as threw the clearest and most welcome light upon interpretation. Mr. Sawyer's change of the division into chapters seems entirely arbitrary and mechanical, intended for the most part to reduce the number, but in Luke increasing it to thirty-two, retaining some of the most awkward and unskilful of the old divisions, and introducing several still more so.* As to the verses, they are simply thrown together in larger paragraphs. The only practical effect of this "improvement" is to make collation and comparison between the old and new translations, if not utterly impossible, yet so extremely inconvenient as absolutely to prohibit it in practice. An analogous "improvement," in a different department, would be to re-arrange the alphabet in lexicons and dictionaries, so as to separate the consonants and vowels, or on any other pretext purely theoretical, without regard to the only true use of the alphabetical arrangement, namely, the facility of reference.

With a singular conception of his work as a *translator*, Mr. Sawyer undertakes, at the conclusion of his Preface, to settle one of the most vexed questions in what is technically called Introduction, by affirming that St. John was not the author of the Book of Revelation. The gratuitous nature of this dictum, its irrelevance as prefatory to a mere translation, upon which it could not possibly have any bearing, the entire omission of all other kindred questions as to authorship, (for instance in the Gospels, Acts, Epistle to the Hebrews, 2d Peter, 2d and 3d John, James, Jude,) and the one-sided argument adduced, all

* See Acts ix–xi, where the old division is retained, and p. 237, where the beginning of Paul's third foreign mission ends a paragraph and chapter.

make us fear that he has hastily caught up some partial statement of the case and swallowed it, without knowing upon what grounds it has been rejected, even by some of the latest and best German writers, and without suspecting that the very circumstance he mentions, i. e. the use of the name John without additional specification, is regarded by that class of writers as among the strongest proofs of apostolical authority and origin.

With equal coolness, and we must say shallowness, he marks two passages of some length as interpolations, without appearing to suspect that there are two sides to the question, much less that the other has been clearly proved to be the right one.

Having now allowed the author to define his own position, and to characterize his own performance, it remains to consider how far this position is tenable and this estimate correct. These questions we desire to settle, not by general and vague description, but by actual exemplification, shunning at the same time an empirical detail of insulated faults and failures, or appeals to prejudice and fixed association, and endeavouring both to save space and secure completeness, by a classification of the facts which we adduce, and an exhibition of the principles on which the version is constructed.

We begin by stating what some of Mr. Sawyer's critics have entirely ignored, if not explicitly denied, to wit, that on the supposition of a new translation being called for, or regarding this as nothing more than a corrective comment on the authorized version, there are some undeniable improvements, chiefly consisting in the change of ambiguous terms, or such as have entirely lost their ancient meaning, for unequivocal and clear equivalents. Most, if not all of these, have been suggested by preceding writers, and can scarcely be regarded as sheer innovations. Such is the change, in many passages, of *meat* to *food*, *masters* to *teachers*, *doctrine* to *teaching*, *charity* to *love*, *sitting* (at table) to *reclining*, *room* to *place*, *prevent* to *anticipate*, and several others. Sometimes the change rids us of an awkward periphrasis not in the original, as in the substitution of *paralytic* for *sick of the palsy*, *expired*

for *gave up the ghost*, *dysentery* for *bloody flux*. Sometimes a figure, not in the original and in itself objectionable, is expunged, as in the change of *winked at* (Acts xvii. 30) to *overlooked*. Sometimes, but very seldom, the correct sense, as now commonly explained, has been restored, as in the change of *all appearance* to *every form* (*of evil*, 1 Thess. v. 22.) Sometimes, where the meaning is more doubtful, the expression is at least brought nearer to the form of the original, as in the change of *private interpretation* to *own solution* (2 Peter i. 20,) and *the root of all evil* to *a root of all evils* (1 Tim. v. 10.) Sometimes the same thing is effected with respect to the precise form of the syntax or construction, where the sense remains the same, as in the substitution of the participial forms, *the lost* and *the saved*, for the enfeebling relative construction, *them that perish* and *are saved* (1 Cor. i. 18); *the multitude standing and hearing* for *the people that stood by and heard it* (John xii. 29.) Sometimes in addition to the restoration of the Greek construction, a material error is precluded on the part of the unlearned reader, as when *should betray him* is exchanged for *was* (or *was about*) *to betray him* (John vi. 64.) Now and then the improvement has been borrowed from the margin of the English Bible, which is part and parcel of the authorized version, as when the paraphrase, *the law is open*, is exchanged for the translation, *court-days are held* (marg. *kept*, Acts xix. 38.) To these may be added some few cases, one of which has been already cited for another purpose, where the version is improved by the omission or insertion of the article, according to the requisitions of the modern philology. But these cases are outnumbered by a multitude of others, where the same rule is applied empirically and without discrimination, as if an article must always stand in English where it stands in Greek, and *vice versa*, without regard to difference of idiom, which extends to this as well as to the other parts of speech.

While we recognize the merit of these changes, as improvements on the common version, most of which had already been proposed or introduced in exposition, we are bound to add that they are few in number, and that many similar amendments, no less obvious, and at least as necessary, are entirely omitted

in this new translation. It may indeed be stated still more generally, as a characteristic of the author, that he does his work by halves; that even what he seems to recognize as great improvements, he has failed to carry out, except in a few cases, which engross his whole attention, or withdraw it from a multitude of others of precisely the same nature; thus imparting to his version an unfinished and one-sided character, of which its enemies may take advantage, unless corrected in a new edition. To facilitate this process, we shall now exemplify the general description which we have just given, by enumerating some specific cases.

One of the most striking features of this version is the absolute exclusion of some words which have been hitherto considered indispensable in biblical translation, because expressive of ideas inseparable from the Christian system, because no equivalents are furnished by the language, and because the terms before used have been wrought into the very texture of religious phraseology. Among these words are *gospel*, *church*, *repentance*, and *temptation* (with the cognate verbs *repent* and *tempt*.) Some, unacquainted with the author's boldness and decision, will be slow to believe, what is nevertheless literally true, that excepting a few cases where he has forgotten his own rule and inadvertently employed the tabooed forms, and a few more where he has been forced to add the word *church* in brackets as a sort of note or comment, these familiar terms are universally replaced by *good news*, *assembly*, *change of mind*, and *trial*.

That the author should have thought it an advantage *per se* to get rid of these words, and to tear up by the roots their manifold associations, we are neither willing to believe, nor able to imagine, but are bound to take for granted that he felt himself constrained by some inexorable law of language to make this sacrifice, so painful to himself and others. If so, it is easy to perceive that this inexorable law was one requiring words to be translated in accordance with their primary and "proper" meaning, as determined by their etymology or derivation. Thus the lexicons give *change of mind*, *assembly*, *trial*, and *good news*, as the original idea or essential meaning of the Greek words, *μετάνοια*, *ἐκκλησία*, *πειρασμός*, *εὐαγγέλιον*. Mr.

Sawyer, therefore, substitutes this primary import for the conventional translation, with a care and uniformity which show how much importance he attaches to the principle.

But if the principle is sound, if words must always be translated by their primary and etymological equivalents, why is the application of this law to be restricted to the few words above given, and perhaps as many more of less importance? Why are *angel*, *elder*, *deacon*, *disciple*, *synagogue*, *apostle*, *gentiles*, and a multitude of other secondary senses, here retained, to the exclusion of the primary and strict ones, *messenger*, *old man*, *waiter*, *learner*, *meeting*, *missionary*, *nations?* Above all, how can *baptism* and *baptize* be reconciled with this inviolable canon of translation; which requires words to be taken, not in their conventional and customary but their primary and strict sense? Mr. Sawyer's practice as to *gospel*, *church*, &c. is a full concession of the ground on which the Baptists urge a new translation.

But while the principle, if true, must be applied to all these cases, irrespectively or recklessly of consequences, it is proved by the cases themselves to be a false one. If in all the words which have been cited, the New Testament usage is derivative and secondary; if, as a general rule, admitted by all sound philologists, classical terms, applied to Christian subjects, undergo a modification of their meaning to adapt them to their purpose; if such changes are in fact what constitute the Hellenistic dialect, as differing from the Attic, or the *κοινὴ διάλεκτος*; and if no reason can be given for excepting those which Mr. Sawyer has excepted; then we fear that in order to be decently consistent, he must either go a great deal further or go back to the familiar but despised words, *gospel*, *church*, *repentance*, and *temptation*. These are in fact the only single representatives or equivalents of the corresponding Greek words. It is just as certain and as clear as any other fact of lexicography, that *ἐκκλησία*, in the Greek of the New Testament, does not mean an assembly, simply as such, but a body of men called out and called together by divine command for a religious purpose; that *πειρασμός* never denotes trial in the general, but trial of character, especially by giving men the opportunity of doing either right or wrong, and for the most part more specific-

ally still, by direct solicitation or incitement to sin. To render such words by the vague terms *trial* and *assembly*, is as incorrect in kind, though not in degree, as it would be to render *βασιλεύς* a *ruler*, or *θεός* a *spirit*. The case is still worse with the other two words, *gospel* and *repentance;* for the sense attached to them is not the primary and strict one after all. In the classics, *εὐαγγέλιον* never means good news, but a reward for bringing it, and in the Greek of the New Testament, specifically good news of salvation, sent from God to man. According to the best etymological analysis of *μετάνοια*, its primary import is not change of mind, but afterthought, reflection, while in the New Testament it always means specifically change of mind (i. e. both of judgment and feeling) upon moral subjects, with particular reference to one's own conduct. To translate terms thus used *change of mind* and *good news* is as incorrect as it would be to exchange *prayer* and *sacrifice* for *wish* and *slaughter*. With respect to this whole notion of insisting on the primary or "proper" sense of words, without regard to their conventional or actual usage, we shall only quote (from memory) what Sydney Smith said of the Quakers' objection to the names of the days of the week, as heathen in their origin, that if we go so far back, we must take *sincere* as a synonyme of *unwaxed*, and *consider* as meaning to *put stars together*.

Another instance of one-sided inconsistency in urging some things and neglecting others of the same kind, is the constant use of the uncouth form *Nazorœan*, as an epithet of *Jesus*. What we object to here is not the restoration of the adjective or gentile form instead of that used in the common version (*Jesus of Nazareth*.) Such a change is desirable, at least in exposition, on account of the prophecy in Matt. ii. 23, *He shall be called a Nazarene*. But why must this familiar and endeared form be exchanged for *Nazorœan?* On the principle, that every proper name must be exactly reproduced as it is written in Greek letters? Even granting that the form *Ναζωραῖος* is the true text, has it any more claim to be thus carefully preserved than *Jesus*, *Elias*, *Eliseus*, *Osee*, *Cis*, which Mr. Sawyer has, with great alacrity and wisdom, written *Joshua*, *Elijah*, *Elisha*, *Hosea*, *Kish?* These are not even Hebrew forms, but English ones, familiar to the English

reader, although far less dear to him than *Nazarene*. After swallowing these camels of orthography, it does seem pharisaical to strain out or to strain at such a gnat as *Nazorœan*.

Another instance of this disproportionate attention to a single class of objects, while a multitude of others, not unlike them, are neglected, is afforded by the zeal and assiduity with which Mr. Sawyer explains ancient measures, weights, and coins, by printing within brackets what he takes to be their modern equivalents. It might be asked on what consistent principle these comments have been introduced at all into a simple version, and why either one or the other equivalent was not suppressed, as in the rest of the translation. But apart from this general objection to such glosses, as belonging rather to interpretation, it may still be asked what special value or importance can belong to these particular specifications, rendering it necessary to define them with elaborate precision, not omitting fractions. Even granting that the values are correctly given, which is doubtful, as the best authorities often vary as to such details, why is the reader any more interested to know how many mills would make an ancient penny, or how many pecks would make an ancient bushel, than to know a hundred other things left unexplained? The information thus imparted is by no means always necessary to the just interpretation of the passage. For example, when our Lord says that a candle is not lighted to be put under a bushel or a bed, why are the precise dimensions of the bushel any more important to the sense than the dimensions of the bed, since both are used for the same purpose, and that a purpose not at all connected with their size? In fact, the *modius* is mentioned not as a measure at all, but as a vessel or utensil, which might have been exchanged for *box* or *basket*, without any variation in the sense.

But even granting that such comments are legitimate and needed, why restrict them to this single class of words? On what intelligible principle are *metretes* and *denarii* and *stadiums* to be left in the text of the translation, with a bracketed gloss annexed, while *synagogue*, and *proselyte*, and *cohort*, and *centurion*, and *legion*, are left unexplained, and *prefect*, *lictor*, *procurator*, *proconsul*, *athlete*, *Sanhedrim*, *Tartarus*, and

*Hades*, are introduced for the first time without a word of explanation? It is plain that consistency requires one of these two courses; either that the same mode of explanation should be equally extended to all Greek and Latin words retained in the translation, or that those denoting coins and measures should be treated like the rest, and left to find their definition in the lexicons or expositions. The truth is, that these matters are determined by a sort of fashion, and that Mr. Sawyer, with all his independence and decision, has been led into these inconsistencies by imitating others. We are glad that he has not gone the whole length of his models, or he might have revived the inextinguishable laughter raised by Campbell in his Dissertations on the Gospels, at the expense of the unhappy Frenchman, who reduced the five and ten pounds of our Lord's instructive parable, where all depends upon proportion, not upon intrinsic value, to the fractional equivalents of French or English currency. Such cases are instructive as disclosing the false principle involved in others not so palpably absurd, or even plausibly defensible upon some utilitarian pretext.

We have hitherto left out of view one most essential feature of this version, upon which its claims as a competitor or rival of King James's Bible must materially rest. We mean the English into which it is translated. Mr. Sawyer may not be aware, but we must venture to inform him or remind him, that the English of the present day is not a single, narrow, straight canal, nor even a broad river with a single channel, but a mighty flood with many affluents and branches, overspreading a large portion of the earth, and wherever it flows, presenting some peculiarities of course or surface. Here the stream has brought down more, there less, of the old drift-wood; here it is coloured more than yonder by the soil through which it percolates, or by the scenery which overhangs it. Or to drop the metaphor, though just and natural, the dialects of English, as now spoken, even by the educated classes, differ greatly in their measure of adherence to old usage, both in lexicography and grammar. Forms are still used in New England which are elsewhere obsolete; the same is true of Virginia and Jamaica, Scotland and Ireland, and of different places, classes, and conditions in England itself. The further we depart from

the cradle of the language, the more we find a tendency to drop what still remains in use there, whether absolutely or in exchange for new and local forms. This process, naturally tending to impoverish the language, may be checked and counteracted by a common literature, and especially by cherishing the old part of the language, not attempting to accelerate, but rather to retard that process of mutation which is really essential to the life of every spoken tongue, but which will always travel fast enough, without the use of artificial means to quicken it. It will therefore be found, in every civilized nation, and especially in every English-speaking country, that while common parlance and the usage of the newspaper press are constantly producing innovations, some gratuitous and others unavoidable, the influence of scholars and of cultivated tastes is to withstand this process, so as to retard but not entirely to prevent it. This conservative tendency is powerfully aided by the continued circulation of old English books among us, by the more or less extended use of Shakspeare, Milton, Addison, the English Prayer Book, and the English Bible. These exhaustless wells of English undefiled are constantly neutralizing and diluting the new waters, fresh and bilge, flowing in from other sources.

It is natural enough for those who know all this to be a little jealous of proposed improvements, and especially when any of these ancient safeguards is attacked in this way, to inquire who it is that is attempting it, by what attainments or experience he is qualified for such a task, and by what means he undertakes to do it. Should such a reformer, in reply to these inquiries, say he knows or cares nothing about old English, that to him the language is identical with what he learnt at school and has since read in the papers, without any reference to what is used in England, India, or Australia, or to what was used a hundred years ago; the answer would be perfectly decisive, if not wholly satisfactory.

But from this ideal case we turn to that before us and endeavour to describe, as fairly as we can, the dialect in which this version is composed. And first, we may premise that there is nothing to imply unusual familiarity with English classics, old or new, nor any of that *curiosa felicitas* and *copia verborum*,

which commonly bear witness to the love and study of the best models. In addition to the meagreness arising from the absence of such culture, there is what may be called a voluntary poverty, like that of the monastic orders, a deliberate attempt to cut off all variety of forms, all choice between alternative expressions, and a settled resolution to say every thing according to the stereotyped formula of some provincial school or circle. Thus the English verb, but poor at best in temporal and modal forms, is here reduced to its most beggarly condition, stripped of its subjunctive mood and forced to be exclusively indicative or jussive, even when the sense to be expressed is a contingent one. *If it be, if it were,* which every gentleman in England, and a multitude in these United States, still use for the expression of a shade of meaning different from *if it is* and *if it was,* are here confounded with them and rejected as superfluous. This single instance may illustrate a whole class of such grammatical excisions, all resulting in a paucity of forms and a rigidity of sameness. How "thoroughly modern" this translation is in point of English Grammar, may be gathered from the constant use of *eat* as an imperfect, and the occurrence of such forms as *have drank* (p. 416,) *preach you* (p. 265,) and to *have go* (p. 231.)

As we must deal in examples, and yet cannot cite more than a few, we choose such as represent the greatest number of particular cases, or in other words, such as are most frequently repeated. One of these, which stares the reader in the face on almost every page, and which illustrates more than one point of the author's English, is the merciless proscription of the plural *brethren*, and the constant substitution of what grammarians call the "regular" form, *brothers.* We have noticed only one place where the former has been suffered to remain, but whether inadvertently, or on some secret ground of lawfulness in that one case, we dare not even guess. Now why is this change made? Not because the one form is more "regular"; for surely Mr. Sawyer would not, if he could, say *oxes, childs,* and *mans,* instead of *oxen, children, men,* though this is the unquestionable tendency of much that is esteemed grammatical correctness among modern pedagogues. Is it because *brethren* is not fully understood by every child and slave who

speaks the English language? The Bible itself has nullified this reason, and the same end is promoted by the use of the term, not only in religious but in social and political parlance. The only ground for the exclusion then is that the other form is younger, having come into common circulation since the Bible was translated. But this would only be a reason for preferring it, in case the other had gone out of use, or ceased to be intelligible; whereas both have continued side by side, the younger denoting the mere natural relation, while the older comprehends a variety of others, all included in the usage of the Greek *ἀδελφοί*, to which *brothers*, therefore, is not an equivalent. This is one out of a multitude of cases, in which overstrained precision aggravates the evil which it seeks to remedy. But over and above this reason for retaining the old word, as in many cases necessary to a strict translation, it deserves to be retained for the very reason that it is old, and has never lost its place in current English, and is just as clearly understood as *brothers*, from Valentia to Victoria, from Calcutta to Chicago. What a dialect must that be, in which *brethren* is as strange a word as *church* or *gospel!*

Another sample of the same impoverishing process, and the same provincial narrowness of usage, though unworthy of attention but for its perpetual occurrence, is the constant substitution of the pronoun *you* for *thou* and *thee* and *ye*, thus happily reducing, at a single stroke, four distinct and most familiar forms to one. It might be plausibly alleged, that this monotony ought rather to be shunned than sought; that the use of one form in so many senses is as contrary to good taste as to sound philosophy; that the change in general colloquial usage is itself a reason for maintaining the old forms in books; that their continued use among the Quakers, and in many parts of Britain, renders this still more allowable. But no, our author is inflexible. He finds one form for both the cases and both numbers of the second person to be quite enough for him and his, and he resolves that others shall have no more, either in talking or in reading the Bible. The consistency of all this is presented in a bright light by the one exception, that of prayer to God. And why is this excepted? Simply because modern English practice happens to retain it, without any valid reason,

and in opposition to the foreign papal usage, which, with some show of reason, uses the more courteous form in prayer as well as in polite conversation. Thus the tendency is still to lop off and to tear away the few remaining boughs of the old English tree, yet clinging to King James's Bible, and to make the language just as bare and lifeless as a maypole or an awning-post.

There is one prevailing weakness, as to English words, from which our author seems entirely free, the rage for Saxon vocables, to the exclusion of all French and Latin forms, as if the former by themselves would make a language worth preserving. Mr. Sawyer, far from giving into this extravagance, most evidently verges towards the opposite extreme, and always gives the preference to what is not of Saxon birth, whenever he can choose between them. To this happy prejudice we owe the introduction of such fine sonorous forms as *subjugate*, *excavate*, *circulate*, *criminate*, *extinguish*, *aliments*, *insipid*, *argument*, *precipitate*, *compensate*, *athlete*, *cauterize*, *crystallize*, *archetype*, *perceptive*, *libation*, and some others, which have too long been excluded from the English Bible. Hence the happy substitution of *collect* for *gather*, *conceal* for *hide*, *product* for *fruit*, *select* for *choose*, *exterior* for *outer*, *mortal* for *deadly*, *injure* for *hurt*, *pure* and *impure* for *clean* and *unclean*, even in speaking of corporeal washing; and of *eternal* for *everlasting*, even where the reference is only to the future. Another symptom of the author's taste is the increased number of original Greek forms retained in the translation, and to be henceforth reckoned as good English. Besides certain names of coins and measures, which have been already mentioned as accompanied by explanations, we have also, without note or comment, such euphonious forms as *athlete*, *myth*, *iris*, *chiliarch*, *hades*, *tartarus*, &c., to which may be added, drawn from oriental sources, the Hebrew *sanhedrim* and the Persian *khan*, the last as a more popular and modern synonyme of the obscure old English *inn*. Sometimes, instead of retaining the original, the translation is enriched by a supposed equivalent in Latin, such as *lictor*, *procurator*, *proconsul*, *cranium*, all which, except the last, are pure gain to the Greek text as well as to the English Bible; or by a mongrel combination of the Latin prefix *co-* (so much more modern and expressive than *fellow*)

with a Greek or English word, as in *co-laborer*, *co-presbyter*, and *co-elect*. Sometimes the improvement is in Natural History as well as English, for example in the change of *brimstone* to *sulphur*, *husks* to *carob-pods*, and *tares* to *poisonous darnel*.

Too much credit cannot be awarded to the author for his strenuous exertions to distinguish things that differ, where the difference is so important as to make it worth the trouble. We have seen that the distinction between *thou* and *thee*, *ye* and *you*, is not considered worth preserving, even in such a case as Luke xxii. 31, 32, where the line is drawn so clearly, by the use of the singular and plural pronouns, between Peter and his brethren (*O sit venia verbo!*) We have seen that *everlasting* and *eternal* are confounded as convertible expressions. But when we come to the distinction between *baskets*, there is no such indiscrimination practised. As the words used in the two creative miracles of feeding the multitudes are not the same, and as that by which Paul was let down from the wall of Damascus, is called in 2 Corinthians by a third name, the author could not conscientiously confound them, and accordingly translates them, *travelling-basket*, *store-basket*, *rope-basket*. Without stopping to dispute the truth of these distinctions, it may still be questioned whether it would not have been a more exact translation of three single words entirely unlike, to use as many corresponding forms in English, such as *hamper*, *crate* or *hurdle*, unless these are all extinct in "modern style," than to let the English reader think that a word meaning *basket* is employed in all three cases, with a qualifying epithet prefixed to each. Another nice distinction is between the words ἀγαπάω and φιλέω, both translated *love* in the common version of John xxi. 15—17. To mark this, which the author seems to think important, he translates the second verb, *I am a friend* (*to you*.) This singular precision as to love and baskets, makes it more unfortunate that in that famous pair of verbs (γινώσκω and ἐπίσταμαι) which no interpreter has ever thoroughly explained, the author gives it up, and modestly transcribes the common version, *Jesus I know and Paul I know* (Acts xix. 15.) Other words where he has failed to show the same discriminating gift as in the baskets, are the twenty verbs translated *show* in our Bible, the fifteen rendered *bring*

*forth*, the eleven answering to *consider*, the one-and-twenty to *depart*, and the same number to *take*. We do not mean to say that Mr. Sawyer has retained all these, for we have not examined; but we do make bold to say that he has not found as many corresponding terms for these important words as for those denoting baskets.

Besides the changes which appear to have resulted from the preference of Greek and Latin forms to those of Saxon origin, we now proceed to specify a few which can only be ascribed to the author's taste for "a thoroughly modern style" (Preface, p. 1), even where the sense is not materially affected. Under this head we may place such forms as *fishermen* (for *fishers*) *of men*, *whitewashed tombs* (for *whited sepulchres*), *private rooms* (for *secret chambers*), *picking heads* (for *plucking ears*), *pasturage* (for *pasture*), *precipice* (for *steep bank*), *girl* (for *damsel*), *perform* (for *do*), *do no business* (for *have no dealings*), *on my account* (for *for my sake*), *good courage* (for *good cheer*), *avarice* (for *covetousness*), *servitude* (for *bondage*), *pious* and *piety* (for *godly* and *godliness*), *died for nothing* (for *died in vain*), *anger* (for *wrath*), *speaks still* (for *yet speaketh*), *leads off as prey* (for *carries captive*), *chief guide and perfecter* (for *author and finisher*). It would be so easy to extend this process on the same rule, or rather without any, that we know not whether to regret that it has gone so far, or to wish that it may go still further.

In this conversion of an antique into a "thoroughly modern style," it would have been surprising if he had not sometimes hit the wrong nail on the head, and changed the sense as well as the expression. Thus *brokers*, *goods*, *custom-house*, and *sailing-master*, are all thoroughly modern terms, but unfortunately not expressive of the things intended. The construction, too, is sometimes missed, as in the question of the magi, *Where is the King of the Jews born?* and in many other cases, which we have noted but need not specify, where the sense is either wrongly or inadequately given.

When we open a new version of such high pretensions and containing multitudes of changes which we are obliged to take upon the author's credit, it is natural to turn up some of the hard places, where the common version has been long

regarded as defective, in the hope of finding some desirable improvement. In pursuing this course we have found with some surprise that several of these places, and among the most important, stand unaltered, without any means of ascertaining whether they were simply overlooked, or whether we are now to look upon the old translation as the right one after all. As samples of this class we name the well known case in Matt. xxviii. 14, where the best interpreters are now agreed, that both the form and the connection peremptorily require a reference to judicial hearing in the presence of the governor, and not an accidental rumour. The new version changes the expression, but retains the sense (*if this is heard of by the procurator.*) Another is the famous phrase, *I see men, as trees walking* (Mark viii. 24), where the old ambiguity, to say the least, is still retained, and English readers left to construe *walking* not with *men* but *trees*, which is impossible in Greek. A third case is the old mistake of *cloven tongues* (Acts ii. 3), here simply changed into *divided*, whereas usage peremptorily requires *distributed* (among them.) The inexact translation, *save yourselves*, instead of *be saved*, is retained in Peter's pentecostal sermon (Acts ii. 40), in the midst of many less important changes. The paraphrastic version, *put to death* (Acts xii. 19), remains unaltered, though the literal translation (*led away*) sufficiently suggests what followed. The retention of the old phrase, *should be kept* (Acts xxv. 4), is more remarkable because it not only disturbs the sense but is also a subjunctive form, not found in the original. The only other case which we shall mention is the strongest, that of *live* in Acts xxiii. 1, where the whole sense is affected by this strangely inadequate translation of a Greek verb which can only mean to be a citizen or act as one.

