THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1859.

No. III.

ART. I.—1. *Introduction à l'Histoire du Buddhisme, India.* Par E. BURNOUF. Paris, 1844.

2. *Manual of Budhism.* By R. SPENCER HARDY.

3. *Eastern Monachism*, by the same.

4. *Notices of Chinese Buddhism.* By Rev. J. EDKINS. Shanghae: Published in the North China Herald, 1855–6.

IN the antiquity of its claims and the wide-spread influence of its dogmas, Budhism comes to us as one of the most imposing systems which man has ever devised. Commencing with India, where it held sway for more than a thousand years, it sent its missions into Cashmere and Thibet on the north, to Ceylon on the south, to Birmah, Siam, Java, China and Japan, on the east, and to this day, though driven from the country of its birth, it holds sway in nearly every country of its adoption; while the number of its votaries far exceeds that of any other religious system on the globe.

To have sustained itself so long and so successfully, this system must have had some power of adaptation to the wants of mankind, and must also have found those in the course of its progress who have advocated its principles both with learning and zeal. Though it may now appear to us as a decayed and worn-out system, it has had its youth and vigour. The time was, when Kings and Emperors thought it their highest glory

to contribute to its promotion. It is the only system too of any note, except Christianity, which ever propagated itself out of the country of its birth, by persuasion. It has weathered many a storm of persecution; and endured until it has rivalled or outstripped indigenous systems of belief.

In the following article it is proposed to give some account of the main features of this system, relying for authority mostly on the works named at the head of this article. The system, however, comes to us under so many different aspects, it has in the long course of its history undergone so many changes, and is represented by so many different countries, and oftentimes by so many schools in each country; and the sources of authority are moreover so little known to occidental writers, that it is not easy to give even its main features. Some other writer, investigating from another point of view, may find features which seem to him entirely irreconcilable with those here presented. The object in the present instance was to investigate Budhism in China, but as it is a plant of foreign growth there, it was thought more satisfactory to trace its peculiarities in its native land; and then mark the changes which have occurred in transplanting it to another soil. This article divides itself therefore into Budhism in India and Budhism in China.

Before entering in detail upon the consideration of this subject, it seems necessary to refer to the sources of authority from which information is derived. These divide themselves into the remote or original authorities, and the nearer or those accessible to European students. The original sources of information come through the medium of the Sanscrit and Pali. The former is the authority for the Northern school of Budhists, and is that from which the sacred books in China were translated. A large collection of Budhist books, written in Sanscrit, was made by Mr. Hodgson, while British resident in Nepaul. Considerable portions of these were translated by Mons. Burnouf into French. He divides these books into three classes. First, the Sutras, or works which were intended to represent the sayings of Budha, but which were afterwards much enlarged. The second class treats of metaphysics, or the doctrinal parts of the system; and the third, of the discipline and morals, or the externals of the system.

Burnouf appears to favour the opinion that the Sanscrit was the learned language of both Budhists and Brahmans, while the Pali was the spoken language of Magadha—the country in Central India to which Budhism owes its origin. The Pali, however, became a highly cultivated language. Hardy says that in Ceylon he found thirty-five works on the grammar of this language, some of them of considerable extent. He supposes that it held universal sway in India during the prevalence of the Budhist faith, and that it prevailed to some extent in Bactria and Persia. The Southern school of Budhists, as Ceylon and Siam, look to the Pali as the medium through which they have received their sacred books. It was in Ceylon, and mostly from Singhalese authorities, that Hardy collected the materials of his Manual of Budhism.

Upon many points, and in fact in all the main features of the system, these two sources of authority, the Northern and the Southern, the Sanscrit and the Pali, agree. Some features appear more prominent in one than in the other, but this may be owing partly to the different way in which they were seen by Hardy and Burnouf—the former an English missionary in Ceylon for twenty-five years, and looking mostly at the practical features of the system—the latter a learned Professor in Paris, examining it mostly from a literary and philosophical point of view. In reference to Budhism in India, our labour will be to arrange and compile mostly from these two sources, such information as will give an idea of the main features of the system. For the sake of convenience we adopt, with some modification, the division of Burnouf, and consider 1st. The origin of the system, or Budha himself. 2d. The metaphysics or doctrinal part, and 3d. The externals of the system—its morals and discipline.

The first point of inquiry is its *origin*. Here we have to distinguish between the real historical origin, and that mythical exaggerated account which is now current in all Budhist countries. The historical founder was Gautama Budha,* who

* Burnouf conjectures that the term Gautama or Gotamo (which, like Budha, is spelled in every variety of form,) was the sacerdotal family name of the military race of the Sakyas. (Introduction, p. 155.) Sakyamuni is one of the common designations of Budha in India and China, and means "sage of the house of Sakya."

was born in the kingdom of Magadha, a country of Central India, lying between the Ganges and the Himalayas, in the year 618 B. C. He probably appeared among his countrymen as a simple ascetic, in the same manner with the Brahmans, and differing in no respect from them, either as to manner of life or teachings, except about the method of escape from the inevitable law of transmigration. The idea of transmigration, which the Budhists have borrowed from the Brahmans, is that the visible world is in a state of perpetual change; that death succeeds life, and life death; that the animal or man is reproduced in some other form either as animal or man, without any end. From this fatal law of change, Budha proposed the possibility of escape by entering upon the state called *Nirvana*, or as most writers upon this subject say, upon a state of annihilation. This doctrine of the *Nirvana* is the central one of Budhism, and though subject to modification and change, like every other part of the system, has yet maintained its place more uniformly than any other doctrinal feature. Its rites and ceremonies—the externals of worship—have changed less than its teachings. This may be true of all false systems. Error has no certain ground to stand upon. It claims to be progressive, but only shifts its position from one sliding foothold to another, and finally rests for quiet in the mere externals of worship.

The followers of Budha, unlike those of Confucius, were unwilling that their founder should retain a mere historical position; and they have accordingly embellished his life with every extravagant fancy which even an oriental imagination could furnish; and not only that, the doctrine of transmigration has furnished them with an easy method of supplying biographies *ad libitum*. Books are filled giving accounts of him as he appeared in various states and personages, sometimes as an animal and sometimes as a man, before his appearance on earth as a Budha. Our slow imaginations weary in attempting to follow back the present Budha through the interminable existences in which he has appeared.* And then

* The Budhists have a method of getting at the indefinite period which has past, which will bear some comparison in length to the days of creation according to modern geologists. They divide the periods in which changes have taken place into Kalpas. Eighty small Kalpas make one large one. One way of getting at the length of a small Kalpa, is the following. During its con-

there were twenty-four, some say one hundred Budhas beyond him. "Between the manifestations of one Budha and the advent of his successor a long period is represented as intervening, in which the religion revealed by one Budha becomes extinct. When the next Budha appears, he revives by revelation the doctrines of the Budhistical faith. The religion of the present period, it is said, will endure five thousand years, of which two thousand four hundred, or not one-half, have already passed." (*Turnour's preface to a translation of the Mahawanso*, p. 28.) We shall not attempt to pass back into the interminable period of the preceding Budhas, nor into the former lives of the present Budha, merely remarking in passing that though tedious in the extreme, they sometimes contain passages of real beauty, where the moral is pointed with force, sometimes with a fable which might grace the pages of an Æsop. We append two by way of example, in a note,* taken from *Hardy's "Manual of Budhism."*

As already intimated, Budha was born in the kingdom of Magadha. He was the son of the king of that country, and left his father's house at the age of nineteen, to lead the life of

tinuance the age of man gradually decreases one year at a time from an immeasurable length down to ten years, and then increases in the same ratio from ten to eighty thousand years. Now it took twenty of these small Kalpas to complete the world; through twenty more it remains in the same state. We are in this division of which there are eleven more small Kalpas to come. These are the Kalpas of establishment; and then come forty small Kalpas of destruction; which, together, make eighty or one great Kalpa. (*Edkins's Notices of Chinese Budhism.*

* The unwise use of strength is represented by the son of a carpenter who was called by his father to kill a mosquito that had lighted on his bald pate. The boy seizes an adze, and strikes such a blow that he not only kills the mosquito, but his father too.

Another represents tho folly of spending our thoughts on the present. A turkey-buzzard sees the carcase of an elephant floating with some drift-wood in the current of a river. The buzzard flies to the prey and congratulates itself on the feast which it has for so many days. Intent upon its prey, the wood and the carcase float on; and still and quiet the buzzard is borne out to ocean. Its food becomes less, the wind arises, scatters the drift-wood, the bones of the elephant sink, and the buzzard then realizes, as it looks out on the broad ocean, —its food and its support all gone and no land in sight—how foolish it was to have been so engrossed with its appetite. Vain then were its efforts. Its heavy wings could not bear it to land, and wearied and tired it sank beneath the waves.

an anchorite; at thirty, he suddenly came to the perception of the true wants and conditions of mankind. After this he lived forty-nine years, and discoursed to his disciples "of the revolutions of the wheel that perpetually carries mortals through the four miseries, that is birth, sickness, old age, and death; and of the excellent fruits of the religious system which he proposed;" or, in other words, a release from transmigration by entering upon the state of *Nirvana*. The death of Budha occurred at the age of seventy-nine, in the year 543 B. C. The time of his death is the point from which Budhists reckon. There has been much discrepancy as to this period, the Chinese annalists generally placing it further back; but the one just given is now usually received. In appearance and stature, Budha was represented as very extraordinary. He is said to have been twelve cubits high, and when his foot touched the earth, a lotus sprang up at every step. Thirty-two beauties are enumerated respecting his person. Not only did he possess these, but he was considered the beau-ideal of all that is most beautiful, praiseworthy, and great. Among his praises, it is said "the eye cannot see anything, nor the ear hear anything, nor the mind think of anything more excellent, or more worthy of regard than Budha." One of the perfections ascribed to Budha is complete knowledge. "There is no limit," it is said, "to the knowledge of the Budhas, and they are the only beings ever existent of whom this can be predicated. From them nothing can be hid. All times as well as all places are open to their mental vision." (*Manual of Budhism.*) Budha is on account of this knowledge considered a revealer. It is through him alone that anything is known of past history, that is, of the times preceding the present Budha. The scheme of religion is developed by revelation through Budha, and his inspired disciples; the age of inspiration having passed away in the century preceding our era. (*Turnour's preface to the Mahawanso*, p. 28.) One of the titles of Budha is, that he is omniscient of the present, the past and the future. Miraculous power is also ascribed to Budha, and to some extent to his disciples. There is also a class of beings higher than man, who, in their invisible state, often perform very wonderful things. On certain occasions they appear in human form, and

confer great blessings upon the faithful followers of Budhism. These marvellous tales of the power of Budha and his followers, who are able to call the invisible world to their assistance, fill up the pages of the Mahawanso, which was intended as an historical poem, giving an account of the early progress of Budhism.

Notwithstanding Budha's omniscience and miraculous power, he is never described as the Creator or Governor of the universe. Though worshipped by the common people as God, according to philosophical Budhism, he is in no sense God. He helps beings to obtain *Nirvana*, but not by any power which he exercises, but only by revealing the way. Wisdom and intelligence are ascribed to him in the highest degree, but no power or efficiency either over men, or the universe at large. He is often called a Saviour, but it is only in the sense of a revealer—he points out the way. The rest is accomplished by the individual, and the *opus operatum* efficacy of good works. The title of Saviour is a common one. Huc says that to the question, "Who is Budha?" a Mongol always replies, "The Saviour of men." In the Mahawanso, the object of his obtaining the supreme omniscient Budhahood, is said to be that he might redeem mankind from the miseries of sin. And again, he is said to be the vanquisher of the five deadly sins, the Saviour and dispeller of the darkness of sin.

There can be more than one Budha—not at a time—but in succession, after the lapse of *Kalpas*. Any being may be a candidate for this state, though it can only be obtained by being made the uniform object of pursuit through innumerable ages. In this process, they pass through countless phases of being from any of the lower order of animals to *dewas*, (who are the highest in the order of sentient beings, and are celestial or angelic in their nature.) In this incipient state, they are called Bodhisatwas. In the birth in which they become a Budha, they are always of woman born, and pass through infancy and youth, like ordinary beings. At death they enter *Nirvana*, or a state of non-existence, as is generally supposed. According to this view, Budha at his death B. C. 543, ceased to exist. He is no longer Budha, neither did he enter upon any other state of being. (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 5.) This places the worshippers of Budha in the marvellous position of

worshipping an extinct being. It is a matter of curiosity to see how the Budhists meet such an objection. Hardy gives the following, (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 228.) An individual is introduced with the objection, that if Budha now receives the offerings of men he has not obtained *Nirvana*, as in that state all cleaving to existing objects is destroyed; he is not existent, he cannot receive the offerings made to him. Nagasena, an expounder of Budhism, replies that he does not receive the offerings that are presented. Budha has attained *Nirvana*. Nevertheless, those who make offerings to him will receive the three great favours—the happiness of this world, of the *dewalokas* and *Nirvana*. Although Budha does not receive the offerings of the faithful, the reward of those offerings is certain. This statement is enforced by several comparisons, as of fire. Budha in the world was a brilliant flame. There is no desire in the flame to consume the grass or fuel, so there is none in Budha to receive the offerings. The flame does not exist, because of its desire to consume, but consumes what is placed in its way.*

This attempt at reconciling so absurd a thing as the worship of an extinct being has practically been of no avail. The people worship him not only as if he had not passed into *Nirvana*, but as if he had all the power of a god—a power which, in primitive Budhism at least, is never ascribed to him.

We come next to the consideration of the metaphysical or doctrinal part of the system. We have just seen that Budhism is theoretically atheistic.† Budha did not speak of any God. He did not claim to be himself God, and if extinct, in the state of *Nirvana*, he can be, in no sense, God. The fundamental

* It is also said that Budha, foreseeing what would happen in future times, told one of his disciples, "when I am gone you must not think there is no Budha; the discourses I have delivered, the precepts I have enjoined, must be my successors or representatives, and be to you as Budha."

† Hodgson, in speaking of the four principal schools of philosophy in Nepaul, (*Asiatic Researches*, Vol. xvi., p. 423,) mentions one which he terms Theists. They speak of one God, an intelligent being under the name of Adibudha. Although they deny his providence and government of the world, yet all beings were created more or less directly by him; and in order to escape from the fatal law of transmigration it is necessary to return to the bosom of God. This, though found in the midst of Budhism, is, as Burnouf remarks, only Brahmanism under another name.

idea of Deity, that of exercising power and control over the universe, is absent from the system. In this respect it is the very opposite of Brahmanism, which is Pantheism. Brahm is the only entity in the universe, the world and all it contains being only a manifestation of the Supreme spirit. In an atheistic system like Budhism the question immediately arises, what is their theory of accounting for the creation and government of the world?

The Budhists do not trace back the origin of all things to the calling them into existence out of nothing, but keep going back in the circle of existence—the bird is produced from the egg, and that from a former bird, and so on. If pressed still farther, they make *ignorance* the first term in the series of existence. Thus says Budha, "On account of ignorance, merit and demerit are produced; on account of merit and demerit, consciousness; on account of consciousness, body and mind; from body and mind, the six organs of sense; from these touch, then desire; from desire sensation, from sensation cleaving to existing objects—thence renewed existence: on account of reproduction of existence comes birth; from birth comes decay, death, sorrow, crying, pain, disgust and passionate discontent. Thus is produced the complete body of sorrow. From the cessation of merit and demerit is the cessation of consciousness, then of the body and mind, then the six organs of sense, and so on, until there is a cessation of birth and cessation of decay, and so the whole body of sorrow ceases to exist." (Quoted *Manual of Budhism*, p. 391.)

Here we have an abstract quality or *ignorance*, producing another abstract quality called *Karma*, or merit and demerit. This *Karma* (of which it is necessary to say more soon) produces consciousness, and consciousness endowed with physical force, produces body and mind. The Brahminical account is something similar. "Whilst Brahma formerly in the beginning of the *Kalpa*, was meditating on creation, there appeared a creation beginning with *ignorance* and consisting of darkness. From that great being appeared fivefold ignorance, consisting of obscurity, illusion, extreme illusion, gloom and utter darkness. The creation of the Creator thus plunged in abstraction was the fivefold (immovable) world, without intellect or reflec-

tion, void of perception or sensation, incapable of feeling and destitute of motion. Since immovable things were first created this is called the first creation."* This imperfect creation was succeeded by eight others, each more perfect than the preceding. The difference between the two systems appears to be that Brahmanism assigns the creation of this ignorance or darkness to Brahma, who is thus the original essence, and in some sense the first cause. But Budhism ignores any cause saying the beginning of duration does not appear. Ignorance was the first in the order of existence and duration; and what was beyond, it does not pretend to affirm. Thus a king is represented inquiring of Nagasena the expounder of Budhism: What is the root or beginning of past duration? what of future duration? what of present duration? The reply is, the beginning of these is ignorance or deception, and then follows the sequence in the order given above of consciousness, &c. An illustration is taken from a circle of which the priest asks the king if he can find the beginning or end—so it is, he says, with duration. There is no end to the order of sequences.

As Budhism thus rids itself of a Creator, let us next see how it disposes of a governor and controller of the universe. The second thing in the order of creation is said to be *Karma*—or the sum of merit and demerit. This is an abstract quality pervading all existence. In fact, Burnouf translates its equivalent as the *moral existence*, the being worthy of recompense or punishment. It does not seem, however, to be so much a part of existence as a law. No personality is ascribed to it. It has that kind of efficiency which is often ascribed to a law of nature. In the individual it is the sum of merit and demerit, and determines his state and character. Budha declared that "it was not by his own inherent power, nor by the assistance of the Dewas, (the highest of sentient beings,) that he obtained the Budhaship, but by the *Karma* of previous births." (*Manual of Budhism*, p. 448.) The Karma appoints whether the being to be produced shall be an insect or a worm, a fowl, a beast, a man, or a Dewa. The Karma is controlled by its own character. If it be good, it must necessarily appoint the being that will be produced to a state of

* Wilson's Vishnu Purana quoted *Manual of Budhism*, p. 393.

happiness; but if evil, it appoints the being to a state of misery. It works without the aid of material instrumentality; as the earth causes the seed to germinate, so the *Karma* produces a new existence; neither the earth, nor the seed, nor the *Karma*, possesses mind.

This *Karma* forms the connecting link in the theory of transmigration—a theory common to both Brahmans and Budhists. The idea of that theory is not that the soul passes from one state of existence into another, but that all the elements of existence are dissolved or broken up at death, and that the being no longer exists. And yet, the abstract *Karma*—the sum of merit and demerit, exists not as an entity—as an individual—or as a soul—but like a seed, determining what the next reproduction will be. It may not be like that immediately preceding, but varied according to the sum of merit and demerit, of all the preceding existencies. Thus a man may during his present existence, be one of the most meritorious of beings, but latent in his *Karma*, like an hereditary disease, may lie the crime of murder committed ages ago, which in the next stage of existence will have to be expiated. (*Manual of Budhism*, p. 396.)

One of their illustrations on this subject, is as follows:—Milk put away for the night becomes curd, from this curd comes butter, and this butter turns to oil. The priest asks, Now if any one were to say that milk is curd, or that it is butter, would he speak correctly? The king answers, No; because of the milk, oil has been gradually produced. In the same way says the priest, one being is conceived, another is born, another dies; when comprehended by the mind, it is like that which has no before and no after; no preceding and no succeeding existence. This illustration is applied to the same being, as the child and the grown up man.*

* An objection to this system, very naturally arises on the ground of moral responsibility. The king says, If the same body and mind is not again produced, that being is delivered from the consequences of sinful action. The priest replies, This does not necessarily follow. A man steals mangos. The owner of the fruit seizes him and brings him to the king. The thief replies, I have not stolen his mangos; the mango he planted was one; these are other, and different from that; I do not deserve to be punished. But the king rightly decides in favour of the owner, because the mangos stolen are the product of the one he had planted. So, in like manner, one body dies, another body and

It will be seen that this theory of the *Karma* introduces, instead of a moral governor, an abstract quality, which determines by a kind of blind law—by rule and measure—the state of each individual. It takes away the idea of responsibility to any supreme controlling power, and throws it into the hands of a blind fate, which like the germinating principle in plants, determines its precise state and form. As Hardy says: "It acknowledges that there is a moral government to the world, but it honours the statute book instead of the lawgiver, and adores the sceptre instead of the king."

This theory also helps us to understand what is peculiar in their teachings in regard to man. The connecting link in transmigration is not the soul, any more than it is the body, and the latter may vary in form through the successive stages of existence, from an insect to a Dewa. That is said to be a heterodox idea, that represents the soul "as flying happily away like a bird from its cage." But though heterodox, it is no doubt very commonly entertained. The philosophical theory however is, that the *Karma* is the connecting link. In the conversations already referred to, the king asks if the mind and body that are conceived in the present birth, are conceived in another birth? The priest replies, "No: this *nama* and *rupa*, (or mind and body,) acquires *Karma*, whether it be good or bad, and by means of this *Karma* another mind and body is produced." Thus the soul as well as the body, commences at each successive birth *de novo*.

Man, according to Budhism, is composed of five elements, which Burnouf gives as form, sensation, idea, conceptions, consciousness. These unite in the thinking, sensitive principle, the moment birth occurs. It is these united, that make the man—the individual; just as the different parts of a chariot, the wheels, the covering, &c., make the chariot. No one of the separate parts can be called a chariot, but the whole put together.

But the central or fundamental idea, in the metaphysical, or doctrinal system of Budhism, is that of *Nirvana*. This, how-

mind is conceived; but as the second mind and body is produced by the Karma of the first mind and body, there is no deliverance from the consequences of sinful action. (*Manual of Budhism, p.* 429.)

ever, presupposes—what is an axiom in Budhist faith, namely, that sorrow belongs to whatever comes into the world. All that is present and passing—all the phenomena of existence are evil. From this evil, the way of escape is by entering *Nirvana*—the primary idea of which state was release from present evil. And as evil is connected with everything that exists, it involved a cessation of all the known forms of existence. To this state man was taught to look forward, as one of perfection. There was to be not only a deadness to the world, but an abstraction from all forms of existence. Thus the four principles or grounds of supernatural power are said to be, 1st. The faculty of conceiving the abandonment of every idea of desire; 2d. of thought; 3d. of energy; 4th. of investigation. From all which, says Burnouf, it results that the Budhists attribute supernatural faculties to him who has reached the point of imagining that he has renounced all idea of desire, of thought, of effort, and of investigation or meditation, that is, to him who has, as it were, disengaged himself from all mental activity. (*Introduction*, p. 625.) This method of looking at all existing things as evil, and attempting to disengage the mind from all contact with passing phenomena, seems to have led them to adopt the conclusion, that everything objective was an illusion. In one of their books, which Burnouf translates, (p. 465) it is said, "that the Bodhisatwa, to whom it belongs, to live in the perfection of wisdom, must not stop at form, nor at sensation, nor at idea, nor at conception, nor at consciousness. Why so? Because if he stops at form, he lives in the notion, that form exists; he lives not in the perfection of wisdom. To one in this state form is intangible, and the same is true of sensation, idea, conceptions, consciousness—all which things are intangible to one in the state of perfection of wisdom." Again, "form is said to be an illusion, and illusion itself form."

This idea, that all things are an illusion, seems to extend only to the objective, and not to the subjective, though Hardy says the Budhists consider man as a nonentity. The Northern Budhists, however, speak specially of the non-reality of external things, and this mostly in connection with a preparation for the state of *Nirvana*. The mode in which that state was to be reached, was by the cessation of evil desire, and that involved

a cessation of the elements of existence. The attempt was to be made, to divest one's-self of all passion and enjoyment, and thus by considering all things as an illusion, prepare for the state of perfection. Thus Budha says to Purna, a rich merchant, who had determined to adopt the life of a devotee: "Where there is no pleasure, there is neither satisfaction nor complacence. Where there is neither satisfaction nor complacence, there is no passion. Where there is no passion, there is no enjoyment. Where there is no enjoyment—the devotee, O Purna, who is affected neither with pleasure, passion nor enjoyment is said to be very near to *Nirvana.* There are, O Purna, sounds adapted to the ear, odours to the smell, tastes to the sense of taste, feelings to the touch, laws to the mind—all which are qualities desired, sought after, loved, transporting, giving rise to passion, and exciting the desires. If a devotee, perceiving these qualities, has no satisfaction in them, seeks not after them, feels no inclination towards them, has no complacence in them, it results that he has no pleasure; he is said to be very near *Nirvana.*" (*Burnouf*, p. 252.)