It was not to be expected that the author, in adopting a "thoroughly modern style," would be able to succeed at once in purging out the old leaven of antique expression from the text of Scripture. This can only be effected in a series of editions, such as those which formed and settled the Greek text in the sixteenth and succeeding centuries. In aid of this important work, we venture to suggest the following words and phrases as scarcely falling under the description of "thoroughly

modern." *Ship* of old was equivalent to *vessel*, but is now restricted to a certain class. The word *boat* has been substituted sometimes but not always. *Fishes* is not the modern plural of *fish*, which serves both turns, as *you* does four. *Watch* is not modern in its primary sense of *wake*, but only in its secondary sense of *guard*. *Bottles* is not the modern name of skins for holding liquids, the material having now become no less essential than the use. *Legion* is not a modern military term, and ought to have been either changed or explained in brackets. *Platter* may be modern in some places, but is not so in all dialects. *Draught of fishes*, to be modern in the sense of this book, should be *haul of fish*, and *herd of many swine* should be a *large drove of hogs*. *Whomsoever* (for *whoever*), *lightly* (in the sense of easily or readily), *besought* (for *begged*), *espoused* (for *married* or *engaged*), *behold* (for *see*, or *look here*), *blessed* (for *happy*, fortunate, or lucky), *harlot* (for *prostitute*), *husbandman* (for *farmer*), *householder* (for *housekeeper*, *landlord*, or the like), *mansions* (for *residences*, homes, or dwellings), *lord* (for *master*, as opposed to *servant*), *bonds* (for *imprisonment*), *nourished* (for *supported*), *oracles* (for *words* or *revelations*), are all more or less infected with the vice of being old expressions. The same thing may be said of certain phrases, such as *bill of divorcement*, *children of the bridechamber*, *take counsel*, *set at nought*, *use it rather*, *reasonable service*, *blackness of darkness*, *come short*, *in a figure* (ἐν αἰνίγματι); and of certain collocations and inversions, such as, *neither tell I you—I go to try them—when came you hither—whence he is—him he hears—will one die—begat he us —seal not up*—and *all heard I*. Not one of these properly belongs to the "thoroughly modern style," in which this version is composed, and into which all this must be translated, if the work is to have any consistent uniformity of diction.

Among the old forms thus retained, we have observed a few, which do not seem to have been clearly understood, or perhaps are retained in a modern sense, distinct from that belonging to them in the common version. Such are the words *offend*, *offence*, which Mr. Sawyer seems to understand as meaning *displease*, *displeasure*, as he sometimes changes *in* or *at* to

*with*. We need not say that in Old English, as in Latin, these words have a far more comprehensive meaning. Another such word is the verb to *reason*, which has very sensibly modified its usage. *Injurious* now means hurtful, but of old retained more of its moral sense, implying violation of right. *Inform* is several times used in the old legal sense of accusation, whereas now it would convey the bare idea of communicating knowledge. *Ought*, the imperfect tense of *owe*, is not a mere auxiliary form, but a distinct verb, and requires to be otherwise expressed in modern English. *Ought not Christ to suffer these things?* means far more than *was it not his duty?* which is all that the translation now conveys to English readers. The retention of these old forms, which have changed their meaning, in the work before us, makes us apprehensive that the author has not constantly "translated from the Greek," but sometimes made his labour easy by attempting to improve the common version.

There is one class of changes which we must not pass unnoticed, as the author seems to have bestowed considerable care upon it, and no doubt attaches much importance to it. We refer to the euphemistic changes, or removal of indelicate expressions, which is always a severe test of the writer's taste, and serves to show whether he is really refined or only nice, according to Swift's famous definition. From the nature of the subject, we can only give a few of the substituted phrases, with a reference to the places where they are inserted. *To the earth* (Matt. xv. 17.)—*Put on manure* (Luke xiii. 8.)—*Became pregnant* (Luke i. 24.)—*Became a mother* (Heb. xi. 11.)—*Gave it birth* (Rev. xii. 2.)—*Gave me being* (Gal. i. 15.)—*Obtained him in my bonds* (Phil. 10.)—*Become an unborn infant of his mother* (John iii. 4.)—*Of foreign birth* (Heb. xii. 8.)—*Marriage life without blame* (Heb. xiii. 4.) We must confess that most of these corrections seem to us entirely gratuitous, and all of them unskilfully performed, especially the last but one, where *foreign birth*, as used in modern English, gives a sense wholly different from that of the Greek νόθοι, the equivalent of which is *spurious* (illegitimate), not *foreign* (or outlandish.)

Whatever be the value of the foregoing strictures, every reader will perceive that they are not the fruit of casual or cursory inspection, but of thorough and deliberate examination. All the examples cited, and a multitude of others necessarily omitted, have been noted in the course of a continuous perusal, and then carefully digested under heads, as we have here presented them. By this laborious induction of particulars, we have endeavoured to avoid a superficial and empirical mode of treatment, and to put it in the power of our readers, who are not themselves acquainted with the book before us, to sit in judgment on the truth or falsehood of a few summary conclusions, which we now feel justified in drawing, for the sake of recapitulation and conclusion, not from abstract premises, but from the very data which we have already furnished and could easily increase fourfold.

1. The first of these conclusions is, that this translation does embody a few obvious corrections and improvements, which have long been floating on the surface of our exegetical literature, consisting partly in the dropping of ambiguous or wholly unintelligible terms, and partly in a simplification of the syntax by a nearer approach to the original construction.

2. In making these legitimate corrections the translator often changes both the sense and the construction for the worse; while on the other hand defects and imperfections, no less obvious and commonly admitted than the few which have been rectified, are left entirely untouched, either through ignorance or inadvertence.

3. In many cases, where there seems to be no effort to improve the sense, the form is gratuitously marred, by the exchange of words still perfectly familiar and intelligible, either for pedantic and exotic synonymes, or for equivalents no more expressive or exact, and generally less so.

4. This arbitrary process has been pushed so far as to exclude from the translation some of the most precious and familiar terms of our religious phraseology, their places being filled by vague and inexact equivalents, and sometimes by diluted paraphrase, the whole proceeding on a false principle of lexicography and a factitious canon of translation.

5. The English dialect adopted in this version is a hard and meagre one, rejecting all variety of forms in lexicography and grammar, and excluding, as obsolete or incorrect, expressions still entirely current and familiar in the best usage both of England and America, thus assuming as the standard of the language what appears to be by no means the most eligible even of its local or provincial variations.

6. Even in carrying out the doubtful or erroneous principles already mentioned, there is no consistent uniformity, the process being pushed to an extreme in one case, or one class of cases, while in others wholly undistinguishable from them, it is either not applied at all or so imperfectly, that what is changed and what is left produce the painful and incongruous impression of an old but still sound garment gratuitously patched with undressed cloth of the crudest quality and coarsest texture. This is the secret of the shock which every cultivated reader feels on opening the book, it scarcely matters where; a shock which could not be produced by simple innovation, how extravagant soever, but which really arises from the motley piebald mixture of incongruous materials, constraining every one not "thoroughly modern" in his taste and education to cry out, in a paroxysm of æsthetic nausea, "the old is better!"

7. The impression irresistibly produced upon the mind of the unbiassed reader, in relation to the author, is extremely favourable to his honesty and courage; to his honesty, in thinking that a great and glorious work is to be done, and that he not only is raised up to do it, but has actually done it; to his courage, in deliberately setting at defiance the religious prepossessions and associations of at least two centuries and many millions; the taste of the whole English-speaking race insensibly matured and chastened by a matchless literature, secular and sacred; and, to a great extent, the actual colloquial usage of the two most enlightened and instructed nations in existence.

8. It is scarcely requisite to add, that this translation is not likely soon to supersede the English Bible; that even if its merits were as great as Mr. Jewett represents, the power of old prejudice and fixed association would be still too strong for it.

However wrong and foolish it may be, the very errors of the old translation will prove more attractive to this evil generation, and to many after it, than Mr. Sawyer's most superb improvements; so that "fire and sword" would be as powerless in forcing this new version down the throats of a regorging public, as in quelling his own manful resolution so to force it.

9. We regret to be obliged to say that, even as a modest contribution to the great work of revising and correcting the old version, Mr. Sawyer's book has no extraordinary value. This is only a corollary from the facts already stated, that he leaves untouched some of the places most in need of retractation, and that a vast proportion of the changes which he does make are either without use or for the worse, in point of taste, exactness, or correct interpretation.

10. This being the case, the interesting question, as to the retention or revision of King James's Bible, stands precisely where it did before the sudden apparition of "the greatest work of this age or of any age since King James, 1610." And as this great question must continue to increase in interest and importance for all English-speaking Christians, they will naturally look to other quarters for the hope and means of its solution. Their attention will especially be turned to the accomplished scholars of Old England, equally familiar with the ancient and the modern, with the classical and biblical authorities, a class represented by the present Dean of Westminster, nearly all whose corrections and improvements Mr. Sawyer claims to have anticipated (Preface, p. ix), but of whom we may take an early opportunity to show, that unlike his American competitor, and like a scribe discipled into the kingdom of heaven, he brings out of his treasure things both new and old.

ART. IV.—*The Position of Hosea in the Scheme of Divine Revelation.*

Der Prophet Hosea erklärt und übersetzt von Dr. AUGUST SIMSON, u. s. w. 8vo. pp. 352.

THE Old Testament consists of thirty-nine distinct but not unrelated books. It is not an aggregate of treatises having no other bond of union than that they chance to be bound together in the same volume, or have proceeded from the midst of the same people, or contain an exposition of the same system of religion. Nor is the whole truth exhausted by saying that they are all alike inspired. They contain the record of a divine scheme of training, under which Israel was placed with reference to the future Messiah and the dispensation which he was to introduce. The unity and consistent progress of this scheme involve the unity of the Old Testament and the intimate relation of all its parts, which thus conspire together to one predetermined end. This being so, to be studied aright this portion of the sacred volume should be treated as one harmonious whole, and the endeavour made to understand its various parts, not in themselves alone, but in their relation to the rest, and the place which they severally occupy in the general plan. As God is the wisest of teachers, we may derive instruction from his methods, as well as from his lessons; and it behoves us to give heed at once to the truth and to the fitness of his teachings, both as respects the general design and each particular emergency.

The structure of the Old Testament in its main divisions is obvious and simple. The books of Moses, which form its earliest portion, and lie at the foundation of the whole, record the constitution which God gave to Israel as his chosen people, and under which they were to be kept in pupilage until the times of the Messiah. The historical books exhibit this constitution in actual operation, and show the conduct of the people under it, and the leadings of God's providence with respect to them and it. The poetical books reveal the divinely guided struggles of the pious as they strive to realize the perfection of the law in

themselves, or to understand the consistency of its teachings with the ordinary experience of the world. The books of the prophets recall the transgressing people to the law by re-enacting its precepts and solemn sanctions, and by a growing fulness in their exposition of the goal to which all was tending.

Prophets had been raised up amongst the chosen people from time to time, from their first settlement in Canaan. But it was not until the reigns of Uzziah of Judah, and the second Jeroboam of Israel, that the conjuncture arrived in both kingdoms which called for the permanent recording of prophecy. The kingdom of the ten tribes was then upon the eve of its rejection and downfall. The mighty ministries of Elijah and Elisha had been tried upon them, but had failed to turn the mass of the people or their rulers back to God. The partial reformation of Jehu had never advanced beyond the abolition of Baal-worship. The idolatrous service of the calves and the schismatical separation from the temple at Jerusalem still continued, and the moral corruption consequent upon religious apostasy made the people an abomination. The instrument of their destruction was already preparing, and that generation would see its accomplishment. The last king of vigorous and successful sway was on the throne; from that time onward the history of Israel presents a constant succession of regicides, usurpations, anarchies, and civil wars, until the Lord in anger cast them out from his presence. But before such an extraordinary step was taken as the excision of ten-twelfths of the chosen people, it was important for the justification of the ways of God, the warning of future transgressors, and the consolation and information of the truly pious, that the grounds of it should be clearly stated, and left in a permanent form. Consequently the prophets, who were commissioned to make the last unsuccessful effort for their reformation, were instructed to make it appear both to their hearers and to all future ages, that they suffered as they did, not from the inability of their covenant God to protect them, for he had repeatedly warned them of this, and himself brought it upon them; and that he was not herein unfaithful to his promises made of old to their fathers,

for Israel was dealt with justly, and those promises should after all be fulfilled.

At the same time that crisis occurred in the affairs of Judah, which led to a new form of prophetic labour, and to the reduction of prophecies to writing in that kingdom likewise. Judah was not utterly apostate, and was not to suffer total rejection; but she was entering upon a new and important stage of her history, the meaning of which needed to be explained to herself and others. A recent writer has suggested that the history of the chosen people may be regarded as successively typical of the three offices of the Redeemer. As organized under the Levitical law given in the wilderness, they appear in their sacerdotal character, containing in the midst of them the atoning sacrifice and the interceding priest. They had not yet attained their ultimate form of civil organization. This was reached under David, when they became a kingdom with a line of princes upon the throne, to whom perpetual sovereignty was promised. When in later years the glory of the kingdom waned, the prophetic character of the people stood more distinctly forth in the new prominence of the prophetic order, and in the nation being itself made the teacher of the world, and spreading abroad the knowledge of the Messiah's mission and character as had never been done before. By others the history of the chosen people has been regarded as typical of the two states of Christ in an inverted order: the glory of the kingdom under David and Solomon setting forth his state of exaltation, its subsequent depression his state of humiliation, which was nevertheless in the case of the type as well as of the antitype, a passage-way to new splendour and elevation.

It is with this last period, which according to these views presents Judah in her prophetic character, or in her humiliation, that we are now concerned. The sins of the people were such that they needed severe judgments to purify them, and bring them back to God, and keep them from turning aside completely from the fulfilment of their high destiny. This work of judgment was to proceed even to the extent of dispersing them widely among the nations, thus scattering everywhere the seed of the divine word, and preparing auditors in every land for the gospel when it should come to be preached in its fulness. The

hostility of the surrounding heathen was made the instrument of effecting these ends; especially the great Asiatic empire, which bearing essentially the same character, and embracing the same territory, changing only its centre and seat, was successively known as the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian, and subsequently fell under the Greek and Roman dominion. This was to be the rod of Judah's chastisement, and the instrument of their dispersion. It was besides to accomplish the work among the heathen themselves of breaking up their separate nationalities, and reducing them to one homogeneous mass, governed by the same laws, and amenable to a common authority, over which, when the proper time had arrived, the gospel might spread without encountering the obstructions which the existence of petty and independent States would everywhere have interposed.

Upon the threshold of these grand movements in Judah and in the heathen world, the prophets were commissioned to unfold their design and the duties which they involved, for the instruction and comfort of their contemporaries and of succeeding generations. Unexplained they would have presented a most perplexing and distressing problem, fraught with temptation, on the one hand to unbelief, on the other to despondency. The people of God were to be depressed while the heathen triumphed over them, even to the destruction of their State, the overthrow of the city where God had recorded his name, the burning of his temple, and the exile of the people from the land which he had given them. This would give occasion to the unbeliever to say that the gods of the heathen were mightier than the God of Judah: it would suggest to the heart of the believer the desponding conclusion that God had cast off his transgressing people, and that his covenant with their fathers was annulled. The prophets give the solution of this anomalous condition of affairs. They show the people that what they were enduring was both just and necessary. This humiliation and suffering was needed to purge them from sin; it was by this means they were to accomplish the task, assigned them in preparation for Messiah's coming, of making his mission known among the nations: it would, when its ends were answered, lead to the glory, which belonged to the true people of the

living God, the certainty and character of which were now set forth with new and increasing clearness. On the other hand the exaltation of heathen nations, and especially of that great power which then oppressed the people of God, was provisional and temporary. God's instrument to chastise Judah and to subject the nations, they should be cast down when their work was done, and "the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven be given to the people of the saints of the Most High."

Quite distinct ministries were thus demanded from the prophets of the two kingdoms, conditioned by the circumstances in which, as we have seen, they were respectively called to act. The books of the prophets, whose general intent and aim has already been stated, naturally divide themselves accordingly into the prophets of the kingdom of Israel, and those of the kingdom of Judah, each having a function to perform in the economy of the volume of revelation peculiar to themselves. If again we proceed to examine the history of Judah from the beginning of written prophecy to its close, we shall find it governed by three great crises which bound its successive periods. The first is the Assyrian invasion under Sennacherib in the middle of the reign of Hezekiah; this power having overthrown the kingdom of the ten tribes, threatened destruction to Judah, but was miraculously defeated. The second is the Babylonish invasion under Nebuchadnezzar, which not only threatened but actually destroyed Jerusalem and the Jewish state, and carried the people into exile. The third is the decree of Cyrus permitting the exiles to return to their own land. These great providential events with their causes and results may be said to govern the prophetic themes, each in their proper period. They determine the circumstances and spiritual necessities of the people, or supply the most impressive and needed lessons. The inspired instruction which is given gathers about them, or takes its rise from them, and to whatever expansion, elevation, or far-sighted penetration it may attain, still borrows from them its form and its direction. Conformably to these hints the prophets of Judah are readily divisible into four classes. The first comprises those who uttered their prophecies before the Assyrian invasion, or immediately subsequent to it, and while this was still the most prominent subject

before the people; the second those who prophesied before Nebuchadnezzar's conquest, or immediately after, as long as prophetic labours continued among the wretched remnant of Judah; the third those who were in exile; and fourth, all after the edict of restoration to the cessation of the spirit of prophecy.

Each of these classes of prophets will be found to have characteristics which are peculiar to themselves and distinguish them from others, growing out of the circumstances of the period and the condition of things in which they prophesy. Each age had its special wants; and the inspired communications were adapted to those wants. And not only were the amount and character of the prophetic revelations of each period thus determined by the general plan of God, and the particular junctures of his providence, but special functions were assigned likewise to each individual prophet within his own period. One was commissioned to meet the existing spiritual necessities of the people upon one side, another upon another. They thus mutually complete each other, and it is by the combination of the whole that their appointed task is fully accomplished.

The utterances of the prophets accordingly exhibit neither a dull uniformity nor a disordered confusion. There is a reason why they are what they are, and are made when they are; why, for example, the revelations of Isaiah were granted to him rather than to Amos, and why neither saw what was disclosed to Daniel. There is a divine mechanism here; a skilful disposition of parts, and a close concatenation, such that all is made to fit harmoniously together, and to tally precisely with the concurrent developments of Providence, thus plainly showing, behind the human agents and above them, an all-embracing Intelligence, directing the whole agreeably to one preconceived, consistent, and admirable scheme; and the more this is studied, the more wonderful it will be found to be. And hence may be derived a fresh check to the unwarrantable procedures and conclusions of such unbelieving critics, as setting aside the well attested evidence of the genuineness of the books of the prophets, have, from newly invented criteria of their own, ascribed them to different periods from those to which they really belong.

Every alteration is a derangement. It is like taking out a wheel at random from a complicated machine, or altering the position or proportions of a limb or member in a finely modelled statue: the result can only be confusion and deformity. A right conception of the whole will of itself justify the proportions and adjustments of the several parts. And in like manner when the genuineness of paragraphs or sections in particular books is denied, the completeness and symmetry of an individual ministry is oftentimes defaced thereby. The writings of the prophets are not random and fragmentary compilations of stray discourses casually brought together. There is a method in them, even when they contain the record of the longest ministry, which verifies their unity, and forbids the mutilation of their various parts.

It is not our design at present to evince the truth of these remarks in regard to the prophets generally, but simply to make a few suggestions touching the position of Hosea in the scheme of prophetic communication. This will require us to glance at the mission of the period to which he belongs, the function assigned to himself in particular, and the plan or arrangement of the book which bears his name.

Eight prophets, one-half of the whole number, belong to the first prophetic period, embracing the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah of Judah, and extending from the reign of the second Jeroboam of Israel to the destruction of the kingdom. Of these, three exercised their ministry in Israel—Hosea, Amos, and Jonah; and five in Judah—Joel, Isaiah, Obadiah, Micah, and Nahum. It will not be necessary to delay upon the proof that the minor prophets succeed each other in the canon in their true chronological order, which for reasons deemed sufficient is here assumed. Nor need we stop to show that Hosea was a citizen of the ten tribes: the arguments of Hengstenberg and others have set that quite at rest. Nahum, though born in the territory of the ten tribes, is classed with the prophets of Judah, because the former kingdom was in all probability already destroyed when his prophecy was uttered, and it is expressly addressed to Judah, (i. 15.)

This division of the prophets, agreeably to the sphere of their labours, into those of Judah and of Israel, though important

to a correct understanding of their respective ministries, must not be too rigorously pressed. They are in some respects analogous to the circumcision and the uncircumcision as separate fields of apostolic labour, which general division however did not hinder Paul from writing his Epistle to the Hebrews, nor Peter from preaching the gospel to Cornelius. Though politically severed, and though from their diversity of character and circumstances requiring a different treatment from the inspired messengers sent them, the two kingdoms were not entirely distinct. The twelve tribes formed the one people of God, and neither the prophets nor the pious inhabitants of either kingdom recognized the legitimacy of the sinful schism. Pious princes like Hezekiah failed not to assert the claims of the theocracy over both realms, (2 Chron. xxx. 1–11.) It was on the ground of this unity that we find in this period one prophet taken from each of these kingdoms to minister in the other. Amos, like the man of God in the time of the first Jeroboam, (1 Kings xiii.) was sent from Judah to Israel, and Nahum from Israel to Judah. It is for the same reason that Hosea and Amos direct occasional admonitions to Judah, though the main body of their prophecies is addressed to Israel. Isaiah also (xxviii. 1–4, etc.) and Micah (i. 5, 6,) take a like attitude with respect to Israel, the latter even emphasizing his position by including Samaria as well as Jerusalem in his title. It need scarcely be added that no sanction whatever is given by the above division to Maurer's totally unfounded idea that the prophets of Israel taught a different doctrine from those of the rival kingdom, being the pliant tools of those in power, and winking at if not sanctioning the established idolatry of the golden calves.

The prophets of the two kingdoms are distinguished both in the tone and the contents of their respective prophecies. The tone of those ministering in Israel is severely denunciatory. The books of Amos and Hosea are filled with withering rebukes of sin and fearful threatenings of punishment from beginning to end, with but one ray of mercy in the closing verses of the former, and a few interjected gleams in occasional verses of the latter. Jonah had been commissioned before the period of written prophecy properly began, to utter the last promise of

temporal prosperity made to his own generation, (2 Kings xiv. 25,) which had not however its designed effect of winning the people back to God. In the book of Jonah, Nineveh repenting at the preaching of the prophet rises up against obdurate Israel to condemn them; and the sparing of the former stands in silent but unmistakable contrast to the doom which must await the latter. The kingdom of Israel was sunk in apathy and sin, and had reached the very verge of judicial abandonment. Nothing would answer here, therefore, but the language of rebuke and denunciation, which might startle them if possible from their security, or leave the evidence that their doom had been plainly set before them if they perished. Only so much of promise appears in each, expressed in Hosea and Amos and inferentially in Jonah, as is always found in every message of God to men, that he is faithful to his own word of grace, and that the penitent shall find mercy.

The kingdom of Judah, on the other hand, although sinful and needing to be rebuked, had not like Israel openly renounced the true worship of God. They were yet the chosen vessel of God's mercy, from the midst of whom the salvation of the world was to proceed. The tone of the prophets here is accordingly quite different. It is prevailingly consolatory: as compared with the prophets of the other kingdom, or with Jeremiah of the subsequent period when Judah had become far more corrupt, and a large portion of it was on the point of being cast away, it is strikingly so. This enlarged consolation is given both negatively and positively; positively, by the increased space now devoted to promise as compared with denunciation. Exactly one-half of Joel is promissory. Isaiah, besides abundant passages of the most joyful character, some of them spreading over several consecutive chapters in the first part of his book, devotes himself in the last twenty-seven chapters expressly to the work of comfort. The space given to consolation is proportionably large in Micah likewise. The negative consolation is that afforded by the denunciation of their heathen foes and oppressors; for the overthrow of these was in mercy to God's people and in vindication of them, and the breaking down of the ungodly kingdoms of this world is represented to be in order to the transferring of the dominion and power to the

saints of the Most High. This is the entire sum of Obadiah and Nahum, and enters more or less prominently into the predictions of the other three prophets likewise. The prophets of Judah speak of the heathen temporarily triumphing over the people of God, but never fail to add in the same connection that the former shall be ultimately cast down, and the latter shall be finally victorious. This the prophets of Israel never do. Hosea and Amos plainly and repeatedly declare that the ungodly kingdom of the ten tribes shall be overthrown by Assyria and the people exiled, but they give no intimation of the future fall of Assyria itself. Jonah even represents its capital as saved from threatened destruction by a timely repentance, and as an object of tender concern to the Lord. Amos indeed begins his prophecy with a series of seven denunciations against various heathen nations and against the other branch of the covenant people; but as appears from the whole structure of his book, as well as from express intimations, (ii. 6, etc.; iii. 2, etc.,) these portend no mercy to Israel. This prophet is peculiar in constructing thus an *a fortiori* argument of heavier doom. If the heathen and Judah shall be punished, much more shall Israel, whose privileges have been greater than the one, and their trespass heavier than the other.

The contents of these books may be considered under the two heads of things nearer at hand, and those more remotely future. To the former belong the existing state of affairs, and the consequent fortunes of the two kingdoms; to the latter, the revelations respecting the Messiah. In portraying national sins and unfolding the proximate future, the prophets are led to confine themselves for the most part to that which directly related to the respective kingdoms in which their ministry was exercised. The range of prophetic vision granted to those of the one realm, was thus quite distinct from that afforded to the other, the spirit of inspiration in each case opening up just such glimpses into futurity as were appropriate to the hearers addressed, and would suggest or convey to them the lessons they required. It is a simple consequence of the fact just stated, and not of any difference in the grade of prophetic power, that the vision of the future possessed by the prophets of Judah, was so much more extensive than that of their

colabourers in the sister kingdom. To the ten tribes it was revealed that the house of Jeroboam should be cut off, the kingdom itself destroyed, and the people carried into exile to Assyria. This terminated their distinct existence, and summed up God's dealings with them as his people. From this time onward, therefore, until the period of returning favour under the Messiah, all is left blank in the prophetic picture. It is only incidentally that the facts are disclosed of Judah's miraculous preservation from the power which should overwhelm Israel, Hos. i. 7, and of a subsequent burning of their cities, Hos. viii. 14, Amos ii. 5, though it is not said by whom this desolation should be effected, nor even whether it should be by the same or by another power. It is also in subordination to the main theme already stated, that the overthrow of several of the minor heathen states contiguous to Palestine is predicted, Amos i. 3—ii. 3, without, however, any distinct announcement of the agency by which it was to be accomplished.

Judah, on the other hand, was to be preserved as the people of God until the coming of the Messiah, and was to be brought successively into contact with some of the mightiest kingdoms of the earth. Accordingly her prophets are enabled to take possession of the wide field thus spread before them, and to adapt the lessons to be drawn from it to the uses of their contemporaries. They foresaw the Assyrian invasion and its miraculous defeat, the Babylonish captivity and the deliverance from it, and even sketch the heathen oppressions to be experienced between this and the coming of Christ, Micah iv. 10—v. 2. And upon the sphere of the world they beheld the overthrow of Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, Syria, and Tyre, not to speak of the fate of inferior nations.

The difference between these two classes of prophets is no less marked in regard to their Messianic predictions, and it arises from the same cause. Inasmuch as the primary design of these predictions is to suggest spiritual lessons for the contemporary generation, it follows as a natural consequence that they take their point of departure and their peculiar form from things then existing, and exhibit the period of the Messiah under such aspects as contrast most strongly with the evils of the present. The prophets of Israel are strictly confined to

this view of the subject. The evils experienced or apprehended in that kingdom were these five, viz. their apostasy from God and consequent abandonment by him, the schism from Judah and the house of David, the coming exile, the reduction of the numbers of the covenant people by their threatened excision, and the hostility of the heathen. The Messianic period is accordingly depicted under five particulars as affording the antidote to precisely these evils, their return to God and inalienable reception into favour, their union with Judah under a prince of David's line, their restoration and perpetual settlement in Canaan, Israel's vast multiplication, and the incorporation of the heathen into the kingdom of God.

The prophets of Judah were charged with the instruction of a people who were to endure to the coming of Christ, from the midst of whom he was to arise, and who needed a special preparation for this their high prerogative among the nations. Besides, therefore, presenting the blessings to be introduced by the Redeemer as a specific remedy for evils then felt or apprehended, they were led to take occasion from these to unfold more fully his person and work, and to present abundant criteria by which on his appearance he might be recognized. In addition to all that was revealed to the prophets of Israel, they speak of Messiah's divine nature, his birth of a virgin at Bethlehem, his life of suffering and sorrow, his atoning death, his priestly and prophetic offices, and the glories of his universal reign, when all mankind should flow to Zion, wars should cease, the harmlessness of paradise return even to the irrational creation, and every disease and infirmity and even death itself be banished or destroyed.

We turn now to the mutual relations of the prophets of Israel. Hosea occupies a place among them which may for prominence be likened to that of Isaiah in the corresponding period in Judah. His ministry is the longest on record, and affords a rare instance of constancy in almost hopeless circumstances, being exercised for sixty years or upwards in the midst of an apostate and deteriorating people, and continued perhaps to the very downfall of the kingdom. The book of Amos records a mission, probably a brief one, from Judah to Israel, and that of Jonah one from Israel to Nineveh. They each clothe

their instructions more or less in a figurative dress. Hosea employs allegory, chapters i. and iii, Amos emblematic visions, chapters vii.—ix, and Jonah a symbolical action. The disclosures of Hosea bear exclusive relation to Israel, those of Jonah to the heathen, those of Amos to both. Here, as in the case of all the prophets, the disclosures made respecting the heathen were designed not for their own benefit or instruction, but for that of Israel. The covenant people were the exclusive depositaries of divine revelation, and the sole theatre of prophetic ministries under the former economy. Prophecies respecting foreign nations were not in general made known to those nations. And where these ordinary limits of prophetic agency appear to be overstepped in individual instances, as in this of Jonah, this is an index to the future rather than the establishing of a new order of things in the present. No permanent mission was established at Nineveh; the extraordinary success of the prophet's preaching was followed by no subsequent labours, and we hear of no evidences or fruits of piety there afterwards. The effects upon the inhabitants of that city were without doubt quite evanescent. Everything goes to show that the divine purpose in Jonah's mission was to incorporate an idea in the progressive scheme of revelation, the time for whose full development had not yet arrived. The word of God, which Israel refused, should one day be preached to the heathen, and they would hear it. This enables us in some measure to understand how Jonah could urge the mercy of God as a reason for his having at first fled to Tarshish, iv. 2, and why he subsequently repined at the sparing of Nineveh. He could not bear to see the divine favour transferred from the children of Abraham to the heathen Ninevites; the latter penitent while the former continued obdurate; the latter spared while the former were hastening on to judgment. The conduct of the prophet is the less to be wondered at, since even in New Testament times it required repeated revelations to prepare the church for the passing away of Old Testament restrictions, and for the reception of the heathen into the church upon equal terms with the Jews. The book of Jonah is accordingly a practical prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles.

Amos, in the beginning of his prophecy, reveals God's justice

as a universal ruler in punishing heathen nations for their sins, and at the conclusion, ix. 12, intimates his mercy by expressing the same truth with Jonah, but in a different form. The theocracy shall extend its conquests over surrounding nations, and they shall be called by the name of the Lord. Of all this Hosea says nothing; his prophecy is confined to the covenant people, the justice of God in the judgments of the present, his mercy in the returning favour of the future. And yet with this evident distinction in the functions which these prophets were severally called to discharge in the unfolding to Israel of the plans of God, and while the phases of the truth which they respectively present, as viewed with Old Testament eyes, are quite distinct, the prophecies of Hosea, as contemplated from the point of their fulfilment, will be seen to involve in fact, though not in form, the same mercy to the Gentiles which it was given to Jonah and Amos unambiguously and in explicit terms to announce.

We find predicted by Hosea i. 10, 11; ii. 1, 14–23; iii. 5; xi. 11; xiv. 4–8, the first four of the five Messianic blessings already spoken of as revealed to the prophets of Israel. It is agreed by all that these met a partial fulfilment before the coming of Christ, when descendants of the ten tribes joined themselves with the exiles of Judah, returned after the Babylonish captivity, under the lead of Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David, and with a new zeal for the worship of God, were established in the promised land. Accordingly we find the twelve tribes spoken of as still existing in repeated passages of the New Testament; and that the genealogies of all the tribes were still preserved distinct appears from the statement that the apostle Paul belonged to the tribe of Benjamin, Rom. xi. 1, and Anna the prophetess to the tribe of Asher, Luke ii. 36. But it is manifest that this event cannot be regarded as a complete accomplishment of these predictions, for it does not exhaust the terms employed in any one of the particulars. There was then no complete conversion of all Israel to God, and betrothal of them to him in faithfulness for ever. And although the schism was entirely healed, so that after the captivity there were no more rivalries or animosities between Israel and Judah, and in feeling they became one people, still the

entire body of these two sections was not united under Zerubbabel, and even he was not a king. All Israel, moreover, did not come up out of exile, nor were they swelled to such countless multitudes as the sand of the sea. It becomes a question, therefore, in what events are we to look for the accomplishment of that residue of these prophecies, which was still unfulfilled at the coming of Christ? To this question in the case of these and like predictions two answers have been returned, viz. that their accomplishment is to be sought in the line of the natural descendants of Israel, or in that of their spiritual seed. According to the former view, the lineal descendants of the ten tribes shall be as numerous as the sands of the sea; shall be converted to God, and made once more his people; shall be restored from their wide dispersions to the land of Palestine; shall be united to the lineal descendants of Judah, and the old theocratic kingdom restored, with a son of David on the throne, which must then be a personal reign of the Lord Jesus, on an actual throne in Jerusalem, as king of the chosen people. For there is no scriptural warrant for believing that any other descendant of David shall ever again sit upon a throne. According to the other view, the Israel contemplated in these promises are to be counted, not in the line of natural descent, but of spiritual succession.

That this latter is the only admissible view may be argued in the first place from the fact that Israel as God's people, in the sense of the Scriptures generally, and of the promises in particular, never was exactly coextensive with Abraham's natural descendants. From the beginning some of his natural descendants were excluded, and others not descended from him were included. Ishmael and the children of Keturah were cut off, and the descent counted in the line of Isaac. Esau was cut off, and the succession limited to the line of Jacob. At the same time provision was made for giving the seal of the covenant to those born in Abraham's house, or bought with his money, though not of his seed. This is doubtless one of the items to be taken into the account in solving the problem of the immense multiplication of the people in Egypt; the retinues of the several patriarchs were mingled with their seed. Mention is also made of a mixed multitude going up with Israel out of

Egypt. The provision was inserted in the law of Moses that strangers might join themselves to the Lord's people, and by receiving the rite of circumcision, and observing the requisitions of the covenant, might be as those born in the land; and this was practised at every period of the history. On the other hand, those of the natural Israel who violated the provisions of the covenant, were to be cut off from among their people. This excision and incorporation might take place on a small or a large scale, in the case of individuals or of whole communities. Hosea threatened the ten tribes with this excision, i. 9, "Ye are not my people, and I will not be your God." They failed to take warning, and the excision was actually effected. The line of the covenant people was thenceforward continued in Judah only, 2 Kings xvii. 18. At the Babylonish exile there was another narrowing down, the corrupt mass of Judah itself was cast off, and such as returned out of the captivity to the holy land had alone a right to be entitled the people of God. When Christ came, another large excision took place. The unbelieving Jews rejecting him were rejected by him, and thenceforward formed no part of God's true people. The real Israel were they who, from among the nominally covenant people, received Christ. These were the true seed of Abraham. All others were apostate, and had no more right to be considered a part of Israel than the descendants of Ishmael or Esau. It is in the faithful few that the true line of the succession is be sought. At the same time their numbers were swelled by immense accessions from believing Gentiles, who were incorporated with them, and thus the continuity was preserved. God had not one people under the Old Testament, and a different people under the New Testament. It is one and the same people. It was Israel then, it is Israel still, not by a figure of speech, but by regular, continuous, legitimate succession. And the law of their constitution is still the same that it was at the beginning, "believers and their seed," with the provision now as then that the natural descendants failing to comply with the terms of the covenant, are to be excluded, while the stranger who takes hold of the covenant, may be incorporated amongst them. In the light of the history of the case, then, believers in Christ are the Israel of the Scriptures.

A second proof of the same position may be drawn from the abundant and explicit testimony of the New Testament. The doctrine pervades all the writings of the Apostles, that the Christian Church is not a new body recently formed, but is the legitimate continuation of the Old Testament Israel. All that they say upon this point cannot here be cited, but some of the most striking passages are the following: Gal. iii. 7, They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham: iii. 29, If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise: iv. 22–31, Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children, answered to Hagar, who was cast out with her son; Christians correspond to Isaac, the child of the promise. Rom. ii. 28, 29, He is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but he who is one inwardly: iv. 11, 12, Abraham is the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, and the father of them that are circumcised only in case they walk in the steps of his faith: iv. 16–18, The promise to Abraham that he should be a father of many nations, is explained to mean the father of all us Christians: ix. 6–8, They are not all Israel which are of Israel; neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children: chapter xi, The truth of the promises to Israel is preserved in the existence of a believing remnant after the excision of the blinded mass, the grafting in of Gentile branches upon the original olive tree, and the ultimate salvation of all the natural descendants. Eph. ii. 12–20, In their unconverted state the Ephesians were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise; but in Christ Jesus, from being afar off they are brought nigh, made fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God: iii. 6, Gentiles are in Christ fellow-heirs, of the same body, and partakers of the promise. Phil. iii. 3, We are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus. Rev. ii. 9, iii. 9, Unbelieving Jews say they are Jews and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan: vii. 4, Those protected from divine judgments by the seal of God in their foreheads, i. e., God's elect people (his redeemed, xiv. 3,) are an hundred and forty-four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel: xi. 8, The city, where our Lord was crucified, is spiritually called Sodom

and Egypt: chapter xii, The woman, who bare the man-child, i. e., the Messiah, is Israel, the church of God in both dispensations; and verse 17, her seed are they which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ: xxi. 9–12, The Lamb's wife, i. e. the glorified church, is the holy Jerusalem, bearing on its gates the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel. In the judgment of the inspired authors of the New Testament, then, believers in Christ and not the natural descendants of unbelieving Jews or Hebrews, constitute the Israel of God in the sense of the promises.

In the third place, that Israel has this sense in the predictions of Hosea, which are now in question, is determined by the interpretation put upon them by two different apostles. Both Peter (1 Peter ii. 9, 10) and Paul (Rom. ix. 25, 26) cite them in proof of the calling of the Gentiles. Although it could not be fairly claimed that the sense of the original passage must be limited to the application thus made of it, it must certainly include it within its proper scope.

Other arguments might be brought from parallel passages in the prophets, and from difficulties which beset the general scheme of interpretation here opposed. Thus the closing chapters of Ezekiel show us to what lengths those must be prepared to go, who see in the Israel of the Old Testament only the natural descendants of the patriarchs, and in its Canaan only the physical territory of Palestine. They must allow that the temple is to be rebuilt, and the ritual restored, which the New Testament declares to be among the shadows that have for ever passed away, and could be only resumed again to the prejudice of that perfect priesthood which it was temporarily instituted to prefigure. What has been already said, however, is sufficient to warrant the conclusion that the Christian church, considered as the body of believers in Christ, is the legitimate heir of the promises made to Israel; and it is to that church, not to the natural descendants of the ten tribes, that these promises are to be fulfilled. This is not expecting a promise to be fulfilled to one subject, when it was really made to another. It is not taking a prophecy out of its literal and imposing upon it a spiritual interpretation. It is not that Israel was typical of the Christian church; but it is that the Christian church is

Israel in the sense of the Bible, in the sense both of the Old and of the New Testaments. This is what the Holy Ghost intended in the promise. This is its proper and real meaning in its strict and literal acceptation. Israel was a church as well as a nation. It was as the people of God, that is, as a church, that they were contemplated in the promise; and that church is now perpetuated in believers in Christ.

But how are the four promises which we are discussing to be fulfilled to the Christian church? The first declares that they who had not been God's people should become his people, and be blessed with his perpetual love and favour. The last, that true believers shall be as numberless as the sands of the sea. To the other two we must apply that principle so constantly exemplified in prophecy, that the events of the future are represented under the forms of the past and the present. The schism between Israel and Judah is the great standing type of divisions among the people of God. These shall be done away, and all that interferes with or mars their unity shall cease. The kingdom of David, under which they are to be united, no longer requires a visible throne nor an earthly capital. The royal Son of David sits upon his everlasting throne in the heavens. And as to the remaining promise, Palestine derived its significance under the old economy from its being the seat of God's worship and of his visible kingdom. There was the temple with the special presence of Jehovah in the midst of it: there only could acceptable sacrifices be offered. To be cast out of this land was to be expelled from the place where God was, to be debarred from the public exercise of his worship, to lie under his frown. To be brought back to this land was a symptom of being received again into favour, and being reinstated in the possession of all the privileges of God's house. Under the present dispensation there is no such local seat of the true religion. To worship in Jerusalem is now nothing: everything lies in the worship in spirit and in truth. Every land may now be a Canaan to the believer. To come back from exile to the Lord's land, is from a state of distance and separation to come into the possession of the true worship of God and the privileges of his kingdom. The promise assures us that this shall be accorded to all true believers.

It has sometimes been objected to this view of the subject, that the threatenings against Israel are understood in their literal sense, and applied to the natural descendants of Israel, while the promises that these threatenings should in future days be reversed, are understood in a different sense, and applied to the Christian church. If exile is threatened, it means that the natural descendants of Jacob should be carried away from Palestine: when a return from exile is promised, ought it not then to mean that these natural descendants should be brought back to Palestine? But this is no more the case here than it is in all analogous passages in the Scriptures. The visible church or people of God has always contained two dissimilar classes—those who are truly his, and those who are only such by profession and in outward appearance. Threatenings against the church are always intended primarily and mainly for the impenitent and unbelieving portion; and on the other hand the promises are for the believing portion. If the evils or blessings are of such a nature that they respect an aggregate body, it must be dealt with in the mass, according to its prevailing character. If expulsion from the Lord's land is threatened, it must naturally be executed upon transgressing portions of his visible kingdom; and as it took place during the former dispensation, it was fulfilled in a form appropriate to that dispensation, their actual removal from the land of Palestine. If a return from exile is promised, it is as naturally to a believing portion that this is to be fulfilled; and in so far as it met its fulfilment in the Old Testament times, it was in the form appropriate to that dispensation, an actual coming back from the profane land of their captivity to the Lord's land. But in so far as it is accomplished under the New Testament, it must be to those who are now what the natural seed once were but are no longer, the Lord's people, and in a form which has already been shown to be the only one adapted to the present dispensation.

Have then the natural Israel no part in these promises made to their fathers? Undoubtedly they have. They are nothing but dead branches now, and have nothing to hope for so long as they continue in their unbelieving state. But they shall be grafted again into their own olive tree, and shall then partake

of the root and fatness of the olive. They are not the children of Abraham now, and are as truly aliens from the commonwealth of Israel as any Gentiles ever were. But when they believe in Christ, they will become children of Abraham by faith in him, just as those of any other nation do, and then they will, like others and precisely as others, become heirs in full of these promises; not because they are Jews, nor any more for being Jews, but because they are believers in Christ.

But shall not these promises have a literal fulfilment in their case, which they do not have in the case of others, at least in so far that they shall be restored to the land of Palestine? In reply to this, the following considerations embrace what we consider of chief consequence. The ten tribes, of which Hosea mainly speaks, are wholly lost; all efforts to rediscover them have so far failed, and there is no reason to expect better success in the future. The providence of God by thus obliterating them from among the nations, has rendered such an event as a restoration to Palestine in their case at least, if not impossible, yet to the last degree improbable.

As to the descendants of the Jews, the New Testament predicts their conversion, and that this shall be an occasion of new life to the Gentile churches, but no where intimates that they shall be brought back to Palestine. In the absence of any authority from our Lord or his apostles to the contrary, it is quite possible to explain the prophecies of Hosea, as we have seen, and all analogous predictions of other prophets, without the necessity of assuming a literal return. It is nevertheless a most remarkable fact in providence, and one without a parallel elsewhere, that the Jewish people have been preserved distinct from all others for so many ages; and that Palestine has been kept, too, to so great an extent unoccupied, containing no such population as it is capable of supporting: and that there is no insuperable barrier to their literal return, supposing that to be the purport of these prophecies. It will be wisest and safest, as it appears to us, to reserve our decision of the question, whether it is the will of God actually to accomplish this return, until the event shall disclose it. The prophecies may all be satisfactorily fulfilled, so far as we can see, without this. And yet if this were to take place, it would be God's

own comment upon the meaning of his predictions, and show that this was intended to be included. It is here as it is in regard to a multitude of other prophecies, those for example which relate to the first advent of our Lord. It would have been impossible to distinguish accurately before the event, what was intended literally from what was only to be understood figuratively. Who could have known beforehand from Zech. ix. 9, that Christ would make an actual entry into Jerusalem upon an ass, and that this was not merely a figurative representation of his general meekness and lowliness? And who could have known from Ps. xxii. 18, that the soldiers who crucified Jesus would actually cast lots upon his vesture, and that this might not have been intended merely to convey the general idea that he would be treated with extreme hostility? The event, however, has set the question at rest with regard to the meaning of these passages: and if we are content to wait patiently, it will do the same with the passages now before us.

It appears, therefore, that while Hosea does not in form, as the other prophets of the kingdom and particularly Jonah, reveal the participation of the heathen in the blessings of the covenant, which was for those who lived under the old Testament a real diversity, still in the range of their fulfilment his prophecies do in fact cover the same ground, the distinction between Jew and Gentile being done away in Christ. It remains to define the relation of his predictions to those of Amos having respect to the covenant people. Here they are in substance precisely coincident, both revealing with equal distinctness what have already been stated to be the prophetic lessons of this period for Israel, the fall of Jeroboam's house, the overthrow of the kingdom, the exile of the people, and the several Messianic blessings. There is, however, a marked distinction in the point of view from which they respectively contemplate their theme. Hosea's leading idea is, that Israel in their sin and apostasy from God, are grossly offending against the most tender love. Hence the allegories of chapters 1 and 3, (whether they be parables, or a literal record of events in the prophet's life,) setting forth the relation of Israel to God under that of the marriage bond, and thus stamping their sin

as a flagrant and shameful violation of most sacred obligations, a repudiation of their own solemn engagements, and an outrage upon the tenderest affection. Hence Israel's immorality, idolatry, and sinful seeking of aid from heathen powers, are uniformly throughout the book represented under the same image of a wife unfaithful to her husband's love. Hence, too, the frequent upbraiding of the transgressing people, by recitals of God's acts of mercy to their fathers. Hence the unequalled tenderness of his expostulations, vi. 4—xi. 8, and the assurance of God's readiness to anticipate the first symptoms of return to him, xiv. 4. On the other hand, the main thought of Amos is, that Israel is worse than other nations. Hence the brief introductory woes against the heathen and Judah, to pave the way for the more prolonged and heavier denunciation of Israel, which is mingled with no such tenderness as that of Hosea, and relieved by no exhortations, expostulations, and promises, save the few Messianic verses at the end.

In some minute details Amos discloses facts of the proximate future not revealed to Hosea, viz. the dreadful mortality which was to prevail during the final siege of Samaria, vi. 9, 10, and the fate that awaited Amaziah, priest of Bethel, and his family, vii. 17. An intimation of greater consequence in the unfoldings of the divine scheme of revelation, which is peculiar to Amos, is that, ix. 14, of the fallen condition of the house of David at the time of Messiah's appearing; this is the earliest prophetic announcement of a fact more fully unfolded by the prophets of Judah in this and subsequent periods. As a counterpoise to this it is peculiar to Hosea to present, xiii. 14, the germ of the doctrine of the resurrection. The power of death shall be broken, and death itself destroyed by the redeeming love of God. The prophet does not expand this thought to the full extent of the New Testament doctrine upon the subject. He does not even dwell upon it long enough to show whether he fully comprehended himself all that is involved, and whether in his intention and in the connection in which it stands, it denotes the deliverance of those who have already fallen under the power of death, or the rescue of such as were threatened by it, or a deliverance of the nation from impending ruin presented under this figure. Be this as it may, the thought is expressed

of a triumph over death and the grave, effected on the behalf of his people by the love and grace of God. And it is from this very point and under this same aspect that Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel develope the doctrine of the resurrection. The apostle Paul also in 1 Cor. xv. presents this as the last and most glorious of the Redeemer's triumphs, citing verse 55 with a burst of exultation—this very passage from Hosea as the climax of his whole discussion.

It should be observed further, in relation to this passage, that the prophets, even when predicting events that lie at the conclusion of the present dispensation, do not ordinarily forsake the bounds of Old Testament thought. They speak of the new heavens and new earth, of the convulsions that shall shake the frame of nature, of the sun and stars withdrawing their light, and straightway join with it something that belongs to the existing order of things. It does not follow from this that their predictions do not relate to the events which their words seem properly to describe, but are mere figures or symbols of things much nearer at hand. This conclusion can often only be reached by emptying their expressions of their manifest import, and converting them into the language of strained hyperbole. The fact is, that while glimpses of the magnificent events of the ultimate future were afforded them, these were mere glimpses; the time had not come when these objects were to be presented in all their relations and proportions, with the clearness and fulness with which they are unfolded now. The prophets stood on Old Testament ground, and could not anticipate more than it was in God's plan then to reveal. But we have on this account no right to rob them of their grandest disclosures, or to reduce them to mere figures of speech, because the events that are to usher in eternity are set in a framework borrowed from the things of time.

We have now arrived at our last topic, the structure of the book of Hosea, to which we must devote a brief consideration. In the opinion of some it is a collection of different discourses or portions of them, as they were orally delivered by the prophet at various periods of his ministry. Thus Maurer divides

it into thirteen such discourses, which he distributes as follows, viz.

1. Chapters i.—iii, reign of Jeroboam II.
2. ix. 1—9, " "
3. ix. 10—17, " "
4. xii. 8—15, " "
5. Chapter iv, succeeding interregnum.
6. Chapter viii, reign of Menahem.
7. v. 1—vi. 3, reign of Pekah.
8. vi. 4—11, " "
9. Chapters xiii, xiv, succeeding interregnum.
10. Chapter vii, reign of Hoshea.
11. Chapter x, " "
12. Chapter xi, " "
13. xii. 1–7, " "

Bertholdt, who makes of it fourteen discourses coinciding in the main with the division into chapters, assigns chapters iv, xii, vii, viii, x, to the first interregnum; chapters i.—iii. to the reign of Zachariah; chapters v, vi. to the reign of Pekah; chapter xiii. to the second interregnum; and chapters ix, xi, xiv. to the reign of Hoshea. Sebastian Schmidt makes ten discourses, and Dathe seventeen. Stuck finds three distinct discourses at the beginning of the book, and two at the end, with a body of disconnected fragments making up the intervening portion.

These conflicting divisions and many more of the same kind are based upon supposed allusions in the course of the book to particular events of determinate date, whereupon the passages in which they occur are erected into distinct discourses, delivered shortly after the events referred to. But these criteria are for the most part precarious and imaginary, as is shown by the endless diversity in the results to which they lead. They are commonly descriptive of a general state of things, rather than of any single events; or if this latter were the case, it is scarcely to be expected that it could be identified with facts mentioned in a history which despatches the entire term of Hosea's ministry in little more than a single chapter; or supposing the allusion made and the event identified, it still does

not necessarily follow that the passage containing it must belong to a separate discourse pronounced just after its occurrence.

Another serious objection to this view is the confusion which it assumes to exist in the book, discourses from every period of a long ministry being jumbled together in the utmost disorder. It becomes especially objectionable when pressed to the length of supposing that we have only fragmentary remains of scattered discourses, put together after the prophet's death, by some compiler as he chanced successively to light upon them. There is no reason to believe that any of the books of the prophets owe their present form to another than the prophets themselves, but on the contrary there are good reasons for the belief that they in every case wrote out and published their own predictions. Even at the hands of a sensible compiler, the confusion here supposed to exist would be inexplicable, but as proceeding from the author himself it is utterly inadmissible. This particular difficulty is escaped by those who assume a chronological order in the discourses. Thus Lightfoot places the first four chapters in the reign of Jeroboam II, the next two at the end of Pekah's reign, or in the following interregnum, and the last eight in the reign of Hoshea. And Dr. Wells, as quoted by Bishop Horseley, presents the following scheme of five discourses:

1. Chapters i.—iii, reign of Jeroboam II.
2. iv. 1—vi. 3, thence to the death of Pekahiah.
3. vi. 4—vii. 10, reign of Pekah.
4. vii. 11—xiii. 8, reign of Hoshea.
5. xiii. 9—xiv. 9, prophecies of restoration from the captivity.

Even thus, however, arbitrary assumptions must be made of allusions which are not evident, and of facts which are not recorded. Van der Hardt has quite outstripped all competition in ingenious absurdity, by distinguishing twenty-nine discourses of a single verse and upwards, the historical occasion of each of which he defines in regular order from the reign of Jeroboam II. to the fall of the kingdom. A principle which can lead to such results can scarcely be accepted by sober minds.

Another objection, and it is a fatal one to this view, however modified, is that no such partition of the book is possible as

would separate it into these distinct discourses. They are distinguished by no diversity of occasion or of theme: they are marked by nothing which has the appearance of indicating the beginning or close of separate portions.

A second class of interpreters abandoning the idea of sections composed at different times, have sought to establish a topical or logical division in the treatment of a general theme. Thus one of the old writers finds the theme propounded, chapter i., its explication, chapters ii.—xi., objections refuted, chapters xii. xiii., and the conclusion, chapter xiv. Carpzov divides all after the opening allegorical chapters into two parts thus: chapters iv.—x. legal, chapters xi.—xiv. evangelical. There is, it is true, a transition from denunciation in the beginning to mercy at the close, but these cannot be separated in the manner here proposed. Ewald divides these chapters into three parts:

1. iv. 1—vi. 11 a—charge of sin, first against the people generally, chapter iv., then against particular classes, v. 1—vi. 11 a.

2. vi. 11 b—ix. 9, denunciation of punishment.

3. ix. 10—xi. 11, and xi. 12—xiv. 9, two retrospects of ancient and better days, joined with consolatory hopes for the future.

But the distinction here made is unfounded. Charges of sin are as prominent in the second part as in the first; there are denunciations of punishment in the first as well as in the second; and both extend into the third.

The simplest view of the book, and that most accordant with the phenomena which it exhibits, appears to be that which supposes the prophet in the later years of his life to have committed the substance of his previous predictions to writing, in so far as they were adapted to the permanent use of the people of God. How far he may have retained in this abstract the language and form of earlier discourses, we have no means of ascertaining; and it would be of little advantage to us if we had. The form of the prophecy in our possession is the only one with which we are concerned, and is not only equally authoritative with the prophet's oral discourses, even if they could be certainly restored, but was prepared under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, with a special view to the wants of the

church in all times to come. Such a summary of his prophetical career might easily include allusions to particular events, or to the general state of things at various periods of his ministry; so that their occurrence, where they really are found, is upon this hypothesis readily explained. The mention, x. 14, of Shalmaneser's first invasion, in the reign of Hoshea, shows that the book must have been written after that event.