Both Sanscrit and Pali authorities agree in teaching that *Nirvana* means annihilation. Hardy's statement on this subject is as follows: "The unwise being, who has not yet arrived at a state of purity, or, who is subject to a future birth, overcome by the excess of evil desire, rejoices in the organs of sense, and commends them. These, therefore, become to him like a rapid stream, to carry him onward toward the sea of repeated existence; they are not released from old age, decay, death, sorrow, &c. But the being who is purified, perceiving the evils arising from the sensual organs, and their relative objects, does not rejoice in them, nor does he commend them, or allow himself to be swallowed up by them. By the destruction of the one hundred and eight modes of evil desire, he has released himself from birth, as from the jaws of an alligator; he has overcome all attachment to outward objects, he does not regard the unauthorized precepts, nor is he a sceptic; and he knows that there is no egotism, no self. By overcoming these four errors, he has released himself from cleaving to existing objects, he is released from birth, whether as a Brahma, man, or any other being. By the destruction of birth, he is released

from old age, decay, death, sorrow, &c. All the afflictions connected with the repetition of existence are overcome. Thus, the principles of existence are annihilated, and that annihilation is *Nirvana.* (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 291.)

But upon this point there is a satisfaction in knowing how this doctrine is presented by the Budhists themselves. One of the conversations which Hardy quotes (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 398,) commences with the idea that *Nirvana* is independent of any exterior cause. It is, of course, independent of Budha, for it is a state to which he attains. If it is annihilation, it is like space, in which the individual being is lost and swallowed up. But to proceed with the conversation. The king makes the statement that everything must have a cause—the son has a father, the scholar a teacher, the bud a seed. But the priest replies, *Nirvana* is not a thing that can be produced, and therefore it has not been said by Budha that it has a cause; it is a mystery not to be understood; it cannot be said that it is past, present, or future. The king says, Then you speak of a thing that is not; you merely say that *Nirvana* is *Nirvana*, therefore there is no *Nirvana.* The priest replies, Great king, *Nirvana is*—it is a perception of the mind, the pure, delightful, free from ignorance, and evil desire is perceived by the *rahats* who enjoy the fruition of the paths. He then compares it to the wind, the colour of which cannot be told, neither can it be said that it is long or short; it cannot be taken into the hand, yet the wind *is;* even so *Nirvana* is—destroying the infinite sorrow of the world, and presenting itself as the chief happiness of the world, but its attributes or properties cannot be declared. Again, the king asked the priest, Is the joy of *Nirvana* unmixed, or is it associated with sorrow? The priest replied that it is unmixed satisfaction, entirely free from sorrow. The king does not at first understand this, as there is sorrow in attaining it. But the priest shows that there are many things that are pleasant in the fruition, which, in the acquisition, are attended with sorrow. Now while the logical conclusion seems to be that *Nirvana* means the annihilation of the thinking subject, inasmuch as, in that state, he is released from the evils of existence, from all cleaving to and delight in existence in any form, yet some of their representations, such

as those above referred to, give an apparent substantiality to this state. It is, and it is a state of happiness. Still that happiness has nothing of activity about it. Budhism knew of no implantation of right affections and holy desires which could be as active as the evil had been, and in the exercise of which heaven could consist. It only spoke of rooting up the evil, and of the cessation of evil desire, which necessarily clave to, and was connected with existence. This made its heaven, annihilation. Goodness on earth is quietism, indifference to existing objects. The less satisfaction, pleasure, or complacence the Budhist took in anything existing, the nearer was he to being released from the fatal law of transmigration, and the nearer his approach to *Nirvana*.

The counterpart of *Nirvana* is properly existence, or this world of sorrow through which human beings are called to pass in the countless changes of transmigration. But the idea of annihilation is one from which the human mind revolts, and such a *Nirvana* has often been exchanged for a place of reward, and as a counterpart, a place of punishment has also been invented. Punishment, except in the course of transmigration, does not appear at first to have been very prominent, but afterwards became one of the principal features of Budhism. This punishment does not, however, seem to be final and eternal, except in the case of five deadly sins.* It is more like purgatory, and is in the course, or line of existence, on that endless wheel of transmigration, the whole course of which is sorrow.

Before proceeding with the externals of the system, we will quote Burnouf's summary of the metaphysical system of primitive Budhism. "Although it is difficult to form a precise opinion concerning a system so imperfectly known, as by the Sanscrit books of Nepal, he figures Sakyamuni in entering upon the life of a religious devotee, as adopting the atheistic doctrines furnished by the Samkhyas, (one of the Brahman schools,) which, in ontology, denied the existence of one God,

* The sins which shut a man out of Nirvana, even though they have been committed in some former state of existence, and he may be unconscious of them, are Patricide, Matricide, the murder of a *rahat*, wounding the person of Budha, (his life cannot possibly be taken,) and lastly, causing a schism among the priesthood.

and held to the multiplicity and eternity of the human soul, and in physics, to the existence of one eternal nature, endowed with qualities which transform themselves, and possess the elements of those forms which clothe the human soul in the course of its voyage through the world. Sakyamuni borrowed from this theory the idea that there was no God, as also, the doctrine of the multiplicity of the human soul; that of transmigration, and that of *Nirvana*, or deliverance, which appertains in general to all the Brahman schools. Only at this day it is not easy to see what he meant by *Nirvana*, since he did not define it. But as he never spoke of God, Nirvana to him was not the absorption of the individual soul in the bosom of the universal God, as the orthodox Brahmans believe; and as he never spoke of matter, his Nirvana was not the dissolution of the human soul into its physical elements. The word *void*, (*vide*,) which appears in all the monuments which are proved to be the more ancient, induces me to think, that he saw the supreme good in the complete annihilation of the thinking subject." "That which Budhism denies, is the eternal God of the Brahmans, and the eternal nature of the Samkhyas; that which it admits, is the multiplicity and individuality of human souls, of the Samkhyas, and the transmigration of the Brahmans. That which it wishes to attain, is the deliverance and freedom of the spirit, as wishes all the world in India. But it did not enfranchise the spirit, as the Samkhyas supposed, by for ever detaching it from nature; nor as the Brahmans supposed, by plunging it again into the bosom of the absolute and eternal Brahma; but it took away the conditions of its relative existence, by precipitating it into an empty void, that is, to all appearance, into annihilation." (P. 520, &c.)

The next point is the externals of the system, including its morals and discipline. The term morals, we shall use in a wide sense, as referring to good works—whatever confers merit. Budhism recognizes the fact that man is in a state of sin or sorrow. The four sublime verities, or fundamental axioms of its doctrine, are 1st. That sorrow exists. 2d. That it belongs to whatever comes into the world. 3d. That it is desirable to be delivered from it. 4th. That deliverance can be obtained by

knowledge alone.* (*Burnouf*, p. 290.) Instead of this fourth axiom, it might rather be said that deliverance can only be by the acquisition of merit. The knowledge that is necessary, is only to know how to perform good works. There is no dependence on the merits of another, and no expiation of sin by the sacrifice of another. Sacrifices with the Budhists are only offerings. Sacrifice of life would be inconsistent with the first of the fundamental precepts of Budhist morality—not to take the life of any living thing. "Their religious ceremonies consist in the offering of flowers and incense, which are accompanied with the sound of instruments, and the recitations of chants and prayers." (*Burnouf*, p. 339.) The performance of these ceremonies, together with alms-giving, as well as those actions which belong more strictly to mere morality, are looked upon as efficacious, in the acquisition of merit. It is fortunate for their system, that merit may, in their view, be more easily acquired, than demerit. Thus, it is said, "a man gives alms, or keeps the precepts; by this means, his mind is filled with satisfaction; again and again, this satisfaction wells up within him, and he is induced to acquire a greater degree of merit; it is like a perpetual fountain, continually flowing over; but when a man does that which brings demerit, his mind becomes sorrowful, and he is deterred from pursuing the same course like a river that is lost in the sand of the desert. It is in this way, that merit increases and becomes great, whilst demerit is diminished." (*Manual of Budhism*, p. 459.) Merit too is easily acquired, especially by alms-giving. This is said to be the first of the four great virtues, namely—alms-giving, affability, promoting the prosperity of others, and loving others as ourselves. The greatest merit is acquired by offerings to Budha; as a florist, who presented to a former Budha eight nosegays of jessamine flowers, received in the same birth, elephants, horses, sons and daughters—eight of each, was preserved from being born in hell during a hundred thousand Kalpas, and received blessings without number in the world of men. The merit of

* Those who comprehend these truths, and conform their conduct to them, are called *Aryas*, or elders, in opposition to ordinary men, who do not reflect on these important subjects.

alms-giving decreases in proportion to the demerit of the person to whom they are given, "just as the seed planted on poor ground does not yield so much as that on good." But, so great is the merit of almsgiving, that if he gives food to dogs, crows, &c., with the intention of receiving merit, he will have long life, prosperity, beauty, power, and wisdom, in a hundred births. (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 83.)

Hearing the bana, or word, by the same sort of inherent efficacy, also, confers great benefit. This is not the doing of the precepts, but simply hearing, or reciting them in an unknown tongue. This gives occasion for the adoption of those "vain repetitions, which the heathen use." The bana, or word, is one of the three precious gems,* and is literally worshipped, and benefits are expected to be received in consequence of this adoration, as much as if it were an intelligent being. (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 192.) The most efficacious mode of almsgiving is to provide for the recitation of the word. Budha is reported to have said, "Were one to give the three robes (necessary for the priest,) to Budha, the Pasi-Budhas, or the *rahats*, though the material of their fabric were as soft and smooth as the tender bud of the plantain, the hearing or reading of one single stanza of the bana, or word, would bring him a greater reward; indeed, its reward would be more than sixteen times greater." He, however, says, that in order to the full enjoyment of the benefit, it requires attention, and that each one should exercise meditation, and observe the ordinances, that he may attain wisdom.

Besides these works, or efforts, the main object of which is to acquire merit, Budhism also inculcated a system of morality. In fact, Burnouf thinks that the prominent characteristic of primitive Budhism was its morality, and in this respect, it was distinguished from Brahmanism, the prominent features of which were speculative philosophy on the one hand, and mythology on the other. But Budhism, by its morality, and especially by its holding to the principle of universal charity, or self-sacrifice, for the good of others, has obtained for itself the first rank among the ancient religions of Asia. These

* The three precious gems, are, Budha; the truth; and the associated priesthood.

characteristics of primitive Budhism, which rested chiefly in simple moral rules, and which set forth Budha as an example of intelligence and virtue, which any one might propose to follow, are to be distinguished from that second age of Budhism, in which Budhas and Bodhisatwas were invented, to compete with the mythology of Brahmanism, and in which the metaphysical dogmas and the discipline developed themselves, to the almost entire exclusion of morality, so that it no longer became the principal object of religion. (Pp. 335–7.)

In external regard for propriety, there was more of it about the Budhist system than the Brahman. As for instance, the Budhist, besides a mat to sit upon, and a bowl for begging, was also to have three garments, but the ascetic among the Brahmans went entirely naked. Woman also, was placed in a higher social position, and this in itself would tend to a higher tone of morality. Even the nunneries, however corrupted in a later age, showed a desire to elevate woman to the same religious privileges with man. Precepts were also given for the proper performance of the relative duties, as those which belong to husband and wife,* parents and children, master and servant, and for the way in which one friend should assist another.

The more general precepts of Budhism are usually given as ten in number. The 1st. is not to take life, (which includes all animal life, insect as well as man.) 2d. Not to steal. 3d. Not to commit adultery, (with the priest forbids all sexual intercourse.) 4th. Not to lie. 5th. Forbids all intoxicating drinks. 6th. Not to eat solid food after mid-day. 7th. Forbids attendance upon dancing, music, singing, and masks. 8th. Forbids to adorn the body with flowers, or to use perfumes, and unguents. 9th. Forbids to use high, or honourable seats, and

* It is said there are five ways in which a husband ought to assist a wife. 1st. He must speak to her pleasantly, and say to her mother, I will present you with garments, perfumes and ornaments. 2d. He must speak to her respectfully, not using low words, such as he would to a servant, or slave. 3d. He must not leave the woman he possesses, by giving to her clothes, ornaments, &c., to go to a woman who is kept by another. 4th. If she does not receive a proper allowance of food, she will become angry, therefore she must be provided for, that this may be prevented. 5th. He must give her ornaments, and other similar articles according to his ability.

couches. 10th. Forbids to receive gold or silver.* Some of these precepts are such only as an ascetic is bound to obey. In some things it will be seen that the Budhist precepts have erred as much by excess as they have by deficiency in others. They are deficient in the whole class of precepts which are enumerated in the first table of the Decalogue, and which form the proper basis of religious reverence or worship, in distinction from mere morality. Again, they err by excess. Precepts which are too strict, that is which make the same of tithing mint, anise and cummin, which they do of the weighter matters of the law, defeat their own object. This is seen in the precept about taking life. It doubtless owes its extension to animals, to the idea of transmigration. But, it has had the effect of leading to a disregard of human life. Thus, in Major Phayris' Report on Pegu, he says, "Perhaps the main cause of the disregard of human life which exists (in Pegu) may be traced—paradoxical though it be—to the Budhist religion, which forbids the taking of all animal life, but draws no broad distinction between the life of the lower animals and that of man. When the passions are excited, the feeble bonds which restrain from murder are soon burst asunder. There is little doubt, but at the capital it is infinitely easier to compound for the killing of a man, than of an ox."

One point worthy of commendation, though apparently not much acted upon, is the inculcation of charity, or self-sacrifice, for the good of others. One of their leading maxims is this, "Whatever of happiness is in the world, it has arisen from a wish for the welfare of others. Whatever misery is in the world, it has all arisen from a wish for our own welfare." (*Journal of American Oriental Society*, vol. 1st, p. 133.) The object too, at which the Budhist ascetic aimed, was not to elevate himself alone, but to extend the benefit to other men. Thus Budha addresses one of his disciples, "Thyself made

* These precepts are not always uniformly given. In some books, only eight are enumerated. In one Chinese work, the ten prohibitions enumerated, are—1st. Killing. 2d. Stealing. 3d. Adultery. 4th. Lying. 5th. Selling wine. 6th. Speaking of others' faults. 7th. Praising of one's self, and defaming others. 8th. Parsimony joined with scoffing. 9th. Anger, and refusing to be corrected. 10th. Reviling the three precious ones.

free, free others; having reached the other shore, lead others there; being consoled, impart consolation; having thyself attained to complete *Nirvana*, be the means of others attaining to it," that is, he was to induce others to become devotees.

The observance of all other precepts of Budhism will avail but little, unless in some stage of his existence a man has been an ascetic. Asceticism is a necessary consequence of the first principle of speculative Budhism, that evil is connected with all passing phenomena. Evil desire was to be checked, and attachment to the objects of sense loosened, "as a drop of water falls off from the lotus leaf." In order to accomplish this object, a course of voluntary poverty and chastity was entered upon. Budha himself was an ascetic, and it is a part of his system which he borrowed from Brahmanism. The organization of the priesthood was different, but the principle of asceticism belonged to both systems. Budha, in the same manner with the Brahmans, gathered around him his disciples, and they adopted the life of mendicants. There seem early to have arisen distinctions among his followers—some carrying these principles much further than others. Some retired into the solitude of forests; and monasteries, at a very early period in the history of Budhism were introduced. Some even carried the renunciation of things present to the extent of giving up life. An instance is given of a young Brahman retiring to the depths of a forest, to be devoured by a hungry tiger. "He gave up life," he said, "not for the sake of royalty, not for the joys of pleasure, not for the rank of Sakra, not for that of a sovereign monarch, but for the sake of arriving at the state of a perfect Budha." All had not this zeal, and therefore, they were not required to adopt the strict rules imposed upon the priesthood. These are called Upasakas, or, what we would term the laity. In one of the legends quoted by Burnouf, it is asked, "What does the mendicant state require?" "It requires the observance during one's whole life, of the rules of chastity." "That is impossible; is there no other way?" "There is another, my friend; it is to become an Upasaka." "What does this state require?" "It requires the keeping of one's self during life, from every inclination to murder, to theft, to pleasure, to falsehood, and to the use of intoxicating drinks." (P. 281.) Still, it was necessary

in some stage of a man's existence, to have been an ascetic, as will be seen by the quotation from Hardy, given in a note."*

It is not necessary to enter into particulars concerning the rules specified for the observance of the priesthood. Celibacy, as well as voluntary, *i. e.* individual poverty, was enforced. The candidate was to have his head and beard shaven, put on a yellow robe, receive a bowl for begging alms, and place himself under one more advanced for instruction.

A more important point, and one which made a broad line of distinction between the ascetic, or priestly class of the Budhists and the Brahman, was, that the former disregarded all distinction of caste. The Brahman, arrogated to himself the highest position among the four castes—he was the head of Brahm, while the others were parts of his body. The lower classes could not attain to the religious privileges and distinctions of the Brahman. The Budhist on the other hand, of whatever class, might enter upon a life of asceticism. This was not owing to any clearer ideas of Budha, in reference to social

* It is related, that Milinda, the king, was one day reflecting on religious subjects, and he wondered how it was, that if householders could enter the path leading to Nirvana, any one should take the trouble to observe the thirteen ordinances—the practice of which is so difficult, and he accordingly went to the priest with his doubts on the subject. The priest told him, That myriads of householders, or those who had not renounced the world, had obtained Nirvana. The king replied, If a sick man can be cured by simples, why torture his body by emetics, or violent purgatives? if water can be procured from a natural fountain, it is to no purpose to dig wells or tanks; so, if a man who enjoys worldly possessions, can obtain Nirvana, of what benefit are the thirteen ordinances? The priest replies, That besides the advantages, (such as fearlessness, protection, freedom from evil desire, &c.,) and virtues, (hatred avoided, no habitation required, meditation exercised,) attendant upon the observance of the thirteen ordinances, no householder obtains Nirvana, unless he has kept the thirteen ordinances, in some former state of existence. He amplifies the benefit of such a course by such comparisons as the following. Men eat food, that they may receive strength, take medicine to drive away disease, enter a ship to cross the sea, use flowers and perfumes, that a fragrant smell may be emitted; so he who would receive the full benefit of asceticism, practices the thirteen ordinances. As water for the nourishment of grain, fire for burning, women for contention, treasure for independence, withs for binding, a couch for repose, a place of refuge for safety, the mother for rearing children, jewels for ornament, garments for clothing, scales for equality, the lamp for dispelling darkness, and the precept for restraining the disobedient, so is an attention to the thirteen ordinances for the nourishing of asceticism, the burning up of evil desire, &c." (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 15.)

equality, but having established chastity, *i. e.* in the Romish sense of not marrying, as one of the rules of the priesthood, its existence and continuance was provided for, by opening the door for all classes to enter the priesthood. Directly, Budhism made no war on caste, for it has co-existed with it on the island of Ceylon. But its indirect influence, in lowering the distinction which had been given to the Brahman, was, no doubt, the principal reason of the opposition and persecution which they met with from them. They would not have objected so much to Budha's proclaiming deliverance from the fatal law of transmigration, but placed as they were at the head of the system, they did not like to have their position interfered with. But whatever Budhism lost in this respect, by being brought into antagonism with Brahmanism, it was more than made up by its increased facility for propagation in other countries. Brahmanism was confined necessarily to its own country, or could only be propagated in equal ratio with the Brahminical caste. Like Judaism, it was confined by its hereditary priesthood. But Budhism, by admitting all who chose to take its vows into its priesthood, though driven out of the country of its birth,* was not destroyed. The new convert, of whatever rank or nation, could at once enter the novitiate, and look forward if he chose, to becoming himself a Budha, or, at least, obtaining *Nirvana.* The facility thus afforded for entering the priesthood, gave full scope for its propagation into other countries.

Besides this, there were other things in the system itself, which need to be taken into consideration, in accounting for its wide-spread progress. These are chiefly the partial truths which it contained: 1st. The fact that it recognized man's sinful, or lost condition. It spoke to the universal consciousness, by saying that man is in misery. The first of its four great truths was, "that every existent thing is a source of sorrow." This is, indeed, pushed to an extreme, by making evil a necessary part of existence, and as always connected with matter—thus, pushing its more logical followers into idealism here, and leaving them no hope but that of annihilation, hereafter. 2d. It proposed a remedy for these evils, and the remedy proposed

* Budhism flourished in India, from one thousand to twelve hundred years.

is that which is the most natural to the human heart, namely—mortification of evil desire; man making himself good; purchasing merit. 3d. There were also held out motives drawn from a future world, to bear upon men's actions in this, and which answered in some measure to the longings of the human heart for a life beyond the grave. Whatever Nirvana was, philosophically, it was looked forward to by all as a state of happiness, a release from the inevitable law of transmigration, and by many Budhists it was exchanged for a heaven of action and sensible enjoyment. We have, in these partial truths, sufficient to account for the wide-spread influence of Budhism. Its leading doctrines were at least partially adapted to the wants and capacities of human nature. One thing, wherein primitive Budhism failed in this respect, was afterwards supplied. It was, originally, a system of atheism. There was no God who had created, and who sustains all things—no being, in fact, to worship. This want was supplied by making a god of Budha, and by adopting, so far as Northern Budhism was concerned, the prevailing mythology of India and China.

Having considered the more prominent points in the system of Budhism, it would be a matter of no little interest, to trace the efforts made for its propagation. This, excepting in reference to China, we can only do in the most cursory way; and yet it is a matter of no little interest, as it would help to throw light on a point, which every writer on Budhism has felt pressing upon him, namely—the resemblance between Budhism and Romanism. Is that resemblance owing to any historical connection between the two, or has it arisen entirely from similar workings of the human mind in reference to certain fundamental ideas?

The fact of this resemblance early attracted the attention of the Roman Catholic missionaries to the East; and, at first, it was supposed that the Budhists had borrowed from the Christians, as it was known that missionaries from the Syrian church had penetrated eastward, as far as the province of Shen-Se, in China, in the seventh and eighth centuries. But, as Budhism was found to have existed prior to our era, this supposition would not do. Premare, an able missionary of the Romish faith in China, ascribed the resemblance to the devil,

who had thus imitated holy mother church, in order to scandalize and oppose its rites. (*Williams's Middle Kingdom*, vol. ii., p. 257.)

It is indeed not strange that there should be a resemblance in many particulars, when the leading idea which lies at the foundation of both systems is the same. Philosophically the systems are different, but in their religious bearings upon man, the main idea—that of the acquisition of merit, by good works—is prominent in both. Asceticism, if not the growth of this idea, is fostered by it. In both systems a higher degree of holiness is hoped for, by renouncing the world. The Budhist is the more consistent in his renunciation, because he believes that evil is connected with everything existent. Now, though it be not strange that men should adopt the same ideas in different parts of the world, yet it is strange that they adopt precisely the same methods in carrying them out—that the priests, for instance, should adopt the same rules of celibacy and voluntary poverty, that both should shave the head, that both should have the same system of monasteries and nunneries, that both should use the rosary. There are other points of resemblance, such as auricular confession and veneration of relics, which Burnouf, perhaps naturally enough, writing as he did, in the midst of a Roman Catholic nation, attempts to account for on general principles. In respect to auricular confession, he says, "The most ancient legends represent it as established, and it may be easily seen to connect itself with the very foundations of the Budhist faith. The fatal law of transmigration, which we know attaches recompenses to good actions and penalties to bad, allows also of making amends for the one by the other, as it offers to the guilty person the chance of recovering himself by the practice of virtue. Hence comes that expiation which occupies so large a place in Brahman law. This theory passed into Budhism, which received it entire, together with so many other elements of the Hindoo social state, but it there took a peculiar form, by which its practical application was easily modified. The Budhists continued to believe with the Brahmans in the compensation of bad actions by good, for they admitted with these, that the latter are fatally rewarded, and the former are fatally punished.

But since on the other hand they did not believe in the moral efficacy of tortures, by which, according to the Brahmans, the guilty person might efface his crime, expiation was naturally reduced to its principle, that is, to the sentiment of repentance, and the only form which it took in practice was that of acknowledgment, or confession. (P. 299.)