The only distinction that he seems to have preserved in his ministrations is that of his earlier and his later prophecies. In i. 2, what follows is announced as "the beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea;" and the opening chapters contain nothing inconsistent with the idea that the people are contemplated as in the enjoyment of external quiet and prosperity, as was the case in the reign of Jeroboam II. The prediction, i. 4, of the fall of the house of Jehu, likewise implies that when originally uttered, that house must still have occupied the throne. After the fourth chapter the tone changes, and the prevalence of crimes of violence, the frequent regicides, the low state to which the kingdom was reduced by foreign invasion, their alternate and unavailing reliance on Assyria and Egypt, plainly depict the state of things after Jeroboam's death, when successive usurpations and periods of anarchy followed to the close of the kingdom.

In consequence of these facts, and of the intrinsic difference of the portions themselves, the book is commonly divided into two parts respectively, embodying the substance of Hosea's earlier and his later ministrations.

1. Chapters i.—iii, predictions in allegorical form.
2. Chapters iv.—xiv, predictions in literal terms.

Ewald has proposed a division differing from this only in transferring the third chapter to the second part. Each portion of the book will then consist of an allegory, with an added expansion or enforcement of the same essential ideas in literal terms. The two allegories, chapters 1 and 3, begin with denunciation and end with promise. The intervening chapter 2 does the same. The last eleven chapters form a continuous composition, throughout the whole of which the prophet dwells upon his main theme, surveying it in every light, and directing his treatment of it not by any artificial division, but by the law of

spontaneous association, which brings prominently forward the most impressive features of his subject, and leads him to return to them again and again. The distribution is that of the poet rather than of the logician. The natural flow of his thoughts creates certain pauses and transitions, which cannot be better indicated perhaps than by following what appears to be the most obvious suggestion of the book itself. The severe denunciations of the people's crimes, and of the wrath which they had incurred, which constitute the body of the prophecy, is interrupted three several times by exhibitions of the mercy and love of God, which, though sorely wounded, still yearned over them with incomparable tenderness. We thus arrive at three sections, framed after the analogy of the previous portions of the book, each beginning with a threatening and ending with a promise. These promissory passages (vi. 1–3, xi. 8–11, xiv. 1–9) are progressive in length, and form a climax in thought. The first contains simply an exhortation and a conditional promise, declaring that the speedy return of God's favour was as certain to follow upon repentance as the sun to rise or the rain to fall in its season. In the second, God's persistent love revolts at the utter destruction to which the people were dooming themselves. The third combines the preceding while it goes beyond them both. Israel is not only exhorted to penitence, but is actually seen and heard exercising it. And God's love, no longer struggling with the stern demands of his justice, is freely restored to his repentant and obedient people, with all the blessings that flow from this reconciliation with their Maker and Redeemer. With this blissful prospect the book closes.

Our discussion has led us so far, that we shall not now undertake to characterize the Commentary on Hosea, named at the head of this article, further than to say, that it is one of ability and learning, though the author is unfortunately no believer in divine inspiration. His exposition is commonly sober and judicious, and, with the general caution already given, may be of service in the study of the prophet.

Charles Hodge

ART. V.—*The Testimony of Modern Science to the Unity of Mankind;* being a Summary of the Conclusions announced by the Highest Authorities, in the several departments of Physiology, Zoology, and Comparative Philology, in favour of the Specific Unity and Common Origin of all the varieties of Man. By J. L. CABELL, M. D., Professor of Comparative Anatomy and Physiology in the University of Virginia. With an Introductory Notice, By James W. Alexander, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 344.

WE have seldom read a book which better answers to its title. It is precisely what it purports to be, a summary of the conclusions at which the highest scientific authorities have arrived as to the unity of mankind. This summary is drawn up with a comprehensive knowledge of the whole field, especially so far as the departments of Zoology and Physiology are concerned. It is not a mere retailing of the opinions of other men, but the intelligent exposition by a scientific man of the teachings of science, authenticated and confirmed by the testimony of the most competent witnesses. It is conducted throughout in a truly philosophic spirit, discussing scientific questions on scientific principles. There is no attempt to prove physiological facts by moral arguments, nor to refute anatomy by tradition. The unity of mankind is presented as a problem of natural history, and is discussed as such, just as the question of the specific unity of any of the varieties of the lower animals would be discussed, in which no interests but those of science were involved. In this point of view, the book must satisfy even those who deny that anything but science has a right to be heard on the subject. It is, however, higher praise to say, that Dr. Cabell, while considering the question to which his book is devoted, as a matter of science, is neither ignorant nor indifferent as to its moral and religious bearings. He does not pretend to regard it as a small matter whether all mankind are brethren of the same family, or members of races specifically distinct in nature and orgin. In other words, he is not one-sided. His mind and heart are

large enough to take in the spiritual as well as the physical aspects of the subject. He can see in man a soul as well as a body, and, therefore, understands that the unity of the race involves the question of the relation in which men as spiritual and immortal beings stand to each other. We would only remark further, so far as concerns the general character of this work, that it bears everywhere the impress of the Christian and the gentleman. The author is mild and courteous, even when dealing with shallow pretence and gratuitous irreverence.

We have said that the unity of the race is here discussed as a matter of science. It is, however, a matter of deep religious interest. The departments of theology and science in many points overlap each other. Science takes cognizance of man; his origin, nature, prerogatives, and powers. So does theology. The philosopher has no right to warn the theologian off of this ground as a trespasser; and the theologian has no right to put the philosopher under an interdict. Both have their rights. The field is common to both. They differ not as to the subject to be investigated, but as to the mode of investigation. Science seeks to learn what man is, by induction and analogy; theology by revelation. Let each pursue its course independently yet harmoniously. Neither should ignore the other. It is not only unwise but unphilosophical for the man of science to conduct his investigations on the assumption that nothing more than scientific facts can legitimately be taken into view. The horse is found in a wild state all over the American continent. What would be thought of the naturalist who should insist on determining the question of its origin, and the relation of its varieties, as a mere question of zoology? What would any man of sense care for his conclusions, if in contradiction to the known historical fact of its introduction by the Spaniards? or what would be said of the man who should undertake on the zoological principles alone, to determine the origin and relation of the different tribes of Europe, ignoring all the lights of history?

Much has been said of the narrow-mindedness of theologians, and of their disposition to determine questions of science by the exclusive authority of the Bible. And there is no doubt ground

for complaint on this score. But we think that theologians (or rather Christians) have much more reason to complain of men of science; who are often disposed to ignore all facts which do not fall within their own department. They often form their theories without any regard to moral and religious truths, which, to say the least, are just as certain, and infinitely more important, than the truths of science. There is not unfrequently a recklessness manifested by scientific men in this matter, which betrays great disregard to the highest interests of man, and which is not only lamentable but revolting. In many cases their conclusions are a balance of probabilities. A straw would turn the scale either way; yet too often they throw the whole weight of their influence on the side of infidelity, when the slightest appreciation of the moral and religious bearings of the question at issue would lead to an opposite conclusion.

It is perfectly conceivable that a scientific sceptic may be led in his principles by a strictly logical process to decide a scientific question one way, when a scientific Christian, by an equally logical process, would decide it another way. The reason is that the latter takes into view legitimate facts and considerations which the former ignores. Which is the higher man? Which is the truer philosopher? Can any man believe that Agassiz with his splendid intellect would have given the sanction of his illustrious name to the theory, (a mere theory,) that the different races of men are indigenous to the zones which they inhabit, each having a separate origin, if he had appreciated the immense *a priori* probability against that theory arising from the teachings of the Bible, and the moral and religious relations of men? Is it wise or philosophical to adopt a theory, on the mere balance of probabilities, which supposes the Bible to be false, sin and redemption to be fictions, in despite of all the evidence which sustains the authority of the Scriptures and the truth of its teachings? Is it wise or philosophical to treat of man as though he were a brute—or draw conclusions from the physical, to the exclusion of the spiritual phenomena of his nature? Is there anything in this mode of proceeding which authorizes this distinguished philosopher, or those who follow him as the dust follows a chariot, to regard

himself as standing on a higher platform than the man who takes all the facts into view?

The church is willing to meet men of science on equal terms. She has her convictions founded on evidence which satisfies the reason and constrains the conscience. These she cannot give up, no matter how she may be puzzled or confounded by opposing arguments. No man can give up his conviction of his own liberty, however overwhelming to his understanding may be arguments for necessity. He knows there must be some mode of reconciling the apparently conflicting testimony of consciousness and speculation, and he is content to wait the solution. So the church will stand by her convictions founded on something surer than consciousness, even the power of God, (1 Cor. ii. 5,) and let science prove what facts it can; assured that God in nature can never contradict God in the Bible and in the hearts of his people. The church, however, is willing that the Bible should be interpreted under the guidance of the facts of science. Science once taught that the earth was a plain and the sun its satellite, and the church understood the Scriptures in accordance with that theory. At last it was discovered that the earth is a globe and moves round the sun. The church accepted the fact, and reads the Bible under its guidance.

It was long assumed that our globe is but a few thousand years old; men of science are now convinced that however recent the origin of the human race, the earth has existed for countless ages. Very well, let them once prove the fact, and the Bible will be found not only to agree with it, but to have anticipated it. Men of the highest rank in science now find in Genesis all that science can teach of cosmogony, and bow with wonder before the prescience of Moses. But while the church, in the consciousness of her fallibility in the interpretation of the infallible word of God, is willing to bow her judgment as to its meaning before the well-ascertained revelations of God in nature, she has a right to demand of men of science, first, that they shall be cautious in announcing facts even apparently hostile to the generally received sense of Scripture. Instead of pouncing on such facts, and parading them as if in triumph, (as in the case of the assumed fossil human skeleton of Guadaloupe,) they should be slow to admit them and withhold their

sanction until the evidence admits of no contradiction or doubt. The interests at stake demand this of every right-minded man. He should be far more reluctant to admit any such fact than to acknowledge a flaw in his title to an estate. There is in every community a large class of men eager after an excuse for unbelief. Men of science should not become panders to this depraved appetite. There is another demand on them which may reasonably be made. There is of course a vast difference between facts and theories. The former, and not the latter, are authoritative. It is the fact that the earth is a spheroid, and moves round the sun, and not the theory devised to account for that fact, which has constrained the church to alter her interpretation of the Bible. It is the fact that the magnetic needle points to the pole, and not any theory of magnetism which challenges the faith of all men. What Christians have the right to demand of men of science, nay, what sound philosophy itself demands of them is, that they should not propound theories framed in view of scientific facts alone, while they overlook the facts of religion. For example, it is a fact that there are many varieties of the human race, or many races of men, existing on the earth, and that these races differ very much in conformation, in colour, in stature, in mental endowments, &c. It is also a fact that these different races have different habitations; some dwelling in the torrid, some in the temperate, and some in the arctic zone. It is a short and easy way to account for these facts to say that the several races originated where they are now found, with conformations and constitutions adapted to their circumstances. A plausible argument may be framed in support of this theory. It may even be admitted, (what is not, however, true,) that the arguments for and against this solution of the problem, considered as a mere question in natural history, are pretty nearly balanced. Now as this theory is against the explicit declarations of the Bible, as it subverts the great doctrines of the common apostasy and redemption of the race, and is opposed to the universal faith of the church, for any man to give it the sanction of his authority shows a heartless disregard for the highest interests of men. The chances, to speak after the manner of men, are a thousand to one against the truth of the theory in

question. There are many other ways of accounting for the facts above mentioned, and however probable, considered as a mere question in zoology, the theory of separate origin may be, it is in the highest degree improbable, when considered in the light of all the facts in the case. If there were no other possible solution of this problem; if it were demonstrated to the satisfaction of all competent men, then the principle *fiat justitia, ruat cœlum* would justify its annunciation. But to put it forth as a mere plausible guess, to clothe it with the imposing robes of science, and dignify it by the sanction of an illustrious name, is one of the greatest injuries which can be committed against society. All therefore that believers in the Bible ask of men of science is, that they should reverence truth, and not be disposed on slight grounds to assume facts hostile to Christianity; and that in forming and announcing their theories they should have regard not simply to scientific or physical facts, but also to the facts of history, and to the phenomena of man's moral and religious nature, as well as to those of his external organization.

As to the question of the unity of mankind, which is so intimately connected with the whole system of revealed truth, and with the moral and social relations of men, we find the following opinions among scientific men: First, that all mankind are of one species, and have had a common origin. Second, that they are of one species, but have not had a common origin. Third, that they are different in species, as well as diverse in origin. It is obvious, therefore, that the unity of mankind involves two distinct questions, which cannot be confounded; viz. unity of species, and unity of origin. For although the latter implies the former, the former does not necessarily imply the latter. It is conceivable that mankind may all belong to the same species, have a common nature, and in that sense, constitute a common brotherhood, and yet have been created at different times, and in different places. Oaks of Europe may be specifically identical with the oaks of America, without assuming that the one were derived from the other. The fish of the rivers of England may be of the same species with those found in the rivers of France, without supposing that they were transported from the one country to the

other. So the men of New Holland may be one in nature with those of Africa and Europe, and yet be of different origin. A hundred years ago Voltaire said, if you find flies everywhere, it is a stupidity to be surprised that you everywhere find men.* Plants and animals, brutes and men, spring up wherever the circumstances are favourable, either identical or diverse in species, and when of the same species in many cases modified to suit their peculiar location. This is the old pagan theory as to the origin of man. The earth is our common mother; men are everywhere *autochthones;* Africans are the product of Africa, the Asiatics of Asia, the Esquimaux of the arctic zone. As this old doctrine has, in a modified form, been revived, and received the sanction of at least one illustrious name in science, it of course imposes a double task on the advocates of the unity of mankind. They must not only prove that men are of the same species, but also that they have had a common origin.

The first question then is, Are all men of one and the same species? There can be no intelligent answer to this question without a previous definition of terms. We must first know what is meant by species, and then what are its characteristics; i. e. the criteria by which we are to distinguish between species and varieties. Are the mastiff and the lap-dog of different species, or are they only varieties of the same species? How is this question to be decided? It must be by some general principle applying not to that particular case only, but to all analogous cases. Here after all is the great difficulty. Scientific men are not agreed on these points. Some use the word species in one sense, some in another; and many give it no definite sense at all. Some designate as varieties what others regard as distinct species. We cannot stir a step until this fog is cleared up. What is the use of debating whether men are of the same species, when you do not know what species is?

The general classification of animals has its foundation in nature. This is clear as to the division of all animals into four departments. 1. The Vertebrates, including all animals having a skeleton with a backbone as its axis. 2. The Articu-

* Etudes des Races Humaines, par M. Hyacinthe Deschamps, p. 12.

lates, or animals whose bodies are composed of rings or joints. 3. The Mollusks, or animals with soft bodies without an internal skeleton. 4. The Radiates, or animals whose organs radiate from a centre. Each of these departments is divided into classes. Thus the Vertebrates include, 1. Mammals, or animals which nurse their young. 2. Birds. 3. Reptiles. 4. Fishes. These classes are divided into orders. Thus the Mammals include—1. Beasts of prey. 2. Those which feed on vegetables. 3. Animals of the whale kind. These orders are separated into families; families into genera; genera into species; species into varieties. All this up to a certain point is clear. There is a real foundation in nature for this classification. It proceeds on the assumption that there is a plan and design in creation; that the different classes, orders and genera of animals are constructed on a different plan, and for a different purpose, or that the peculiar form and arrangement of the organs have a relation to each other, and to a definite end. We do not find the teeth of a herbivorous animal combined with the claws of the carnivorous class. It is only when we come to the lower divisions that difficulty and obscurity occur. "The genus," says Agassiz, "is founded on some of the minor peculiarities of anatomical structure, such as the number, disposition, or proportion of the teeth, claws, fins, &c., and usually includes several kinds. Thus, the lion, tiger, leopard, cat, &c., agree in the structure of their feet, claws and teeth, and they belong to the genus Felis; while the dog, fox, jackal, wolf, &c., have another and a different peculiarity of the feet, claws, and teeth, and are arranged in the genus Canis. The *species* is founded on less important distinctions, such as colour, size, proportions, structure, &c. Thus we have different kinds or species of ducks, different species of squirrel, different species of monkey, &c., varying from each other in some trivial circumstance, while those of each group agree in all their general structure. The specific name is the lowest term to which we descend, if we except certain peculiarities, generally induced by some modification of native habits, such as are seen in domestic animals. These are called *varieties*, and seldom endure beyond the causes which occasion them."* According

* Principles of Zoology, p. xiv.

to this view species are distinguished by "slight peculiarities" of colour, size and structure; and the only distinction between specific differences and the differences between varieties of the same species, is that the former are permanent, and the latter transient, i. e., such as are induced by change of habits or circumstances, and lasting only so long as these transient causes operate. The only criterion of species, therefore, is slight permanent peculiarities of colour, size and structure. On this definition we would remark, 1. That if this is all that is meant by the term, then it is, and must always remain in many cases, a matter of uncertainty to what species a particular animal is to be referred. Because varieties of the same species differ from each other by permanent peculiarities of size, colour and structure. The characteristic difference, therefore, between species and variety is obliterated. Take, for example, the case of the dog. It belongs to the genus *Canis* which includes the wolf, fox, jackal, &c., but all dogs belong to one and the same species, according to all naturalists of any name or authority. Within this species, however, there are an indefinite number of kinds distinguished by permanent peculiarities. Some of these kinds extend back as far as any historical record goes, being depicted on the ancient monuments of Egypt. The difference, therefore, has existed for thousands of years. The peculiarities, moreover, cannot be obliterated by any change of habit, external circumstances, food, &c. You may vary the surrounding of a terrier *ad libitum*, and to the end of time, and you can never change him into a mastiff or a greyhound. Here then are permanent peculiarities beyond the control of circumstances, distinguishing different varieties of the same species.

This proves two things, first, that the above definition or description of species amounts to nothing; and, secondly, that it is impossible for any man to pretend, on scientific principles, that the varieties of men constitute distinct species, because distinguished from each other by permanent peculiarities of colour, size, and structure, which are independent of circumstances, while all the varieties of dogs which differ by still more marked peculiarities, no less permanent and indomitable, are referred to one and the same species. It is argued that the

Negro must be a distinct species from the Caucasian, because he is depicted in the ancient monuments (not the most ancient, however,) of Egypt. But there we find the mastiff and the hound. If this antiquity in the varieties of dogs be consistent with identity of species, why may not a like antiquity in the varieties of men be consistent with their specific identity? This of course is too palpable a dilemma to escape the attention of naturalists of the modern school, in which, however, we do not include Professor Agassiz, who belongs to a different class, and who has lent his name as a jewel to be worn as on a stage and for a night. The modern school of naturalists to which we refer, are those American writers who have made themselves so prominent in endeavouring to introduce new principles into science, for the purpose of establishing the original and specific diversity of the different races of men; some, no doubt, from a sincere conviction of its truth; others apparently for the purpose of furnishing a satisfactory foundation for the perpetuity of African slaveholding; and some, as they endeavour to make conspicuous, for the sake of overthrowing the authority of the Bible. These naturalists, discovering that the same arguments which prove the identity of species of all varieties of dogs, would unavoidably prove that all the varieties of men are of the same species, have been driven to deny that dogs are all of the same species. Dr. Nott and his associate maintain that there are races of dogs specifically distinct. Dr. Morton is quoted, who thinks that our domestic dogs had a threefold origin.* But what are these among so many? Suppose we admit that there were three original sources of dogs. This does not meet the difficulty. There are more than three varieties of dogs distinguished from each other by permanent peculiarities. We must therefore either admit that new species can be originated, which is a new idea in science, or we must acknowledge that permanent peculiarities may exist within the limits of the same species. The definition remains a failure. Permanent peculiarities are not a criterion of species. Such peculiarities may be induced by the gradual operation of difference of climate, food, and modes of

* Types of Mankind, by J. C. Nott and Geo. Gliddon, p. 381.

life; by accident, i. e. by the operation of causes which elude our notice; by a careful process of breeding; by the mixture of different varieties of the same species. These are facts which cannot be denied, and which are, so far as we know, universally admitted. No one pretends that all the permanent varieties of dog are distinct species. They are never found in a wild state. There are no wild mastiffs, greyhounds, or spaniels. All, or at least many of these varieties, have originated or been produced subsequent to the origin of the species. The horse is widely diffused over the earth, and differs in its varieties as to colour, size, and proportions, as much as the various races of men differ. The domestic hog is no less extensively distributed in numberless varieties, all descended from the wild boar, which differs from the domestic animal in colour, covering of the skin, and formation of the skull, as Blumenbach himself admits, as much as the negro differs from the white man.

Naturalists report a breed of cattle originating in South America, beyond the La Plata, with permanent, transmissible peculiarities, far more marked than those usually relied upon as proofs of difference of species. "Their forehead is very short and broad, with the nasal end turned up, and the upper lip drawn back; their lower jaws project forward; when they walk they carry their head low, on a short neck, and their hind legs are rather longer compared with the front ones, than is usual." *Cabell*, p. 24. The works of naturalists are filled with examples of this kind.

It is not our object to write a zoological treatise. We are simply testing the correctness of a definition. We wish to show that permanent peculiarities of size, colour, hair, proportion, and structure, are no proof of diversity of species. All such peculiarities occur in varieties known from history to have had a common origin. The inevitable conclusion from this fact is, that the mere existence of such differences among men is no proof of diversity of species, and no evidence against their common descent from the same parents. If all the horses in the world *may* have descended from the same stock; if all the varieties of swine *may* have descended from the wild-boar; and if all the varieties of dogs, or any considerable portion of

those varieties, *may* have had a common origin, then all the varieties of men *may* have had a common parentage.

The uncertainty of the criteria of species is a matter generally acknowledged. On this subject Dr. Carpenter says, "The uncertainty of the limits of species is daily becoming more and more evident, and every naturalist is aware that a very large number of races are usually considered as having a distinct origin, when they are nothing more than permanent varieties of a common stock."* On the following page he says, that "Mr. J. E. Gray has shown, among other instances, that what have been regarded as *six* distinct species of *Murex*, are in reality but different forms of *one*." In the same connection he remarks, that the naturalist is disposed to adopt "easily recognized external characters as the basis of his classification," instead of relying on peculiarities of internal structure, "which are less subject to variation." It is too obvious to need remark, that when scientific men are not agreed among themselves on the criteria of species, and find it so difficult to decide between species and varieties, it would be absurd to expect Christians to give up faith in the Bible, or to renounce important doctrines of their religion, out of deference to a principle of classification so utterly uncertain. Even among the advocates of the doctrine of the specific difference between the various races of men, there are scarcely any two who agree as to the number of species into which mankind are to be divided. Some make two, the white and black; others three, the Caucasian, the Mongolian, and the African; others make five, others eight. Dr. Pickering says there is no choice except between eleven and one. Bory de Saint Vincent makes fifteen, and Desmoulin sixteen.† What is this but a blatant confession of utter uncertainty, an acknowledgment that the criteria of species, as laid down by naturalists, do not command even their own confidence.

2. The second remark which we have to make on Professor Agassiz's definition of species, is that by obliterating the distinction between species and variety, it destroys all importance

* Carpenter's General and Comparative Physiology, p. 981.

† Deschamps, Etudes, p. 21.

of the question as to the specific unity of mankind. If every permanent variety is a species, then it matters not whether we say there are three or twenty species of men. It is a mere dispute about words. All admit there are numerous varieties of mankind, permanent and to a great degree immutable, and if the definition of a species answers to that of a variety, you may make as many species as you please. Agassiz himself, after for years teaching that all men are of one and the same species, now says they are of as many distinct species as there are permanent varieties of the race. To cite another illustration on this point, the author of the introduction to the American edition of Colonel Hamilton Smith's book on the Natural History of the Human Species, expresses his "own opinion from a careful study of the phenomena, and from personal observation," in favour of the specific diversity of mankind. Yet on the same p. 83, we find this passage: "The most commonly used argument in this connection [i. e. for the unity of mankind,] is furnished by the varieties of the dog, which are considered as belonging to one species. To say nothing, however, of the *petitio principii* here, in assuming the point wished to be proved, many eminent naturalists believe that there are several species of dogs. The objection of F. Cuvier, that 'if we begin to make species, we cannot stop short at five or six, but must go on indefinitely,' is of no weight; the most it can do is to show us the exceedingly vague meaning of the word species, and that we have not yet arrived at the true distinction of species and variety. The 'permanent variety' of Dr. Prichard, from his own definition, is to all intents and purposes 'a species.' " This is certainly a very frank confession. This gentleman tells us that after a "careful study of the phenomena" he has arrived at the conclusion that men are of different species, and on the same page confesses that he does not know what a species is, and that he cannot distinguish between a species and a variety. This is a specimen of a class of birds which rub their bills against the vast cathedral of Christianity, and think they are overturning its foundations. If this gentleman does not know the difference between species and variety, we can tell him thus much at least, that species is something not only permanent but original, whereas a variety, though it may be

permanent, is not original. His saying that Dr. Prichard's permanent variety is to all intents and purposes a species, shows, as he confesses, that his ideas on the subject are exceedingly vague. The difficulty is not to tell the distinction between species and variety, but to ascertain the criteria by which we can discriminate them in the concrete, and say with confidence, these animals belong to different species, and these are varieties of the same species. We of course do not attribute to such a man as Agassiz the confusion of thought to which we have just referred. Every page of his writings is luminous with intellectual light, and glows with kind and genial feeling, so that all his readers become not only his admirers, but his friends. Our objection to his definition is, in the first place, that it does not afford the criteria necessary for practical discrimination; and, in the second place, that if adopted and carried out, it reduces species and variety to the same category of permanent peculiarity, and thus makes the dispute about the specific unity of mankind a dispute about words. This is far from being harmless, because the idea of original diversity is so indelibly impressed on the word species, that if that word be made synonymous with variety, arguments which prove only permanent diversity will be regarded as proving primordial distinction. It is of vast importance to the cause of truth that words should be preserved in their integrity. In the true meaning of the terms, permanent peculiarity (variety) is consistent with community of origin, specific difference is not.