Veneration of relics is another practice common to both systems. A hair of Budha, twelve feet in length, was the occasion of an embassy in the sixth century, from China to Siam. And to this day a relic of the body of Budha, of bead-like shape, is preserved in a temple near Ningpo. This veneration of relics, some of the legends imply was instituted by Budha himself. Burnouf thinks it originated with his earliest disciples and immediately after his death, who, he says, "were doubtless inspired by it with sentiments of respect and regret, entirely accordant with human nature. To be led to render to Sakya honours worthy of a sovereign, his disciples had only to remember that he belonged to the royal race of the Sakyas; to be led piously to preserve his remains, they had only to recall to mind that their master had been a man of whom there was nothing left but these poor remains. Sakya, to them, had entered into the state of complete annihilation; at all events, however this annihilation was understood, there was an end of his mortal person, inasmuch as it was to return no more to this world. It was therefore a proof of their being profoundly penetrated with thoughts of Sakya, that they piously gathered up all that was left of him, and the worship paid to his remains could not but result naturally from the conviction entertained that death destroys the entire man." (P. 353.) Thus, according to Burnouf, veneration of relics came from a desire to preserve what was left of the body, for whatever had been subject to death had been annihilated. Another stimulus to this worship, as Professor Salisbury well remarks, after quoting the above, was the need of some object of worship which could not be satisfied with the atheism of primitive Budhism. (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. i. p. 296.)

While willing to give all due weight to the influence of human nature in working out similar results from the same fundamental ideas; and while, in fact, it is no help to Roman-

ism, whether the resemblances which exist were actually borrowed from Paganism, or are the result of the same ideas working out in the same form and to the same conclusions, yet there are reasons for supposing there was some historical connection. How far it may have influenced opinion and practice, must be left for the ecclesiastical historian to determine.

1. One reason for the belief in an historical connection arises from the fact of the general activity and intercourse which existed among the nations in that part of the world, before and at the beginning of the Christian era. We are apt to judge of the past by the present; and the immobility which now characterizes Asiatic nations, we at first suppose always existed. But it must be remembered that we were once the barbarians, and that the great centres of civilization were not merely around the Mediterranean, but on the banks of the Euphrates and Indus. Cities lie buried, where teeming millions passed and re-passed, not only in the conflicts of war, but in the arts of peace and civilization. We need to people again those blank wastes, as we do the region of the Rhine and the Rhone, and gather larger nations into those wider territories. In those days, travellers and emigrants passed along the high steppes of Central Asia as men now do the passes of the Alps. Some six hundred years before the birth of Christ, Lau-tsz, a Chinese philosopher, journeyed through Central Asia, some think as far as Judea, or Greece. In the first century, a colony of Jews settled at Khai-fung-foo, on the Yellow River; and in the same century, and perhaps earlier, Budhist priests went from India to China, and, as will be seen, that intercourse was kept up for centuries. The Roman Emperor, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, sent an embassy to China, and in the year A. D. 226, a Roman merchant was received with great respect by the prince of the three kingdoms. This Roman, whose name is given in the Chinese annals, is said to have given an account of his own country to the Chinese. Not only was this intercourse carried on by land, but also by sea. The commerce, of which we have a glimpse in the sacred narrative, in Solomon's time, was not confined to Tyre, and Joppa, and Ezion-geber, but eastward it doubled Cape Comorin, and pass-

ing through the Straits of Sunda, India and China exchanged products.

2. Not only was there this general activity among the nations, it was also manifest among the disciples of the different religious systems. The Budhists went forth to the work of propagation with an amount of mental energy, zeal, and devotion, which, so far as they are concerned, has long been extinct. The selection of the sites of their temples and pagodas shows that in former times many of the priests were men of intellectual cultivation and taste; and that by their own devotion to the cause, they commanded an amount of influence which led to the consecration of large sums both from private individuals and those high in rank. The Budhist missions were commenced at an early period in their history. In the 12th chapter of the Mahawanso—an historical work in Pali—is an account of the sending of priests into various foreign countries, for the establishment of the religion of Budha. This took place at the close of the third convocation, which was held B. C. 307, for the purpose of healing schisms in the Budhistic church. (*Turnour's Introduction to the Mahawanso*, p. 45.) The Mahawanso is written in poetry, and the filling up the deeds and exploits of these priests is given in an exaggerated, marvellous air. The priests who were sent out, were endowed with supernatural power, and their preaching, or repeating the discourses of Budha, was attended with extraordinary success. In Kashmir it is said one hundred thousand persons were ordained priests by the *thero*, or head priest, who were sent to convert that country, and from that period to the present day, the author says, the people have been fervently devoted to the three branches of the faith, and the land has glittered with the yellow robes of the priests. (P. 73.) Similar success is said to have attended the efforts of the other *theros*, of whom there were eight; each of whom, in the respective countries to which they were sent, succeeded in inducing one hundred thousand to enter the priesthood. The names of most of the countries to which these missions were sent, have been identified, and so far as identified, they were the countries in and about modern India. Of these missions, one of the most permanent and important was that to Ceylon. In many of these countries,

the monuments of Budhism, in the shape of temples, &c., still remain. One of the most zealous early promoters of the system was Asoka, an Emperor of India, who began to reign, B. C. 258. One of his proclamations, found inscribed upon a rock at Girnar, in Guzerat, refers to the establishment of Budhist usages in the dominions of Antiochus the Great. Another edict of his is supposed to contain the name of Ptolemy of Egypt.*

From what has been said, it is manifest that the influence of Budhism spread at an early period far beyond India. Clemens of Alexandria, and Tertullian, speak of the Budhists and Brahmans as well known. Tertullian, in his Apology, says, "we are no Brahmins, or Indian gymnosophists, no dwellers in the woods, no recluses, retired from the haunts of men." (*Neander*, vol. 1st, p. 273.) This language he uses to show that the Christians were not mere ascetics, but were thankful for the good things of God's providence. Still, there was creeping over the church at that time, a tendency to that very asceticism which Tertullian rebuked. We can easily see how an admiration for the ascetic life should have sprung up in the minds of the early Christian church. That system was in the vigour of its youth. It was rapidly progressive, bringing other nations under its influence. To a certain extent also, it seemed to chime in with the teachings of Christianity, to renounce the world, and mortify the body. Successful and apparently religious, it recommended itself outwardly as well as inwardly, falling in, as it does, with the innate tendency in man to self-righteousness. If positive testimony were wanting, we should still feel that there was no method so probable, for accounting for the resemblances which exist between asceticism in the East and the West, as to suppose a historical connection, or in other words, that Monachism as it exists in the Romish church was oriental and pagan in its origin.

If as yet we have to rely upon probability, in reference to the derivation of many opinions and practices which crept into the early Christian church, there are still other points in regard

* See "Memoir of the History of Budhism," by Prof. Salisbury, in Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 1st.

to which there can be no doubt that they were oriental in their origin. "New investigations and discoveries," says Neander, "have pointed out the way through which Budhism might spread its influences even to districts within the compass of the Roman Empire." In reference to the Gnostic systems, he says we recognize "the spirit of Brahmanism, and especially of Budhism—that longing of the soul for release from the bonds of matter, of nature; for reunion with the primal spirit, from which all life has flowed; that striving after entire estrangement from human passion, and from sublunary things, which strove to pass beyond the limits of finite existence." There was a tendency in all these sects to reproduce the idea that all matter—everything existent, was evil. But, holding as they did to what Budhism did not, namely, to the being of God, it manifested itself in a dualistic principle. The derivation of Manicheeism from Budhism, Neander considers as a point settled on historic grounds. (Vol. 1st, p. 484, &c.) Mani was a Persian by birth, and embraced Christianity at an early age. His attempt was to reform the church from what he considered Judaizing tendencies. He divided the church into two distinct grades—the Exoterics, or auditors, and the Esoterics, or the elect, the perfect, who were the sacerdotal class—the Brahmins of the church. They formed the link of transition from the earthly world—the circle of the metempsychosis—and the kingdom of light. Their mode of life was to answer to this position—utter estrangement from the world in the Budhist sense. They were to possess no worldly property, but were bound to lead a strictly ascetic and contemplative life, to abstain from marriage, from all strong drinks, and from all animal food. Other points showing the derivation of Manicheeism from Budhism, are mentioned by Neander, but we cannot pursue them. This is only stated as an example of the influence which oriental systems exerted in corrupting the church.

There are but few fundamental systems of error in the world; and these have grown old and decayed, independent of Christianity; and it seems to be one of the arts of the adversary, to reproduce them in contact with, and in opposition to the Christian system. Hence Confucianism, or a system of dependence on the principles and precepts of

morality, without the necessity for a divine agent. Hence, Budhism, or a system of good works, founded on asceticism and mortification of the flesh, which has been reproduced in Romanism. Hence, Pantheism, which has grown old and run to seed in gross idolatry in India, reproduced in Germany. And finally, Tauism, the peculiar features of which are communication with spirits, which has been reproduced in modern Spiritualism. These efforts of the devil at progress—this deluding of his followers to think he has manufactured something new, when it is merely the old revamped, show how wonderfully short, after all, he is for weapons to carry on his warfare against the truth.

Having considered the main features of the Budhistic system, we will attempt a brief historic sketch of Budhism in China, noticing, at the close, some of its prominent peculiarities in that country, and the principal schools into which it is divided.

It is said, that as early as B. C. 217, priests from India arrived at the then capital of China, in Shensi, to propagate their religion. Afterwards, a warlike expedition of the Chinese led them to a country where a golden statue was taken, and brought to the emperor. This, the Chinese author states, was the origin of the statues of Budha, which were afterwards in use.*

The usual time, however, to which is referred the introduction of Budhism into China, was during the reign of the Emperor Ming-te, in the year 66 of our era, and is thus given by Dr. Morrison, from the Chinese account. "The emperor dreamed one night that he saw a golden man, of tall stature, large neck, and splendid as the sun and moon. When he inquired of all his ministers respecting it, one said, 'In the west there is a Deity, whose name is Foe;† is it he of whom your majesty has dreamed?' Messengers were then sent to the kingdom of Teen-lo to inquire respecting their religion, to obtain some of their books, and bring some of their Shamun, or priests. The Shamun said that Foe was fifteen cubits tall, of a golden yellow colour, his neck large, and that he shone like the sun,

* Remusat, as quoted by Edkins, in Notices of Chinese Budhism.

† Foe, or Fuh, is the ordinary designation of Budha, in China.

and moon. He is capable of endless transformations. There is no place to which he cannot go; he can understand all things, and he greatly commiserates and delivers the multitude of living men." (*Chinese Repository.*)

The early history of Budhism in China was one of alternate reverses and successes. Now it was favoured by the reigning emperor, and then opposition was stirred up, especially by the Confucianists, and edicts were sent out against them. At first all the priests seem to have come from India, for we have no account of native Chinese being introduced into the priesthood until A. D. 335.

The work of preparing translations of Budhist literature was early commenced. These sacred books having been found to have been erroneously translated in many instances, the work was performed over again in the fifth century. An Indian Budhist was appointed to a high office under the emperor, and eight hundred priests were called to assist; while the king himself, who was an ardent disciple of the new faith, was present at the conference, holding the old copies in his hand as the work of correction proceeded. More than three hundred volumes were thus prepared.

In order to facilitate the same work of fuller acquaintance with Budhist literature, Chinese pilgrims frequently found their way to India. The two most celebrated were Fa-hian, and Hiuen-tsang. The former returned to his native country, A. D. 414, after an absence of fifteen years. Fa-hian went by land, probably taking the usual route, which was to the North-west of the Tsung-ling mountains. In his work on Budhist countries, which has been translated by Remusat, he describes the flourishing condition of Budhism in the steppes of Tartary, among the Onighours, in Affghanistan, where the language and customs of Central India then prevailed. It was also prosperous on the upper course of the Indus, on either bank—"declining in the Punjab, and in a languid state, although existing, on the Jumna and the Ganges. In its most sacred seats—east of the Ganges, the birth-place of Sakya, and the scene of his early career, it had fallen into irreparable decay, and its monuments were crumbling into those

mounds of rubbish which are still found in Gorhack-pore and Tirhut, although a few columns then standing are still erect." In Ceylon he found Budhism triumphant. He stopped at Java* on his return by sea, and found Budhism unknown there; but it afterwards rose into prosperity. Fa-hian procured some copies of sacred books, which he translated and edited on his return. (See *Notice of Remusat's Trans. in Chinese Repository*, vol. ix., p. 334–368.)

The next most celebrated Chinese Budhist who visited India was Hiuen-tsang, (his life and travels have been translated by M. Julien,) who set out on his journey A. D. 629. He also went by land, passing through the north-western extremity of China, westward to the region watered by the Oxus and Jaxartes, where the Turks were then settled.† Passing into India, he spent five years on the banks of the Ganges, studying the Sanscrit and reading Brahminical and Budhistic literature. During his stay, which was prolonged to sixteen years, he went south, and completed the tour of the Indian Peninsula. On his return to his native country, he took with him one hundred and fifteen grains of relics, taken from Budha's chair; two gold statues of Budha, three feet three inches in height, and others of silver and sandal wood. Besides these, he took with him six hundred and fifty-seven different works, borne on twenty-two horses. The Emperor Tae-Tsung,‡ who is praised by Gibbon as the Augustus of the East, was then on the throne, and received the traveller with the utmost distinction. At the command of the Emperor, he wrote a description of the western countries, through which he had passed. With the assistance of twelve monks he revised and translated many works—seven hundred and forty in all. Among them were three

* With respect to Java, his words are, "Heretics and Brahmans are very numerous there; the law of Foe is there out of the question." Other sources of information show that Indian colonies went to Java, A. D. 76, and that Budhism began to spread in the second century. After Fa-hian's time, it became a centre of Budhist influence to other islands in the Indian Archipelago. It was about this period, A. D. 418, that Budhism was introduced into Japan. (See Prof. Salisbury's Mem., Vol. 1st., American Oriental Society, p. 117.)

† About this time, A. D. 643, a Byzantine emperor sent an embassy to China.

‡ The same emperor received with equal favour the Syrian Christians, who arrived A. D. 639, only seven years before Hiuen-tsang's return.

works on logic, treatises on grammar, and a lexicon. The life and adventures of Hiuen-tsang have been made the basis of a novel, written apparently by a Tauist, who represents his "undertaking so distant and dangerous a journey to obtain the sacred books of Budhism, and by translating them into his native tongue, to promote the spread of that superstition among his countrymen, as the highest possible excellence at which the Budhist aims. The effort and the success that crowns it are identified with the aspiration of the Tauist after the elixir of immortality, the hermit's elevation to the state of Budha, and the translation of those whose hearts have been purified by meditation and retirement to the abodes of the genii." (*Edkin's Notices of Budhism*, p. 20.)

Not only did Chinese pilgrims pass to India, but great numbers of Indian Budhists came to China. At the beginning of the sixth century it was estimated that their number was upwards of three thousand. The persecutions to which the Budhists were exposed from the Brahmins, seem to have driven them beyond the Himalayas. This is the period usually assigned for the expulsion of the Budhists from India; but there are some facts respecting this intercourse between China and India, which would favour the supposition that it was not completely expelled from India until a later period. The history of the Sung dynasty mentions the arrival, A. D. 951, of a monk with a number of companions belonging to different families in western India. A little later, a Chinese priest returned from the western countries with relics and Sanscrit copies of Budhist works, written on palm-leaf, amounting to forty volumes. The next year, a hundred and fifty-seven Chinese priests set out, with the Emperor's permission, to visit India, and obtain Budhist books; but nothing is said of their journeyings beyond Cashmere. On one occasion, the son of a king of eastern India was a visitor. In 982, a priest of western China returned from India, with a letter from a king of that country to the Emperor, containing congratulations on the favour shown to Budhism in China. (*Edkins.*)

One of the most celebrated Indian Budhists who visited China, was Bodhidharma, the twenty-eighth of the Patriarchs. He seems to have been advanced in life when he left India.

He left A. D. 526, and went to Canton by sea. On his arrival, he was immediately invited to Nanking, and received by the Emperor with the honour due to his age and character. The Emperor said to him, "From my accession to the throne, I have been incessantly building temples, transcribing sacred books, and admitting new monks to take the vows. How much merit may I be supposed to have accumulated?" The reply was, "None." The Emperor said, "and why no merit?" The Patriarch replied, "all this is but the insignificant effect of an imperfect cause, not complete in itself. It is the shadow that follows the substance, and is without real existence." The Emperor asked, "then what is true merit?" The Patriarch replied, "it consists in purity and enlightenment, depth and completeness, and in being wrapped in stillness and vacancy. Merit such as this cannot be sought by worldly means." The Emperor said, "which is the most important of the holy doctrines?" The Patriarch answered, "where all is emptiness, nothing can be called holy." The Emperor asked, "who is he that thus replies to me?" The Patriarch replied, "I do not know." The Emperor, says the Budhist narrator, still remained unenlightened, and no wonder. The answers of the Patriarch, however, are very much in accordance with the metaphysical ideas of primitive Budhism, which regarded everything objective as an illusion. The main idea of Bodhidharma was to bring men to see the importance of a contemplative life, and to this end he discouraged the use of books. He is the recognized founder of the Esoteric school of Budhism in China, of which more by and by.

Bodhidharma, not satisfied with the result of his interview with the Emperor, crossed the Yang-tsze, and took up his abode at Lo-Yang. Here, according to the narrative, he sat with his face to the wall for nine years, and hence was called by the people, "Wall-gazing Brahman." The Emperor sent messengers to invite him back, but they did not succeed in their errand. The Chinese Budhists, after witnessing the self-control and contemplative life of the Indian sage, seem to have been stimulated to great efforts to conquer the power of the external world. Thus, one who sought to imitate his example, says, "Formerly, for the sake of religion, men broke open

their bones, and extracted the marrow, took blood from their arms to give to the hungry, rolled their hair in the mud, or threw themselves down a precipice to feed a famishing tiger. What can I do?" Accordingly while snow was falling, he exposed himself to it, till it had risen above his knees, when the Patriarch observing him, asked, "what he hoped to gain by it?" The young aspirant to victory over self wept at the question and said, "I only desire that mercy may open a path to save the whole race of mankind." The Patriarch replied, that such an act, (that of standing in the snow,) was not worthy of comparison with the acts of the Budhas. It required very little virtue or resolution. His disciple, says the legend, stung with the answer, took a sharp knife, severed his arm and placed it before the Patriarch. The latter expressed his high approval of the deed, and afterwards appointed him to succeed him as Patriarch in China.*

Bodhidharma had five successors in office. The last in the list, in accordance with his request, did not appoint a successor. In the five petals, as he expressed it, the flower would be complete; he himself, the first of the six, being the stem on which the others grew. It is related of one of these patriarchs, that he was repeatedly invited to court by the second Emperor of the Tang dynasty, but always declined. When a messenger came the fourth time, and informed him that if he refused to go, he had orders to take his head back with him, the old man merely held out his head in token of his willingness to die. The Emperor respected his firmness, and spared his life. In keeping up esoteric doctrines or traditions, this kind of apostolical succession was necessary. The doctrines were handed down through a succession of teachers, each instructed personally by his predecessor, from the time of Bodhidharma,

* Bodhidharma is said to have died of old age, after five attempts to poison him. One Sung Yün, who had been to India after Budhist books, came to inspect his remains. As he lay in his coffin, he held one shoe in his hand. Sung Yün asked him, "whither he was going." "To the western heavens," was the reply. Sung Yün then returned home: the coffin was afterwards opened and found empty, excepting that one of the Patriarch's shoes was lying there. By imperial command, this shoe was preserved as a sacred relic in the monastery. It was afterwards stolen, and now no one knows where it is. (*Edkins.*)

and so further up in the series to Sakyamuni himself, and the earlier Budhas. (*Edkins' Notes*, p. 12, 18, and 33.)

Budhism, which was introduced into China by imperial favour, was afterwards variously regarded by the reigning emperors. In the fifth century, one of the emperors of the Sung dynasty made it a capital crime to construct images of earth or brass, or even to worship them. The books and images were to be destroyed, and the priests put to death. His successor, however, reversed this order, and issued an edict permitting a Budhist temple to be erected in each city, and forty or fifty of the inhabitants to become priests. During the reign of this emperor, which lasted for thirty years, embassies from other countries came, congratulating him on the prosperity of Budhism in his dominions. One of these was from the king of Aratan, who describes his country as lying in the shadow of the Himalayas, whose snows fed the streams that watered it. He praises China as the most prosperous of countries, and its rulers as the benefactors and civilizers of the world. Another embassy was from Ceylon, in which it was said, "that though the two countries are distant three years' journey by sea and land, there are constant communications between them."

The sixth century, about the time of Bodhidharma's arrival in China, appears to have been a period of great prosperity. It was at this time that there were so many refugees from Brahminical persecution in India. The prince of the Wei kingdom, Northern China, spared no expense in providing maintenance for them in monasteries. The number of temples at this time is said to have been thirteen thousand. One of the predecessors of this king had erected an image of Budha more than fifty feet high. More than a hundred thousand pounds of brass were used in its construction, and seven hundred pounds of gold. Four years after its construction he resigned his throne to his son, and became a monk. This practice of becoming priests was followed by other Emperors at a later period. One of the most noted instances of this kind, was that of Liang-wu-ti, who at three different times assumed the Budhist vows, and his ministers had to pay a million of taels, (more than a million of dollars,) for his release. He finally died in a monastery at eighty-six years of age; his adopted

son, whom he had appointed to succeed him, not having furnished him with the proper food. It was early alleged by the Confucianists, that the dynasties which ruled over China had become shorter in their duration since Budhism had been introduced, and that although this Emperor continued so long on the throne, yet he finally died of starvation.

The third persecution against the Budhists was in the year 845; 4,600 monasteries were destroyed, and 40,000 smaller edifices, while more than 260,000 priests and nuns were compelled to return to common employments. This persecution was reversed by the succeeding Emperor, who, after a short time came into office, upon which the Confucian historian expresses his regret. The two previous persecutions, he says, had continued six or seven years, but this, only one or two. These three appear to be, if not the only, at least the more prominent persecutions in the history of Budhism in China. The Emperors generally contented themselves, if opposed to it, with inveighing against the system, and usually, when in favour of it, contented themselves with making offerings, and assisting in the erection of temples and pagodas.* Once or twice decrees were made that those who were to become priests should be examined in the Budhist classics, after the manner of the literati in the Confucian classics, but the practice seems never to have come into very general or long continued use.

Priests seldom held office under any of the Emperors. It occurred once under a mother of one of the Emperors, and

* *Pagodas* in China had their origin in Budhism. They were intended, primarily, as depositories for the relics of Budha, in the same way with the topes of India, though they seem afterwards to have been erected from their supposed favourable influence on the surrounding country. Though not quite so frequent as represented in pictures of Chinese scenery, they are still frequent. There are said to be nine within thirty miles of Shanghai. At Joyang, in the Tsin dynasty, (A. D. 350) there were forty-two, from three to nine stories high. These pagodas belong mostly to an early age in the history of Budhism in China. The zeal which manifested itself in journeys to India, also expressed itself in gorgeous temples, and towering pagodas. Some of the early ones remain to the present time—one in the Chih-kiang province is said to be fifteen centuries old, and the age of the great majority of them is numbered by centuries. The zeal of Budhism, at the present time, seldom goes beyond repairing what their fathers built.

the historians animadvert upon it as one of the monstrosities accompanying a female reign.

The only other point in the history of Budhism, which it is necessary to notice, is the controversy or antagonism between it and Confucianism. Between Budhists and Tauists there has been but little antagonism. In some points they have become so much blended that it is hard to draw the line of distinction. The attempt was made by more than one Emperor to amalgamate the two systems. And though unsuccessful, the idols of both are often found in the same temples. The Confucianists have usually made war equally on both, and yet with the inconsistency which necessarily belongs to a system lacking so much of the religious element, they generally, in times of sickness or trial, seek aid from what they ridicule and oppose. Few go so far in their opposition as to refuse the employment of priests at their funeral ceremonies. When a certain mandarin prohibited it, it was considered as something remarkable. The reason which he gave, in the words of another, was in the true spirit of practical atheism. It was, "that if there were no heaven, there was no need to seek it, and that if there were, good men would certainly go there. If there were no hell, there was no need to fear it, and if there were, bad men would go there." (*Edkins*, p. 29.)

The ground which the Confucianists took in their remonstrances against Budhism was, 1st. That it was a foreign religion. One of them says that Tauism, speaking as it did of mercy and moderation; and the original religion of China, of which the fundamental principles were benevolence and rectitude, were enough for China, and the Emperor ought not to follow any other. The seventh of the sacred commands of Kanghi is, "Degrade strange religions, in order to exalt the orthodox doctrines." A second ground of objection was the follies and superstitions connected with Budhism. In the year 819, on the occasion of a grand escort of a bone of Budha to the capital, the vice-president of the board of punishments presented a memorial on the subject to the Emperor, in the course of which he inquires in strong and bold language, "Why a decayed bone—the filthy remains of a man who died so long

before, should be introduced to the imperial residence?"* They inveighed also against the monks as idlers, as unprofitable members of the commonwealth. One wished to have the monks and nuns turned out of the monasteries, and compelled to marry and raise up families. "The sum of the whole is, these dissolute priests of Budha are lazy; they will neither labour in the fields, nor traffic in the markets, and being without food and clothing, they set to work and invent means of deceiving people." Another, speaking of a festival, says, "The most of the worshippers are women, who like these worshipping days, because it gives them an opportunity to see and be seen in their fine clothes; and most of the men who go there, go to amuse themselves and look at the women."

Other objections rested more upon a doctrinal basis. As, for instance, it was objected that the priests showed a disregard to the principles of filial duty by leaving their parents. In the amplifications of the Sacred Edict, Budha himself is accused of this want of filial piety in leaving his father and mother. And as an inference from this it is asked, "If he regarded not his own father and mother, wife and children, are you such fools as to suppose that he regards the multitude of the living, or would deliver his laws and doctrines to you?" Some of these objections take an atheistic ground. In the eighth century a Confucian mandarin, in a remonstrance addressed to the emperor, says that the wise princes of antiquity secured prosperity by their good conduct, not by prayers and offerings. The emperor went to the other extreme, and when his territory was invaded, simply set his priests to chant their prayers, and it is said the barbarians retired. The Confucian commentator in

* The superstitious follies of the priests were sometimes treated in a very practical way. On one occasion, a monk professed to the Emperor his willingness to be burnt, when the erection of a certain temple was completed. His desire was granted, and an officer sent to see that the temple was built, and the feat carried into execution. The pile was made, and the priest called on to come forward. He excused himself, but in vain. He looked around on the assembled crowd for some one to save him; among priests and people, none however offered to help the trembling victim of his own folly. The stern voice of the imperial messenger bade him ascend the pile. He still lingered, and was at length seized by the attendants, placed forcibly on the pile and burnt." (*Edkins' Notices of Chinese Budhism.*)

condemning the confidence placed in the prayers of the priests, remarks that to procure happiness, or prevent misery after death by prayers or any other means, is out of our power, and that the same is true of the present life.

In their controversies with the Budhists, the Confucianists seem at times to have denied the immortality of the soul, and of course a future state of rewards and punishments. Their idea was that virtue was to be performed for its own sake, and that its influence only extended to worldly honour and prosperity. Motives drawn from a future world were never brought to bear upon men's conduct here. To this the Budhist objected that motives drawn from a future world were necessary to lead men to virtue. "The countryman," he says, "is diligent in ploughing his land, because he expects a harvest." The doctrine of Sakya speaks of hell, and the people fear to sin; of heaven, and they all desire its happiness. It points to Nirvana as the spirit's final home.

There is no question but this filling up the gap in man's necessities as a religious being which Budhism attempted was one primary reason of its success in the land of Confucius. The sage regarded man merely in reference to his life here, and while his unsatisfied followers derided the follies and superstitions, and inveighed against Budhism as a foreign religion, its temples were crowded with worshippers, and its monasteries or pagodas not only appeared in every city, but graced every point of beauty on hill side, mountain top, quiet nook or valley, throughout the empire. The prevalence of the system may be understood from the fact that a census, taken by imperial command in the thirteenth century, gives the number of Budhist temples and monasteries as 42,318, while the priests or monks numbered 213,418.

Without entering further upon the details of the history of Budhism, we will notice briefly its more prominent peculiarities, and the principal schools into which it is divided.

One peculiarity common to northern Budhism is the adoption of the mythology of other systems or indigenous systems of belief. Southern Budhism appears much more strict; images of Budha alone (so far as we are informed,) being allowed in Budhist temples. But with northern Budhism there

has been a complete adoption of the older Hindoo mythology, together with a long list which the imagination, history and other sects have supplied. It was certainly a very cool assumption on the part of the Budhists which led them to make Budha not only superior to the deities worshipped by the Brahmans, but to represent these deities as waiting upon and listening to the discourses of the man Budha. Among them is Brahma himself. Shakra, or Indar, the chief of the Devas or gods, is also represented as one of his disciples. "In some Chinese temples their images are said to form a pair among the auditors of Sakyamuni." The Hindoo divinity which occupies the most prominence in Chinese Budhistical worship is Yama, or as he is known in China, Yan-lo, or the ruler of the dead. He is often represented in their temples surrounded by representations in *alto relievo*, setting forth the various modes of punishment and torture in the unseen world. The common people seem all to expect to meet him after death, and to be judged with the strictest impartiality. He is also supposed to fix the hour of each man's dissolution.

It is unnecessary to go into a detailed account of the different idols worshipped in China. Some of these are historical beings, others have been borrowed from the Tauists, whilst still another class are inventions of the imagination, created in some cases to teach a moral lesson, or to symbolize an idea. Of this latter class one of the most common is Kwan Yin, or goddess of mercy, who is represented under different forms. One of the common representations of Kwan Yin is that of a female figure, holding in her arms a child, which has often been compared to the Virgin Mary, holding in her arms the infant Saviour, whereas the idea intended is rather that of bestowing children on those who pray for posterity. (*Edkins.*)

The philosophic Budhists symbolize all this mythology and idolatry. They are mere signs of ideas. Thus the four fierce figures which stand two on each side of the entrance to a Budhist temple, represent protection, Budha intelligence, Kwan Yin mercy. When he bows before the image and makes offerings of incense, candles and gilt paper, this also is a symbol, and indicates the reverence with which he should receive the instructions of Budha.

The common people, however, look upon these idols as divinities, and pray to them as beings possessed of power to govern and control the world, as able to remove sickness and disease, and all the evils which flesh is heir to. Thus Budha himself, who is in no sense a god, who neither claimed any power or control over the universe, who rather ignored a god, and who in their earlier books is represented more as a teacher, as the wise and the good, who would lead mankind into the paths of Nirvana, who according to the strict interpretation of Nirvana is not, has come to be in the minds of most of his worshippers a powerful divinity. The founder of an atheistic system, and who according to that system has passed into annihilation, retains his hold on his followers, by a worship which shows his system to be a lie.

Budhism in its present manifestation in China is little else but gross and stupid idolatry. The Budhists are very fond of comparing their doctrines to the lotus,* and often plant them in ponds, in the vicinity of their temples; but the greenness and freshness of the flower has all passed away, and left nothing but the stagnant filth of the pond behind.

The priests have become as a class, weak, effeminate and lazy, having but little zeal for religion or cleanliness, and for the most part ignorant of their own system; except as they are called to pass through its outward forms of worship. Many of their most costly temples, on which have been spent in former days immense sums and imperial patronage, have been suffered to go to ruin.

Besides their prominent position as upholders of idolatry, the Budhists have made their main impression on the Chinese mind as defenders of a future state of existence. They differ, however, among themselves as to what this future state is. One of the more popular representations drops the idea of *Nirvana* entirely, and speaks of the western heavens, or the

* One of the favourite books of Indian Budhism which has been translated into Chinese, is called the Lotus of the good law. Its name is thus explained by one of the commentators, "As the lotus grows out of mire and yet preserves its freshness and purity, so the doctrine of this book, the good law, assists men to retain their original nature unsullied, and undisturbed amidst the misery and corruption around them."

heaven of Amida Budha. The description of this is not as an abstraction, but as a place of green woods and bright skies, where summer and winter are unknown, and where the soil is of gold. Into this place of blissful pleasure the common people hope to be born from a lotus flower; and that their souls may pass safely over the bridge into these western heavens, the prayers of the priests are invoked, especially after death. Opposed to this region of happiness is not merely hell, over which the Hindoo God Yan-lo presides, but the whole six modes of existence, the 1st. of which is Heaven, or the abode of the Devas or gods. 2d. Earth or man. 3d. Demons or hobgoblins—ghosts. 4th. Hell. 5th. Wandering, hungry spirits. 6th. Animals. The first three of these are assigned to the good, the latter to the wicked, though the highest good is not to be subject to any of these transmigrations. For whoever comes into the circumference of this wheel, may go where it sinks into misery, as well as where it rises into comparative happiness. The only certain good, therefore, is to escape from its rounds.

Metempsychosis, or the idea of previous existence, which the Budhists adopted from the popular belief of the Hindoos, has become quite a prevalent belief among the Chinese. In accounting for misfortunes to which they may be subject, they are often referred to as punishments for sins in a former state of existence.

The idea of morality, and what constitutes the essence of virtue, was more clearly set forth by the Confucianists than by the Budhists. The only respect in which the latter could claim any advantage was in the motives to the exercise of virtue which they claim should be drawn not merely from the present life, and the practice of virtue for its own sake, but also from a future state of existence. It is, however, to be taken into consideration, that if Budhism brought in the future as a motive to the exercise of virtue, it was of no great practical advantage, for the method in which future good was to be obtained was not, strictly speaking, by moral, but by meritorious actions, which consisted mainly in offerings, in saying of prayers, repeating over the name of Budha, and almsgiving.

The use of charms and the practice of magical arts has been

charged upon the Budhists by the Confucianists. And in the year A. D. 515, several priests were put to death for practising magical arts. There was a sect also among the Budhists, founded about A. D. 720, which had some secret doctrines, and professed to repeat charms with great effect. This kind of superstition was, however, more properly a characteristic of the Tauists.

It only remains to refer to the different schools of Chinese Budhists. The main division is into the Esoteric and Exoteric schools, though there are more or less important subdivisions of each. The Exoteric school is rather the main body of Chinese Budhists who worship Budha, as if he were a god; who believe in the fabulous stories and legends of Budhas, Bodhisatwas, &c.; who in fact are idolaters, and who generally give up the idea of *Nirvana* as an abstraction or annihilation, and substitute the material heaven of Amida Budha. This is popular Budhism in China. Budha is said to have foretold this period, that the true doctrine would be followed for five centuries after his death. After that, for a thousand years, a system of forms or image worship would prevail. This would subsequently give place to another called the "final system," which would terminate the present Kalpa.

Esoteric Budhism owes its origin in China to Bodhidharma, the famous patriarch who came from India in the sixth century. One of the main characteristics of this school is its discarding the use of books. A Chinese writer thus speaks of Budha and Bodhidharma. "The former taught great truths and the causes of things. He became the instructer of men and devas (gods.) He saved multitudes and spake the contents of more than five hundred works. Hence arose the Exoteric branch of the system, and it was believed to be the tradition of the words of Budha. Bodhidharma brought from the western heaven the seal of truth, and opened the fountain of contemplation in the east. He pointed directly to Budha's heart and nature, swept away the parasitic and alien growth of book instruction, and thus established the Esoteric branch of the system containing the tradition of the heart of Budha. Yet, he adds, the two branches while presenting of necessity a different aspect, form but one whole." In connection with this Esoteric branch or

school there were no secret doctrines. They protested against book knowledge or the performance of outward rites, and insisted upon greater attention to the cultivation of the heart. Outward rites have usually been considered not essential by the followers of this school. They may be necessary for the ignorant, but not for those who comprehend the deeper principles of the system. They do not worship the image themselves—an image only symbolizes an idea. With them religion is entirely a matter of the heart, or of the contemplative faculty, and therefore offerings are unnecessary. A man is to rise above the objects of sensation, and attempt to realize the state of Nirvana in this life. The outer world is to become obliterated. Abstraction is the highest state, and as a consequence the distinctions between virtue and vice occupy an inferior position. These distinctions belong to the imperfection of the present state. This was carrying out the idea of the unreality of the present which belonged to primitive Budhism. The Chinese Budhists, however, made more of the mind or heart. The mind itself is Budha (that is, intelligence). "To know, was all that was needful. To become Budha the mind only needs to be freed from every one of its affections, not to love or hate, rejoice or fear. To do or to aim at doing what is virtuous or vicious, is to leave the heart and go out into the visible, tangible world. Let the mind do nothing, observe nothing, aim at nothing, hold fast to nothing—that is Budha. Then there will be no difference between living in the world and entering Nirvana. Then human nature, the mind Budha and the doctrine he taught all become identical."* It will be seen that this view, so far as it recognizes a god at all, does it under a pantheistic form. Budha is the mind. There is nothing real but the mind, and the mind and god are identical. The finite and the infinite are one, and that an abstraction.

The followers of this contemplative school, although apparently not numerous, are in higher repute than the priests of the Exoteric system, especially by the Confucianists, who look with contempt upon the image worship of the multitude.

* Edkins quotes the above from a little Chinese work published in the Tang dynasty.

We have thus gone over all that we proposed in the consideration of this system. The gigantic figure which has spread itself over Asia has long since passed the zenith of its power. The decrepitude of old age is upon it. It woke up for a time an energy and civilization which it had not the vitality to sustain. And now when, after a long and uninterrupted trial, the inherent weakness of a system of asceticism and works of merit is manifest, when it can no longer present the bold front and opposition which it once could, when the door of access to all Budhistic countries has been thrown wide open, may we not hope for the triumph of that righteousness which is by faith on the Son of God? The enemy may, and doubtless will, arouse himself; he may re-appear in another form through the influence of Romish zeal; but there the giant figure lies torpid and dying, his hold on his victims relaxed, and now let the only Saviour of the world be lifted up, and he will draw all men unto him.

ART. II.—*Christologie des Alten Testamentes und Commentar über die Messianischen Weissagungen*, von E. W. HENGSTENBERG Dr. u. Prof. der Theol. in Berlin. 3 Vols. 2d Edition. 1854–1857.

A CHRISTOLOGY of the Old Testament is an exhibition of its doctrine concerning Christ. The scale upon which such a work is projected will vary according to the author's conception of his task. In its widest range it will embrace a discussion of both types and Messianic predictions; or it may be so limited as to exclude the types and confine itself to the predictions of the Messiah; or it may be still further restricted to such predictions as have exclusive and undivided reference to Messiah's person and work.

Each of these methods of treatment has its advantages and adaptations to its own special end. The last and most restricted has the advantage in point of directness, brevity and impressiveness. The passages brought under discussion are

proportionally few, their reference undeniable, their meaning clear, their fulfilment beyond dispute. For the purposes of apologetics, or of elementary instruction, this is therefore to be preferred. Complicated questions are avoided, distracting matters of secondary moment are shut out, the main issue is distinctly presented and readily settled: Jesus of Nazareth is "he of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write."

But he who aspires to a full acquaintance with the lively oracles must not stop here. The spirit of prophecy is in all its utterances the testimony of Jesus. All the prophets, as many as have spoken, have foretold of these days. In order to learn what holy men, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, were enabled to declare of the coming and power of the Lord Jesus, it is not sufficient to examine a few occasional passages of the plainer sort; but all which are in any wise related to the coming Saviour or his work, even though it be obscurely or indirectly, must be brought under review. Every ray of light adds to the gathered brilliancy of the focus, and it is astonishing what new illumination arises from simply bringing passages together. A key is found in one quarter which is needed for the unlocking of a difficulty in another; a suggestion here supplies a missing link there: this perplexed passage would be a hopeless labyrinth but for the happy circumstance that the clue is preserved elsewhere; and thus by patient investigation and comparison the prophetic doctrine of Christ may be elicited in its full extent. It is moreover to be observed that this extended study of the Messianic teaching of the prophets is an important aid to the safe and thorough prosecution even of the more limited method before referred to; for the understanding of individual passages must be both corrected and furthered by a knowledge of the general analogy of prophecy.

This is the task which Hengstenberg has undertaken in his Christology and Commentary on the Messianic Prophecies. Every prediction which bears any relation to the future Redeemer, or which sheds any light upon the conceptions formed of him, or the mode of representation employed respecting him, is examined and commented on sentence by sentence, and word by word. It is needless at this late day to speak of

the ability with which this has been done. The work was immediately upon its appearance, admitted to the rank of a standard authority, not only in Germany, but in England and America. And most of the subsequent treatises upon the same subject, not excepting those of Roman Catholic writers, such as Bade and Reinke, have been little more than diluted reproductions of this. The second edition presents no change of plan, or material alteration of sentiment, from the first. The omission of the Messianic Psalms is due to the fact, that a fresh discussion of them was considered needless since the appearance of the author's commentary on the entire book. A careful revision has made it a more adequate expression of Hengstenberg's latest and most mature views, and afforded an opportunity for introducing what might be thought necessary by way of defence against recent opponents. Minor corrections are to be found in almost every page, sometimes consisting in the modification, insertion, or omission of a single sentence, at others involving long paragraphs. The great body of it, however, is exactly reprinted from the first edition, original typographical errors even being occasionally retained; *e. g.* I. p. 392, last line בְּלִית; III. 2. p. 56, note *quomoda*, which are duly preserved in the American and English translations.

It is not our intention at present to inquire whether the interpretations and comments of Hengstenberg may not be susceptible of improvement in some of their subordinate details, but rather to present a few hints as to the relation of the general plan of this work to Christological science in its highest and most complete form, the direction in which further progress is to be expected and desired, and the extent to which it may be carried. It was remarked at the outset that Christology, in its largest sense, demands an investigation of the types, as well as the Messianic predictions of the Old Testament. It is only when these are brought together, and their combined force is properly estimated, that it can be seen how truly Christ was the centre and heart of the former economy, and how every line which it contained pointed forward to Him.

Types are in scholastic phrase real, as opposed to verbal prophecies; prophecies not in words, but in things, presented not to the ear, but to the eye; persons and things, acts and

relations, which prefigure those to come. That such types exist in the Old Testament is universally admitted by believers in its divine origin; and in fact certain of them are so clearly evidenced in themselves, and so explicitly sustained by inspired authority, that they force themselves upon the most reluctant vision. Who can, with the book of Psalms before him, deny the typical character of David? Or who can read the Epistle to the Hebrews, and not admit that there are types among the Levitical institutions? But when we ask after the number of these types, and the extent of their signification, there is the greatest possible diversity in the answers given. The ancient allegorists crowd the Old Testament with types of the most arbitrary and fanciful description; every imagined resemblance, however casual or constrained, is held to constitute a typical relation, irrespective of the essential meaning of things, and heedless not only of correct principles, but of any principle whatever. The same course has been pursued, though not to equal lengths, by some professed expounders of the types in modern times.

Reacting from these palpable incongruities, and seeking a fixed and evident rule to guide them, through all the intricacies of the subject, others have laid down the maxim, that nothing but an express divine statement, in every instance, affirming the fact, can be a sufficient warrant for assuming the existence of a type. Thus, Bishop Marsh in his eighteenth Lecture: "The only possible means of knowing that two distant, though similar historic facts were so connected in the general scheme of Divine Providence, that the one was designed to prefigure the other, is the authority of that word in which the scheme of Divine Providence is unfolded. Destitute of that authority, we may confound a resemblance subsequently observed, with a resemblance pre-ordained; we may mistake a comparison, founded on a mere accidental parity of circumstances for a comparison founded on a necessary and inherent connection. There is no other rule, therefore, by which we can distinguish a real from a pretended type, than that of Scripture itself. There are no other possible means by which we can know that a previous design and pre-ordained connection existed. Whatever persons or things, therefore, recorded in the

Old Testament, were expressly declared by Christ, or by his apostles, to have been designed as prefigurations of persons or things relating to the New Testament, such persons or things so recorded in the former are types of the persons or things with which they are compared in the latter. But if we assert that a person or thing was designed to prefigure another person or thing, where no such prefiguration has been declared by divine authority, we make an assertion for which we neither have nor can have the slightest foundation."

Nothing could be more welcome, certainly, than such an inspired exposition of all the types of the Old Testament, as Bishop Marsh here supposes. If the conversation of our Lord after his resurrection, with the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, had been preserved in full, in which, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them, in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself, it would have been of inestimable value. But in what part of the sacred writings is there such a professed enumeration of all the types, as to warrant any one in saying, that none others but those so declared are to be admitted to have existed? So far from this, the allusions to them, wherever made, are seemingly of the most incidental and casual description. They are introduced in the exigencies of an argument, or for the sake of an illustration, and in such a way as to leave the impression that individual specimens only are selected from a mass of others which might with equal propriety have been similarly used, had the occasion called for their employment. And when these incidental allusions are culled out and brought together, they appear to form no connected and self-contained system, no intelligible reason can be given why just these particular cases should have been constituted types, and no others. Their recognition avowedly rests upon the mere force of an authoritative statement of fact; their existence is fruitful of no further consequences than as so many additional exhibitions of divine foreknowledge, and the entire subject thus loses its interest and importance. It is moreover assumed without proof, that the divine intention in this matter can be exhibited in no other way than by the express statements of his word, and these repeated in every individual case. For if the purpose

of God can be made known in other ways; if it can be disclosed by the event, revealed in general statements, under which particular cases may find their place, or inferred from analogous instances where it is expressly declared, then the entire argument based upon the contrary supposition falls to the ground; and it is as unreasonable to admit no types of Christ, for which the direct warrant of explicit scriptural statements cannot be brought, as it would be to admit no predictions of Christ which are not explicitly affirmed in the New Testament to have been fulfilled in him.

The rigid rule of Bishop Marsh must for these reasons be relaxed, so as to admit implicit as well as explicit types, those which may on sufficient grounds be inferred, as well as those which are expressly declared. The important question now arises, what grounds are to be held sufficient for the admission of types, and how extensively are they to be found in the Old Testament? There are three general considerations which appear to cover all that is most important upon this point, and these conspire to the same result. 1. There can be no safer guide in the interpretation of the sacred volume, than that which inspiration affords. The principles upon which the evangelists, apostles, and our Lord himself explain and apply the Old Testament must undoubtedly be the correct principles. The methods which they employ in the determination of what are to be esteemed types, are beyond controversy the proper methods. If now, from an induction of the various types recognized and expounded in the New Testament, these divinely sanctioned principles and methods can be developed in such a definite and practicable form, as to be applied to all other cases, the inspired warrant of such a procedure is as real as if conveyed by explicit statement, in every individual instance. This examination will disclose at the outset, that the New Testament recognizes two classes of types as existing in the Old, which may be respectively denominated legal and historical. The former are found in objects or institutions, which owe their being to divine enactment, *e. g.* the paschal lamb, declared by two apostles to be a type of Christ, 1 Cor. v. 7; John xix. 36; comp. Ex. xii. 46; the high-priest, the tabernacle and its services, Heb. viii. 1–5. The latter are found in objects or events

belonging to the sacred history, and which are brought into being under the control of God's gracious providence, *e. g.* Isaac, Gal. iv. 22, etc.; Solomon, Heb. i. 5; the veil upon the face of Moses, 2 Cor. iv. 13, etc.; the Exodus, Matt. ii. 15, comp. Hos. xi. 1, and the flood, 1 Peter iii. 20, 21. Now if, as we have already seen, we may not stop short with the individual cases thus directly mentioned, neither may we be content with a mechanical application of the analogies thence deduced to a few individual cases beyond, but without expecting or finding any system, and screening ourselves from all inquiry as to the reasonableness of the proceeding, behind the bare authoritative statement of inspiration. If the inspired interpretations alluded to are not mere sovereign dicta, but are based upon real and ascertainable principles, these should be investigated, discovered and applied. These principles must have been very far reaching. The applications unhesitatingly made of Old Testament objects, and of passages relating to them, to the objects of the New Testament are so numerous, of such a character, and have so much the appearance of instances selected at random, that they can hardly be explained upon any other hypothesis, than that every thing in the Old Testament is in some sense typical; that its legislation and its history, its ceremonial institutions, its persons and its events have not only their own intrinsic, historical or legal value as facts, persons, or institutions pertaining to the time then present, but in addition possess prophetic bearings, and stand in a distinct and intelligible relation to things which were to come after; that the entire connected scheme with all its individual parts, points forward to the new dispensation, and may be properly and without violence to its true, original, divinely ordained intent, regarded as foreshadowing what belongs to it.