3. A still more serious objection to the definition in question is, that it leaves out of view the immaterial element from nature. It is founded exclusively on what is material and outward. We do not mean that this element is denied, but it is ignored. This is like leaving out of view the soul in the definition of a man. This difficulty arises in part from the assumed necessity of fixing on a definition of species, which can be applied to plants as well as to animals, and even to man. In the plant the external organization is everything. In the lower animals there is besides the external organization, the φύσις and ψυχή, and in man still further the πνεῦμα. The body of the plant is the plant, but the body of a man is not the man. It is the interior higher being which determines his

nature, and decides the order of creatures to which he belongs. This is too plain and too high a truth to be denied. Professor Agassiz in his Zoology, page 9, says: "Besides the distinction to be derived from the varied structure of organs, there are others less subject to rigid analysis, but no less decisive, to be drawn from the immaterial principles, with which every animal is endowed. It is this which determines the constancy of species from generation to generation, and which is the source of all the varied exhibitions of instinct and intelligence which we see displayed, from the simple impulse to receive the food which is brought within their reach, as observed in the polyps, through the higher manifestations, in the cunning fox, the sagacious elephant, the faithful dog, and the exalted intellect of man, which is capable of indefinite expansion." Again, page 43: "The constancy of species is a phenomenon dependent on the immaterial nature." This all important truth, so clearly recognized in these and other passages of the writings of this distinguished naturalist, is overlooked in his definition, or rather in his criteria of species. When he makes species to depend on minute peculiarities of size, colour, proportion, and sculpture, everything immaterial is left out of view. Now it seems very plain, according to his own principle, if species is determined by the immaterial nature, *that nothing in the organic structure can be assumed as proof of difference of species, which is not indicative of difference in the immaterial principle.* That principle in every species is, according to Agassiz, the same; and in that sameness, as he teaches us, depends its identity and perpetuity. "All animals may be traced back," he says, "in the embryo, to a mere point upon the yolk of the egg, bearing no resemblance whatever to the future animal. But even here, an immaterial principle which no external influence can prevent or modify, is present, and determines its future form; so that the egg of a hen can produce nothing but a chicken, and the egg of the codfish produces only the cod. It may therefore be said with truth, that the chicken and the cod existed in the egg before their formation." To determine the species therefore, we must determine the immaterial principle. How is this to be done? Obviously in three ways. First, by the external organization. The

immaterial principle of each species of animals has impressed upon it, or imparted to it a specific nature, in virtue of which it developes itself in one particular form, or moulds for itself organs adapted to its nature and destiny. We determine, therefore, the immaterial principle by the organization which it developes for itself, which cannot change any more than the principle itself can change. If the animal be destined to move through the air, through water, or on the land, this is a law of its nature which determines its organization. If it is to feed on flesh, it has the organs requisite to seize and devour its prey; if to live on herbs, its organs are adapted to that end. The important point is, that no peculiarity of the external organism which is not an adaptation to some specific end, can be taken as an indication of the nature of the immaterial principle of the animal. It is obvious, for example, that difference in the size, colour, or proportions of the horse does not indicate any difference in the interior nature of the animal. Whether he is small or large, white or black; whether his forehead is broad or narrow, whether his shoulder-blade is straight or oblique, is perfectly indifferent. The organism is the same. All that belongs to the idea of the animal, all that reveals the law of its nature, remains the same in despite of these peculiarities, and therefore the species is the same.

So also the feathers on the legs of some domestic fowls are not significant. They indicate no peculiarity in the interior nature of the animal. But a skin connecting the toes, although involving a less expenditure of material, is seen at once to be there with design. It adapts the bird for a different mode of life; and everything else in its external organization and internal nature will be found to correspond with that peculiarity. It therefore is a proper criterion of kind. There may be difficulty in carrying out this obviously correct principle in its application to lower animals. We are too little acquainted with their nature to determine what is, and what is not indicative of design. Hence a spot upon an insect's wing, a little difference in the length of its antennæ, or a slight corrugation in a shell, is held to be a sufficient proof of diversity of species. In such cases the word species loses its meaning and its importance. It becomes synonymous with difference. To

make like trivial peculiarities evidence of a distinction in species among the higher animals, would introduce endless confusion, and make all classification a matter of caprice.

There is, therefore, an important distinction to be made between those diversities which arise out of the nature of the animal, and those which depend on circumstances. While the interior life of every species of animal has its own law of development, from which it cannot depart, so that like always produces like, and so that permanency is one of the laws of its nature, yet, within the limits of its original idea, its external organism may be indefinitely modified. This susceptibility of variation differs greatly in different classes of animals, according to their destiny. If designed to live within narrow limits and under no great variety of external conditions, the capacity for variation is small. The lion and tiger confined to the torrid zone are everywhere the same; whereas the wolf intended to roam over most of the face of the earth, varies within wide limits. This is especially true of the domestic animals. The horse, the ox, the dog, swine and sheep, intended for the service of man, adapt themselves to almost all the regions of the earth. In man, to whom the whole globe is given as a possession and a dwelling, this capability of variation appears in the highest perfection. An amount of difference, therefore, between two lions, which would justify the naturalist in referring them to different species, when found to exist between two dogs or two sheep, is justly regarded as insignificant. The same remark obviously applies with still greater force to the varieties of men. We might admit that the man of the arctic zone differs more in his external peculiarities from the man of the torrid zone, than many species confined to one or the other of those regions differ from each other; and yet science would pronounce the man dwelling in a snow house, and living on oil, as of the same species with man who dwells in a burning desert. The external characteristics of animals are influenced by a thousand causes known and unknown, fortuitous and constant. They change with the season of the year, with the climate in which the animal lives. They are modified by the food it eats, by the vigour or feebleness of its constitution. The historical and

admitted fact, illustrated every day and in every part of the world, is that animals acknowledged to be of the same species, vary indefinitely in size, colour, covering of the skin, proportion and sculpture. As the crab-apple and the pippin are the same species, so the noble war-horse and the miserable hack are the same animal; the domestic hog is the same in species as the wild-boar; the athletic mountaineer is even of the same variety of the human family with the sallow, feeble white inhabitants of a malarious southern coast. These and a thousand similar modifications no one can deny. But in no one of these cases is there any departure from the original type. There is no change of structure indicating a difference in the interior principle. That remains the same, and therefore in all these cases the skeleton is the same—the number and arrangement of the bones are the same; the muscles, blood-vessels and nerves are all the same, because the functions to be performed are the same. It is the neglect of the simple principle that no peculiarity of an external kind should be taken as evidence of specific difference, which is not indicative of the nature of the immaterial principle, that has led to the undue multiplication of species of which naturalists complain, and to much of the confusion which overhangs this subject. As we have just seen in the quotation from Dr. Carpenter, a slight corrugation in a shell, which had nothing to do with the nature of its inhabitant, being assumed as a criterion, led to the multiplication of one species into six. The same writer says that an erroneous multiplication of species of birds has been occasioned by the change of plumage at different seasons. The discrimination of species must ever remain uncertain and arbitrary, so long as peculiarities which are not significant, and therefore make no revelation of the nature of the animal, are assumed as criteria.

In the second place, if it be the immaterial principle which determines the species, and secures its constancy from generation to generation, then it follows that physiology is a surer guide in the discrimination of species than peculiarities of external form. The latter are far more subject to the modifying influences of subordinate causes, than the interior nature of the animal. In other words, the φύσις is a more immediate and

reliable revelation of the immaterial principle than external peculiarities. It is more certain that the germinating spot in a hen's egg will develope itself into an animal of the same nature with the parent bird, than that the new animal will exhibit all the peculiarities of size, colour, proportion, and sculpture of its parent. These latter may be modified by accidental circumstances; the former is everywhere the same. The domestic fowl is recognized as the same animal in all its varieties, in all parts of the world, because it has the same senses; the same laws govern its respiration, its digestion, the circulation of its blood, its mode of reproduction, its periods of incubation, of progress, and decline. It has the same cravings, and the same food. In short it has the same nature, therefore the species is the same. In like manner the wolf widely diffused over the earth, varying in size, colour, and proportion, has everywhere the same nature. What physiology reveals of the laws of the interior life of the wolf of America, it teaches of the wolves of Europe and Asia. So of the horse, the dog, the lion, the tiger. Identity of nature is proof of identity of species. If the φύσις be the same, the immaterial principle is the same; and if the immaterial principle be the same, Agassiz being judge, the species is the same.

In the third place, the immaterial principle, or species, is manifested through the ψυχή. Every animal has its psychology, as well as its physiology. The same species has everywhere the same habits, propensities, and instincts. The bee everywhere builds a hexagonal cell; the beaver everywhere builds a dam; the rabbit everywhere burrows in the earth; birds build their nests after the same fashion, each according to its kind. These instincts remain unchanged from age to age. The elephant has the docility and sagacity, the dog the fidelity to man, the fox the cunning, they had thousands of years ago. These instincts, although thus permanent in their essential character, may be modified by training and change of circumstances, within certain limits. As one man has an eye for painting, another an ear for music, another a genius for mechanics or mathematics, so some dogs have a peculiar keenness of scent; some have a mild, and others a ferocious temper. But all these modifications leave the original physical basis un-

changed. They are not greater than are found among men confessedly belonging to the same division of the human race, and even between the children of the same parents. Besides the infinite diversity of individual character, there are family and national peculiarities distinctly marked, and transmissible from one generation to another. It is impossible to give a Frenchman the character of an Irishman, or an Irishman that of a Frenchman. Yet everything that pertains to human nature belongs as much to the one as to the other. Psychology is not one thing in France, and another thing in Ireland—nor one thing in Europe, and another thing in Asia. The wolf is a wolf, and a lion a lion, and a man is a man, the world over, in every thing which relates to the characteristic propensities of their nature. Here again the argument is, if the ψυχή be the same, the immaterial principle is the same; and if the immaterial principle be the same, the species is the same.

Under Agassiz's guidance we have thus arrived at the conclusion that the criteria of species, as consisting in peculiarities of size, colour, proportion and sculpture, even when these peculiarities are permanent, or extend beyond the limits of actual observation, are altogether inadequate. He has taught us that the species is determined by what lies back of the material development, and determines its character; that this immaterial principle is to be identified and its species decided by those varieties of external form which indicate design; by the physiological and psychological characteristics of the animal whose nature it constitutes.

Most of the popular definitions of species are more or less open to similar objections. Cuvier says: "We are under the necessity of admitting the existence of certain forms which have perpetuated themselves from the beginning of the world, without exceeding the limits first prescribed; all the individuals belonging to one of these forms constitute what is termed a species." De Candolle says: "We write under the designation of species all those individuals who mutually bear to each other so close a resemblance as admits of our supposing that they may have arisen from a single pair."* The objections to

* Introduction to the English edition of Pickering's Races of Men, p. xxxii.

these definitions are, 1. That they do not tell us what species is, but what groups are to be referred to one species and what to another. 2. That they refer to similarity of form as the only criterion; and 3. That they give us no means of distinguishing between species and permanent varieties.

Instead of relying on constancy of peculiarities, others make community of descent the criterion of species. Thus Dr. Prichard says, that under the term species are included all those animals which are supposed to have arisen in the first instance from a single pair. And Dr. Carpenter says: "When it can be *shown* that two races have had a separate origin, they are regarded as of different species; and, in the absence of proof, this is *inferred*, when we see some peculiarity of organization characteristic of each, so constantly transmitted from parent to offspring, that the one cannot be supposed to have lost, or the other to have acquired it, through any known operation of physical causes." The two obvious objections to this are, 1. That community of origin in the vast majority of cases cannot be proved; or it is the very thing to be proved, and therefore cannot be assumed. 2. That diversity of origin is no proof of diversity of species. If God had created one pair of lions in Asia, and another in Africa, they would still be identical in species; for identity of species is only sameness of kind.

Agassiz in his later writings has adopted Dr. Morton's definition, which makes different species to be different "primordial forms." But this is the same thing over again. How are we to tell what forms are primordial? We have seen twenty times over that a peculiarity of form having existed at the earliest period of observation is not regarded by naturalists as proof that it has existed from the beginning. Besides, in the sense in which the word is here used, species is not form. It is not external configuration. This is only one, and as we have seen, beyond certain limits, the most unreliable of its manifestations. To say, therefore, that species are primordial forms, leaves us exactly where we were. If dogs with their acquired peculiarities of form can remain of the same species, had they been created with those peculiarities they would still have been of the same species. If one horse were created a Shetland pony

and another a barb, both would be as much identical in nature as they are now. In another sense of the word *form*, it is synonymous with species. This any dictionary teaches us: "Genus et species, quam eandem *formam* Cicero vocat," *Quinctil. Inst.* 5, 10, 62. It of course does not amount to much to define a word by its synonyme. In the scholastic or philosophical meaning of the term, the form of a thing is its *esse*, that which makes it what it is. It is the essence with its determination. But this sense is foreign from common usage, and would not suggest itself to any reader; neither is it the one intended by the author or advocates of the definition in question. If they would allow us to take the word in that sense we should be satisfied, so far as the meaning is concerned, but should still object to the definition as certain to be constantly misunderstood, and therefore to be a prolific source of error.

Professor Dana of Yale College, so far as our reading extends, is the only naturalist who has presented this subject in its true light. "Species," he says, "are the units of nature."* His formal definition is, "A species is a specific amount or condition of concentrated force, defined in the act or laws of creation," p. 860. We do like this language. We do not approve of the disposition among naturalists to merge substances into forces. Matter, however incapable of definition or conception in itself considered, is not mere force. Force is the revelation of being, and that being is other than the being or essence of God. The same is true of immaterial beings. Thought is not a definition of mind, nor is vital power a definition of a living substance. It is not the form of expression, therefore, that commends itself to our mind, but the idea intended to be conveyed. What Agassiz defines as the immaterial principle or "nature," (φύσις or οὐσία,) on which the permanence of species depends, are, as we understand Professor Dana, the units of nature. "The units of the inorganic world," he says, "are the weighed elements and their definite compounds or their molecules. The units of the organic are *species*, which exhibit themselves in their simplest condition in

* See his instructive paper in the Bibliotheca Sacra for October, 1857.

the germ-cell state. The kingdoms of life in all their magnificent proportions are made from these units," p. 863. On a previous page he says, "When individuals multiply from generation to generation, it is but the repetition of the primordial type-idea; and the true notion of species is not in the resulting group, but in the idea or potential element which is at the basis of every individual of the group."* We therefore understand Professor Dana to agree with Professor Agassiz in regarding the immaterial principle as that which determines the species, so that where that is the same, the species is the same. The question, therefore, whether any two or more animals belong to the same or to different species, is a question whether the immaterial principle belonging to them be the same or different. We have already seen that, apart from revelation and history, the only possible way of determining this point is, the external organization, the physiology, and the psychology of the animals in question. If these are the same in everything which is indicative and revealing, then by all the laws of logic the species is the same.

It follows from all that has been said, that the great characteristics of species are originality, universality, and immutability. 1. By originality is meant that species are underived, owing their existence and character to the immediate creating power of God. As to this point all naturalists, or at least naturalists of all classes, are agreed. This is taught by Cuvier, who says we are forced to admit that species have perpetuated themselves from the beginning of the world. This also is the doctrine of Agassiz, of Dr. Morton, and of all who define species to be primordial forms. This, too, is the view of those who are so desirous to prove that varieties of the human race are different species. They mean by this, that they have differed from the beginning, each having its own origin. It is included in the originality of species that no new species can be produced by external causes, or by the intermixture of dif-

* Professor Dana says, p. 862, that "Dr. Morton presented nearly the same idea when he described a species *as a primordial organic form.*" If this be so, then the word *form* must be taken in its scholastic sense. In its ordinary meaning, *form* is not "force," or "law," or "idea," or "potential element," all which terms Professor Dana uses to express his notion of species.

ferent races. Diversity of species supposes diversity of origin. This fact, although naturalists often forget it, is their own almost universally admitted doctrine. "It is a law of nature," says Agassiz, "that animals as well as plants are preceded only by individuals of the same species; and *vice versa*, that none of them can produce a species different from themselves." Each, therefore, must have had its own distinct origin.

2. Universality. By this is meant, that everything essential and characteristic belonging to any individual of a given species, belongs to every other individual included in it. What constitutes the species lies at the basis of every individual embraced in the whole group. This of course is not disputed. It is only another way of saying that things which are equal to the same are equal to one another. Whatever belongs to the nature of a lion is common to all lions.

3. Immutability or permanence. By this is meant, that the only way that a species can be destroyed is by destroying all the individuals which belong to it. It is by the law of God permanent. Like begets like; and one species does not mingle with another so as to produce a third; nor is one ever merged into another so as to be thereby lost or confounded. This is a general principle which until of late has been universally admitted. In proof of this point, we may refer, in the first place, to the great outstanding fact, that the different species of animals which inhabit our earth, have existed distinct as far back as our knowledge extends. The horse, the dog, the lion, the tiger, the wolf, the elephant, the camel, the sheep, are now what they were in the days of Abraham. Cuvier says that Aristotle describes the elephant better than Buffon does. There has been no confusion from the intermixture of distinct species. The fact that animals of nearly allied species, as the horse and ass, may produce a hybrid, (as a mule, for example,) does not conflict with this statement. Because the product of such discordant unions either remain unprolific, or they die out in a few generations, or by union with individuals of the pure blood the foreign element is eliminated, and the original type is restored.

The two greatest authorities on the subject of hybridity are the Rev. Dr. Bachman of this country, and M. Flourens of

Europe. Both have paid special attention to the subject, and instituted numerous and long-continued experiments to determine the question. The latter, from his official position at the *Jardin des Plantes*, has had the fullest opportunities for the investigation. Both have arrived at the settled conviction that species are immutable; that hybrids are sterile, or die out in a few generations. M. Flourens thus states the conclusion to which his long-continued experiments have led him: "Either hybrids, born of the union of two distinct species, unite and soon become sterile, or they unite with one of the parent stocks, and soon return to this type—they in no case give what may be called a new species, that is to say, an intermediate durable species." "Les espèces ne s'altèrent point, ne changent point, ne passent point de l'une à l'autre; les espèces sont FIXES."* This fact stares us constantly in the face. The oaks and pines of our day are the oaks and pines of our fathers, and of our fathers' fathers, from the very beginning. No one denies this. No one expects the different races or species of plants and animals to change, any more than they expect other laws of nature to change.

It seems strange that naturalists in search of truth, should apparently for the sake of establishing a foregone conclusion, appeal to isolated cases of coerced connection of individuals of different species; gathering their examples from the ends of the earth, and from reports of questionable authority. How can such examples invalidate a law? Where are these mongrel races? Where are the hybrid descendants of the lion and tiger, of the wolf and fox, of the ass and zebra, of the leopard and panther? Has not the experiment been tried long enough during thousands of years? Has not the whole earth been a theatre wide enough on which to make the trial? The experience of ages and the observation of nations have established it as a law, that "beings of a distinct species, or descendants from stocks originally different, cannot produce a mixed race which shall possess the capability of perpetuating itself."†

* De la Longevité Humaine, &c., par P. Flourens, Paris, 1855. We quote from Dr. Nott's Appendix to the translation of Count de Gobineau's work on the Moral and Intellectual Diversity of Races, p. 495.

† Dr. Carpenter, p. 984.

In the second place, permanence is involved in the very idea of species. Indeed this among naturalists is its great criterion. "The ground upon which," says Agassiz, "animals are considered as distinct species, is simply the fact, that, since they have been known to man, they have always preserved the same characteristics."* Dr. Nott, seeing the insufficiency of any other means of proving the varieties of man to be distinct species, renounces all other criteria, and argues, that as living species of animals are distinguished as different species, "simply upon their permanency of type, as derived from history," therefore, "the races of men depicted on the monuments of Egypt, five thousand years ago, and which have maintained their types through all time and all climates since, are distinct species.'† He adduces Professor Leidy's authority, who says, "A species of plant or animal may be defined to be an immutable organic form, whose characteristic distinctions may always be recognized by *a study of its history*," p. 479. The favourite definition of species among naturalists, as we have seen, is, "primordial organic forms." Agassiz's whole theory is founded on the belief of the immutability of species. He maintains that the different varieties of men are not to be referred to the influence of secondary cause, or to intermixture, but that they were created as they are and where they are. How is all this to be reconciled with the doctrine of hybridity? If the idea of species is that of an original and permanent organic form, how can distinct species mingle and produce other and mongrel races *ad libitum?* If species are original, they cannot be produced; and if they cannot be produced, they cannot intermix; for the result of such intermixture, according to the doctrine of hybridity, is the production of new species, i. e. of new, permanent organic forms. It is therefore at the expense of all consistency, of all uniformity in the use of terms, and of all certainty in science, to teach that distinct species can be united so as to give rise to new self-perpetuating races.

It is a palpable contradiction to say that species are original and permanent, and yet that they can be produced and obliterated; and to say that hybrids can be permanently prolific,

* Types of Mankind, p. LXXIV. † Appendix to Gobineau, p. 478.

is to say that specific differences are neither original nor permanent. If, therefore, species are what these naturalists pronounce them to be, the fact that two races or varieties of animals produce permanently prolific offspring is proof positive that they belong to the same species, naturalists must either alter their definition, and. overthrow the very foundations of their science, or they must admit that permanently prolific hybrids are impossible. If they choose to confound the words species and variety, and make every permanent diversity of form proof of diversity of species, very good. It is a mere question of words. But they cannot teach that species are original and permanent—that the varieties of men must have had different origins because their distinctive characteristics have existed for ages—and at the same time maintain that hybrids may be permanently prolific. If this conclusion flows *ex necessitate*, even from the idea of species which makes the external organism everything, much more does it flow from the juster and more profound view of the nature of species which Professor Dana has presented, and which, as we have seen, Agassiz himself frequently propounds. If species are the units of nature, if it is the immaterial principle, as Agassiz says, that gives them character and permanence, then they are raised above the sphere of mutation. They are, so to speak, the thoughts of God; the ideas which from the beginning he determined to express by means of these organic forms and the internal nature therewith connected. If these can be mixed and confounded, then the book of nature becomes unintelligible. You might as well take the letters of a printed page and throw them together pell-mell, and expect them still to spell words significant of thoughts of truth and beauty.

In the third place, this doctrine of the mingling of distinct species is not only contrary to the experience of ages on the wide theatre of the earth's surface, and to the fundamental idea of species as given even by the advocates of the doctrine—it would not only, if true, lead to utter confusion in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, but it is in entire contradiction to the whole analogy of nature.

The permanence of the laws of nature, and the certainty of their operation, are the basis of all science, and the indispensa-

ble condition even of the existence of living creatures. If the law of gravitation could cease to be what it is; if heat could cease to be heat, and light to be light, what would become of the world and its inhabitants. If caloric could combine with magnetism, and become a hybrid, something neither the one nor the other—if the elementary principles of nature could be thus confounded, it is obvious that chaos would prevail. "The units of the inorganic world," says Professor Dana, in a passage already quoted in part, "are the weighed elements and their definite compounds, or their molecules. The units of the organic are species, which exhibit themselves in their simplest condition in their germ-cell state. The kingdoms of life in all their magnificent proportions are made up of these units. Were these units capable of blending with one another indefinitely, they would be no longer units, and species could not be recognized. The system of life would be a maze of complexities; and whatever its grandeur to a being that could comprehend the infinite, it would be unintelligible chaos to man. . . . . It would be to man the temple of nature fused over its whole surface, and through its structure, without a line the mind could measure or comprehend."* As therefore the universe in all its parts is constructed on a definite plan, as the laws of nature are uniform, as the constituent elements of the material world are permanent, it would be in strange contradiction with this universal analogy, if in the very highest department of nature, in the organic and living world, everything should be unstable, that species could mingle with species, and confusion take the place of order and uniformity. So far as our limited reading extends, this doctrine of hybridity is maintained only by those who deny the specific unity of mankind. As the different races of men freely unite and produce offspring permanently prolific, it becomes absolutely necessary for this class of naturalists to maintain that distinct species may give rise to permanent races. They therefore hunt the world over for examples of such prolific unions, and what does it all amount to? No such thing exists on the face of the earth as a race of animals known to have sprung from parents belonging to different species. This fact is itself enough.

* Bibliotheca Sacra, October 1857, p. 863.

If we have succeeded in convincing our readers that species in animals depends on the immaterial principle, which manifests itself in the external organization, in the φύσις and the ψυχή, then the question whether mankind are of one or of different species can, in their minds, admit of no debate. No one denies that the external organization of all men, amid all their diversity of size, colour, proportion, and sculpture, is the same in everything which indicates design, or which serves to reveal the interior being. The skeleton is the same as to the number and arrangement of the bones; the limbs are the same; the muscles, the blood vessels, and their distribution are the same in all. The physiology and psychology of all men are precisely the same. This no one denies. But this is all that is meant by identity of species. It is the sameness of nature. Let it not be supposed that we have Agassiz against us on this point. Agassiz is a genius, but he is no logician. He does not discriminate in the use of words. He says and unsays the same thing, sometimes on the same page. He tells us the species is determined by the immaterial nature, and he further tells us that all men have the same immaterial nature, and yet they are of different species. This contradiction arises from using the same word in different senses. Taken in its true, legitimate, and established sense, as expressing identity of nature, mankind are of one species; taken in the sense of a primordial organic form, Agassiz says, they are of different species; that is, they have had different origins, and have differed from the beginning. This is not now the point before us. We are anxious to show the unity of mankind, the doctrine that they are identical in nature, as truly as the varieties of the horse, or of any other widely diffused terrestial animal. This we think we have fairly done on the principle laid down by Agassiz himself. No definition of species can be authenticated and established on a scientific basis, which will not include in it all the varieties of the human. Even admitting they had different origins, yet if their interior nature is the same, their external organization, their physiology and psychology, then are they the same in every sense in which the inhabitants of France or England are the same. In addition to the identity of the σῶμα, φύσις and ψυχή, which are the

constituent elements of irrational animals, there is a higher bond of union among men in the identity of the πνεῦμα. The rational and immortal soul belongs to all, and is the same in all. This puts them in a class by themselves, and identifies them as a class. The rational soul of the Caucasian, of the Mongolian, and of the African, do not differ the one from the other, more than the soul of one Englishman differs from that of another. There may of course be a great difference in the mental endowments of different races of men, as there are among the different members of the same family. But this does not affect the question of identity. The essential faculties are the same in all. All have the powers of understanding, will, and conscience. These are the elements of our higher nature. Where these are in any inhabitant of our earth, there a man is. Where these are not, there human nature is not. No man whose whole life has not been devoted to material pursuits, whose mind is not so trained to the observation and examination of physical laws, and the phenomena of matter, as to be incapable of appreciating the immaterial and spiritual, could ever doubt the unity of mankind. Unfortunately with many naturalists, the only infallible rule of faith and practice is the scalpel and the microscope. There are, however, truths which neither scalpel nor microscope can reveal, and which, therefore, such naturalists cannot be expected to believe. With them the body is everything. If that be the same, the animal is the same; if it differs, the animals differ. With others, happily, the case is reversed. If the immaterial principle be the same, the animal is the same, and if different, different. Put the ψυχή of a fly into the body of a bee, and it would cease to be a bee. An angel clothed in a human body would be angel, and not a man. The devil when he took upon him the form of a serpent was the devil still. We adhere to Agassiz's saving doctrine, that the immaterial principle determines the species, in spite of unimportant external differences. And as, beyond all controversy, the immaterial, the rational and immortal principle in the Caucasian, the Mongolian, and the African, is the same, so beyond all righteous contradiction they are the same in species. As the immaterial principle cannot be produced by secondary causes, any man

who has ever looked an intelligent, moral, pious African in the face, has had a divine attestation to the unity of mankind, and to the universal brotherhood of man. In this view of the subject, how small a business it is for one naturalist to be measuring the facial angle, another the base of the skull, another to subject a hair to the microscope, in order thus to prove that men are of different species! How can the nature of a human being be determined by such a process? Naturalists may say what they please, a man is man in virtue of his interior nature, their technicalities of classification to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is of course a strong confirmation of the specific identity of all the varieties of the human family, that they are capable of intermixture. The Caucasian and African, the Mongolian and Australian, may intermarry, and their offspring perpetuate their race. In South America they have sixteen distinct names for the various combinations of the European, the Negro, and the Indian. There are over four hundred thousand mulattoes in the United States; and they are just as able to perpetuate their race as either the whites or blacks. That in many instances they are less robust, and more liable to disease than the pure races, may be easily accounted for from their peculiar circumstances, or on the same general principle that the children of near relations are apt to degenerate. The physical peculiarities of the two races may not suit each other, just as it often occurs among families belonging to the same nation, or even village. The great fact, however, of the capability of the different races of men to produce by intermarriage a permanently prolific offspring, is not affected by such considerations. The significancy of that fact has already been noticed. If species are "the units of nature;" if the analogy of the whole animal kingdom, and the analogy of universal nature, is not violated in the single instance of man, the above fact is proof positive that all men are of one and the same species. And this, as Dr. Cabell has abundantly shown, is the conviction of the first men in all departments of science.