2. The result thus reached by induction is further confirmed by the general statements of the inspired writers. The law comprising the ceremonial institutions, and by consequence involving the entire economy to which it indissolubly belonged is declared, Heb. x. 1, to have contained a shadow of good things to come; Gal. iii. 24, to have been a schoolmaster to bring unto Christ; Gal. iv. 1–5, to have been a system of tutors and governors, under which the infant church was in training

with reference to her majority. The same thing is with similar explicitness asserted of the history of the Old Testament. After reciting a number of occurrences in the wilderness, the apostle adds, 1 Cor. x. 11: Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples, *τύποι*, types as it is in the margin of the English version. And in another place, having applied to Christ a passage from the typical experience of David, he adds, Rom. xv. 4: For whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning. These various statements which simply embody in didactic form the current tenor of New Testament representation, certainly teach that the Old Testament was not only a preliminary, but a preparatory dispensation. It was a scheme of training devised and conducted by God, with constant and direct reference to the gospel, which he purposed thus to introduce. Of this training there are two co-ordinate lines, one conducted by the Spirit of God as the revealer of his will, and the other by his providence as the executive of that will, both shaping their way to a common end. Each of these lines embraces two constituents closely intertwined. The line of preparation under the conduct of the Spirit of God, embraces revelations made through the organs and representatives of God, and acts prescribed to be performed by men, or by their representatives on their behalf, that is to say, the prophetic word and the Levitical ritual. The providential line of preparation embraces events accomplished by the immediate agency of God, such as the mighty works which wrought Israel's deliverance from Egypt, which at Sinai made them the Lord's people, at Jordan and Jericho put them in possession of the promised land; and events wrought by the agency of men, still, however, under God's direction and control; or more briefly, miracles and the free acts of men. Under the four heads of the inspired word of God, the divinely appointed ritual, the agency of God, and the agency of man, may be summed up everything which belongs to the Old Testament. These are the several constituent portions of this grand scheme of preparation for the coming of the Son of God, and the economy to be introduced by him, and to each is allotted its appropriate function in the work. Each, therefore, contemplates the future, is framed with reference to

the future, points forward to the future, owes its peculiar form and character to the nature of that future, for which it is designed to serve as a preparation. They must each, from the very purpose which they are intended to accomplish, be predictive at least in so far as the beginnings of a plan give promise of the execution of the remainder, and the fig-tree putting forth leaves foretells the approach of summer.

We here interrupt our argument for a moment to remark that these four branches of the scheme of God answer with unerring precision the end of their ordination: the only particulars in which a disturbing element can by possibility find place are those in which the free agency of man is allowed to enter as a prominent factor. In regard to the revelations and the direct acts of God, or the prophecies and the miracles of the Old Testament, not the slightest deduction can be made from the perfection with which they perform their allotted work of preparation, and with which they consequently point forward to the good things in reserve. The same is true of the ritual as prescribed of God; as actually performed by man, its predictive character was often marred by neglect of its requirements in whole or in part, or by mingling heathen and uncommanded observances. These human excrescences, where they exist, are contrary to the spirit of the economy upon which they have fastened themselves; they partake not, therefore, of its predictive character. Aaron, the high-priest, offering sacrifice to God, and Solomon building God's temple, are predictive; but Aaron casting the golden calf, and Solomon rearing high places to the abominations of the heathen, are not. And so with the sacred history. Where the free acts of men follow the ordinance of God, they carry forward the work of preparation for Christ's coming, and are predictive of it. When they forsake his ordinances, they violate the fundamental law under which the old economy was established, forsake its spirit, run counter to its entire tendency, and the predictive character is obliterated and lost. It is the bud which grows from the life of the tree, is fed by its sap, and forms its genuine development, not the unsightly excrescence which, though joined to it, is not of it, which is prophetic of the flowers and the fruit. Moses interceding for the transgressing people points forward

to the Redeemer and his work, but not Moses speaking unadvisedly with his lips; so Samson delivering Israel from the Philistines, but not Samson in the arms of Delilah; the theocratic reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah, but not the anti-theocratic reigns of Ahaz and Manasseh.

Omitting for the present the consideration of the first of the four constituents into which we have resolved the old economy, viz., the inspired word, with its prophecies of Christ, we resume the proof from the premises now before us, that the remaining three, the ritual, the supernatural events, and the human actions of the Old Testament are, with the limitations just insisted upon, in the strict and ordinary sense of the term, typical of the new dispensation. A type is a prophetic similitude. The prophetic feature has already been established: it has been shown that they do point forward to the good things of the future, and give indication both of their coming and character. If now this prophetic feature exhibits itself in the form of a similitude to future things or events, then their typical character is settled. This is distinctly asserted of the ritual, which is declared Heb. x. 1, to have had a shadow of good things to come, but not the very image of the things, *i. e.* not the objects of the gospel in their absolute and perfect form, but a representation or outline of them. That it is not, however, confined to the ritual, but characterizes the Old Testament throughout, will appear from considering the nature of that preparation for the gospel which it was the plan of God to accomplish by means of it. In order to its being properly understood and embraced on its ultimate appearance, the great truths upon which it is based must first be exhibited to men and lodged in their minds and hearts. It was to this end that Israel was selected to be put in training, and made a theatre for the unfolding of the plan of grace. The great truths of salvation one day to be propounded to the world were taught to them, and by means of them to others in lower and rudimental forms, exhibited in symbols, woven into their history, and made a constituent of the very life of the nation. Spiritual and heavenly things were thus brought down to human capacity by material and earthly representations, and their laws and workings made familiar through the medium of forms which might be endlessly

varied, and with which they were in constant contact. It is thus that a teacher would prepare his pupil to apprehend an abstract or spiritual idea, by repeated exhibitions of concrete or material forms in which it was involved. The deliverance of man from everlasting ruin was foreshadowed by a long series of deliverances wrought for Israel, throughout their history, from external foes. These taught essentially the lessons involved in the former of the grace and power of God, the helplessness of man, the warrant and the necessity of faith. There is, in fact, a double series of such deliverances running through the Old Testament, one consisting of those which are wrought, like that from Egypt, by God's mighty hand and outstretched arm; the other composed of such as marked the period of the Judges, wrought by the hands of men raised up and commissioned for the purpose. The two series converge at that point where Christ, who was at once God and man, became our Redeemer. Preparatory to the coming of the great high-priest a temporary priesthood was established, to perform the offices of mediation and atonement, that men might be familiarized with these great functions, and taught their meaning and necessity. So the prophetic office in Israel was to prepare the way for the reception of the great Prophet; and the kingly office for the reception of the true King of Israel. The altar of sacrifice taught that without shedding of blood there was no remission. The material temple taught that God was dwelling in the midst of his people. The temporal sanctions of the theocracy displayed the same rectitude of the divine administration which shall distribute the awards of eternity. The sufferings of God's children from the malignity of wicked men prepared the mind for the sufferings of God's dear Son from the same source. The humiliation and oppression of Israel, appointed of God to achieve a glorious task, is cognate with the humiliation of God's greater Servant charged with the same mission. The entire history of Israel is thus quickened and pervaded by religious truths. These are made to enter into their perpetual daily experience. They are engrafted, in the most striking manifestations, upon the great epochs of their national existence. They are with the most impressive solemnity exhibited in sacred symbols at the national

capital. And these truths thus presented to the Israelite at every turn are the same that were afterwards to be brought out in their higher spiritual applications in the Gospel of Christ.

This is precisely what is intended by the assertion that the Old Testament is full of types of Christ, and the coming dispensation. Everything in the former economy which really belongs to it and shares its spirit, takes part in the work of preparation for that which was to come; and this preparation is conducted by means of perpetual exhibitions and inculcations, in lower and temporary forms of the truths realized in the gospel. The same relations are maintained; they are only transferred to a different sphere. The old economy was so constructed, as to be in every part the shadow of the gospel substance, the type of its ever-enduring realities. It is not necessary that the Israelites should have known these things to be types, nor that they should have had a conception of what they prefigured. They accomplished their end when Israel learned the lessons they conveyed. The future application to be made of those lessons was already in the mind of the great Teacher, who would disclose it at the proper time; the pupil did not need to know it sooner. The awakening of a conscious anticipation of the future in the minds of the people is the function of prophecies, not of types.

3. In addition to what may be inferred from the practice of the writers of the New Testament, and their general statements upon this subject, a third consideration warranting the same conclusion, is the resemblance, which in actual fact holds between objects belonging to the two dispensations. A proper exhibition of this point would require a detailed presentation of these analogies, which we have not now the space to make. A few have been already hinted at. There is, however, the less need of such an exhibition, as the existence of the resemblance is confessed. Even Bishop Marsh does not dispute it; he only apprehends that "a resemblance subsequently observed" may be confounded with a "resemblance preordained," and hence refuses to admit a type until its preordination shall first be settled by express divine statement. But does not the existence of a pervading system of analogies, found not in what is external and contingent merely, but rest-

ing upon and embodying the same essential truths, show that we are dealing with what is not fortuitous, but designed? And whose design can it possibly have been, but that of God? Merely accidental resemblance, it is true, does not prove a type; casual or fancied points of comparison may mean nothing; but in the general unity of plan which marks the two dispensations, the reproduction of individual objects in their main essential features, is presumptive evidence that this was designed of God, unless the contrary can in any individual case be shown.

If now there is this extensive system of types in the Old Testament, it is plain that a discussion of them necessarily belongs to a complete Christology. And whatever advantages may attend the separate treatment of the Messianic prophecies, as in this work of Hengstenberg, or of the types, as in the Typology of Fairbairn, both must be combined, if the aim is to furnish a connected survey of all that the Old Testament contains of Christ. Such a combination must bring out the part allotted to each in the divine plan, and the relation which they sustain to each other. Hofmann, whose chief merit consists in having drawn increased attention to the fact that such a relation exists, although he utterly failed in his attempt to point out its true nature, actually undertook to sustain the paradox that there is nothing prophetic except types; that the prophecies predict nothing directly and in the strict sense; they merely detect, infallibly, those germs or premonitions of the future which exist in contemporaneous types; and that consequently the prophecies of any period disclosed just so much of the future as is indicated by the types of that period, and no more. His attempt to establish this in detail, leads to perpetual forcing of the plain sense of the prophecies, and emptying them of their evident meaning, in order to reduce them to the level required by his theory. See a statement of his views in the *Biblical Repertory*, for April 1858. This depreciation of the prophecies for the sake of exalting the types really nullifies itself; for unless the evidence is afforded by the prophecies of a plan laid by one who knows the end from the beginning, the ground for believing in the existence of types is insecure. Messianic prophecies are, without doubt, the main

and guiding element in Christology. Types occupy an humble and less conspicuous place. They are, besides, more obscure and difficult, and must borrow light from contemporaneous prophecies rather than impart it. They are, however, too important to be left untouched. The premonitions of the coming dispensation, afforded in the providence of God, belong to one scheme of preparation with that conducted by his Spirit, in the sure word of prophecy. They go along together, hand in hand, with growing fulness as the old economy advances. In what respects they supplement each other, how their harmony is preserved in the midst of diversity, to what extent they are conditioned by each other in form or contents, and what is the sum of their respective revelations, are questions which fall within the legitimate province of Christology.

If, however, a writer upon this subject restricts himself as Hengstenberg has done, to the Messianic prophecies, two methods may be adopted in their treatment. He may simply select the various passages predictive of Christ, subject them to a careful analysis, and elicit their meaning. Or he may go a step farther, and in addition seek to gather these all up into a common unity, inquiring into the characteristics of the Messianic predictions communicated through each of the different prophets, their mutual relations, and the relation in which the Messianic predictions of each prophet stand to the body of his own particular ministry; and exhibiting in connected form the grand resultant of the whole, that figure of the Messiah and the dispensation he was to introduce, beheld alike by all the ancient seers, though variously viewed and seen from different sides. The first of these methods collects the materials; the second, in addition, systematizes them. The second is the more complete, and is the result towards which investigations in this field must tend, if the subject is to receive a thorough, not to say exhaustive, treatment, and to put on a properly scientific form. The first, however, is an indispensable pre-requisite. The system, if it is to be of any value, if it is to be better than a mere fancy, must be preceded by a diligent and careful collection and examination of the appropriate facts; and the more untrammelled the collector is, or unbiassed by antecedent theories, the better. It is the first of these methods which Heng-

stenberg has pursued in the volumes before us. He does the part of collection and examination. He passes in review the various prophecies of Christ, and developes their meaning with that learning, ability, clearness and evangelical soundness, which have made him the prince of German commentators. But he has attempted nothing beyond: and the reader has at least this satisfaction in consequence, that the results of the author are independent of any system to be built up or any theory to be established. So far was he in his first edition from attempting to exhibit the Messianic revelations in their true order and connection, that his arrangement of the prophets seems to have been determined wholly by considerations of convenience, and not to rest upon any discernible principle. Isaiah is put at the head of the prophets; then follow Zechariah, Daniel, the remaining minor prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. In the present edition he has improved upon his former plan by arranging the prophets in their chronological order, showing by a general survey of the ministries of several of them that their Messianic predictions were not isolated utterances, standing apart from all the rest of the communications which they were inspired to make, and giving an occasional conspectus of all the Messianic revelations of an individual prophet. But what he has done in this direction, while it supplies a more convenient disposition of the facts, and facilitates a review of them, does not accomplish their scientific distribution, or their reduction to a system in which their position is defined, and their mutual relations determined.

That such a system does exist, however, which it is the province of Christology to trace out and exhibit, may be inferred antecedently from the universal fact that there is a plan and order in everything that God does. Infinite wisdom invariably pursues a method and adapts means to ends, and this in a manner worthy of the eternal mind. Human science, in its various departments, simply uncovers the plan of God, and it attains its truth and its perfection only as it approximates the exact exhibition of that plan. And especially in a scheme devised for the training of men through successive ages with reference to the advent of the Son of God and the introduction of his great salvation, we must expect that he who appointed

to the winds their weight, and to the waters their measure, would adjust everything with the nicest precision, and that all would betray the most admirable contrivance and the greatest appropriateness to the contemplated end. God's ways, it must indeed be remembered, are not as our ways; and he who approaches their investigation with his mind made up in advance as to the plan and method which they must contain, will be sure to substitute a human for the divine conception. But avoiding the presumption of prescribing a plan for God, it will be safe to begin the study of his proceedings with the belief that he has a plan, and reverently to examine them with a view to its discovery. The prophecies, forming as they do part of a great system of teaching, we may be sure, were not communicated at random, but with that method and proportion which, in the view of the Most High, were best adapted to promote that training which was to be accomplished by them. At every period of the history of Israel those instructions were imparted to them which were appropriate to their existing necessities, and were best suited to carry forward the work of preparation to its destined end. And as Christ's coming was the end of all, we would expect that the revelations concerning him would be the soul of every prophetic ministry; that the peculiar features of the former would determine what is most characteristic in the latter; and consequently that the Messianic predictions of the several prophets, instead of being loosely connected with their other revelations of the future, would be most firmly fastened in the texture of the whole, being that indeed for which all the rest exist, and from their relation to which they derive their chief value, the centre from which all beside radiate, the base on which they rest, the principle and spring by which they are controlled. And while the extremities, so to speak, of a prophet's ministry, his subordinate and inferior revelations may be influenced to some extent by accidental causes, the heart of that ministry, its Messianic prophecies, must be shaped by what lies back of and above all these. Hence the true classification of the prophets and the real purport of their ministries, considered on the whole, and with reference to the plan of God, is to be sought in what they reveal of Christ, and what preparation they make for his coming.

It is no reason for closing our eyes upon the evidences of such a plan, that rationalists have sought to pervert them to the ends of unbelief, by confounding the gradual unfoldings of the Divine purpose of mercy through Christ, with the growth of a merely human idea, and its constant adaptation, in its form and the extent of its presentation, to the necessities and the condition of the people, with anticipations, longings, and vague conjectures, awakened in human hearts by the course of events. The Divine approves itself as such by the truth of its disclosures, and the exactness of their fulfilment. An idea, which after being inculcated with growing clearness for centuries, meets such a realization as that of the Messiah found in Christ, must be born of God. And the whole nature of the doctrine concerning the Redeemer, as of the religion to which it belongs, from which men were perpetually relapsing, and to which they needed to be ever afresh recalled by supernatural agencies brought to bear upon them, proves itself from heaven, and as far removed from the offspring of man's natural heart, as light from darkness, or holiness from sin. No apprehension need be entertained, therefore, of playing into the hands of unbelief by searching that out, which can only add to the convincing evidence of the presence and control of God. A plan wrought out through long ages, and in which men are the unconscious instruments, can be referred to no other than the Supreme directing mind.

Nor need it be apprehended that any constraint will thus be laid upon the Divine sovereignty. God reveals freely and at his own pleasure, what and when he will. But the actings of infinite wisdom need not be capricious or unwise, in order to be free. God's doings cannot be constrained into some petty channel hewn by man, but they flow majestically onward in the bed created by himself. It is not for man to say prior to observation, that God must have disclosed the particulars in his plan of mercy, after just such a fashion, or in just such an order. But when we see how he has chosen to reveal them, we may assert without hesitation, that there is a Divine fitness in his methods. We may not presume to understand all the reasons which lay in the eternal mind, nor explain in all their details, the workings of his plan which we behold, but we shall

undoubtedly find enough to repay attentive study, and give us new impressions of his wonder-working skill.

The anticipations awakened by the considerations already presented, are fully borne out by the facts of the case. Without pretending to a full delineation of the plan upon which the Messianic predictions of the Old Testament are constructed, we shall merely allude to a few obvious features of their arrangement, in proof that such a plan exists.

The growing fulness and clearness of the prophecies of Christ cannot fail to strike the most superficial observer. They begin with the comprehensive, but vague promise, which immediately succeeded the fall. They are continued until the character of the Redeemer, the nature of his work, and the marks for his identification, are drawn with such distinctness and precision, that there can be no mistake nor doubt in applying them.

The Messianic predictions of the Old Testament may be divided into two great periods, viz. that which precedes, and that which follows the settlement of Israel in Canaan. The first of these was preliminary to the second, which furnished the more direct preparation for the coming of Christ. The immediate ends of the first period were twofold; the creation and segregation of a people of God, and the placing them in circumstances adapted to the training which they were to receive. The book of Genesis records what was done to compass the first of these ends; the remaining books of the Pentateuch, (of which Joshua may be regarded as the complement,) record the accomplishment of the second. The Messianic promises of the Pentateuch arrange themselves in precise conformity with this design of the entire history. Those of Genesis are individual, directed to particular patriarchs, the progenitors and representatives of the future nation of Israel; and these revelations keep pace with the various stages of the history, and serve to mark its several epochs. The great epochs of the patriarchal history are the fall, the flood, the call of Abraham, and the descent into Egypt; and with each of these is coupled one distinct promise of its own, made respectively to Adam, to Noah, to Abraham, and to Judah. Adam trembling before his judge, in expectation of

immediate death, received the simple promise of salvation; the tempter and his machinations shall be crushed by the seed of the woman. This promised victory over the serpent, however, was so far from being immediately gained, that the descendants of the woman fell almost universally under his power, and the earth was swept by a flood, one faithful family only being spared, as a fresh beginning of the human race. It was then that Noah, inspired to forecast the destiny of his sons, spoke of Jehovah as the God of Shem and Japhet, in his enlargement dwelling in his tents. The hope of salvation thus revived afresh, seemed doomed to a new disappointment, when Japhet in his expansion abandoned the worship of Jehovah, and even the descendants of Shem were almost wholly given over to idolatry. The utter extinction of the hope of the world, which such a state of things appeared to threaten, was prevented, however, by the selection of Abraham to be the head of a chosen race to be taken into covenant with God, and put in possession of a land where their training might be conducted. The promise of salvation was accordingly renewed to him, and adapted to these new conditions; he shall have a numerous seed, be put in possession of the land of Canaan, and in his seed all nations of the earth shall be blessed. This was confirmed, but neither enlarged nor altered in its various repetitions to Abraham himself, to Isaac and to Jacob. But the promised enlargement of the seed had scarcely begun before circumstances, which they could not control, seemed to threaten once more the frustration of the expected blessing. They were obliged to leave the land of their father's sojournings, the land of their own anticipated inheritance, and go down into Egypt. And lest they might apprehend that the possession of Canaan, and the consequent preparation for a blessing through them upon all nations was thus forfeited, the promise was once more renewed in the most emphatic manner to all the sons of Jacob, that they would come into the possession of Canaan; and to Judah, that out of his seed Shiloh would spring, the prince of a peaceful abundance to receive the obedience of the nations.

Thus ends the patriarchal period, and the record of its training for the coming salvation. The promise was repeated as

often as the emergency demanded, and in a form adapted each time to the exigencies of the case. The terms of the earliest promises, the seed of the woman, the blessing upon Shem, and the seed of Abraham also, left it doubtful whether it was from the body of their descendants, or an individual of their race that the salvation was to arise. It was not until the process of expansion into a nation was actually beginning, that more precise instruction was needed upon this point, and in the promise of Shiloh, to arise out of the tribe of Judah it was afforded.

After the decease of the patriarchs, Israel swelled into a numerous nation. In compliance with his promises to their forefathers, God broke the bondage of Egypt, and led them forth to Canaan. But as might have been confidently anticipated, the end of all was not lost sight of in the prosecution of the means. The individual promises of Genesis are now succeeded by national promises concerning the salvation to arise out of Israel, and the person who was destined to effect it. The first is implied in the ritual, by which the covenant relation of the people to God was sealed and perpetuated, as that is presented in the books of Exodus and Leviticus. It taught the necessity of mediation, atonement, and purification, in order to communion with God. But as this communion and God's consequent favour and blessing were already pledged to them and to the world, they were thus assured that these essential pre-requisites, of which the form was now given, would be provided in their substantial reality. The types by which this is taught belong not to the providential types of history, but were communicated directly by the Spirit of God. They thus fall under the same category with his revealed word, and may therefore not inappropriately be classed among the direct Messianic promises. In the book of Numbers, Israel is brought into conflict with the heathen Midianites, and a heathen seer is obliged to foretell, Num. xxiv. 17, the rising of a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre out of Israel, to destroy all their foes. It is the promise of the theocratic kingdom culminating in the Messiah. A further prediction is given in the book of Deuteronomy. Moses was giving his last instructions, and the people must anticipate his departure. But they are assured, Deut.

xviii. 15, that they would not then be dependent on the miserably deceptive occult arts practised by the heathen. God would raise them up a prophet like unto Moses, unto whom they should hearken. It is the promise of the prophetic order culminating in the Messiah.

The people, thus assured of the mediation, atonement and purification, needed to perfect their covenant intercourse with God, of the coming king who would secure them against, and destroy all their foes, and of the prophet who would instruct them in all that they yet needed to know of the will of God, were located in Canaan, and their recently received divine constitution was set in operation. We thus reach the second period of Messianic prediction, the period of more direct training for the advent of the Saviour. This, like the foregoing preliminary period, is accomplished in two series of promises, respectively linked with individual and national experience. The individual experiences employed as means of instruction regarding the coming Saviour, culminate in the life of David; and the inspired lessons combined with them, or wrought out of them, are mostly written in the Psalms. The national experiences improved to the same end, culminate in the period of Assyrio-Babylonish oppression; and the lessons engrafted upon this period are written in the books of the Prophets. David was led through a varied experience, adapted to serve as a basis for instruction concerning the future Messiah, and which was employed for this end. He passed through a period of severe trials, rose to royal sway, and was made the head of a new dynasty. Each of these particulars furnished a link of connection with the great Redeemer, which inspired Psalmists were enabled to detect and to develope. The persecuted righteous, Psalms xvi., xxii., xl., xli., lxix., theocratic kings, Psalms ii. cx., the seed of David, 2 Sam. vii. 12–16, Psalms lxxii., lxxxix., culminate in him, find in him their ultimate ideal. The people were taught by the Psalmist to rise from these characters placed before their eyes to the true conception of the Messiah, by a method which may be likened to that which theology employs in arriving at a conception of the divine perfections, from the qualities of man, elevated, purified and freed from all defects and imperfections. The universal relations of man are

in two Psalms idealized in the same way that the particular experience of David is in those just referred to; man as the creature of God, Psalm viii., and as a party to the marriage relation, Psalm xlv. The true idea of man shall be realized in the Messiah, as that of marriage shall be realized in Messiah's relation to his people.

The sins of Israel at a later period, and the judgments with which they were visited, led to a fresh series of national experiences, from which occasion was taken to teach new lessons of the person and character of the Messiah, and of the dispensation he was to introduce. At each stage of the painful process of discipline through which they were carried, the sins and distresses of the present were made to exhibit the need of intervention by the great Deliverer, and to set forth by contrast the blessings he would introduce. The chosen people were rent into two hostile kingdoms. One had openly deserted the sanctuary of God, and established idolatry as the national worship. The other was far gone in corruption, and alternated in successive reigns, according to the character of its princes, between the worship of idols and of Jehovah. To save Israel from an utter apostasy which would have frustrated the design of their selection as the covenant people—to check the corruption of the mass, and save the holy seed from extinction—it was necessary to employ those severe but salutary measures of which they had long ago been forewarned by Moses. The corrupt portion of the people must be cut off and removed, and the pious remnant themselves purified by a period of trial—must be freed from their deadening influence. It was for this purpose that the Assyrio-Babylonish empire was raised up. Assyria first overwhelmed Israel, and threatened Judah. As the latter did not take warning, but, in spite of temporary reformations, still declined from bad to worse, Babylon completed the work by overthrowing Judah, and carrying the better portion of the people into captivity, leaving the remainder to perish in the siege and in the miseries that succeeded. The exiles were subjected to a seventy years' discipline, at the close of which a fresh sifting was instituted, and the better portion once more selected and brought back to be the nucleus of the restored theocracy. The fourfold division of the prophets thus created

has been remarked upon a former occasion—(see Art. on Hosea, *Bib. Rep.* Jan. 1859); according as they preceded the Assyrian invasion in Israel or Judah, preceded the Babylonish invasion, laboured in the exile or after the return. It was their faithful ministries, conjoined with these great events of Providence, interpreting and applying them, which wrought the marked change produced upon the people by this means. The form of instruction needed was different in each of the periods just indicated, according to its particular exigencies. To each were supplied its own appropriate lessons; and at the base of all these lessons the prophets placed Messiah and his work. It is not incidentally and occasionally that they speak of him, and in the midst of other things to which greater prominence is given; but the Messianic times form the back-ground of every prophetic picture, whether the fore-ground be light or dark. Every experience of the people is made to illustrate, by contrast or comparison, the future Hope of Israel.