We have left ourselves little space for remark on the question of the common origin of our race. As before admitted, this is not a necessary conclusion from identity of species. It

is conceivable that plants and animals of the same kind may have been created at different times and places. In reference to the origin of men, we find the following opinions: 1. The scriptural view of the subject, that all mankind are descended from one man and one woman. 2. That each of the distinct varieties of our race, whether few or many, had a distinct origin, each from a single pair. 3. That men were created in nations, adapted to their several locations. The second and third of these views do not essentially differ. Those who hold the second are willing enough to accept the third. The only important question is, whether men have had a common parentage, or are derived from sources originally distinct.

Until recently there was no dispute on this subject among those naturalists who acknowledge either the specific or generic unity of man. Unity of species, at least, was universally considered as involving unity of origin. All the great authorities in science, from Cuvier down, as well as those of the earlier schools, included in their definition of species the idea of community of origin. This is still the doctrine of the highest class of scientific men. Dr. Cabell quotes from the contributions of Professor Forbes to the "Memoirs of the Geological Survey of Great Britain," in which the author adduces the strongest arguments to prove that even among plants, identity of species is evidence of a common origin, (p. 184.) Agassiz himself seems to admit this in his later writings. For, whereas he formerly strenuously maintained the specific unity of men, while asserting the diversity of their origin, he now, seeing that these two things cannot hang together, admits that since they have had different origins, they must be different species. We have a right therefore to claim even his authority for saying that if men are all of the same species, they are all descended from the same parents. We shall see directly, that this admission works utter confusion and ruin to Agassiz's whole theory. But that is not now the point. All we wish at present is to show that we have the highest scientific authority for saying that all the arguments which prove the specific unity of men prove also their common parentage. This goes a great way towards settling the question. Until recently, Agassiz himself admitted the proof that men are "everywhere one identical

species" to be perfectly conclusive; and he only avoids this conclusion now by altering his definition of the term. He still admits that men are of the same "nature," while he denies that they are of the same species. This, in our view, and according to Agassiz's own higher doctrine, is admitting and denying the same thing.

But conceding that plants and animals of the same species may have been in fact created at different times and places, this much must be on all hands admitted, viz. that if men are of the same species they *may* have had a common origin. In other words, no diversities of race consistent with unity of species can be inconsistent with the unity of origin. If, therefore, the Caucasian, the Mongolian, and the African do not differ more from each other more than is consistent with identity of species, there is no reason to be founded upon these differences in favour of their being of distinct origins. We have already referred to the inconsistency of naturalists on this subject. They admit all the aborigines of this continent to be the same race, and yet the finest and most degraded specimens of humanity are to be found among them. No two varieties of man can well be more widely separated than some of our northern Indians and the miserable inhabitants of Terra del Fuego. It is, however, unwise to judge by extremes. If you place the mastiff and lapdog side by side, you might doubt the possibility of a common descent; but when all the intermediate steps are taken into view, the case is altered. So if a beautiful Caucasian be contrasted directly with a Hottentot, the disparity may appear to forbid a common parentage, however remote. But when all the numerous intervening gradations in colour, countenance and structure are contemplated, all improbability of a common origin disappears. Besides, it would not be difficult to select from the palaces and hovels of any great city contrasts scarcely less striking. Nay, what contrast can be greater than that between a blooming girl of sixteen, and the same person at eighty, worn down, it may be, by vice, exposure and starvation. Any one who can identify such a girl with such a woman, need stagger at nothing in the varieties of men. All, however, we are concerned about at present is to show that mankind being admitted (as by Agassiz until

recently,) or proved to be of the same species, they are thereby admitted to be capable of a common descent, notwithstanding their distinguishing peculiarities.

The great argument against the common parentage of men is the permanence of the varieties existing among them. As Agassiz, as we have seen, says that the only reason for regarding lions and tigers as distinct species, and as having had different origins, is that as long as known they have been distinguished by their present characteristics. The same principle, he urges, should lead us to assign different origins to the different races of men. Dr. Nott, speaking of Dr. Prichard says, that "he perceived in the distance a glimmer of light from the time-worn monuments of old Egypt destined eventually to dispel the obfuscations with which he had enshrouded the history of Man; and to destroy that darling unitary fabric on which his energies had been expended."* Had he lived, he adds, until the mighty discoveries of Lepsius had been given to the world, he would have found he had wasted his life. The idea is that the Egyptian monuments prove the existence of the present diversities of men thousands of years before Christ, and thereby prove that they must have had different origins. It would have been candid in Dr. Nott to inform his readers that Lepsius is a firm believer in the unity of mankind, which his splendid discoveries are said to disprove. The fact however that negroes are depicted in the Egyptian monuments is no evidence against the common parentage of mankind, 1. Because the most learned Egyptologists are by no means agreed or certain as to the dates of those monuments. 2. Because varieties of other animals are there depicted which naturalists admit to have had a common origin. 3. Because a thousand years is acknowledged to have intervened between the earliest representations of the negro face and the date of those monuments on which only Caucasian features are represented. Birch and Lepsius assign the most ancient monuments to 3890 B. C. Dr. Nott claims for the earliest negro delineation the 24th century B. C. *Dr. Cabell*, p. 61. 4. Because changes of types are known to have occurred within comparative short periods.

* Types of Mankind, p. 56.

Reference has already been made to the rise of a marked variety of cattle in South America, within the memory of man. Two hundred years of exposure, ignorance, and hunger, have sufficed to transform a people, in the mountains of Iceland, "once well-grown, able-bodied, and comely," into a race distinguished by projecting mouths, prominent teeth, exposed gums, pot-bellied, bow-legged, and abortively featured," *Cabell*, p. 98. Within the limits of modern history, the Magyars of Hungary, while preserving the purity of their blood, have laid aside their Mongolian features and structure, and acquired the characteristics of the Caucasian race. "Thus," says Dr. Carpenter, "we have the Lapps, Finns, and Magyars, three nations or tribes, of whose descent from a common stock no reasonable doubt can be entertained, and which yet exhibit the most marked differences in cranial characters, and also in general conformation; the Magyars being tall and well-made, as the Lapps are short and uncouth. The inky Hindu, black for centuries, and the fair Saxon, as their language proves, have had a common origin. It is vain, in view of such facts as these, and hundreds of others of like import, to assert that the existence of diversities of race from even the earliest records of profane history, necessitates the assumption of diversity of origin.

There is still less force in the argument against the common parentage of men derived from the fact of the distribution of the race over the whole earth. Man is able to adapt himself to all climates. Europe, Asia, and Africa form one continuous continent. America approaches Asia so nearly to the northwest, that Dr. Pickering says, it is hard to tell where America ends and Asia begins;* and the islands of the Pacific, and of the Indian ocean, are placed as stepping stones for the progress of the race. Trade winds and currents carry the canoes of savage tribes over large tracts of water, so that the diffusion of men over the earth is not a matter of difficult explanation.

Agassiz's great argument is founded on the geographical distribution of animals, which he regards as affording decisive evidence that they originated in their respective districts; affording also a strong proof that the several varieties of

* Races of Men, (London edition) p. 296.

men originated where they now live. Certain animals are found exclusively in certain zones; others are common to two or more zones, and others again are more or less distributed universally, as the bat and the rat, which are found everywhere, except within the arctic regions. Those animals which are peculiar to a particular region are generally so organized, that they cannot live elsewhere than within their own prescribed limits. The white bear would perish in the torrid zone, and the monkey could not live within the arctic circle. These animals also are fitted to live on the productions of the district for which they were intended, and could find their appropriate food no where else. In his Zoology, p. 177, Agassiz says, "neither the distribution of animals, therefore, any more than their organization, can be the effect of external influences. We must, on the contrary, see in it a realization of a plan wisely designed, the work of a Supreme Intelligence, who created at the beginning, each species of animal at the place, and for the place, which it inhabits." In the *Christian Examiner*, p. 190, he says, "Evidence could be accumulated to show, we will not say the improbability only, but even the impossibility, of supposing that animals and plants were created in single pairs, and assumed afterwards their present distribution. . . . We have been gradually led to the conclusion that most animals and plants must have originated primitively over the whole extent of their natural distribution. We mean to say that, for instance, lions, which occur over almost the whole of Africa, over extensive parts of Southern Asia, and were formerly found even over Asia Minor and Greece, must have originated over the whole range of these limits of their distribution. We are led to these conclusions by the very fact that the lions of the East Indies differ somewhat from those of Northern Africa; these again from those of Senegal. It seems more natural to suppose that they were thus distributed over such wide districts, and endowed with particular characteristics in each, than to assume that they constituted as many species; or to believe that, created anywhere in this circle of distribution, they have gradually been modified to their present differences in consequence of their migration." His contribution to the "Types of Mankind" is designed "to show

that the boundaries, within which the natural combinations of animals are known to be circumscribed upon the surface of our earth, coincide with the natural range of distinct types of man." He divides the earth into eight realms, each of which is subdivided, some into three, some into eight provinces, distinguished by their characteristic faunæ. "The conclusion at which he arrives is, "that the diversity among animals is a fact determined by the will of the Creator, and their geographical distribution part of the general plan which unites all organized being into one great organic conception: whence it follows, that what are called human races, down to their specialization as nations, are distinct primordial forms of the type of man." p. lxxvi. The extent to which he is disposed to carry out his theory may be inferred from a passage on p. lxviii. "We have the Semitic nations covering the north African and south-west Asiatic faunæ, while the south European peninsulas, including Asia Minor, are inhabited by Græco-Roman nations, and the cold, temperate zone, by Celto-Germanic nations; the eastern range of Europe being peopled by Sclaves. This coincidence may justify the inference of an independent origin for these different tribes, as soon as it can be admitted that the races of men were primitively created in nations; the more so, since all of them claim to have been *autochthones* of the countries which they inhabit."

From these extracts it appears that Agassiz denies, 1. That the varieties of animals even when of the same species, (as the lion,) had the same origin; 2. That even those which belong to the same province and are in all respects alike, are descendants of one pair. His theory is that plants and animals arise all over the territory in which they live, or to which they naturally belong. The same he says is true of mankind. The different varieties of men have not only had different origins, but the several varieties instead of being descended each from a single pair, were created in nations. It is important to eliminate from this theory those elements which may be true, or which as concerns religion are unimportant, so as to leave the question of the origin of mankind to stand by itself and on its own merits. First, it may be admitted that animals peculiar to any zone and so constituted that they cannot live outside of its

present limits, were created where they are found. There is nothing in the Bible contrary to this assumption. We have no desire to maintain that the white bear was created in the temperate zone and wandered into the Arctic regions to find a congenial home; nor that monkeys were called into existence in the high table-land of Asia, and then migrated to South America and Africa. 2. It may also be admitted, if naturalists so desire, that many animals were produced in shoals, or flocks, or herds. There is no scriptural reason for teaching that all bees, contrary to their nature, come from a pair of bees, or that all the flies, or all the herrings in the world are the descendants of two parent flies or herrings. The general doctrine among naturalists no doubt is, and in all probability the general truth is, that plants and animals of the same species have had a common origin; but this is not a point in which we are specially interested. When God said, "Let the earth bring forth grass, and the herb yielding seed," &c., there is nothing to intimate that only one plant of each kind was produced. And when he said, "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures," &c., or, "Let the earth bring forth the living creatures after his kind," we are not told that only two of each kind were created. Let naturalists adopt what theory they please as to the origin and distribution of plants and inferior animals, so long as they do not apply their theory to man. As however, Agassiz maintains that men are subject to the same law which regulates the distribution of other animals, it is well to know that his whole theory on this subject is regarded by competent authorities as a flight of the imagination. "The learned and talented naturalist, Professor Forbes," says Dr. Cabell, "has conclusively shown that the analogy of inferior animals and plants is altogether adverse to the hypothesis of a plural origin of identical species." p. 192. "The divisions of the earth's surface into eight great zoological realms, each subdivided into a number of subordinate faunæ, as set forth in the 'Sketch,' is purely arbitrary, so far at least as the precise limits of most of the realms are concerned." This is illustrated by his including the whole of the American continent, south of the isothermal line of 32° Fahrenheit, in one province. Why should this be done? The plants and ani-

mals of North and South America differ as much as those of districts which he assigns to different realms. Why is this? It is because the American Indians are regarded as belonging to one type, and therefore the continent they inhabit must be regarded as one zoological realm. Thus, as Dr. Cabell argues, in order to prove that the boundaries which circumscribe natural combinations of animals, coincide with the natural range of distinct types of men, he arranges his realms to suit those types. Again, Dr. Bachman, the first American zoologist in his peculiar department, shows that Agassiz's doctrine that the types of men were created where they are found, involves, in some cases, an impossibility, and therefore it breaks down entirely as a theory. "Life," he says, "can only be maintained in an Esquimaux winter by stores provided in summer." If therefore the Arctic man had been created where he is now found, he could not have survived a single winter, or even a single month. Dr. Pickering also says that plants and animals indigenous to a district exposed to extremes of heat and cold, moisture and aridity, are by nature furnished with the means of protection. He therefore concludes that "man does not belong to cold and variable climates; his original birthplace has been in a region of perpetual summer, where the unprotected skin bears without suffering the slight fluctuations of temperature. He is, in fact, especially a production of the tropics, and there has been a time when the human family had not strayed beyond these geographical limits."* The doctrine therefore that the races of men originated where they are found, is not likely to meet with favour even with naturalists, who look on the subject as a mere question of zoology. This is an aspect of the matter we must leave to them to discuss. Until they are agreed among themselves, Christians, as such, need not be much disquieted.

There are however facts, not connected with zoology, which show that Agassiz's theory cannot possibly be correct. It contradicts history; it contradicts the known affinities of different races, as determined by their language; and it contradicts some of the best authenticated moral and religious truths, which are

* See Dr. Cabell, p. 202.

facts of the highest order. There are two preliminary remarks which it may be well to make before going further. The first is, that the theory, even in the mind of its author, is founded on mere probabilities. It is an inference from a narrow range of facts, all of the same class. He says it is "more natural" to suppose that animals originated over the whole region of their distribution, than that they are descended from a single pair, or were derived from a single centre. It is, in his own view, therefore, of two possible assumptions only the more natural. This is a slight foundation on which to overthrow some of the best authenticated facts in the history and nature of man. And suppose it were the more natural hypothesis in regard to animals adapted to only one region, does that prove anything with regard to man, a cosmopolite, designed to live everywhere, and with a nature capable of adapting itself to all diversities of climate and modes of life? The European can live in the arctic or in the torrid zone; so can the Asiatic or the African. The analogy, therefore, even conceding the facts on which it is founded, is of the feeblest kind. The other remark is this: Agassiz, when he formed his theory of the origin and distribution of animals, held a certain view of the nature of species; since then he has adopted a definition of that term which is inconsistent with his theory. He formerly held that the immaterial principle determined the nature and constancy of species; and consequently where that principle is the same, the species is the same. From this it follows that diversity of origin does not of necessity imply diversity of species. The varieties of the lion, of the horse, or of man, may have been created at different times and places, and yet constitute "one identical species;" because the immaterial principle or nature remains the same in each class of these several varieties. Recently, however, he has adopted the idea that species, "are primordial organic forms." Hence it follows that every variety of the lion becomes a distinct species. So of all other animals. So of man. These varieties, although differing as little as the lion of North Africa from the lion of Senegal, are assumed to be original. They therefore fall under the category of "primordial organic forms." This will necessitate a sweeping change in the classifications of naturalists. Animals univer-

sally regarded as of the same species, must now be considered as distinct. Mankind, instead of consisting of one, three, five, or eight species of the *genus homo*, must consist of hundreds, if not of thousands of primordial organic forms, "even down to their specialization as nations." The Semitic race is one species; the Græco-Roman another; the Celto-German another; the Sclaves another. Our American Indians must add some thirty or fifty to the list; for many tribes differ from each other far more than the Celts and Germans, or than the lion of Asia from the lion of Africa. This surely is running the whole thing into the ground. It is a *reductio ad absurdum*. This theory not only overthrows the basis of all zoological classification, by multiplying species without limit, but it utterly confounds and destroys the very idea. A distinction of species is not an arbitrary affair. It is a distinction of nature. To say that two animals are of different species, is to say they are of different natures. This is universally admitted. This is Agassiz's own formally professed and laboriously inculcated doctrine. But what is the difference of nature between the lion of North Africa and the lion of Senegal? or between the Celt and the Sclave? When Kossuth was in this country, who ever thought that he was an animal of a different species from the rest of us? Besides, Agassiz and all other naturalists teach us that species are permanent. They do not die out unless they are extirpated, or unless from change in the condition of the earth it is no longer suited for their support. Accordingly, the horse, the ass, the dog, the lion, are now as they were when the pyramids were built. But where are the ancient Egyptians, the old Romans, or the Aztecs, and other strongly marked races of men? They were not extirpated, nor has the earth changed since their day, yet they have disappeared. If they were distinct species, and if species are permanent, why do they not continue, and keep themselves as distinct as the lion and the tiger? It is plain that Agassiz must give up either his theory or his definition. The one is death to the other. It need hardly be added that according to this new doctrine all the recognized criteria of species disappear. Although the Germans and Sclaves have their peculiarities, yet they do not differ more than Jews and

Arabs, Irish and Scotch, nor half as much as a Mandan Indian differs from a Californian. Why should the former be regarded as distinct primordial forms, and not the latter? Besides, you may select a hundred Germans and as many Sclavonians whom no mortal can distinguish. They will have the same facial angle, the same base of the skull, the same colour, the same hair. How can you tell to which species they severally belong? Only by consulting their baptismal registers. We can easily and in every case tell a horse from an ass, a cat from a tiger, but in thousands of cases no man can tell a German from a Sclavonian. Why is all consistency thus given to the winds, and such illogical confusion introduced into books of science? Is it for the sake of establishing what the illustrious Humboldt calls, "la distinction désolante de races supérieures et de races inférieures"? Is it to break the bond of brotherhood among men, and to excommunicate a portion of our race from the church universal of humanity? We gladly acquit Agassiz of any such object. As he sacrifices his logic to his imagination, he is willing enough to sacrifice it to his moral sentiments. He still says that he holds to the unity of nature among men. This, if it means anything, means unity of species. For, according to his own showing, it is the immaterial nature which determines the species. The lion and the tiger, although both belong to the cat tribe, are not of the same nature. The immaterial principle in the one is not what it is in the other. Else, why are they so different? and why do they remain distinct without intermixture, through all generations?

We have endeavoured to show that Agassiz's theory is in conflict with his recent definition of species, and that by enlarging the meaning of the term so as to make the Germans and Sclaves, Romans and Celts distinct species of men, he must introduce the utmost inconsistency and confusion into every department of zoology. Our readers we hope will not accuse us of the presumption of even sitting at the feet of Agassiz as a naturalist. It is only with the logic and metaphysics of his speculations we venture to intermeddle.

We must bring this long article as rapidly as possible to a close. What is historically false cannot be zoologically true. Agassiz says, "it is more natural" to suppose that the lions of

North Africa and those of Senegal were created where we find them, rather than they were modified by circumstances. So it would be more natural to suppose that the horse of Canada and those of South America were created within the limits which they occupy, did we not happen to know that they are not indigenous. It is in vain to set up conjectures against facts. The theory of Agassiz contradicts all history. It makes nations known to have had a common origin to be of distinct species. The scriptural ethnography which divides the human family into three great families, the Semitic, Japhetan, and Hamite, is confirmed from so many sources, from tradition, from monuments, from names of tribes and places, from affinities of language, from profane history, that its correctness, apart from all reference to the Divine authority of the Bible, cannot, at least as to its leading features, be reasonably questioned. Agassiz, however, ignoring everything pertaining to history and language, proceeds as a mere zoologist to pronounce affiliated nations to be of entirely distinct origins. The Japhetan race he breaks up into an indefinite number of specifically different nations. The historical connection of all the inhabitants of Europe and Asia, from Ceylon to Iceland, has hardly been doubted, and yet, according to the new theory, they constitute a dozen or twenty "distinct primordial forms of the type of man." This is a sheer impossibility, without even a semblance of probability, if anything beyond zoological facts be taken into view.

Still more flagrant is the opposition of this theory to the facts connected with the affinities of language. If language consisted only of natural sounds, if it depended for its peculiarities on some modification of the vocal organs, or of the instincts of particular races of men, then there might be some propriety in comparing it to the cries and songs of lower animals. But between articulate speech and the natural cries and calls of brutes, there is an impassable gulf. The latter are the product of instinct, and remain the same from age to age. The other is the product of reason, and is in perpetual change. Language is conventional. The selection of certain sounds to express certain things or thoughts is arbitrary. That two nations unconnected and independent should select even eight

words of the same sound for the same things would be improbable, mathematicians say, in the proportion of a hundred thousand to one. Besides this, there are all the complexities of affixes and suffixes, of conjugation and declension, of syntax and construction, so that if two or more languages exhibit a common character, not only in their vocabularies, but in their grammar and internal structure, the evidence that they had a common origin amounts to demonstration. Comparative philology, therefore, is regarded as a surer guide in tracing the relationship of nations even than history, and is far more trustworthy than external peculiarities of form or colour. The way in which Agassiz deals with this subject, is a surprising illustration of the effect of devotion to one pursuit, to incapacitate the mind to apprehend and appreciate subjects foreign to their vocation. "The evidence adduced," he says, "from the affinities of the languages of different nations in favour of a community of origin is of no value, when we know, that, among vociferous animals, every species has its peculiar intonations, and that the different species of the same family produce sounds as closely allied, and forming as natural combinations, as the so called Indo-Germanic languages compared with one another. Nobody, for instance, would suppose that because the notes of the different species of thrushes, inhabiting different parts of the world, bear the closest affinity to one another, those birds must all have a common origin; and yet, with reference to man, philologists still look upon the affinities of languages as affording direct evidence of such a community of origin, among the races, even though they have already discovered the most essential differences in the very structure of these languages."* Again, in the *Christian Examiner* for 1850, he says, "as for languages, their common structure, and even the analogy in the sounds of different languages, far from indicating a derivation of one from another, seem rather the necessary result of that similarity in the organs of speech, which causes them naturally to produce the same sound." Then why did the Hebrews say *sus*, the Greeks *hippos*, the Latins *equus*, the French *cheval*, the Germans *pferd*, the English *horse*, when they all mean the same thing? "Who

* Types of Men, p. lxxii.

would now deny," he adds, "that it is as natural for men to speak as it is for dogs to bark, for an ass to bray, for a lion to roar, for a wolf to howl, when we see that no nations are so barbarous, so deprived of all human character, as to be unable to express in language their desires, their fears, their hopes? . . . . . The cry of birds of prey is alike unpleasant and rough in all; the song of all the thrushes is equally sweet and harmonious, and modulated upon similar rythms, and combined in similar melodies; the chit of all titmice is loquacious and hard; the quack of the duck is alike nasal in all. But who ever thought that the robin learned his melody from the mocking-bird, or the mocking-bird from any other species of thrush? . . . . . It were giving up all induction, all power of arguing from sound premises, if the force of such evidence were denied." Hear that, ye Humboldts and Grimms, ye Bopps and Bunsens! To the first naturalist in the world, saying Quack, and speaking Greek are, at bottom, the same thing! The one is as natural as the other. Then all young Greeks without instruction, even if brought up in China, should speak Grcek, as all ducks wherever hatched emit the same nasal quack. There cannot be a clearer proof that exclusive devotion to the contemplation of material forms incapacitates the mind to understand mental operations, than that furnished by the above extract. How different is the judgment of competent scholars on this subject! Alexander von Humboldt says, "The comparative study of languages shows us that races now separated by vast tracts of land, are allied together, and have migrated from one common primitive seat. . . . . The largest field for such investigations into the ancient condition of languages, and consequently into the period when the whole family of mankind was, in the strict sense of the word, to be regarded as one living whole, presents itself in the long chain of Indo-Germanic languages, extending from the Ganges to the Iberian extremity of Europe, and from Sicily to the North Cape." D. Max Muller says, "The evidence of language is irrefragable, and it is the only evidence worth listening to, with regard to ante-historical periods. . . . . There is not an English jury now a days which, after examining the hoary documents of language, would reject the claim of a common descent, and a legitimate relationship between Hindu,

Greek, and Teuton." The Chevalier Bunsen says, "The Egyptian language attests an unity of blood with the great Aramaic tribes of Asia, whose languages have been comprised under the general expression of Semitic, or the languages of the family of Shem. It is equally connected by identity of origin with those still more numerous and illustrious tribes which occupy the greater part of Europe, and may, perhaps, alone or with other families, have a right to be called the family of Japhet." This family, he says, includes the German nations, the Greeks and Romans, the Indians and Persians. Two-thirds of the human race are thus identified by these two classes of languages, which have had a common origin. By the same infallible test Bunsen shows that the Asiatic origin of all the North American Indians "is as fully proved as the unity of family among themselves."* Every day is adding some new language to this affiliated list, and furnishing additional evidence of the unity of mankind. Had we time and space we could exhibit the nature of the evidence derived from this source, and show that it has the force of ocular demonstration, to which the counter evidence of variation in the facial angle and colour of the skin appears as mere trifling. Suffice it to say, that if the affinity between English and Saxon, between French and Latin, prove the blood relationship between the English and Saxon people, and between the French and Romans, then the common origin of the vast body of languages above referred to, proves the common origin of the nations who speak them.

The grand objection after all to any theory of diversity of species or of origin among men, is that all such theories are opposed to the authority of the Bible, and to the facts of our mental, moral, and spiritual nature. The church, as we have said, bows to the facts of nature, because they are the voice of God. Theories are the stammering utterances of men before which she holds her head erect. The Bible says that all men are children of a common Father. Accordingly, wherever we meet a man, no matter of what name or nation, we find he has the same nature with ourselves. He has the same organs, the

* See Dr. Cabell, pp. 213–239.

same senses, the same instincts, the same faculties, the same understanding, will and conscience, the same capacity for religious culture. He may be ignorant and degraded; he may be little above the idiot brother who sits with us at our father's table, but we cannot but recognize him as a fellow-man. The Bible tells us that all men fell in Adam's first transgression. Accordingly, we search the earth around, and we find the evidences of an apostate nature wherever we find the human form. Our adorable Redeemer says that he died for all men, and bids us preach his gospel to every creature under heaven. We go, and nowhere, from Greenland to Caffraria, do we find any class of men to whom the gospel is not the grace of life; none who do not need it, or who are not capable of being partakers of the salvation which it offers. Would that men of science could but enlarge their views. Would that they could lift their eyes above the dissecting table, and believe that there is more in man than the knife can reveal. Then would they feel that the spiritual relationship of men, their common apostasy, and their common interest in the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, demonstrate their common nature and their common origin beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt.

---

## SHORT NOTICES.

*The Limits of Religious Thought.* Examined in Eight Lectures, preached before the University of Oxford, in the year MDCCCLVIII, on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A., Canon of Salisbury. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D., Reader in Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalen College; Tutor and late Fellow of St. John's College. Oxford and London, MDCCCLVIII.