To the present corruption of the people they oppose the time when Jerusalem and its inhabitants shall be holy; to the sinfulness of the princes, and their impotence before their foes, that King who shall reign in righteousness, and be a covert from the storm; to the humiliation and oppression of Zion, her future triumph and glory; to the disastrous schism of Judah and Israel, the period of their complete re-union. When Judah were in apprehension from Syria, Isaiah reassures them by the promise of the birth of Immanuel. As a pledge of deliverance from Assyria, he points to the child that is born, and the son that is given, whose name is Wonderful. In the foresight of Judah's captivity, he shows how the great Head of his people must likewise pass through sorrow and humiliation to his glorious reward. Jeremiah predicts the loss of the ark, but speaks of the time when it would be no longer missed from the new effulgence of the Divine manifestations; the approaching temporary interruption of the royal and sacerdotal offices gives him occasion to speak of Him in whom they would be perpetual. When the temple lay in ruins, and Canaan was forsaken of its former inhabitants, Ezekiel sets forth the Messianic period under the image of the temple rebuilt on a larger scale than before, its services restored, and the land once more appor-

tioned among the tribes. When the predicted seventy years had brought about the period of the expected restoration, Daniel foretells that seventy weeks shall intervene before the advent of the great Restorer. He sees the future succession of human empires, and this gives occasion to predict that all shall be ultimately swallowed up in the empire of Christ. The meanness of the structure reared by the exiles, as compared with Solomon's more splendid temple, leads to the promise, by the mouth of Haggai, that this house should be filled with the Divine glory in a higher sense than that which had preceded it.

And thus it is universally: whatever the immediate occasion of any prophecy may be, it is improved to give some lesson concerning Christ. Each prophet is thus led to survey the character or work of the Redeemer from his own particular point of view as furnished by the circumstances in which his ministry is exercised. We can thus see why one is commissioned to disclose certain features of the Messiah distinct from those revealed to another. We can see how these supplement and complete each other; and while each is peculiarly fitted to make its own distinct impression adapted to the special end of its communication, the whole combined makes up that total of prophetic instruction, which the Spirit of God saw fit to impart prior to Messiah's advent.

A minor blemish of this second edition of the Christology as compared with the first, upon which we may spend a few words in closing, is that Hengstenberg has taken occasion to introduce into it his pet fancy about significant numbers. This idea which he first applied extensively to the structure of the individual Psalms, then to the book of Revelation, and then to the Song of Solomon, is now fastened to the prophecies. In some of the most important of them he finds or imagines the words and verses carefully counted into conformity with this newly devised standard. Thus of the great prediction of Messiah's vicarious sufferings, Isaiah lii. 13; liii. 12, he says that the first three verses are introductory, the last two form the conclusion, which added make five, the signature of the incomplete. The body of the prophecy shows its completeness by consisting

of ten verses. This is divided into seven verses relating to the humiliation and suffering, and three relating to the exaltation of the servant of the Lord. The seven is, as usual, divided into four and three. Three verses contain an exposition of his sufferings, and four of their cause, his representative character.

The objections to this, and to all that he says besides of the same import are, 1. Its trifling character; it is a petty business for the sacred writers to be everywhere arranging their sentences and words with a view to the exhibition of these significant numbers, especially in such a detailed and recondite manner as is here assumed, and when no imaginable end of utility or beauty is answered by it. 2. The proof adduced is to the last degree precarious and insecure. In exhibiting the structure of the Psalms particularly, he makes every number a symbolical number. Three is the signature of the blessing, four of the earth, five of incompleteness, six is a double three, seven is the signature of the covenant, eight is a double four, nine a triple three, ten the signature of completeness, eleven is half the number of the alphabet, twelve the number of the tribes of Israel, and the multiples of any of these numbers have the same significance with the numbers themselves. With such an array of significant numbers to be used upon occasion where could he fail to find them, particularly as the liberty was taken of lopping off one or two verses from the beginning or end, as the introduction or conclusion? 3. These numbers may just as readily be applied to any other composition as to the Scriptures. Hengstenberg's own books are as full of them as the inspired writings of the Hebrews. If his own methods are worth anything, his Christology is pervaded by a constant regard to them, not in its words and sentences alone, but in its lines and letters. Thus the title page of the first volume of the Christology is divided into three parts by parallel lines, to indicate, no doubt, that the work was to appear in three volumes. It is besides manifestly governed by the number ten, the symbol of completeness. The number of words to the first period is ten; the number of lines above the first horizontal stroke is ten; the number of words, including the year of publication, beneath the same stroke is ten; the number of lines

beneath this stroke is five, marking the volume therein described as the incomplete part of the complete whole, whose title is given in the ten lines above. Other numbers also appear, though less prominently, upon the same page, chiefly twelve, the number of the tribes; and seven, the signature of the covenant; to signify that this complete work has relation to the truth of the covenant made with the twelve tribes. The very first word, which is that by which the work is most generally known, contains twelve letters. So does the name of the author; to this two initials have been prefixed, manifestly for the sake of making the number fourteen, which is twice seven. That this was from design is the more apparent when it is observed that the letters in the name of the publisher are also twice seven. The ten lines above the first horizontal stroke are divided by a period into seven and three. Between the first stroke and the second are four words, beneath the second are three lines; adding these we have once more seven. We do not think it necessary to pursue the investigation into the succeeding pages, but they who are disposed to make further discoveries for themselves, can scarcely count in vain. If any one were to suggest that some of these numbers may be due to the printer, rather than to the author, we answer that Hengstenberg has relieved us of that difficulty, by holding the sacred writers responsible for the Masoretic verses, with which they had far less to do than a modern author with the typographical arrangements of his printer. And now, if any portion of the sacred writings, whose words and verses have been so pompously counted off, can be shown to possess greater evidence of artificial or numerical structure, than the page just examined, we will admit that there may be something in it.

ART. III.—*The Atonement in its relations to Law and Moral Government;* by the Rev. ALBERT BARNES. Parry and McMillan: Philadelphia, 1858.

THIS book, as the author states, is the result of his best efforts to meet difficulties on the great doctrine of the Atonement—difficulties which have occurred to himself, and much perplexed him; and it has been published with the laudable desire of relieving other minds beset with like embarrassments. It is a book on law, written by one who had, in early life, intended to enter the legal profession, and is dedicated to a lawyer of high repute.

The class of persons who are supposed to encounter the difficulties which it is the design of the book to remove, are presumed to be conversant with law, and of a philosophic or sceptical turn of mind. The claims of this class to the standing of philosophers may be more readily estimated, after a consideration of their reputed difficulties.

It seems strange that the author should have felt himself under any obligation to apologize for dealing so much in law, as if he were travelling beyond his profession, in attempting the discussion of legal principles. His special object demanded the examination of legal principles, and his theme, if rightly apprehended, is a matter of law from beginning to end. Of such importance is the apprehension of this truth, that the man who has failed to discover it, has failed to discover the Gospel. That this book is chargeable with this tremendous oversight, notwithstanding its title-page, will appear in the sequel.

The plan of the book is, for the author's purpose, a very judicious one. In the first place, we are presented with certain difficulties which are said to embarrass philosophic minds in the investigation of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement. These difficulties are followed by a statement of the objects which an atonement is intended to secure. Then, in as many consecutive chapters, the author argues the probability, necessity, and nature of the Atonement. Having thus determined what the Atonement ought to be, he proceeds to confirm his own independent conclusions from the Bible. This, with a

chapter on the extent of the Atonement, comprising an argument conducted on the same principle, (of first determining what the Scriptures ought to teach, *if they are to be received by men*, and then citing a few apparently confirmatory passages in support of the sentence of Reason), concludes the whole.

As the principle stated in the last sentence is a fundamental one with the author—one which has given direction to all his investigations in connection with the great theme of this book, and has manifestly ruled and determined his mind in all the conclusions herein recorded, it must be a matter of primary interest to ascertain whether this principle be valid. The question to be determined is simply this: Are we able, independently of Revelation, to determine what a revelation must reveal and teach? This brings up the well known and very important question: What is the province of Reason in matters of faith? It would prevent a great deal of confusion in the consideration of this question, if those who discuss it were to observe the distinction between a judge and the law which guides and governs him in his decisions. The *potentia cognoscens* must be distinguished from the *norma judicandi*. The confounding of these two things usually leads to the exaltation of the lamp of human reason—the light of nature, into a standard whereby the word of God is to be tested, and approved or condemned. It is one thing to approach the sacred volume with an apprehending power in order to learn; another, and a very different thing, to draw near with an independent revelation of our own, in order to judge of the matter that volume contains. It is one thing to ascertain the sense of a given proposition as laid down in the Holy Scriptures; another, to judge of the truth of that proposition, and to pass sentence upon it, in accordance with an outside and independent standard. He who approaches the word of life for the latter purpose must be sadly lacking in that grace of humility which is one of the leading traits in the character of those who have received Christ as their Prophet.

It is true that right reason hath, even in matters of faith, a *judicium contradictionis;* and if any deliverance purporting to be a message from God, were found to contain a contradiction of an already authenticated communication, whether

that communication have come through the medium of nature, or of Revelation, the reputed message were to be rejected. But this is a different doctrine from that which would have us receive the word of God upon the ground of its agreement with our own views. What is this latter, but an attempt to establish our faith, not in the power of God, but in the wisdom of man?

The principle, therefore, is wrong. It is wrong first to determine what God is, and then to come to the Bible to confirm our doctrine. What are we—creatures who have opened our eyes upon the teeming wonders of a wondrous universe, some thirty, or three-score years ago, and have spent the greater part of this period in correcting errors into which we have been continually falling—what are we, that we should attempt to solve, on principles of law, as received by men, the central mystery of redemption, only drawing on the Bible in support of our foregone conclusions? It may be right and wise to speak to them that know law in legal phrase, and to discuss with such the principles of law may be eminently judicious; but if in the doing of this right and laudable thing, we introduce principles determining the very nature of the Atonement, and draw upon Scripture merely for confirmation, we assume an attitude towards the word of God, which must be exceedingly offensive to its Author.

As already charged, this principle has controlled the author of this book from the beginning to the end of his work. This is no mere inference, though it were a most warrantable one, from the spirit and method of the entire discussion. It is an avowed principle. (See pages 320, 321, &c., and the author's work on Slavery and the Church, pages 37, 186.) Indeed, the proof may be found in almost any page of the present volume. Whether he is reasoning with lawyers, or discussing with theologians, the most important points connected with this subject, he invariably settles the whole matter, by an appeal to reason—*as a judge and rule*—confirming only occasionally by a reference to Scripture.

From the fundamental and determining principle of the book, we proceed to notice some of the reputed difficulties which philosophic minds are said to encounter in the investi-

gation of the Scripture doctrine of the Atonement. The first of these is given in the form of a presumptive objection, against the doctrine of pardon through the substituted sufferings of the innocent for the guilty. In human governments, it is alleged, no such arrangements are adopted—none such would be allowed. Pardon is extended only where there is danger of severity—where the trial may not have been fair—where there are some mitigating considerations, either in the character of the individual, or in some circumstance connected with the commission of the offence. Where such reasons are not found, pardon is never granted among men—where such reasons do not exist, the offender languishes in prison, or dies.

Thus it is with men; and therefore—Therefore what? What, we ask, must be the conclusion of a philosophic mind as to the Divine administration? Why simply this, that God would never pardon one whom he had found guilty. The very circumstances under which, as stated by this philosopher, human governments never extend mercy, are, without an exception and in perfection, found wherever God judges and condemns. As a philosopher, then, such ought to be his conclusion. But such it is not. When he comes to speak of the Divine Government, he introduces a new principle, viz: that God can extend pardon where it ought to be extended, without bias, or danger either of error or of evil. This may pass with some men for philosophy; but it appears to us, that from the analogy in question the conclusion of a truly philosophic mind would have been exactly the reverse of the dictum here so quietly and complacently assumed. Human governments, we are told, never pardon except "where the law in its operations is too severe"—"where there are mitigating circumstances in the case, of which the law in its regular operations cannot take cognizance," or "where the offender manifests such a spirit of penitence, that the interests of justice will not suffer by his release." Now as there can be no error in judging where God is judge, and no severity in the operation of a righteous law administered by a righteous Sovereign, and consequently no mitigating circumstances in any case where that law has been broken and that Sovereign offended, and as tears of penitence (if such could be found) are not the balm for injured justice,

how could a philosopher come to any other conclusion than that God would never pardon sin? How, in view of these unquestionable truths, could he ever glide into the persuasion that there are cases where pardon should and ought to be extended? The idea is an unphilosophic assumption, unwarranted by the premises. A fair comparison of the two administrations, the human and the Divine, would have shut up this reputed philosopher to the dreadful alternative of eternal wrath. Had he not been kindly furnished with a new principle in the second member of the comparison, he might have seen that where an omniscient and righteous Judge, administering a law which is holy, and just, and good, pronounces a man guilty, pardon, *so far as human reason can discover*, is for ever impossible. Blessed be God there is pardon—pardon for the chief of sinners; but the scheme by which it is secured, and in which it hath been disclosed, is one which human wisdom in its highest efforts has never conceived—one which exhibits the manifold wisdom of God. The glad tidings that God can be just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly, have come to our ears, not from the lips of earth's philosophers, but from the lips of men inspired by the Holy Ghost.

The principle which forms the very kernel of the second chapter, viz: that there has everywhere been a deep-seated conviction, that pardon should in certain cases be extended to the guilty—a principle which the author of this book adopts, and applies to the case of the sinner and the Divine administration, is a most dangerous one. It will be seen that it is but the echo of the first presumptive objection, as it is, indeed, the all-pervading idea of the book. The impression produced on the mind of any careful reader must be this: that if the Divine government would avoid the appearance of harshness and severity, sin must be pardoned, and the Atonement is the expedient by which, with a due regard to the interests of the universe, this can be done. This is the sum and substance, the beginning, middle, and end of the whole matter.

Now if this principle be true—if it be true that pardon ought in certain cases to be extended to the guilty, we would like to know how in such cases salvation can be ascribed to the good pleasure of God, or to the exceeding riches of his

grace. Such cases would certainly seem not to be included in those specified by the apostle, Ephes. i. and ii., for he refers the predestination, election, and actual redemption of all concerned, to the good pleasure of the will of God, and assigns, as the ultimate end, the manifestation of His own glorious grace. But if justice could not be exercised against the guilty, without reflecting upon the Divine administration, representing it as "harsh, tyrannical, severe," where was there any room for good pleasure or choice? How, we ask, could a scheme, to which the Divine government was compelled, in order to avoid the appearance of cruelty, ever be to the praise of the glory of God's grace? Such a scheme might reflect honour upon those high intelligences whose moral sentiments, expressed or entertained, compelled the adoption of it; but one hymn of praise it could never evoke, either from the subjects of Redemption, or the angel hosts who rejoice before the throne. In fact, the doctrine is so subversive of the whole economy of grace, and so derogatory to the Divine character, that it is painful either to read or review it.

On all these preliminary objections of reputed philosophers, we would remark once for all, that the fundamental assumption of them is false. They assume that the Atonement is a perfectly plain, common-sense transaction; that there is no mystery about it—nothing that has not its parallel in the principles of human jurisprudence and the administration of human law. Hence we have a chapter on the embarrassment felt among men through lack of an Atonement, and a correlative one on the probabilities of some such arrangement being made. These chapters warrant the conclusion that among other things, the design of the book is to smooth down the gospel, and make it so plain and philosophical, that there shall remain nothing of mystery about it—nothing too high for reason—nothing requiring faith; and thus to commend, on the ground of its entire comprehensibility, an economy before whose impenetrable mysteries the great apostle of the Gentiles stood in reverent awe, and cried, "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" And what is this but to degrade the mystery

of all mysteries—the mystery of the obedience, and sufferings, and death of the incarnate God, to the level of the every day transactions of the erring administrators of human affairs? If men can see that the principles of the whole economy are embodied in the science of human jurisprudence, where, we ask, is the marvel of redemption? If this be true, what reason is there for representing a ransomed church, as the great mirror in which angels and principalities shall see reflected the manifold wisdom of God? If the nature and bearings of the central work of the whole economy may be determined *a priori*, from principles of human law, what need was there that angels should stoop down from their own habitations to look into these things?

To satisfy our readers that this is no unfair representation of the spirit and tendency of the book, one quotation, we are persuaded, will be more than sufficient. In the chapter on the embarrassments experienced for lack of some such arrangement as an atonement, a case of forgery, which occurred in England in the last century, is cited as an illustration. Dr. Dodd, a subject of high standing and excellent name, had, in an evil hour, used, without authority, the name of the Earl of Chesterfield on a bill. The fraud was detected. There was no question of his guilt. Such, however, was the sympathy of the public toward the man, and such his conduct, both before and after the commission of the offence, that every possible effort was made to save him. The paper itself, which was indispensable to his conviction, was purposely put within his reach, but through some strange infatuation he neglected to destroy it. "A petition for his pardon, drawn up by Dr. Johnson, and with his name at the head, received at once no less than thirty thousand signatures, and all the warm feelings of the sovereign himself prompted him to clemency. The benevolent feelings of a large part of the British nation would have been gratified with his pardon. But on the other hand, there was the explicit judgment of the law. There was the aggravated character of the offence—an offence tending to destroy all confidence in a commercial community." "The law was suffered, therefore, to take its course. The offender died, and the world approved the stern decision of the sovereign."

And this is the case that is to illustrate the necessity of an atonement, or some such device! What are we to think of the philosophy, or the theology of an author who could cite this case to illustrate the necessity of the Atonement? According to our author's philosophy, an atonement was the very thing required to relieve both the government and the nation, in this embarrassing juncture. But is this a philosophic, or reasonable view of the case? Why, it must be manifest, almost to a child, that the whole embarrassment arose from the injustice of the penalty then attached to the crime of forgery. And it must be equally manifest that the thing required was not an atonement, but an adjustment of the penalty. If Dr. Dodd had been sentenced to imprisonment instead of death, there had been no such manifestation of sympathy. It was the glaring disproportion between the offence committed and the penalty to be endured, that thrilled the national heart and stirred up the merciful to the rescue. But where this disproportion is not found, where the penalty is the righteous award of the transgression, whether the case occur on the footstool, and under the magistracy of man, or in Heaven among the first-born subjects of the Sovereign Jehovah, the judgment and punishment of the transgressor can never be regarded by any right-minded intelligence, as "harsh, tyrannical, or severe." Where a sentence is just, it cannot be unjust to inflict it.

But there is something worse than bad philosophy in this case of forgery: it is brim full of the worst ingredients of a corrupt theology. What! the case of a forger overburdened with an unrighteous penalty, set in comparison with that of a transgressor of God's law, visited with the sentence of a law which is holy, and just, and good, and that by the Judge of all the earth! Are we to infer from the harshness of the government of George III. in putting Dr. Dodd to death for forgery, a similar harshness on the part of the righteous Jehovah, in putting the sons of Adam to death for rebellion against his own august Majesty? Ah no; let God be just, though all the sons of men be tyrants. We believe that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things; and that judgment is, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

And what is true of this case, is true of all others that are or can be cited on this behalf. There can be no case found among the sons of men, or in the history of law and government, to furnish a true parallel to the case of the sinner, as he stands related to an offended God, administering a broken law. What would be wrong, or harsh, or cruel in a finite, erring man, sitting in judgment on a fellow-man, can never, with the sanction of sound reason, much less of Scripture, be set up as a standard whereby to measure the righteousness or severity of God. If it could be shown that human law is infallible in the wisdom of its enactments, that the penalty annexed is always the righteous measure of the offence, that those who administer it are omniscient and unswerving in their moral rectitude, and that the sentence is ever in accordance with the law and facts of the case, and then, that, after all, the government felt embarrassed for lack of an atonement, there might be some ground for such analogical reasonings as those which make up this book. On such a firm basis a man might found, with all the independence of Scripture which characterizes our author, and with some show of plausibility, a system of theology emerging from an Atonement, measured and determined in all its essentials, and in all its relations and objects, by the great principles of human law. From such premises on the human side, a man of a philosophic mind might argue out the necessity and probability of an Atonement on the Divine. But what are we to say either of the philosophy, or the theology which draws such an inference from the imagined wants of a government, where law is fallible and penalty often unjust? Why, the fact is, when we come to run these principles to their legitimate and avowed conclusions, we begin to tremble before the blaze of that wisdom and justice they would so irreverently tarnish, and so presumptuously impugn.

We pass now to the theology of the fourth chapter; a chapter on the objects to be secured by an Atonement. These objects as enumerated by our author are as follows: The maintenance of the authority of law; the securing of the object contemplated by the penalty; the insuring of the reformation of the offenders in whose behalf it is made; the protection of the interests of the community against evils which might arise from the

pardon of the guilty; and the guarding of the government from disparagement in the eyes of the world.

On this enumeration, we would remark that it is singularly defective, and defective on the great essential point of all. If carried out and applied, as it is, to *the* Atonement, it represents God as determined, in the providing of Redemption, by considerations drawn exclusively from without, and from the finite. There is not in the whole enumeration, nor is there in the whole compass of the book, a single intimation of the satisfaction of Divine justice being included among the objects of the Atonement! The only thing that wears the least semblance of an acknowledgment of this all-important truth, is the reference which the Atonement is said to have to law and penalty. But even this semblance vanishes when the author comes to state the relation between the Divine law and the Divine nature. On page 80, after raising the question why the thing that is commanded is right, and why the thing that is prohibited is wrong, he lays down three theories, viz. that which refers it to the will of the lawgiver, that which refers it to the nature of things, and that which refers it to the bearing of the thing commanded or prohibited upon the happiness of the creature. Which of these theories exhibits the true foundation of the distinction between right and wrong, our author does not undertake to determine, but merely adds, with characteristic unsatisfactoriness, that "it is a question which has never been so determined as to demand the assent of all men!" What a reason for declining a candid avowal of his own doctrine, on a question which lies at the very foundation of virtue! Is there, after all, nothing fixed and certain, even in morals, but those principles and maxims which have commanded the assent of all men? If this be true, the sooner the Bible is laid aside, and a congress of the kindreds and tribes of this world assembled to determine upon a universal creed, the better.

Our author, however, might as well have stated in plain terms what his views on this question are, for in saying that "a difference of opinion on these points does not affect his position," he has disclaimed the doctrine that the law of God is a transcript of the Divine nature, as forming any part of his system, and thus has indirectly denied that there is anything

in the nature of God requiring the punishment of sin. That this is his doctrine on this subject, will be still more manifest as his theory of the Atonement unrolls.

We are, therefore, justified in affirming, that this book does not include among the objects to be secured by the Atonement, the satisfaction of Divine justice, and in representing it as a scheme which exhibits God as determined throughout by the interests of the universe. That such a system can never be reconciled with the word of God, ought to be patent to every reader of the Bible. That word uniformly represents God as acting with reference to himself, and for his own glory; nor can there be a single passage pointed out, in which he is said to have been determined by the interests, or sentiments, or "finer feelings" of his creatures. And what is this but to make the glory of God the chief end for which all things were created? and what is this would-be philosophy, but an attempt to subordinate God himself to the universe, which his own power and wisdom have brought into existence, and continues to sustain? It is true that the best interests of his creatures are secured by that administration, which hath for its final end his own glory; but to elevate these interests into the determining cause of all that God has done, or will do, yea, or can do, in the economy of redemption, is to reduce the I AM, the Alpha and the Omega, of whom, and through whom, and to whom, are all things, to a state of vassalage to the universe!