In our notice, in this Journal for October, 1855, of Sir William Hamilton and his Philosophy, we made special mention of the relation which that philosophy bore to Christianity. When speaking of its great metaphysical canon relative to our knowledge of the unconditioned, we said:—"There is no philosophy which in its spirit, its scope, and its doctrines, both positive and negative, so conciliates and upholds revealed religion

as that which is based on this great canon of Metaphysics. The conditions on which revelation, with its complement of doctrines, is offered to our belief, are precisely those which this canon enounces." Mr. Mansel, in the Lectures before us, has proved, to the very letter, all that we then said. In the Preface, he explicitly avows, that the inquiries pursued in the Lectures have been suggested to him, by the great principle of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, that "the unconditioned is incognizable and inconceivable;" and that Sir William's practical conclusion, that our knowledge is not necessarily co-extensive with our faith, "is identical with that which is constantly enforced throughout these Lectures." We, who put before the public our estimate of Sir William Hamilton's philosophy in so elaborate a manner, because we knew its mighty power for good, feel no little gratification at seeing it working out that good, in the most sacred of provinces, through these lectures of Mr. Mansel. As a philosophical defence of Christianity, there is no work, in the English language, which can at all compare with it, except Butler's Analogy. And when we compare the great work of Butler with that of Mr. Mansel, and see how much better, in the latter, the true theory of the limits of human thought is exhibited and applied to theological criticism, we at once learn the immense stride which the philosophy of the human mind has taken in the last hundred years, and what powerful aid it can now furnish in theological polemics.

We may, perhaps, hereafter give our own independent reflections on the great theme of Mr. Mansel's Lectures; the more especially, as while too much praise cannot be given for the general ability, learning and literary elegance of the lectures, it seems to us, that in the fourth lecture, Mr. Mansel has not very accurately distinguished and correlated the intellectual and the moral natures of man, as related sources of the knowledge we have of the existence and attributes of God. He seems to us, to lean too much towards the Kantean doctrine of the superlative weight of our moral reason, in the evidences of the existence of God; and is not altogether free from a seeming confusion in his doctrines. It is important, that this special point in the basis of all theology should be accurately explicated; for philosophy is still entangled in the grand paradox of Kant in regard to our moral consciousness.

We have occasion to know that these Lectures are producing a sensation in Great Britain; and we earnestly recommend them to all who wish to see theoretically, how profoundly Christianity is laid in the depths of human nature.

*Inspiration not Guidance nor Intuition; or, the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* Second Series. By Eleazar Lord. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1858.

The orthodox doctrine of inspiration is perfectly clear and simple. It is precisely that which the great mass of Christian people have no difficulty in apprehending and believing, nay, cannot help apprehending and believing: viz. that the Sacred Scriptures, in all their parts, as to matter and style, thoughts and words, are the Word of God, written by his direction, uttering his mind, and clothed with his authority. This is the doctrine, so called, of Plenary Inspiration.

Those whose principles or feelings revolt at the plain averments of the Bible, of course, seek to divest them of Divine authority. This begets rationalism, which, according to its intensity and virulence, either denies that the Scriptures are inspired at all, or if not this, that they are altogether inspired. Some turn them into myths. Some admit their substantial historical verity, their unrivalled exaltation and purity of sentiment, their fertility in unfolding blessed truths before unknown, their high ethical value, who still maintain that they are the productions of uninspired, though unequalled men. Others say that parts of the Bible are inspired, and parts uninspired, varying the relative proportions of each, according to their several tastes. A much more wide-spread and insidious doctrine is, that the substance of the sacred writings is inspired, but not the form, the thoughts but not the words in which they are presented. These, it is contended, were left to the discretion of the writers, without any decisive Divine guidance. Still another specious form of assault upon the plenary inspiration and Divine authority of the Bible, is the intuitional scheme of Morell and others, who deny the possibility of any objective revelation of what has not already been attained by our own inward experience and intuition. They confound inspiration with spiritual illumination, in this respect not differing from the mystics.

Mr. Lord, in this volume, which is in the nature of a supplement to a former one published by him on the same subject, of course, makes vigorous warfare against these various impugners of the plenary inspiration and Divine infallibility of the Scriptures. In his argument against the intuitional and anti-verbal theories of inspiration, he displays considerable logical and metaphysical acumen, together with a close observation of the operations of the human mind, so far as these are implicated in the discussion. His modes of statement on these subjects, however, often fail of that clearness, simplicity and aptness,

without which they are not easily intelligible, and which can only be acquired by long familiarity and thorough culture in these departments.

The main object of this book, nevertheless, is not directly to combat rationalists or intuitionalists. It is rather to combat a certain position taken by most of the defenders of plenary inspiration, which he appears to regard as a perilous concession to their adversaries. It consists chiefly of strictures on an article on inspiration in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for January, 1858; on an article in this Journal for October, 1857, on the same subject; and on the volume by Mr. Lee in regard to it, to which those articles have special reference.

The issue joined is simply as follows: The matter of the Bible is of two kinds. First, is that of which the inspired writers knew nothing except as it was made known to them by special revelation, such as prophecies, and the doctrinal teachings peculiar to Christianity given by the several writers. Secondly, there is the narration of facts, of which the writers had previous personal knowledge. In regard to the first, the distinction between revelation and inspiration is brought prominently into view. Revelation is the communication of truth; inspiration is the guidance of the Holy Spirit, by which its subject is rendered infallible in the communication of the truth. In regard to matters of which the sacred writers had previous knowledge, as in the case of the evangelists, of the acts and teachings of Christ, the Spirit brought all things to their remembrance, and guided each writer so as to render him infallible in his narration. In neither case, however, is there anything mechanical in this theory of inspiration. Each writer, whether communicating truths immediately revealed, as in the instance of St. Paul, or narrating facts of which, as Luke says of himself, he had a perfect understanding from the beginning, was free, in the sense of being spontaneous, in all his mental exercise, and therefore impressed his own character of thought and style on his discourses or narrative. What Mr. Lord means by the sacred writers, according to this theory, being left "free to use such language, and to narrate such circumstances as suited their own taste or purposes," we do not know. The language quoted is not ours, and is not such as we would use. He objects that making inspiration (as distinguished from revelation) "guidance," rests the infallibility of Scripture not on the fact that it consists of the words of God recorded, but on the fact, real or supposed, that the writers were rendered infallible in selecting and recording the words. And what higher infallibility or ground of infallibility can he desire or conceive?

He adds, that, on this theory, "it was at their option as men, to narrate such circumstances as suited their taste or purposes," and more to the same effect. This, however, is expressly denied in the passage which he is criticising, except so far as is consistent with their being "guided to the use of words which expressed the mind of the Spirit." Are not the words, according to this view, determined by the Holy Ghost? Is any exercise of the faculties of the writers permitted, which does not ensure this? Did not these holy men speak, on this hypothesis, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost? And are they any the less the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, than they would be, if they were so given as to exclude all intelligent activity in the writer's mind, in shaping the language? Really, is there a lurking peril in such a doctrine of inspiration, whereby it extends to every word of the Bible, which calls for a sturdy volume to refute it?

We honour our author's zeal for the entire and intact doctrine of plenary inspiration, and his godly jealousy of the least semblance of any deviation from it. We submit, however, that he has not, on this issue, made out the semblance of such a deviation from it. He has been beating the air, and spending his strength for nought. If it is bad not to see pitfalls into which we are groping, it is quite as bad to be imagining pitfalls beneath us, when we are treading solid ground.

*Nature and the Supernatural; as together constituting the One System of God.* By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner, 1858.

The arrangements for our present number were so far completed before this volume came to hand, that we are precluded from giving it that thorough review at this time, to which, on various accounts, it is entitled. It is quite the most able and valuable of Dr. Bushnell's works on Theology. It, of course, bears the imprint of the author's genius, in its fresh and brilliant diction, its affluent originality and bewitching felicity of illustration, its episodic passages of marvellous beauty and eloquence.

It gives us pleasure, moreover, to add, that the doctrinal tone of this book is greatly in advance of his former books, (*God in Christ*, and *Christ in Theology*,) which were so widely and justly offensive to the Christian world. Not that there is any explicit and formal recantation; not that we do not trace occasional intimations or implications of some of the anti-evangelical views protruded with a bold and defiant nakedness in those volumes: but they are not here avowed with emphasis; they are kept in the back-ground behind the more prominent

and significant assertion of views in contradiction to them, and in harmony with the faith of the church. They would not generally arrest the attention of those unversed in this sort of polemics. Every one who compares this volume with those which preceded it, must be struck with the fact that as Dr. Bushnell has increased his knowledge of the standard theology of the church, he has increased his respect for it. He sees more and more of truth, power and vitality in it, since he has ceased to confound it with two or three systems of provincial theologico-metaphysics, which, in his *God in Christ*, he evidently mistook for it. In this he was not singular. It was a common mistake of large numbers, resulting from the training they received, and the atmosphere they breathed. It is also clear that he has less respect for the negations and cavils of Socinians, than when he knew less of the issues between them and their adversaries. Indeed, the principal power of the book lies in the vigour of its attacks on Unitarian scepticism, and the blanker pantheistic infidelity of Parker. The latter is the prominent adversary assailed. Especially in the thousand unconscious and indefinable revelations of sympathy, which are often more significant than formal propositions, no one can fail to see that Dr. Bushnell in his feelings, at least, has drifted from his former position and bearings. The attitude in which he is placed by the kind of work in which he is engaged, accounts in part for this. In the former case the nature of his undertaking required him to search out and lay bare the infirmities of orthodoxy. The present work is apologetic. It aims to defend the supernaturalism of Christianity against infidels and sceptics. The consequent difference of attitude, of predisposition to sympathy and appreciation with regard to the different parties, and still further as to the points to be made prominent and obtrusive in the discussion, is obvious.

As a sample of the improved tone to which we refer, we cite a single passage. It is familiar to many of our readers, that in his *God in Christ*, Dr. Bushnell professed to have discovered a "chemistry of thought," whereby he saw no difficulty in "accepting as many creeds as were offered him." He sublimely disavowed responsibility for his opinions, as much as for the growth of his body. What now does he say?

"Charity holds fast the minutest atoms of truth, as being precious and divine, offended by even so much as a thought of laxity. Liberality loosens the terms of truth, permitting easily and with careless magnanimity variations from it; consenting, as it were, in its own sovereignty to overlook or allow them; and subsiding thus, ere long, into a licentious indifference to

all truth, and a general defect of responsibility in regard to it. Charity extends allowance to men; liberality to falsities themselves. Charity takes the truth to be sacred and immovable; liberality allows it to be marred and maimed at pleasure. How different the manner of Jesus in this respect from that irreverent feeble laxity that lets errors be as good as truths, and takes it for a sign of intellectual eminence, that one can be floated comfortably in the abysses of liberalism." Pp. 312—13.

This book, as a whole, however, is a new evidence to us that Dr. Bushnell is more a poet than a philosopher or theologian. Its power lies in its separate parts, its pithy and glowing sentences, its graphic representations and eloquent appeals, in the felicity and force with which single topics are presented. Of this sort is the argument from the character of Christ for his Divinity. This, though not new in its general conception and outlines, is presented with that new strength and vividness which genius imparts to familiar ideas. With this strength in some of the parts, as a concatenated whole it is feeble and incoherent. If some of the links are of adamant, others are of clay. As a statement and defence of supernaturalism, it is loose and erratic in definition and proof, inconsistent and self-contradictory in its positions. It lacks logical accuracy, unity and cohesion. We can at this time barely refer to one or two of the more glaring features of the work on which this judgment is founded. He so defines "Nature and the Supernatural" as to bring the human will within the province of the latter. "Man, as a being of free-will, is no part of nature at all, no arc in the circle of nature," p. 340. "The very idea of our personality is that of a being not under the law of cause and effect, a being supernatural. This one point clearly apprehended, all the difficulties of our subject are at once relieved, if not absolutely and completely removed," p. 43. We think as much. There is no difficulty in proving that there is a God if men are gods, that there are angels if men are angels, that the Bible is inspired if all great writers are inspired, or that the supernatural exists if we ourselves are supernatural. But the supernatural, in the only sense known or important in the controversy between believers and unbelievers, denotes precisely that which is above, not only physical, but human nature, above man's powers unassisted by superhuman aid.

This conception of the supernatural deranges and vitiates the whole discussion, of which it is the cardinal feature. Such a supernaturalism is easily maintained. With this generous extension of the term, it is hardly surprising that he maintains the continued existence of miraculous gifts and works in the

church, substantially according to the views of the Irving school, and even places in this category some wholesome suggestions made to him by an ignorant but profoundly pious negro. Pp. 487—8.

His view of the human will as supernatural, involves, of course, the assertion of the extreme Pelagian view of its absolute and independent antinomy. But he maintains, no less strenuously, that the fall of this supernatural agent into sin is, essentially, an inevitable necessity in the due development of a moral agent—very much in accordance with the latest and most approved theory of fatalistic and pantheistic optimism. A very different and precious doctrine, which has a firmer support than this pestilent theory, he also propounds—we mean the inability of the sinner to regenerate himself, and his absolute dependence on the Holy Spirit therefor, to the full length of Old-school Calvinism. In this we rejoice. How now do these doctrines consist with his doctrine of the will? But we stop. Our object now is to notice, not to review the book. But in doing this, we could not withhold our general judgment of its character, or, in giving this, avoid all reference to some of the more obvious grounds of that judgment.

*Blind Bartimeus; or, the Story of the Sightless Sinner and his Great Physician.* By the Rev. William J. Hoge, Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, Prince Edward, Virginia. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1859.

When Dr. Bellamy was once preaching, a thunder-storm arose in the midst of his discourse. The peals of thunder grew loud and terrific as he reached its impassioned parts, and deepened the solemnity of the audience—a circumstance he did not fail to make good use of, in his further appeals to his hearers. The sermon produced an extraordinary impression, and excited a vehement and general demand for its publication. Accordingly a committee waited on him next day to request a copy for the press. His answer was, "if you can print the thunder and lightning too, you may have it." It is rare that the force and fire of the most eloquent discourses can be transferred to the printed volume. However powerful and penetrating may be the matter and style, yet so much is added by the circumstances and surroundings, by warmth and earnestness of manner, by the living voice, effective elocution, attitude and gesture, by the sympathy between speaker and hearer—a dying man speaking to dying men—which helps what he says to penetrate and kindle the heart of his auditory, that the eloquence of the most eloquent discourses is seldom set in type. It evaporates in the very attempt to condense and embalm it. Who has not

read the sermons of Whitefield, nearly if not quite the most effective pulpit orator of modern times, with a feeling of disappointment, wondering what they contain to entrance assemblies of ten and twenty thousand, and melt the sturdiest scoffers?

We confess we took up this beautifully printed volume, with some misgiving, lest those who might look for a reproduction on its pages, of the high power which they have discerned and felt in Dr. Hoge's discourses, as spoken from the pulpit, should be disappointed. On the contrary, we were ourselves disappointed, most happily. The volume consists of a series of discourses, preached during the author's pastorate in Baltimore, thoroughly revised, and set in a series of appropriate chapters. It is greatly above the average run of this species of religious literature. It contrives, from the various suggestive aspects presented by the story of Bartimeus, to educe the entire gospel, and apply it with extraordinary skill to the various phases of character and condition exhibited by saints and sinners. Rich in scriptural quotation and allusion, thoroughly sound and evangelical, full of unction, probing the heart, revealing its distempers, and applying scriptural remedies with peculiar skill, instructive, convictive, searching, startling, or consolatory, as exigencies require, this volume offers these characteristics to its readers in classic and nervous English, with great affluence of imagery and illustration, with fervent and impassioned earnestness; in "thoughts that breathe, and words that burn." Few books of this class are better fitted to enchain and benefit the reader—to rouse the careless, guide the inquirer, or stimulate, strengthen, and comfort the Christian.

*The Noon Prayer-Meeting of the North Dutch Church, Fulton Street, New York;* its Origin, Character, and Progress, with some of its Results. By Talbot W. Chambers, one of the Pastors of the Reformed Protestant Dutch (Collegiate) Church, New York. Board of Publication of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church. 1858.

As the daily meetings for prayer, which have had such an obvious and remarkable connection with the great awakening of the past year, largely owe their origin and their peculiarities to that which forms the subject of this book, the Christian public will prize the full account which Mr. Chambers has here published, in regard to "its origin, character, progress, and results." Those results are blessed. We rejoice that this meeting is still sustained with lively interest, and that the tokens are abundant, that the prayers there offered are not unheard or unanswered. We gratefully acknowledge the obligation of the church to our brethren of the Dutch Church, for the part they have taken in opening and sustaining this meet-

ing, and for the disposition as well as ability which they show to keep alive the worship of God in the monetary heart of our metropolis, whence nearly all other Christian temples have been banished, to make room for the temples of Mammon.

*The Higher Christian Life.* By the Rev. W. E. Boardman. Boston: Henry Hoyt. Chicago: William Timlinson. 1858.

There are undoubtedly grades in the Christian life. There is a weak faith and a strong faith; a dawning twilight of hope, and the full assurance of hope. The true Christian goes from grace to grace, from strength to strength, from glory to glory. It is also true that many professing Christians remain content with the lower stages of Christian experience, of faith, love, hope, joy, consecration. And hence, so many are not only feeble, thriftless and joyless in their own spiritual estate, but they are inefficient in promoting the great cause; barren and unfruitful in the work of the Lord. The object of this book is to rouse these faint and sluggish Christians from their inert and drooping state, and incite them to aspire to that higher stage of the Christian life in which they are filled with all the fulness of God, and rejoice in the hope of his glory. The author presses his point with much earnestness and power. His reasonings and exhortations are enlivened and enforced by a number of sketches of the religious experience of eminently pious persons.

This higher Christian life he appears to ascribe to a "second conversion," to which he exhorts us to aspire. We have no doubt that it requires what may be called a second conversion in the case of the fallen, the backslidden, the slothful—which is the case with multitudes. We do not, however, recognize the necessity of any such marked crisis after the first conversion, in order to lift the believer up to the summits of assured hope, in cases where there are no formidable distempers of this sort. We may not limit the Holy One of Israel, who giveth to each one severally as he will; lifting some like David and Peter, by sudden and startling methods out of their fallen state, while the course of others is, from the first, quietly and steadily progressive. "The path of the just is as the shining light, shining more and more unto the perfect day." There is a sense, indeed, in which conversion is repeated in all Christians, not once only, but all their days. The Christian life is a constant turning to the Lord. This, however, is not the special second conversion in question.

*The Living Epistle; or, the Moral Power of a Religious Life.* By Cornelius Tyree, of Powhatan county, Virginia. With an Introduction by Rev. R. Fuller, D. D. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1859.

The "Higher Christian Life," treated of in the volume last noticed, is here set forth and urged with especial reference to its influence upon the world. The author contends, very justly and forcibly, that a more perfect exemplification of the power and beauty of religion in the lives of its professors would do more to commend and propagate it, than any mere verbal argument or expostulation can accomplish without it. It cannot be too often or earnestly impressed upon the church, that her most effective argument against unbelief is the "logic of the life."

*Materials for Thought, designed for Young Men.* By the Rev. Griffith Owen. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien. 1859.

This volume, like several we have just noticed, appears to be among the products of the remarkable attention to religion which has crowned the past year. It "does not aim at originality; it is simply a compilation. The selections are made from choice and rare publications, not easily accessible to most readers." Its object is to "aid young men and others in becoming labourers in the conversion of the world." So far as we have been able to examine, the selections are judicious and well adapted to kindle holy impulses and high resolves in the bosoms of young men.

*Seven Miles around Jerusalem.* From original Surveys and Observations, projected and drawn by the Rev. H. S. Osborn. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son.

This is the second of a series of three Maps, the first being a map of Jerusalem, the third, of Jerusalem and its environs, published in a neat and elegant style; projected from original surveys, and referring to such authorities as Robinson, Hackett, Thompson, and Samson, as vouchers for their accuracy.

*Titcomb's Letters to Young People, Single and Married.* Timothy Titcomb, Esquire. Tenth Edition. New York: Charles Scribner, No. 124 Grand Street. 1858. Pp. 251.

The Preface of this little volume is dated July 1, 1858. The "tenth edition" so soon, shows that it is enjoying a remarkable popularity. We can give it no higher commendation than by saying, we think it deserves the favour with which it has been received. We cannot subscribe to every opinion of the author, but his book contains much wholesome advice to the classes to which it is addressed, and is calculated to be useful, especially among those who would be repelled from a strictly religious volume.

*Biographical Sketch of Amariah Brigham, M. D., late Superintendent of the New York State Lunatic Asylum, Utica, New York.* Utica: W. O. McClure. 1858.

Dr. Brigham was a self-made man. Without the advantages of academic training, he rose to the highest professional distinction. With the boldness and self-reliance common to such men, he sometimes advanced crude views which shocked the religious community. In his disgust at some extravagances which were current in the era of New Measures, he published strictures in regard to some of them, and incidentally in regard to religion as implicated with them, which bore a sceptical taint, and begat a distrust of him in the Christian community. We are glad to see in this calm and candid volume, that, as he advanced in life, he became a sincere believer in the gospel, and put his entire trust in Christ for salvation.

*A Quarter Century Discourse;* Delivered in the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, on Sunday, November 7th, 1858. By Henry A. Boardman, D. D. Philadelphia: Parry & McMillan. 1858.

A pastorate over the same church of twenty-five years' duration has been rare during the last quarter of a century. The few instances of it, therefore, deserve attention for the purpose of looking into the causes which promote that permanency which is so desirable in this relation. In this case the simple explanation is, the ability, tact, and fidelity of the pastor, together with a grateful appreciation of his services, a considerate attention to his wishes and wants, and warm personal attachment to him, on the part of the people. Christian love so welds together faithful ministers and faithful congregations, that their separation becomes an act of violence and sacrifice to both parties.

We are glad to have pastors avail themselves of opportunities to rehearse the dealings of God with them and their flocks, not only because it is fitted to awaken gratitude for the past, and courage for the future; to stir tender memories and solemn reflections; to instruct others, and provoke them to love and good works: but because this is the only way in which ample and sure materials can be provided for future church history. When Dr. Boardman entered the ministry it was the sanguine belief of many, who were not slow to proclaim it, that young ministers who espoused Old Calvinism were doomed to an impotent and barren pastoral career. The history of his pastorate is only one of a thousand which might be adduced to silence such pretensions. On these subjects Dr. Boardman has uttered no uncertain sound, and it is not the least important testimony given in this discourse, that the experience of a quarter of a century has only served to confirm his faith.

*The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* Translated out of the Original Greek, and with former Translations diligently Compared and Revised. New York: Collins & Brother. 12mo. pp. 548.

This is a beautiful and (so far as we have observed) correct edition of the authorized version, but divided into paragraphs, the old division into chapters and versions being scarcely indicated in the margin. To those who are offended or disturbed by the frequent pauses of the usual arrangement, nothing could be more acceptable than this neat volume. We observe an error in the prefatory statement to the reader, where the common division into chapters, as well as into verses, is ascribed to Robert Stephens, whereas the former was the work of Hugo de Sancto Caro, a learned Dominican and Cardinal, who died about six hundred years ago.

*Text-book of Church History.* By Dr. J. C. L. Gieseler. Vol. V. (From 1814 to the present time.) Edited from the author's manuscripts by Dr. E. R. Redepenning. Leipzig. 1855. 8vo. pp. 408.

This, with a supplementary volume on the History of Doctrines, completes the great work begun more than thirty years ago, and nearly at the same time with Neander's. Both works have been sufficiently described in former numbers of this journal, and our only object in this notice is to lay before our readers the following picture of religion in America as drawn by one of the great church-historians of the age. "Trade and gain is that which especially engrosses the American. A smooth politeness and cold selfishness, with an extravagant appreciation of his national institutions and contempt for all that is European, are chief traits of his character. In trade, deceit and overreaching is so habitual to him, that he is in this respect notorious throughout the commercial world. The inhabitants of the north-east provinces, (!) New York and Pennsylvania, precisely those who are most distinguished for external piety, are also most notorious for skill in cheating. Their religion shows itself by no means in its good effects upon their morals, and cannot therefore be so inward and sincere as it appears without. The truth in reference to this religiosity may thus be stated. America received her first stock of European colonists from England, and these brought a religious spirit with them from their fatherland. But the peculiar development of this religiosity in America must be explained from the one-sided inclination of the people to trade and gain. This effort occupies the greatest part of their time; the end of all their thoughts and plans is lucky speculation and great gain. The more entirely their whole estate, and therefore their whole happiness are at stake, and the greater the avidity

for gain, the greater is their need and their desire of the divine blessing on their efforts. On the other hand, so many frauds and cheats are practised, that their conscience forces them to seek for some atonement. Hence they feel constrained, after they have spent the largest portion of their time exclusively in business, to devote certain days and hours no less exclusively to the work of reconciliation with God, and making him well-disposed to them. It is not genuine religion which animates them, for this fills men at all times and pervades all their acts and thoughts, but a false and superstitious religiosity, which thinks by outward devotion and money-spending to conciliate and appease God. Of course such men are far from all reflection on religious subjects; they take the religion which the church provides, and reckon it indeed as meritorious to believe without change all that is prescribed to them. This is precisely one of their good works which they imagine they present to God." Pp. 372–3. This must be what the Germans call "Philosophy of History." We learn from it how justly we are sometimes treated, as a nation, in the lecture-rooms of Germany, and by her greatest men, though few of them have editors so brave and wise as to print posthumously what the author never meant to publish. Besides the general correctness of this portrait by the hand of a great master, it is worthy of remark how nicely it discriminates between the "north-east provinces" and others, thus showing that the author's sweeping declarations as to a whole people, without any loop-hole for exception or gradation, save the one just mentioned, were not made in haste but with deliberation. We need not say how much the knowledge and benevolence here shown in dealing with contemporary history must strengthen every reader's confidence in Gieseler's exhibition of antiquity, or suggest that some among us who can hardly believe that two and two make four, unless they have a German's word for it, may now be enabled for the first time to obey the oracular precept, KNOW THYSELF.

*History of the Christian Church.* By Philip Schaff, D. D., Author of the History of the Apostolic Church. From the Birth of Christ to the reign of Constantine, A. D. 1—311. New York. 1859. 8vo. pp. 535.

This may be regarded either as the first instalment of a general Church History, or as a complete work on the first three centuries. A little more than one fourth of the volume is occupied with a condensation or abridgment of the author's larger work on the Apostolical Church, which we reviewed at great length just five years ago. The remaining space is filled

with a continuation of the history until the time of Constantine, and seems to us, upon a cursory inspection, to have all the merits of the author's previous publications, which are too well known to need description here, and which have placed him in the first rank of contemporary writers on Church History, not only in this country but in Germany and England. The only faults, of form or substance, which have struck us on a slight examination, are such as may be charged upon the whole modern school of historiography which Dr. Schaff so creditably represents. An example, of the more substantial kind, is the concession which the German writers, by a sort of fashion, and as if without renewed examination, now habitually make as to the ancient mode of baptism, a concession not at all required or warranted, in our opinion, by the extant evidence. The same thing is equally, though less emphatically, true of some things that are said in reference to the origin of infant-baptism, episcopal church government, and liturgical worship. All these gratuitous concessions may be readily abused as premises, from which to draw conclusions not intended, and indeed repudiated, both by Dr. Schaff and the most eminent contemporary German writers. As to form, we see a great improvement on the favourite German method of Church History, with its endless subdivisions and its stereotyped rubrics, and would gladly have observed a still more marked approximation to the luminous and simple plan of Grote and Gibbon. We have some objection to the archæological rather than historical account of the religious states and usages of three whole centuries, as if they had been fixed and uniform, instead of indicating the specific changes, with the greatest chronological precision now attainable, and constantly distinguishing between the earlier and later portions of the same great period. What can be more dissimilar, for instance, than the penitential discipline, the form of worship, and the number of church-officers, at the beginning of the second and fourth centuries? And yet the general reader might be sometimes pardoned for supposing that the same description was intended to apply to both, although we doubt not that a diligent inquiry would discover, in the history itself, the data needed to correct this error, the defect here pointed out being one of form, not of substance.

It seems that Dr. Schaff began to write the work in English, which would probably have given it more freshness and vivacity, with less of that comparative prolixity and tameness incident to all translation, but with less too of that neatness and correctness which it now owes to the practised and accomplished pen of Mr. Yeomans; a correctness seldom marred, so

far as we have seen, by foreign idioms, or needless innovations, or an inadvertent substitution of the German for the English mode of writing proper names. The typography is elegant, with one exception, much more common in American than English publications, the incongruous mixture of inferior Greek type with the finest Roman. We conclude with an expression of regret that, even when completed on the present scale, the work will scarcely be adapted, as to size and cost, for academical instruction; but we trust that this deficiency or failure will be made good by its usefulness, not only as a standard work of reference for scholars and professional inquirers, but also as attractive and instructive reading for a wider public.

*The History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism, considered in its different denominational forms, and its relations to British and American Protestantism.* By Abel Stevens, LL. D. Vol. I. From the Origin of Methodism to the Death of Whitefield. New York: Carlton and Porter, 200 Mulberry street. London: Alexander Heylin, 28 Pater Noster Row. Pp. 480.

This descriptive title gives a good idea of the plan and purport of the volume before us. It is the commencement of a great work, as the author contemplates another volume to complete the history of Methodism proper, to be followed by two additional volumes, to give the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Few events in the history of the church, since the Reformation, can be compared in importance with the rise and progress of Methodism. It is a subject worthy of the ablest pen in the service of the church. It has often been treated in detail, or in detached portions. We have lives of Wesley, of Whitefield, and of Fuller, but there has no one yet risen to take a large, catholic, and at the same time, philosophical view of this great movement. Dr. Stevens has evidently appreciated the true compass of his task, and has produced a work of high interest and value. So much depends on the stand-point of an author, that however able and candid he may be, he cannot fail to present things as they appear from his point of view, and of course rather differently from that in which they present themselves to those occupying a different position. We can conceive of one history of Methodism written by an Arminian, another written by a Calvinist, another written by a man neither the one nor the other, all equally able, learned, catholic, and honest, and yet differing as much as so many pictures of the same landscape, painted by different artists, and from different positions. Dr. Stevens, while he does not attempt to conceal his own theological opinions, has endeavoured to do equal jus-

tice to the Arminian and Calvinistic elements of Methodism. This is a high and proper aim. It seems, however, to be beyond the reach of ordinary mortals. One of the first qualifications for a historian of any great religious movement is cordial sympathy with it. (How would it be possible for a Romanist to write a fair history of the Reformation?) But cordial sympathy with Arminianism is repugnance to Calvinism, and so *vice versa*. We must be content to have the views taken at different angles, and then pray for the stereoscope of charity, by which we may see them as one.

*The Martyred Missionaries. A Memorial of the Futtehgurh Mission, with some Remarks on the Mutiny in India.* By the Rev. J. Johnston Walsh, sole surviving member of the Futtehgurh Mission of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, No. 111 South Tenth street. 1858. Pp. 338.

The clerical members of the Futtehgurh mission were the Messrs. Freeman, Campbell, Johnston, and McMullin; of each of these a brief memoir is given, and also of their wives. These missionaries being all Americans, educated among us, in the prime or morning of life, known, therefore, to thousands of Christians still living, endeared to multitudes by personal intercourse and associations, and embalmed in their own blood, shed in the service of the Lord Jesus, whatever relates to them is sure to awaken a deep and wide-spread interest. One will turn to this volume to see the face of one long familiar, others will look for another. Princetonians will turn with special interest to the portrait and memorial of Robert McMullin. He was so recently among us, his features are so familiar, the impression left of his character is so pure and mild, that few dry eyes will look on the reflection of his well-remembered countenance. The fiery trial, even unto blood, through which the church has passed in India, will, we trust, awaken new interest in the work of missions in that part of the field, and help to keep in perpetual remembrance those who have perished in the cause. To both these ends the work before us is well adapted to minister.

*The Giant Judge; or, the Story of Samson, the Hebrew Hercules.* Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., of San Francisco. San Francisco: Whitton & Co. 1858. Pp. 324.

The eminent services which Dr. Scott has rendered the church as a pastor in New Orleans, and latterly in San Francisco, and the demands made on his time and strength by his arduous official duties, have not prevented him from distinguishing himself as a scholar and an author. His book on

Daniel, his Wedge of Gold, and now his Giant Judge, furnish abundant evidence of varied attainments and research. The last mentioned volume, of which mere accident prevented an earlier notice, is not designed simply to derive practical lessons from the history of Samson, but to furnish a vehicle for important doctrinal instruction. Thus we find in one chapter a learned dissertation on the office of the Judges under the old dispensation, and in another an instructive discourse on the theophanies recorded in the earlier books of Scripture, and proof that the manifested Jehovah of the Old Testament was the Logos afterwards manifested in the flesh. The style in which these works are written is clear and forcible; the doctrines which they contain are the doctrines of our standards, and their whole tendency is to promote knowledge and practical religion.

*The Life and Labours of the Rev. Daniel Baker, D. D., Pastor and Evangelist.* Prepared by his Son, the Rev. William M. Baker, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Austin, Texas. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, No. 606 Chestnut Street. 1858. Pp. 572.

To few of our readers can the name or character of Dr. Baker be unknown. He was not only so successful, but so extensive in his labours; he ministered in the gospel in so many parts of the country, that he was more widely personally known than almost any other minister of our church. The Memoir of his life and labours has been prepared under unusual advantages. It is the work of an affectionate and admiring son, who had long cherished the purpose to erect this monument to his father's memory. He therefore made preparation for the work through a course of years, and induced his parent himself to furnish, in the form of an Autobiography, the materials which form the basis of the present volume. This, with the numerous letters which had been preserved, enabled the biographer to present the full and satisfactory account of Dr. Baker's extraordinary course of usefulness which we find here recorded. There is much in the volume not only to interest the wide circle of personal friends of the deceased, but also to instruct both ministers and private Christians.

*Day-Dawn in Africa; or, Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Mission at Cape Palmas, West Africa.* By Mrs. Anna M. Scott. New York: Protestant Episcopal Society for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge. 11 Bible House, Astor Place. 1858. Pp. 314.

This history commences with the year 1851. The mission was established in 1836; for an account of its earlier years the reader is referred to the work of Mrs. E. F. Hening, a member of the mission. This volume is adorned with numer-

ous illustrations, which add materially to its value. Every accession to our knowledge of the progress of the gospel in heathen lands is of importance to the whole church. It tends to strengthen the faith and encourage the hope of all the people of God, and to give new vigour to their efforts for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. To no part of the world are the eyes of Christians turned with more interest than to Africa; and in no part of the missionary field do they find more to encourage and excite.

*The Revelation of John the Divine; or, A New Theory of the Apocalypse, corroborated by Daniel and other Prophets.* By Samuel S. Ralston. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 40 North Sixth street. William S. Young, 1023 Race street. 1858. Pp. 208.

"Fully convinced," says Mr. Ralston, "that the true key to this complicated system is yet to be discovered, the writer has laboured intensely for the attainment of this great desideratum; in the hope that the boon may be given by Him who said "Let there be light." Such devotion to a laudable object is worthy of all respect, even when success does not reward the student's zeal. We cannot pretend, in the compass of a notice, to give our readers an idea of the author's theory, much less to enter on a discussion of its merits. We can only recommend it as the fruit of long continued and laborious study.

*A Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors, living and deceased,* from the earliest accounts to the middle of the Nineteenth Century. Containing thirty thousand Biographies and Literary Notices, with forty Indexes of subjects. By S. Austin Allibone. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Childs & Peterson, 602 Arch street. 1858. Pp. 1005.

The labour involved in the preparation of such a work as this, no one but the author, or some one engaged in a like herculean task, can in any way understand. Nor can its value be duly estimated except after long use. It is necessary that the student should, time after time, find his own labours abridged, the sources of desired information pointed out, and facts determined on the spot which could not otherwise be ascertained without extended research, before the full worth of such a work as this can be comprehended. What a lexicon is to the student of a new language, this work is to the student of English and American literature. The plan of the writer leads him to give a brief biographical notice of the several authors, a list of their works, and either an independent judgment on their merits, or citations from the critical judgments of others. Literary questions of interest are also discussed, and the literature relating to them is pointed out. For example, seven columns and a half

of closely printed matter are devoted to the vexed question of the authorship of the Letters of Junius. We cannot do more than express in the strongest terms our respect for the diligence, ability, and fairness which Mr. Allibone has exhibited in the preparation of this important work.

*Annals of the American Pulpit, or Commemorative Notices of distinguished American Clergymen of various Denominations, from the early settlement of the Country to the close of the year* 1855. With Historical Introductions. By William B. Sprague, D.D. Vol. V. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 815.

Having given reviews of the former volumes of Dr. Sprague's great work, we have only to repeat our judgment, that it is a storehouse of valuable historical information not elsewhere to be found. The estimate of the importance of the work rises with the appearance of each succeeding volume. Those relating to Presbyterians had an interest of one kind, which the others had not; and on the other hand, this, which treats of Episcopalians, including the memoirs of distinguished men with whose lives and labours Presbyterians were less likely to be familiar, has on that account its peculiar claims.

*The Last Days of Jesus; or, the Appearances of our Lord during the Forty days between the Resurrection and Ascension.* By T. V. Moore, D. D., Richmond, Virginia. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 300.

The combination of learning, ability, and piety, evinced in this and other publications of Dr. Moore, have secured for him ready access to the ear of the church. The peculiarly interesting and solemn nature of the occurrences which are here illustrated and unfolded, give to this his latest work a special attraction for Christians.

*The Land and the Book; or, Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and Scenery of the Holy Land.* By W. M. Thompson, D.D., Twenty-five years a Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in Syria and Palestine. Maps, Engravings, &c. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1859. Pp. 557 and 611.

Probably no one now living is so well qualified for the task here undertaken as the author of these volumes. The fact that he has been twenty-five years a missionary in the lands which he essays to describe, and from which his illustrations of Scripture are drawn, is itself enough to secure confidence in his representations. But to this must be added not only his superior personal accomplishments, but also the consideration that his duties led him to extensive travel, and to protracted sojourn in various parts of Syria and the Holy Land. His opportunities of observation, therefore, have been as varied as pro-

longed. We are satisfied that the reader will find a peculiar charm in these volumes, and be surprised at the number, felicity, and importance of the illustrations of scriptural expressions and allusions with which they abound. The work has just come to hand, but we found it hard to lay it aside after once commencing its perusal. We congratulate our friend the author on the accomplishment of a truly valuable work.

*The Happy Home.* By Kirwan, author of Letters to Bishop Hughes, Romanism at Home, Men and Things in Europe, etc., etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Sqnare. 1858. Pp. 206.

The versatile and skilful pen of "Kirwan" has found a new field. It is no longer the humour and quiet vein of sarcasm which rendered his letters to Bishop Hughes so effective and so successful, but the serious, didactic tone of the experienced pastor. He says in his Preface, that having devoted special attention during his long ministry "to the instruction of his people as to the family institution, and as to the duties arising out of the relations which the members of the family bear to one another," and having witnessed the beneficial effects of such instruction, he was led to commit the views which he had inculcated from the pulpit to the press, in hopes of a more extended benefit. He treats in order, first of the moral, then of the mental, then of the religious training of children; enlivening wise counsel with interesting anecdotes and historical incidents. We commend the book both to parents and children.

*Obedience, the Life of Missions.* By Thomas Smyth, D. D. Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 170.

This is a sequel to the two preceding works of the same author, "How is the World to be Converted?" and "Faith the Principle of Missions." They were all prepared by Dr. Smyth as Chairman of the Committee of the Synod of South Carolina on Foreign Missions, and ordered by the Synod for publication. They come, therefore, before the churches with the sanction of a high authority.

*Palestine, Past and Present.* By the Rev. Henry S. Osborn, A. M., Professor of Natural Science, Roanoke College, Va. Member of the American Scientific Association, and Honorary Member of the Malta Scientific Institute. Philadelphia: James Challen & Sons. 1859.

"This work is the result of recent researches in Palestine and a portion of Syria. It embraces the Natural, Scientific, Classical and Historical features of this, the most interesting of all lands, and identifies and illustrates many scriptural pas-

sages hitherto unnoticed." The engravings are from new and original designs taken by the author, and the map is from his own actual surveys. This work is designed to be not only instructive, but itself ornamental as a work of art. The illustrations prepared for the volume are chromographs, tinted lithographs, and the finest wood engravings. This is a fitter subject on which to lavish the resources of the press, and the graver, than ideal likenesses of celebrated beauties.

*The Children of the Church and Sealing Ordinances.* Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 110.

A republication of an article from the *Princeton Review;* attributed to the pen of the Rev. Dr. Atwater. We are glad that our Board of Publication has at last seen their way clear to give their imprimatur to an article which could never have been the subject of misgiving, had it not been from strange misunderstanding. It would be a serious matter of regret if views expressed almost in the words of the symbols and leading theological writers of the Reformed Churches, should fail to meet the approval of Old-school Presbyterians, who boast of their adherence to the faith of their fathers.

*A Sermon, delivered on the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Author's Ministry in the Third Congregational Church, New Haven, July 25th,* 1858. By Elisha Lord Cleaveland. New Haven: Thomas H. Pease.

*Misrepresentations Corrected.* Review of Dr. Cleaveland's Anniversary Sermon. From the *New Englander* for November, 1858.

*Dr. Cleaveland's Statement in reply to Dr. Dutton's Review of his late Anniversary Sermon.* New Haven: Thomas H. Pease. 1858.

Those who know the history of Dr. Cleaveland's church, know that its position and career have been determined by the author's rejection of Taylorism. No truthful or even intelligible account of its fortunes and vicissitudes, for a quarter of a century, could be given, without referring to this fact. Any historical review of this church for this period, which ignored this fact, would be like playing Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out. Dr. Cleaveland, therefore, specifies the self-love theory of Dr. Taylor as having first awakened his repugnance. Dr. Dutton complains of this as a "gross misrepresentation of Dr. Taylor." How any one familiar with Dr. Taylor's teachings can consider this a misrepresentation, we do not see; much less how Dr. Dutton can so consider it. For, in his eulogy of Dr. Taylor, he says that his "self-love theory, or desire of happiness theory, as it has been called; viz. that all motives that come to the mind find their ultimate ground of appeal in the desire of personal happiness; and that the idea of right in

its last analysis is resolved into a desire of personal happiness," will not "bear the test of time and light."

Dr. Cleaveland next declared his disbelief of "that native freedom from sin, that undiminished power of will, that limitation of the Spirit's office-work, and that enthronement of reason as the judge of Scripture, so confidently maintained by the friends of the new theology." Dr. Dutton pronounces this "a palpable and injurious misrepresentation"! What next? Who will tell us, after this, what were Dr. Taylor's discoveries and improvements in theology? How does Dr. Dutton prove this grave charge? Does he deny that Dr. Taylor held to "native freedom from sin"? Not at all. He says Dr. Taylor and his friends "did *not* teach, as this paragraph virtually declares, that men are not by nature sinners." Who said that they did? Not Dr. Cleaveland. Dr. Dutton does not venture to deny what Dr. Cleaveland said. He attributes to him what he did not say, and then complains of it as a "gross and palpable misrepresentation." All we can say is, that if it be a misrepresentation, Dr. Dutton, not Dr. Cleaveland, is its author. Dr. Dutton proceeds: "they did *not* teach that the human will is unaffected by sin, or by the apostasy." Who said that they did? A will "unaffected by sin" is one thing. "Undiminished power of will," to which Dr. Cleaveland objected, is another. Nor does Dr. Dutton venture to deny that this was taught. And is it to be questioned that the office-work of the Spirit was limited by the theory of a power in the will to sin "despite all opposing power"? Or can any man fairly deny that human reason and common sense were raised by this school to an oracular authority in reference to the obvious teachings of Scripture, which was quite novel in orthodox communions?

Dr. Cleaveland adverted to the recent disintegration of old parties and the formation of new ones in the communion to which he belongs, stating that, while some were growing more orthodox, others were pushing their speculations closer to the heart of Christianity, to the Trinity, atonement, &c., and some were even "exchanging signals of sympathy with Unitarians." This last seems most seriously to have disturbed Dr. Dutton. It appears that, a few years ago, he admitted Professor Huntington of Harvard College to his pulpit. He assumed that Dr. Cleaveland had a chief reference to this fact, in the foregoing paragraph, and that it was so understood by his auditors. This was a wholly gratuitous inference. We venture to say that not one in twenty of the hearers or readers of Dr. Cleaveland's discourse so much as thought of the circumstance. For there was too much of a far graver character in other quarters,

of which we, and we presume others, thought, on reading the discourse. Dr. Cleaveland declares that he did not so much as think of it in penning the paragraph so loudly complained of.

We see no "misrepresentations," therefore, for Dr. Dutton to correct in this case, except his own.

---

# LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

## GERMANY.

H. Hupfeld, The Psalms translated and explained. Vol. II. 8vo. pp. 424. This volume extends through Psalm 50.

L. Reinke, The Messianic Psalms. Introduction, original text, and translation; with a philological, critical and historical Commentary. Vol. II. Part 2d. 8vo. pp. 316.

L. Reinke, Deviations of the Septuagint and Vulgate versions of the Psalms, from the Hebrew text, compared with the Latin translation of Jerome and the Hebrew text, with critical explanations. 8vo. pp. 314.

W. Neumann, Jeremiah of Anathoth, an Exposition of his Prophecies and Lamentations. Vol. 2. (which completes the work.) 8vo. pp. 536.

M. Baumgarten, Acts of the Apostles, or the Development of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome. Second Edition. Vol. I. from Jerusalem to Corinth. 8vo. pp. 630.

A. Trana, Pauli ad Galatas Epistola. 8vo. pp. 80.

C. J. Bunsen, Complete Biblical Apparatus (Bibel-werk) for the Community. Vol. I. Containing preliminary essays and a new translation of the Pentateuch. 8vo. pp. 394 and 348.

H. Hupfeld, On the Hebrew feasts and festivals. Part 3. On the Sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee. 4to. pp. 22. (Latin.)

J. Bachmann, The Laws respecting Feasts in the Pentateuch. 8vo. pp. 152.

C. F. Kahnis, On the Angel of the Lord. 4to. pp. 20. (Latin.)

C. J. Trip, The Theophanies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament. 8vo. pp. 219.

J. H. Kurtz, The Sons of God in Gen. vi. 1—4, and the Angels that sinned in 2 Pet. ii. 4, 5 and Jude verses 6, 7. 8vo. pp. 95. This is a defence of the author's previous publication, The Marriage of the Sons of God with the Daughters of Men, against some strictures from the pen of Hengstenberg.

Gregorii Bar-Hebræi Scholia in librum Jobi. Edited from the MSS. with an explanation of the more difficult passages, and critical notes, by G. H. Bernstein. 4to. pp. 16.

H. G. Hoelemann, The Position of St. Paul relative to the question of the time of the Second Advent. 8vo. pp. 32.

C. G. Wilke, Greek and Latin Lexicon of the New Testament. 8vo. pp. 860.

The Book of Wisdom in Greek and Latin. Edited by F. H. Reusch. 8vo. pp. 62.

Lieutenant van de Velde, Plan of the town and environs of Jerusalem. Constructed from the English ordnance survey and measurements of Dr. T. Tobler, with memoir by Dr. Titus Tobler. 4to. pp. 24, with 3 lithographs in 4to and folio. Scale 1 to 4843.

Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation, by an American citizen, translated from English into Hebrew at the request of his brethren, the divinity students in the United Presbyterian Seminary, Edinburgh, by Isaac Salkinson. 8vo. pp. 184.

H. Ewald, History of Israel. 2d edition. Vol. 6. History of the Apostolic age to the destruction of Jerusalem. 8vo. pp. 754.

J. M. Jost, History of Judaism and its Sects. 2d Part. 8vo. pp. 463.

H. Graetz, The Legislation of the Western Goths regarding the Jews. 4to. pp. 36.

J. H. Kurtz, Outlines of Church History. 4th Edition. 8vo. pp. 206.

J. H. Kurtz, Handbook of Universal Church History. 2d Edition. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 558 and 206.

D. Schenkel, Christian Dogmatics in 2 volumes. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 512.

F. H. Frank, Theology of the formula of Concord historically and dogmatically developed. Part I. Original Sin and Free Will. 8vo. pp. 240.

H. Laemmer, The ante-Tridentine Catholic Theology of the period of the Reformation, from the original sources. 8vo. pp. 353.

H. Heppe, History of German Protestantism from 1555 to 1581. Vol. IV. from 1577 to 1581, a continuation of the history of the Lutheran formula of Concord. 8vo. pp. 399.

C. Wile, Beginnings of the renovation of the Church in the 11th century from the sources. Part I. 8vo. pp. 140.

J. E. Jörg, History of Protestantism in its latest development. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 1158.

Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviæ. Collection of original documents relating to the history of Moravia. Vol. VII. Part 1. 4to. pp. 440.

L. Preller, Roman Mythology. 8vo. pp. 822.

T. Mommsen, Roman Chronology to the time of Cæsar. 8vo. pp. 283.

A. Fabretti, Glossarium Italicum, Explanatory of the words found upon the Umbrian, Sabine, Oscan, Volscian, Etruscan and other monuments. In 10 numbers. No. 1. 4to. pp. 160. Turin.

J. G. Stickel, The Etruscan shown by an Explanation of inscriptions and names to have been a Semitic language. 8vo. pp. 296.

Facciolati, Forcellini et Furnaletti Lexicon totius Latinitatis, enlarged from the works of Klotz, Freund, Döderlein and others, by F. Corradini. In 4 vols. of 10 numbers. No. 1. 4to. pp. 80. Venice.

F. Mone, Greek History. Vol. I. No. 1. 8vo. pp. 80.

J. P. Fallmerayer, The Albanese Element in Greece. Part 1, on the origin and antiquity of the Albanese. 4to. pp. 71.

H. Brugsch, Geographical Inscriptions of Egyptian Monuments. Vol. II. Geography of neighbouring lands from Egyptian monuments, with 23 plates. 4to. pp. 96.

A. Gladisch, Empedocles and the Egyptians, with elucidations from the Egyptian monuments, by H. Brugsch and J. Passalacqua. 8vo. pp. 156.

R. Lepsius, King's-book of the ancient Egyptians. 4to. pp. 188, with 73 lithograph plates.

M. Uhlemann, Handbook of universal Egyptian Archæology. Part 4th, The Literature of the ancient Egyptians explained and illustrated by examples. 8vo. pp. 316.

Bibliotheca Ægyptiaca, Repertory of the various writings, treatises, and essays, in scientific and other journals, which had appeared up to 1857 in relation to Egypt, its geography, natural history, monuments, language, etc., etc., by H. Jolowicz, with an alphabetical register. 8vo. pp. 244.

F. Müller, The Expression of the Verb in the Arian and Semitic cycle of languages. 8vo. pp. 39.

Mutanabbii Carmina cum Commentario Wâhidii. Ex MSS. ed. F. Dieterici. No. 1. 4to. pp. 176.

Ibn Hishâm, Life of Mohammed, from the MSS. By F. Wüstenfeld. Part 2d. 8vo. pp. 296.

Ibn Abd-el-Hakemis history of the Conquest of Spain, now edited for the first time, translated (into English) from the Arabic, with critical and exegetical notes, and a Historical Introduction, by J. H. Jones. 8vo. pp. 114.

Mohammedan Sources for the History of the Countries on the Southern Shore of the Caspian Sea, published, translated and explained, by B. Dorn. Parts 2 and 3. 8vo. pp. 528 and 323. St. Petersburgh.

History of Georgia from antiquity to the 19th century, translated (into French) from Georgian, by Brosset. Part 2d. Modern History, No. 2. 4to. pp. 576. St. Petersburgh.

C. Lassen, Antiquities of India. Vol. 3. History of trade, and of the Greek and Roman knowledge of India, and the history of Northern India, from A. D. 319, to the Mohammedans. 8vo. pp. 1199.

J. Muir, Original Sanscrit texts on the origin and progress of the religion and institutions of India, collected, translated into English, and illustrated by notes. Part 1. The Mythical and Legendary account of Caste. 8vo. pp. 204. London.

F. Miklosich, The formation of Nouns in Old Slovenic. 4to. pp. 100.

F. G. Bergmann, The Scythians, ancestors of the Germanic and Slavic peoples. 8vo. pp. 76. (French.)

Library of Anglo Saxon Poetry, with a Glossary, by C. W. Grein. Vol. 2d. 8vo. pp. 416.

Calendewide, i. e. Menologium Ecclesiæ Anglo-Saxonicæ poeticum, ed. Bouterwek. 8vo. pp. 40.

Ulfilas, or the monuments preserved to us of the Gothic language, Text, Grammar, and Dictionary, by F. L. Stamm. 8vo. pp. 472.

A. Castren, Koibalic and Karagassic Grammar, with lists of words from the Tartar dialects of the Minussin Cycle. 8vo. pp. 210.

J. C. Buschmann, The Tribes and Languages of New Mexico, and the Western side of British America. 4to. pp. 206.

G. M. Thomas, Newly Discovered Poems of Petrarch. 4to. pp. 16.

C. Tischendorf is about making an addition of three more volumes to his Monumenta Sacra Inedita, Nova Collectio. He has already published accurate copies of twenty-five of the most ancient manuscripts, or portions of manuscripts, of the Greek and Latin Scriptures, thus making these invaluable sources of textual criticism more generally accessible, and placing their

preservation beyond the risks to which the documents themselves, with all the care that can be bestowed upon them, are liable. The first two volumes of this collection, which appeared in 1855 and 1857, contained nine of these ancient documents. A third and fourth volume are promised the present year, and a fifth with an appendix in 1860. The third volume is to contain a reprint of the Leyden manuscript, older probably than the fifth century, and remarkable as containing fragments of Origen's Octapla, marked with the critical signs which he employed; the Wolfenbüttel palimpsest of about the same age, containing fragments of Luke and John, which was imperfectly examined a hundred years since by Knittel; and some smaller fragments of Mark and Luke from a palimpsest at St. Gall. The fourth volume will contain a Greek Psalter of the seventh century, which is written in letters of gold and silver upon purple, and belongs to the public library of Zurich. The fifth, fragments of Genesis from the Vienna purple and illuminated manuscripts; fragment of the Gospels recovered from the Wolfenbüttel palimpsest of the sixth century; fragments of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, found in Paris, from the same manuscript of Origen's Octapla as those in Leyden; all the citations from either Testament in a Wolfenbüttel manuscript of Chrysostom of the sixth century; the complete text of the books of Judges and Ruth, from a manuscript found by the editor in the East, and now in the British Museum; and a fragment of the book of Genesis, which is perhaps without its like in having the uncial character upon one page, and the oldest form of the Greek small letter upon another. In an appendix will be published a new edition of Bishop Laud's Oxford manuscript of the Acts of the Apostles, in Greek and Latin, which was printed, though with many inaccuracies, one hundred and fifty years ago. These volumes will be issued in a style correspondent with their predecessors, which were honoured with the prize medal at Paris, and will be accompanied with fac-similes and prolegomena. Two hundred copies only will be issued. The price is sixteen Prussian thalers, or sixty-four francs per volume.