The fact is, the doctrine which underlies this whole theory of the Atonement is subversive of theism altogether. A being determined by considerations outside of himself cannot be God. It is essential to the very nature of God that he be independent and omniscient; but with these attributes a determination *ab extra* is utterly and for ever irreconcilable. What an amount of bad philosophy and worse theology would the church be saved, were men to get their minds thoroughly imbued with the answer given in our Shorter Catechism to the question, "What is God?" "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth." Were theologians to learn this first truth, and couple with it that noble utterance with which the Catechism opens, viz. "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy

him for ever," they would never be found framing theories which would strip God of his justice, and set the universe above the throne of their Creator. What is true of man's end and man's happiness, is true of the end and blessedness of all the moral intelligences which God has created; and it is true of man that it is only in the advancement of the glory of God that he can have any true enjoyment. Nor is this to humble either man or angel. God is himself the highest end for which even He could act. As he could swear by no greater, so he can work for no greater. Can we conceive of God as stooping to a lower than the highest end? And if his own glory be an end becoming the forth-putting of the might and wisdom of God himself, surely he may well claim, for the advancement of that glory, the highest service of the highest seraph! Ah! there are none of the enraptured hosts who stand with veiled vision before the blaze of that glory in the temple above, who would regard it a bondage to be employed in advancing it. What child of God is there upon the foot-stool, who does not look upon that service as the source of the sweetest enjoyment, and look forward to the beholding of that glory as the richest reward? What then, are we to think of a theory of the Atonement, a theory of the redemption work accomplished by the Son of God, which leaves all this out of view—a theory which makes all the objects of the Atonement terminate upon something outside of, and therefore beneath God? It cannot be the theory of the Bible, for the Bible expressly teaches that the glory of God was the end of the whole emprise. Such, however, is the doctrine of this book; and this fact is sufficient to stamp it as another gospel.

But besides this defect in the objective reference of the Atonement, the book is defective on another point, which we must regard as a vital one. Is it not a singular fact, that a work on the Atonement should leave out of view the obedience of Christ? Is it not still more glaringly singular, that a work professing to exhibit the Atonement in its relations to law, should be chargeable with such an omission? This charge we do prefer against this book. It ignores, both by its silence and by its principles, the part which the obedience of Christ has achieved in the great work of Atonement!

Now law, as all men who know law teach, embraces two elements, precept and penalty. Indeed, our author has gone further than this, and exhibited the penalty as the mere adjunct. In conformity with these elements of law, there are two things required from those who will satisfy it, viz: obedience and suffering, the latter, of course, only where the law has been broken. If then the precept or rule, as our author teaches, be the main thing in law, one would expect that obedience ought to be the main thing in an Atonement. How comes it then, that the Atonement described in this book is destitute of this essential element? How comes it, that the thing required by that which, in our author's estimation, is the sum and substance of law, is not to be found in his system? Here is evidently a departure from what his own premises would have driven a logician to, as it is a departure from the faith of Christendom. Let any man take up the confessions and catechisms of the churches of the Reformation, or the works of such men as Turretine, Calvin, or Owen, and mark the prominence given to the obedience of Christ in the work of redemption, and we are fully persuaded he will conclude that the theology of this book is not the theology of the Reformation. The key to this exclusion of Christ's obedience from any share in the Atonement is to be found in the author's aversion to the doctrine of imputation. If it had been admitted that Christ was made under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law, and that his obedience had anything to do with making the many righteous, it might have become too manifest, that whilst living under the law, there was a righteousness wrought out, available as the judicial ground of the justification of his people, and which might therefore be imputed. But as our author denies the existence of any such righteousness, and the possibility of imputing it, even if it did exist, it behoved him to keep it in abeyance, or merge it in the notion of a service done to the universe.

And as there is nothing in this Atonement to meet the claims of the precept, so there is nothing to meet the demands ofth e penalty. As there is no legal obedience, so there is no penal suffering. Having stripped the poor sinner of the only robe that could cover his nakedness, the author proceeds

to remove from the lintel and door-posts of the house in which he has taken refuge, the sacrificial blood which alone can avert the sword of the destroying angel. He speaks, it is true, of sufferings; yea, of sufferings unto death; but of what avail are these, if not inflicted in satisfaction of law, and by the hand of justice? The reasonings employed against the doctrine, that Christ bore the penalty due to our sins in his own body on the tree, are enough to produce the most painful impression on the mind of any one, who has trusted in those very sufferings, as his shield against the wrath of a righteous judge. They are, in the main, the very arguments of Socinus, and would, if carried out, lead to the adoption of the entire Socinian system, with regard both to Christ's work and person.

His first objection—for it is no argument—against the doctrine that the sufferings of Christ were penal, is that it would imply on Christ's part the experience of remorse—an objection which has been echoing from Socinian to Remonstrant, and from Remonstrant back to Socinian, from the days of Socinus, up to the hour in which it received a fresh repetition in this book. And after all, what is it worth? Why it obviously rests on two false assumptions; 1. That remorse is a necessary part of the penalty. 2. That imputation implies a transfer of moral character. If the former be true, how comes it that children are visited with penal suffering. Here is surely penal suffering, but where is the remorse? It is not remorse, but death, that is the penalty denounced against sin. "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "The wages of sin is death." "They which commit such things are worthy of death." Remorse may be a part of the woe of the lost, but what has this to do with the doctrine that Christ's sufferings were penal? Is it logical to argue from the mental emotions connected with the infliction of the penalty on one who has actually transgressed, and is morally corrupt, to what must be the experiences of a sustitute who has never sinned, and who is holy, harmless, and undefiled? As already stated, this reasoning must be propped up with the assumption, that imputation implies a transfer of moral character; and without this prop it is utterly insupportable. That such an assumption is false, is so obvious that there is no need

of refuting it. Would the imputation of the debt of Onesimus to Paul have been attended with an experience of the regrets of Onesimus for contracting it? Did the sons and daughters of Achan, who were put to death for Achan's sin, undergo the same mental anguish as their father, who had coveted and hidden the silver, and the wedge of gold, and the Babylonish garment? These cases settle the whole controversy. Those who hold that imputation implies a transfer of moral character, must prove that these are not cases in point, or they must acknowledge that their boasted principle is false. But to prove that these are not cases in point, is simply impossible, for they embrace the fundamental principle of imputation. That principle is, *that what personally, and in law, belongs to one, is made the judicial ground of dealing with another.* Paul recognized this principle, when by his letter he bound himself, and that in law if Philemon had chosen, for the debts of Onesimus. Joshua and Israel, or rather Jehovah, (for the whole transaction was by the order and counsel of the Lord,) recognized it, when Achan's family were stoned to death, and burned with fire, for Achan's sin. And if this was not the principle on which the Amalek of Saul's day suffered for the sin committed by the Amalek who lay in wait for Israel when he came up out of Egypt, four hundred years before, we would like to be told what interpretation we are to put upon the following language. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up out of Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." No righteous exegesis can ever eliminate from this passage the fundamental principle of imputation. There it is as manifest as language can make it. He who proclaimed himself from Sinai, "a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate him," here illustrates the principle of that righteous law, by commissioning Saul to execute upon the fourth generation the sin of a buried ancestry. And did space not forbid, it were easy to show that there is no principle more uniformly recognized, or more frequently

illustrated, either in the Scriptures, or in profane history, than the one which we have been defending, and which it is a primary object with our author to ignore. It is uttered from Sinai with the voice of thunder, and is endorsed and re-iterated by our Saviour in the days of his flesh. Yes, it mingles with that voice of lamentation which a rejected Redeemer lifts up over the devoted Jerusalem: "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation." Before these utterances it becomes us to bow, and exclaim, with one who was favoured with the sight of things within the veil, "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"

The next objection urged against the doctrine of penal suffering, viz. that it would have involved, on the part of the sufferer, subjection to eternal death, is from the same source as the former, and confounds the design of the sufferings with the period of their duration. The attribute *eternal* belongs to the latter, and not to the former. It simply expresses the duration of the suffering, if man is to be the sufferer. That the sufferings of Christ, as our legal substitute, were not eternal, arose from the infinite dignity of his ever-adorable person. For the objector whom this glorious truth will not silence, or satisfy, the word of God has no further answer.

We cannot, however, take leave of this portion of the book, without noticing one other argument, which our author has advanced against the doctrine that Christ's sufferings were penal. "If such were the nature of the Atonement," he argues, "there could be no mercy in the case. When a debt is paid, there is no forgiveness; when a penalty is endured, there is no mercy. In the case of one who should be willing to pay the debt, or to endure the suffering, there may be the highest benevolence; but there is no mercy exhibited by him to whom the debt is paid, or the penalty of whose law has been borne." This argument he illustrates as follows: "It would have been kindness, indeed, in an Egyptian to have come in

voluntarily, and aided the oppressed and burdened Hebrew to furnish the tale of bricks;" but there would have been no kindness or compassion evinced by the task-master who had appointed the task, for the whole demand would have been complied with. So far as he who performed the work was concerned, and so far as the burdened Hebrew was concerned, it would have been a transaction of mere law and justice; so far as the task-master was concerned, there would have been in the case neither mercy nor compassion."

This passage is a specimen of what we must regard as a deplorable feature of the theology of this book. It is an attempt, on the one hand, to furnish a palliation, if not an apology for sin, and on the other, to disparage the character, law, and government of God, by representing them as harsh, tyranical, and severe. The animus of the foregoing illustration must be palpable to any candid mind. Why not put the case fairly? Inadequate as it is to illustrate the relation of a rebel sinner to an offended God, yet, had it been fairly stated, it would have sustained the very doctrine it was designed to overthrow. The case fairly stated would stand thus: A law of Egypt, which the king is as unable to change as he is to change his own nature, demands at the hands of a Hebrew very heavy toils and great suffering. The king, however, so loves the Hebrew that he spares not his own well-beloved son, the heir of Egypt's crown, but sends him into the brick-fields as a slave, to furnish for the Hebrew the 'tale of brick' demanded by the law. The son enters with all his heart into the gracious purpose of his father, delighting to do his father's will, and loving the Hebrew with the same intensity of love. He takes the place of the Hebrew in the field of toil, and when the term of service closes, he gives into the hand of Egypt's law the full tale of brick, and claims the emancipation of those for whose deliverance that service was rendered, and those sufferings endured. This is the case fairly put; and so far as such a case can illustrate the work of Redemption, it is from beginning to end, an illustration of the very doctrine our author has been labouring to destroy. It exhibits a king girt about with justice, and moved with a love that will hesitate at no sacrifice. Who, with his eye upon such an act of kingly condescension and compassion,

could have the heartlessness and injustice to conclude, that there was nothing of mercy manifested by him who originated the whole scheme of deliverance? And when we substitute for the unrighteous enactment of Egypt's tyrant, that law under which man is held amenable to penal suffering—a law which is holy, and just, and good; and in the place of Pharaoh, Him who so loved the world as to give his only-begotten Son; and instead of an heir to the crown and kingdom of Egypt, the Heir of all things; and for the poor slave in the brick-field, suffering under an unrighteous bondage, the rebel sinner filled with enmity against his rightful Lord and Sovereign, who embraces in his character all moral excellence in infinite perfection, and then finish the comparison with what the Scriptures reveal of the free and sovereign grace wherewith the Eternal King stooped to extend his sceptre to his enemy, what but astonishment at the magnitude of the grace, and what but tenfold astonishment at the insensibility that has failed to discover and admire it, can possess the soul of any right-minded moral intelligence? Yes, penal suffering on the part of the substitute is not inconsistent with the manifestation of mercy to those in whose place he stood. It is justice that awakes the sword against the Shepherd, but it is mercy that spreads her wings over the sheep. Justice has her vindication in the infliction of the penalty, mercy unveils her face in the transfer of the penalty from the transgressor to the substitute. Here is mercy, not on the tremendous terms of this book, not mercy obtained by the sacrifice of God's truth, and law, and justice; but mercy sustained throughout, by every principle of law and truth, and righteousness; the mercy of Him who is "just and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

We do not deem it necessary to dwell long upon what our author says on the extent of the Atonement. We find in his chapter on this subject nothing more than common-place misconceptions and objections. He limits the discussion to the relation of the Atonement to the human race, not because from his view of its nature, it has any special suitableness to men more than to angels, but simply because there is no intimation that it "was designed to secure the salvation of any other fallen being than man." According to Mr. Barnes, therefore, the

Atonement is limited to the human race; and its limitation is determined, not by its nature, its sufficiency, or its suitableness, but simply by its design. Suppose we apply this to its relation to the human family. Unless Mr. Barnes holds that the Atonement was designed *to secure the salvation* of all men, he cannot maintain that it was designed for all men. If its limitation is determined by its design, and if its design is determined by its actual or revealed effect, then, if the fact that it was not designed to secure the salvation of angels shows that it was limited to the human race, the fact that it was not designed to secure the salvation of all men proves that it was limited to those whose salvation it does secure. Mr. Barnes has stumbled at the very threshold of his argument. He begins by teaching the very doctrine which he labours through the whole chapter to refute. That doctrine is, that the extent of the Atonement is determined, not by its nature, its sufficiency, or its suitableness, but by the effect it was designed *to secure*. Yet he argues from its suitableness and sufficiency that it was designed for all men, while he admits that it was not designed to secure the salvation of all. He therefore refutes himself. He says the sources of evidence on this subject must be, 1, analogy; 2, probabilities from the nature of the Atonement; 3, the testimony of Scripture. Under the first head, he argues from the abundance and suitableness of the *materia medica*, to a like sufficiency and suitableness of the provisions of grace. But he forgets that, by his own showing, the question does not relate to the sufficiency or suitableness of the Atonement, but to its design. The argument from analogy, if it is worth anything, is simply this: God has made abundant provision for the physical wants and maladies of men, therefore it is probable that he has made similar abundant provision for their spiritual necessities. This no one denies. The argument from analogy, therefore, proves nothing to the point. God has made the earth productive, and stored it with inexhaustible treasures of silver and gold. Does this prove that he designed that all men should be rich? Does it prove that this provision of the sources of wealth was designed for those who never enjoy them? If so, the purpose of God has failed. Because God has given healing virtue to plants and minerals, does that prove that he

designed that all men should be healed of their diseases? Things were designed for the ends which they actually accomplish. If, therefore, the *materia medica*, notwithstanding its abundance and its efficacy, does not heal all men, it was not designed to heal them. It was designed to heal those whom it does heal, and no others. In like manner the Atonement of Christ, however abundant and suitable for all men, was designed for those who are thereby actually redeemed.

His argument from the nature of the Atonement is equally inconclusive. He argues that there is nothing in the nature of the atonement to limit it to a particular class of men; and from the dignity of Christ's person, that there is no necessity for such limitation. "If," he says, "the Sufferer had been a mere man, then it would seem necessarily to follow that the Atonement must have been limited. It would be impossible to conceive how a mere man, however pure in character, elevated in rank, or lofty in virtue, could have such merit that his sufferings could avail to the redemption of the entire human race, &c." According to this, the necessity for the Divinity of Christ as a redeemer arises from the *number* to be redeemed. Had fewer souls been the objects of redemption, then the merit of a creature, of an angel or a man, would have sufficed. Such is the legitimate consequence of the principle involved in this argument. According to the Bible, the necessity of the Atonement arises from the nature of sin and the justice of God; and therefore the same merit in the Redeemer would be demanded if one soul or millions were to be redeemed. All that Mr. Barnes's arguments under this head can possibly prove, and all, we presume, they were intended to prove, is that the Atonement is, from its nature, suitable for all men, and, from the dignity of the Redeemer's person, sufficient for all. This we cheerfully admit. This is the doctrine of our church, and of the church universal. But what has this to do with the question? So far as *the extent* of the Atonement is concerned, the point in debate is not its nature or its value, but its design. Mr. Barnes admits that we cannot infer the design of the Atonement from its suitableness and sufficiency. According to him, it is sufficient and suitable for angels as well as for men, yet he says it is limited to the human race. After admitting

this, he turns round and argues that it is designed for all men, because it is sufficient and suitable for all. This, as every one sees, is a *non-sequitur*.

It is palpable that the only source of knowledge as to the design of what God does is his own declarations on the subject. The testimony of Scripture, therefore, instead of coming last, as it does in Mr. Barnes's argument, as though its only office were to confirm the deductions of our own reason, should come first and determine the question beyond dispute or appeal. Our author refers to the passages usually quoted to prove that the Atonement has equal reference to all men. One of these passages is John iii. 16, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, might not perish, but have eternal life." The argument here is that as the word *κόσμος*, *world*, means men, mankind, the human race, therefore the design of God in sending his Son as a Saviour, had equal reference to all men. If this proves anything, then it proves that when we call our Lord, *Salvator hominum*, as all Christians do, we mean to say that he is the Saviour of all men; that when Paul says, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, he means all sinners. It is true, that the design of Christ's work was to save sinners, but it is not true that he designed to save all sinners. In all such cases the words, *men*, *world*, *sinners*, designate the class of persons whom Christ came to save. In John iii. 16, for example, our Lord teaches that the design of God in sending his Son was the salvation of men, not of angels; of men generally, and not of Jews exclusively. The declaration that men and not angels, men generally and not the Jews only, are embraced in the design of God, does not teach that he designs to save all men. Our church has adopted the Westminster Catechism, which teaches, that "God having out of his mere good pleasure from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer." According to this, election precedes redemption. God elects some to everlasting life, and sends his Son to redeem them. The work of Christ, therefore, has a special reference to the elect. Such is the doctrine of

our church. Now, suppose some one should turn to our hymn book, and endeavour to prove that the church which sanctions that book, teaches that Christ died equally for all men—because in the hymn book it is said in substance, over and over, perhaps a hundred times, that "God pitied dying men, and sent his Son to give them life again;" or that the Lamb of God "sustains the dreadful load of man's iniquities;" or, "Lord, what is man, that he should prove the object of thy boundless love?" or, "to save a guilty world he dies;" would such an argument amount to anything? Does the hymn book contradict the Catechism? Is saying that Christ came to save sinners, to save men, inconsistent with saying that his death had a special reference to his own people? If not, then the argument for an indefinite Atonement founded on such passages as that quoted above amounts to nothing. The illustration which our Lord himself uses, is derived from Moses lifting up the serpent in the wilderness. The design of God in this transaction was twofold; first, to illustrate the method of salvation, as we learn from the use made of the incident in the New Testament; and secondly, actually to heal a certain portion of the people. Now there is no question: 1st. That the method of cure proposed to the Israelites was adapted to all. It was as well suited to one case as to another. 2. That it made no matter whether one, or ten thousand was healed by the appointed means. One man's looking at the serpent did not hinder another man's looking. There was no possibility of exhausting the healing power of the means of cure. There could be no tendency to such exhaustion. 3. That the cure was offered freely and sincerely to all the afflicted. 4. That in fact some were healed and others perished, and so far as the design of God was concerned, the lifting up of the serpent was intended as a means of cure, to those whom it was rendered effectual, and not for those who perished. Many, doubtless, never heard the proclamation; many who heard it were too stupid to avail themselves of the means of restoration; some, no doubt, preferred trusting to some other remedy. 5. Notwithstanding this limitation in the design of God, in providing this method of cure, it would be perfectly proper to say in general terms, that God so pitied the dying Israelites, that he

ordained that whosoever looked on the brazen serpent should not perish, but be restored to health. No one would be authorized to infer from this language, that God intended the provision as much for those whom he had determined to save, as for those whom he had determined to allow to perish. The application of all this to the work of Christ is too obvious to need any remark. That work is adapted to the salvation of all men. It is sufficient for all. It is freely offered to all. It was designed for God's own people, and in perfect consistency with his limitation as to design—it may be said, as in the case of the Israelites, that God so pitied dying men, or he so loved mankind, or the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believed in him should not perish, but have eternal life. Such declarations afford, therefore, no argument to disprove the plain doctrine of the Bible, that Christ laid down his life for his sheep; that their salvation was the end intended to be secured by his death, and that he died for them in a sense in which he did not die for those that perish.

Another passage quoted is Heb. ii. 9. "He tasted death for every *man*." Of course, Mr. Barnes knows that the word for *man* is not in the Greek. It is simply *ὑπὲρ παντός*, *for every one*. Does this mean for every sensitive creature? Mr. Barnes says, No, for irrational creatures are not the objects of redemption. Does it mean every rational creature? He again says, No, for unfallen angels do not need redemption. Does it mean every fallen rational creature? Again the answer is, No, for the atonement was not designed for fallen angels. What then does it mean? It means that Christ tasted death for every one of the objects of redemption. It is, and must be, thus limited. Christ tasted death for every one of those whom God designed to redeem by his blood. It is on this principle that Mr. Barnes limits the text, and says, it does not mean every creature, nor every intelligent creature, nor every intelligent fallen creature, but every one of those embraced in the design of God. Whether that design includes all men or all the people of God, depends not on this passage, but on the general doctrine of the Bible. If the Scriptures teach that God designed to save all fallen beings by the death of Christ, then the passage means that Christ tasted death for every intelligent fallen creature.

If they teach that he designed the salvation of all men, then it means that Christ tasted death for all men. But if the Bible teaches that God designed to save his own people, then it means that the Redeemer tasted death for every one of the elect. The question is not as to the meaning of the words, about which there can be no dispute, but simply, as to the point, who are the redeemed. Christ died for every one of the objects of redemption. In this exposition, both parties must agree, and therefore the passage cannot decide anything.

Mr. Barnes, of course, makes the common objection from the universal offer of the Gospel. If salvation is offered to all men, on the ground of the death of Christ, he must have died for all. He uses the familiar illustration of captives in a foreign land. Such captives do not wish to be informed merely of the ability of some one to redeem them; they wish to know "whether it is the intention 'of such an one,' thus to appropriate his wealth;" whether the offer of deliverance is founded merely on the fact that he in whose name the offer is made, is a man of wealth, or on the ground that the ransom is actually paid or provided; whether the offer is made "to mock their misery by the exhibition of wealth, which cannot in any event be theirs," or whether it is made in good faith, &c. &c. This is intended to prove that the offer of the gospel to all men, must be insincere, and a mockery, unless Christ died for all men. As soon however as the case is fairly stated, the weakness of this argument, and the grossness of the misrepresentation which it involves, become apparent. Suppose a man hears that his own family, together with many other persons, are held in captivity; suppose the ransom demanded for his own family is the same in value as that demanded for the ransom of the whole body of captives. He determines to pay the ransom, with the design and purpose to deliver his own children, whom he can constrain to accept deliverance at his hands. When the ransom is paid, although designed for the deliverance of a part, yet being sufficient for the deliverance of the whole, he offers redemption, not only to his own, but to all who choose to accept it. Is there any mockery in this? Does the fact that the ransom was paid with a special reference to some, prevent its being freely offered to all? If those to whom it is

offered prefer their bondage; if they refuse to be indebted to him who has paid the ransom for their deliverance; if they think they can deliver themselves; if on these, or any other grounds, they refuse the offer of deliverance, the guilt and folly are their own. If a king makes a feast for his friends, does this prevent his sincerely inviting all who choose to come and partake of his bounty? If God, in giving his Son for the redemption of his own people, has paid a ransom sufficient for the deliverance of all men—does the purpose for which that ransom was paid, present any barrier to the general offer of salvation? It is a weary business to have to answer the same objections, and correct the same misrepresentations, day after day and year after year.

The impression made upon our minds by this book is a very painful one. We have great respect for its author. He has been a laborious and successful pastor and writer. He stands deservedly high in the estimation of the community. That such a man should put forth a book so thoroughly rationalistic in its principles and spirit as the one before us, is deeply to be lamented. We can hardly believe that it contains truth enough to save the soul. A man might as well attempt to live on the husk of a cocoa-nut. We have no idea that Mr. Barnes, as a Christian, lives on the doctrine of the Atonement as here presented. There is a sense in which we are full believers in the difference between the theology of the intellect and the theology of the heart. A man in the retirement of his study, may, by a perverted train of thought, satisfy himself that matter has no existence—but he is an idealist only so long as that train of thought is present to his mind. The moment he goes out into the world he resumes his normal state, and is as much a believer in the existence of things external as other men. Thus really good and devout men may spin out a theory which to their understanding seems true and consistent, but which they believe only so long as the pen is in their hand. Their inward practical faith is determined by the direct assertions of the Bible and by their own religious experience. We rejoice to believe that Mr. Barnes is a thousand times better than the theology of his book.

ART. IV.—*Lectures on the Moral Government of God.* By NATHANIEL W. TAYLOR, D. D., late Dwight Professor of Didactic Theology in Yale College. New York: Clark, Austin & Smith. 1859.

THE great prominence of Dr. Taylor in the theological conflicts which issued in the disruption of the Presbyterian Church, the loosening of the bonds between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, the formation of opposing parties among the latter, and the planting of rival theological seminaries to propagate their respective views, will lead many to scrutinize this full and authentic exposition of his system with peculiar interest. We say full, for although these volumes comprise but a portion of his theological lectures, which are, as we understand, to be published, yet they contain his entire series of lectures and disquisitions on the moral government of God. On this subject, and its applications, he laid out his chief strength. In this department chiefly he claimed to have made decisive and momentous contributions to theological science. Here he and his adherents challenged, in his behalf, the honours of discovery and invention. Here the cardinal principles of all that is distinctive and peculiar in his metaphysics and theology are most elaborately stated and defended. All that has been known as the cardinal principles of Taylorism is here subjected to exhaustive discussion.

Although these volumes are posthumous, they are not unfinished or fragmentary. They, with the volumes yet to follow, are the mature products of the author's life-long labour, and of continual retouching, with a constant eye to their ultimate publication. Indeed, few publications bear more unequivocal marks of the *labor limæ*. In some cases it goes to a length of inducing weak and cumbrous forms of statement, while the more free and unstudied expressions of the author are generally remarkable for precision and force.

This authentic exposition and defence of his system is welcome, because it enables us to settle some questions of historical justice. Dr. Taylor's previous outgivings of his system were partial and fragmentary, as they came forth in the discussions

of occasional controversies. He and his adherents claimed that he was injuriously misunderstood and misrepresented by his adversaries; and that the recoil from his system which rent our Church, and founded new institutions for the support of orthodoxy in his own communion, was largely due to groundless prejudice and "devout calumny." These volumes will brush away all mist that may still overhang these allegations. We deem them quite as important for the light they shed upon past conflicts, and the merits of the respective polemics, as for any power they possess to revive controversies already fought through, or to re-vitalize a system whose first meteoric success was only eclipsed by the rapidity of its decline. We do not intimate that this system is yet extinct, or absolutely effete. But we do assert, without fear of plausible contradiction, that since its first flooding irruption upon our American churches, it has been steadily ebbing. Old-school doctrines have been steadily gaining influence and ascendency. They have shown their power in the quiet but rapid growth of the bodies which cling to them most tenaciously; in the comparatively stationary or retrogressive condition of most of the bodies which repudiate them; in the extensive reactionary movement within these bodies in order to their conservation from further waste and decay; in the new forms of latitudinarian theology itself which overshadow the issues of Taylorism, so obtrusive twenty years ago; and in the fact that many admiring pupils of Dr. Taylor, who still eulogize him as the oracle of his day, are forward to discard his fundamental ethical principles. How much of any peculiar theory of *moral* government can survive the overthrow of its fundamental ethical principle, it is not difficult to imagine.

In order to appreciate Dr. Taylor justly, it is necessary to look not merely at his theories—which, of course, stand or fall upon their own merits—but at the circumstances and surroundings which evoked and largely moulded his thinking. All men, while they have the roots of their character and achievements in themselves, are strongly impelled and guided in their development and outworking by the external influences in which they find themselves immersed. Even if they sturdily withstand all that besets them, they are not unaffected by it. The

conditions and objects that environ them are the provocatives and objects of their thinking. If these do not sway them—even if they are strenuously resisted—still, they incite this very antagonism, and give it their own "form and pressure." It is impossible to understand the genesis of Dr. Taylor's theories irrespective of the atmosphere he breathed, the training he enjoyed, the forms of doctrinal and practical opinion which in his view most urgently required an antidote, and the evils, real or supposed, which he aimed to remedy. Much less is it possible, without this, to account for a certain two-sided or ambiguous aspect of many of his writings, which has been an enigma to multitudes; or to reach the most favourable construction of his spirit and aims of which his case admits, and in which Christian charity will rejoice.

The principal circumstances affecting Dr. Taylor's early theological development, which require to be noted in this connection are, 1. The wide prevalence of Infidelity and Atheism, which appalled good men, during the period of his theological training and early ministry. Its focus was France—but it radiated thence over Christendom, and shot its most baleful rays over our own country, then so deeply in sympathy, on political grounds, with revolutionary France. Presidents, Senators, jurists, public men of every grade, caught the infection—colleges and literary institutions were deeply inoculated with the virus. It was quite a matter of *ton* to be sceptical. The consequence was, that the mind of the Church was largely engrossed with the refutation of Deism, Atheism, and the various forms of scepticism, open or masked. The great theological works of this period were mostly apologetic. Dr. Dwight, Dr. Taylor's theological instructor, achieved his highest fame and his grandest success by his celebrated discourses on infidelity. They revolutionized the current of opinion and feeling in Yale College, prepared the way for those revivals of religion which signalized his administration, and exorcised the fell spirit of infidelity from the institution. His whole system of theology, and tone of preaching, bear traces of being shaped with the especial design of confronting and overpowering infidels. Dr. Taylor's mind, both from its own peculiar structure and from the impulses given it by his teacher, would inevitably

gird itself for the conflicts which then agitated the Christian world, and with ample confidence in its ability to solve difficulties which had before embarrassed the ablest defenders of the faith. This explains why most of his theological peculiarities, while they have to do with the very nature of the Christian life, are yet adopted for the purpose of strengthening the apologetic side of theology, and silencing infidels and sceptics.

2. At this period scepticism began to develope itself openly within the precincts of the New England churches, under the title of improved and liberal Christianity. Unitarianism and Universalism had obtained control of the metropolis of Puritan Congregationalism, of its most ancient and renowned seat of learning, and from these centres of influence had already propagated themselves into the very heart of Massachusetts, poisoning her more powerful churches, and commanding the favour of her educated and aristocratic classes. These heresies, which repudiate nearly all that distinguishes Christianity from heathen morality but the name, began to worm themselves into the adjacent States, having strong ecclesiastical and social ties with the old home of their birth and dominion; and to assume a formidable attitude which engaged the anxious attention of the friends of truth and piety throughout the land, but especially in New England. Dr. Taylor's speculations have a special respect to the objections levelled at the evangelical system from this source. Endorsing many of their objections to old orthodoxy, he endeavours to reconstruct the evangelical system so as to evade them. To this point much of his strenuous argumentation tends. He concedes much to the cavils of these errorists against the doctrines of the church, for the sake of proving that the doctrine of eternal punishment, which they most of all abhor, is demanded by the benevolence of God, on which they rely to subvert it. In maintaining and denouncing the eternal misery of the wicked to the uttermost, no divine is more emphatic, uncompromising—we had almost said, unrelenting.

3. Orthodoxy in New England had been undergoing transmutations in the laboratories of successive metaphysical schools, until it began to crystallize into the arctic dogmas of Emmons.

What these were, we have so recently pointed out, as to supersede the necessity of distinct specification here.* This system in its higher or lower potencies, tinctured much of the practical, and even revival preaching of many of the most able and earnest orthodox divines of New England. Divine sovereignty, election and decrees were intensified and pressed out of their scriptural relations and proportions, into that foreground which the Scriptures award to Christ and him crucified. They were largely employed to offend, startle, and alarm the unconverted, to perform the office of the law in producing conviction of sin; while submission to, or acquiescence in them, was often made the hinge-point of true conversion. Thus the love of God in Christ, the true inspiration of evangelic preaching—the power of God unto salvation—was often shaded into relative unimportance. Of course, all this arrayed orthodoxy in gratuitous horrors, which invigorated the Universalist and Unitarian defection, while it was like an ague-chill, alternating with the warm life of the gospel, in congregations still cleaving to the faith once delivered to the saints. This was keenly felt by Dr. Dwight, and the large class whom he represented in New England, who lost no opportunity of denouncing the sublimated hyper-Calvinism of Hopkins and Emmons, especially the latter, in regard to decrees, the divine production of sin, exercises, resignation, &c. It was inevitable that, to a mind like Dr. Taylor's, surveying this whole subject from the stand-point of one striving to clear the gospel of incumbrances which hindered its access to the unconverted heart, and exposed it to the assaults of Universalists, Unitarians and Deists, the whole doctrinal system in vogue should seem to require reconstruction. The peculiar state of speculative theology in New England, as may readily be seen by those conversant with the facts, had much to do with determining the drift of Dr. Taylor's speculations. This was so, not only as it presented the offensive features already noted, but also as in other respects it furnished the germs of those peculiarities which constituted the essence of his own system,

* Article on Edwards, and the successive forms of New Divinity, in the October number, 1858.

and which he employed in assailing, not merely Hopkinsianism and Emmonism, but the whole Augustinian, or Calvinistic system. We refer here to the doctrine of natural ability, then naturalized and nearly universal in New England; to the dogma that moral quality pertains exclusively to exercises, which was prominent in Emmons's scheme; to the wide prevalence of the dogma, that all virtue consists in benevolence; to the nearly universal rejection of the doctrine of imputation, whether of Adam's sin, or Christ's righteousness, inaugurated by the younger Edwards; to the governmental scheme of atonement, no less in vogue, and having the same author. Here we find the seed-principles of a large part of the treatise on Moral Government. The peculiar chaotic state of New England theology, when Dr. Taylor came upon the theatre, furnished the motives, the means, and the objects of his innovations. As his reading and theological culture scarcely extended beyond the astute metaphysical theologians of New England, he knew little of standard Augustinian and Reformed theology, beyond the fragmentary representations and misrepresentations of it, found in these second-hand, and in many respects, hostile authorities. To the day of his death he never comprehended this theology in its import, spirit, logic, power. He often confounds it with certain dogmas which it disowns, mere New England provincialisms, and quite as often with the caricatures of its adversaries.

4. It deserves consideration in this connection, that Dr. Dwight held the utilitarian theory of the nature of virtue; that it consists exclusively in benevolence, or a desire to promote the happiness of the universe. Dr. Dwight did not work this theory out to many of its logical and practical results. Nor did it so figure in his published writings, as to attract any marked attention. Yet there is reason to suppose it was a favourite theory with him, and that he signalized it even more in his private instructions than in his published works. And we do not doubt that his influence encouraged Dr. Taylor's speculations on this subject, till they culminated in startling dogmas, from which Dr. Dwight probably would have recoiled—at all events which, after being distinctly brought to public

notice, justly awakened the deepest distrust and dislike of his whole system.*

Passing now from these objective moulding influences to notice the subjective peculiarities of inward life and intellectual constitution that contributed to make Dr. Taylor the theologian he was, it is to be observed that his extraordinary power was rather in the line of logical acuteness and ingenuity, than in that breadth and depth of insight, without which the mere logical faculty is quite as likely to precipitate us into error, as guide us to the truth. There are three ways in which the mind comes to the knowledge of truth: 1. Intuition. 2. Testimony. 3. Logical deduction from what is known by intuition and testimony. It is obvious that logical processes can unfold only what is enveloped in the premises from which they start; that the truth of the conclusions reached depends on the truth of the premises, and the accuracy of the reasoning process. It is obvious still further, that all reasoning must ultimately start from truths given by intuition or testimony, else it is but a chain without a staple; that it can have no stronger evidence than the self-evidence of its ultimate premises; that the longer and more involved the steps which intervene between first premises and the conclusion, the greater is the liability to error; and that if any conclusion reached by reasoning militates against any self-evident truth, the process is thereby clearly evinced to be faulty, either in the premises or the reasoning, whether we can detect the flaw or not. Now when we say that Dr. Taylor's breadth and depth of insight were not commensurate with his logical power, we refer to that want of insight into the intrinsic

* In a letter from Dr. Taylor respecting Dr. Dwight, we find the following: "In my senior year, I read as an exercise before Dr. Dwight, an argument on the question, 'Is virtue founded in utility?'—a question in which he always felt a peculiar interest. To those who preceded me he said, 'Oh, you do not understand the question;' but when I had finished my argument he remarked with great emphasis—'that's right,' and added some other commendatory remarks, which, to say the least, were adapted to put a young man's modesty to rather a severe test. But it certainly had one good effect—it determined me to make intellectual efforts, which otherwise I probably never should have made; *not to say the very kind which, above all others, I love to make.*"—*Sprague's Annals*, Vol. i., pp. 162, 163.

nature of moral good and evil, the self-evident excellence and obligation of first moral truths, which an inspection of his reasonings will bring to light. Discerning no intrinsic good but happiness, he reasons at all lengths, and in all directions from this hypothesis; he follows the remorseless bent of his logic, whatever first principles and sacred instincts it overbears—even though, to use his own favourite phrase, it "go down Niagara." A consequence of this was, that within the field of his vision he saw with the greatest confidence and assurance, while he pushed his reasonings within this circumscribed area with all the greater force and momentum, because he did not take that broader survey of first truths which would have made them brakes to check the impetus that bore him so rapidly and confidently to startling conclusions. Hence the remarkable assurance and self-reliance with which he propounded principles confessedly at war with the doctrines of all branches of the church, his marvellous confidence in the power of his reasonings to enforce the assent of adversaries, and his difficulty of understanding how men should reject them on grounds creditable to the head and heart. It is further to be observed, that Dr. Taylor believed that the true power of Christianity was to be found in those bodies that hold certain elements of the reformed and evangelical faith. Especially did he regard the doctrine of eternal punishment as vital to effective Christian preaching. On the whole, he found more in the practical and doctrinal tone of the Presbyterian and Congregational churches that was congenial to him than elsewhere. On the other hand, he regarded Unitarianism and Universalism as emasculating the gospel of all that can arouse the soul to salutary concern and earnest religious efforts, yet he deemed it necessary to reconstruct the accepted orthodox system, so as to obviate certain objections, to which he agreed with these errorists in thinking it obnoxious. This accounts for the double-faced aspect so often and plausibly charged against him and his system. He was often charged with seconding Unitarians in their assaults on the orthodox faith. In response, he claimed to be the most earnest and relentless adversary of these heretics, and to be unwaveringly devoted to the doctrines of Calvinism, which he was undertaking, not

to overthrow, but to place on a firmer basis. Within certain limits and in a certain sense, all this is true. It is quite certain that he adopted and echoed the arguments of Socinians against important parts of the orthodox system. It is no less true that he expected thus more effectually to vanquish them, and retain intact the essentials of the orthodox faith. Did he succeed? The answer to this question will bring us at once to the consideration of the distinctive features of his system.

Dr. Taylor's estimate of his own theological achievements in comparison with those of his predecessors, appears in such passages as the following:

"All the attempts made by theologians to systematize the great and substantial truths of both natural and revealed theology have hitherto proved utter and complete failures, by a necessity arising from the manner in which they have been made. For in all these attempts there never has been any exhibition, nor even professed attempt at exhibition, of that great and comprehensive relation of God to men, to which all things besides, in creation and providence, are subordinate and subservient; *his relation to men as administering a perfect moral government over them as moral and immortal beings, created in his own image.*" Vol. ii. p. 2.

"So unreflective and careless on this subject have been the prominent theological writers, Catholic and Protestant, Orthodox and Latitudinarian, that from the times of Origen, not to say of Irenæus, they have scarcely, to any extent worthy of notice, given any form to the great scriptural doctrine of justification, which has not in my view involved down-right Antinomianism, the subversion of the law of God in one of its essential elements." *Ib.* p. 151.

"Have the Orthodox ministry then thus pressed men to act morally right under God's authority, grace or no grace? . . . Have they not, to a great extent, taught *a mode of dependence* on the Holy Spirit, which, instead of enhancing as it does, man's obligation to act morally right in obedience to God's authority, absolutely subverts man's obligation so to act, and God's authority to require him so to act? . . . And more than this,—where in the whole range of theological literature, can be found anything, which even in pretence can be esteemed

a thorough treatise on the high relation to God, to which his every other relation is subservient—that of the supreme and rightful moral Governor of his moral creation?" *Ib.* pp. 25, 26.

This is extraordinary language. The moral government of God is his government of moral beings. Every treatise on theology is a treatise in regard to God's government of such moral beings as we have knowledge of. It treats of the being, attributes, law and gospel of God, of our relations thereto, and of what is necessarily implied therein. Dr. Taylor could not have meant that his assertion is true, except in a narrow sense corresponding to his own arbitrary restriction of the meaning of the words "moral," "government," etc. It is quite true that no one has treated the subject after the method of these two volumes, or founded his reasonings upon the same fundamental principles. It is in these that the primary peculiarity of Dr. Taylor's system lies. To these are to be traced its strength and its weakness.

Dr. Taylor undertook to silence those who insist that the eternal punishment of the wicked is incompatible with benevolence in God. In doing this, he contended that benevolence in God as moral governor, required the everlasting punishment of incorrigible sinners, and that failure on his part to threaten it would prove him to be a malevolent being, without right to govern his creatures, or claim to their confidence. He undertook to prove this by argument as cogent as mathematical demonstration. The argument is simply this: The happiness of sentient beings, or the means of such happiness is the only good; therefore, benevolence or the desire and purpose to promote such happiness is the only virtue, or the sum of all virtue. Sin, as the opposite of benevolence, consists in selfishness, or the preference of other sources of enjoyment to seeking the happiness of the universe. A moral governor cannot show himself truly benevolent, entitled to reign, or to command the confidence of his subjects, unless he promotes benevolence in his subjects by the highest rewards, and discourages selfishness by the extremest penalties. So far as he comes short of this, he fails to show perfect benevolence; for he fails to do what he might do to promote perfect benevolence, and thereby perfect happiness. This is the sum of the argument devel-

oped by the author in manifold forms, and occupying a large portion of his book. It seems, if the premises be granted, to be quite conclusive. The conclusion, however, though with a single qualification yet to be noted, proved by Scripture and not discordant with reason, does not prove the truth of the premises. A false conclusion proves the premises from which it is deduced false. A true conclusion, however, may happen to come from false premises as well as true, and therefore proves nothing with regard to their truth or falsity. From the premise, "all colleges have astronomical observatories," it follows that Yale College has such an observatory. The conclusion is true, the premise false. If the foregoing is a true account of morality, and if this gives us the differentia of moral government, then we must award to Dr. Taylor the honour of having first given it, as he claims, a thorough and systematic treatment. But it is time for us to verify our account of his system.

"Benevolence then, as the primary, morally right affection, is the elective preference of the highest happiness of all—the *sentient* universe—to every conflicting object." *Ib.* 255. On the next page and elsewhere, he speaks of veracity and justice as "forms of benevolence." Each of them, "contemplated as including this principle, is truly and properly said to be *morally* right, and is properly called a virtue. But then its *moral rectitude* consists exclusively in the element of *general benevolence*, since if we conceive the particular disposition, affection, or purpose to exist, as it may, without this element of *general benevolence*, we necessarily conceive of it as a form of selfishness. If again, we conceive of the element of general benevolence as existing in the same degree without the particular disposition, affection, or purpose, we necessarily conceive of the same degree of moral rectitude. . . . When, however, we contemplate justice or veracity, or any particular disposition, purpose, volition, separately from, or as not including either the benevolent or selfish principle of the heart, it is neither morally right nor morally wrong. At the same time it must be admitted that justice, veracity, &c., each being conceived as a particular subordinate purpose or disposition without general benevolence, and including its appropriate executive action, are in some

sense *right*, but not *morally right*. They are *right* as they are fitted to promote some limited good necessary to the general good. It may be truly said of any of these subordinate acts, that it *ought* to be done. But its *rightness* or *oughtness* is not *moral* rightness or *moral* oughtness, for this is a predicate only of (general) benevolence, or that which includes it." Pp. 256–7. He proceeds to describe this *oughtness* or *rightness*, as being like that of a watch or pen, with reference to the end for which it is made—a "mere *natural fitness*." The italics are all the author's. This representation clearly annihilates all virtue but benevolence, all sin but selfishness. Truth, justice, lying, fraud, cruelty, aside from the benevolent or selfish spirit which may prompt them, are void of moral character. They belong to adiaphorous things as truly as running or walking. The consequence is, they become morally good or evil, according to circumstances.

Says Dr. Taylor, "There is no kind of subordinate action, which in any circumstances is fitted to subserve the end of benevolence, which in other circumstances may not be fitted to subserve the end of selfishness, and be prompted by this principle." Vol. i. p. 53. "At the same time there are few, if any kinds of subordinate action, which in all cases are fitted only to promote the end of selfishness, or which in some possible circumstances may not be fitted *to subserve the end of benevolence, and be performed from this principle.*" *Ib.* p. 54.

"And now, if we suppose the essential nature of things to be so changed, that the authority of law and the public good as depending upon it would be destroyed, and absolute and universal misery follow, unless the innocent were to be punished, would it not be right to make innocence, now become the true and necessary cause of such fearful results, the ground of punishment? If it is now right or just to punish the disobedient, it would then be so to punish the obedient—to punish for a thing having the same relative nature, though it should have another name." *Ib.* pp. 134, 135.

We do not see how any language could more utterly confound and vacate all moral distinctions. Actions are right and wrong not intrinsically, but solely as they are instrumental of happiness. The end sanctifies the means, whatever they may be.

Desert of punishment and the righteousness of its infliction depend not upon the culpability of the victim, but upon its relation to the public good. This determines whether the woes of punishment may righteously be inflicted upon the innocent, or the wicked! These are the inevitable logical results of the theory that virtue is founded in utility, that it has no intrinsic quality, but is merely the means of happiness. All actions and dispositions are indifferent but benevolence, and even that is good, not intrinsically, but as a means to happiness, as will yet more fully appear! On such a subject, argument is out of place; there is no doubt what the primary intuitions of every unperverted mind reveal on this subject. Let him who undertakes to speculate them away, find anything out of the Bible more certain with which to begin or end his reasoning if he can. Dr. Taylor does not hesitate to impress these intuitions into his service where it suits his purpose, and to make them oracles for determining what scripture may or may not teach. He says in reference to imputation as misconceived by himself, "that a morally perfect being, even Jesus Christ, cannot be ill-deserving, is an *intuition*." Vol. i. ii. p. 158. Indeed, we accept as the conclusive refutation of the above ethical theory, the very language which Dr. Taylor hurls with prodigious force at his own imagination of the doctrine of imputation.

"Indeed, if we are to rely on the necessary decisions and judgments of the human intellect—without which we can rely on nothing as true—then in this scheme these necessary decisions concerning law, justice, truth, equity, veracity, moral government, everything which lies at the basis of faith, of confidence and repose in God, are changed into their opposites; law ceases to be even respectable advice; for the lawgiver abandons its claims by sovereign prerogative, justice is converted into injustice." *Ib.* p. 159. Suppose all this were so—what then, if Dr. Taylor's ethical theory be true, and if our intuitive "necessary decisions respecting justice, truth, equity, veracity, moral government, everything which lies at the basis of faith, of confidence and repose in God," do not bury this scheme for ever out of sight? So true is it that men who speculate away their own moral instincts, are compelled after

all to recognize them—and to use them as both shield and sword in defensive and offensive warfare. They can no more eliminate them from their practical faith, than an idealist can act as if there were no external world.

But we have not yet reached the lowest deep of this ethical theory, to which logical necessity precipitates, and our author follows it "down Niagara." Why is benevolence singled out to be made the comprehensive generic virtue, rather than justice, veracity, &c.? And why is selfishness made the only sin? "Inasmuch as one is perfectly, or, in the highest degree fitted to prevent the highest misery, and to produce the highest well-being of all other sentient beings, and of the agent himself; and the other is perfectly, or in the highest degree fitted to prevent the highest well-being, and to produce the highest misery of all other sentient beings, and of the agent himself." Vol. i., p. 19. But is there no good, and no well-being but happiness? No evil, but misery, &c.? Let the author answer. "Nothing is good but happiness and the means of happiness, including the absence of misery, and the means of its absence." *Ib.* p. 31. "Nothing is *evil*, but misery or suffering, and the means of it, including the absence of happiness and the means of his happiness." P. 35. The *goodness*, or the *worth*, or the *value*, or the *excellence* of a thing, is not the *absolute* nature, but the *relative* nature of that of which it is the predicate; or more particularly, it is the real nature of that of which it is predicated, *as related to sentient being*." P. 31. "All the evil which pertains to action on the part of a moral being, is its fitness or adaptation to produce misery or suffering to other beings and to himself." P. 35.

According to this, moral acts and qualities, even benevolence itself, have no intrinsic moral quality whatever. Their excellence is wholly "relative," and consists simply and exclusively in their being means of happiness. It is the happiness of beings too, considered simply as "sentient"—whether their sensibility be corporeal or spiritual, animal, esthetic or moral—the *quantum* rather than the *quale*. Says Dr. Taylor, in vindication of the doctrine that the love to God primarily required by the divine law is the love of benevolence, not of complacency:

"The love of benevolence is the love of the well-being, or of the highest happiness of the sentient universe. As God comprises in himself immeasurably, 'the greatest portion of being,' and of course compared with the universe besides, the greatest capacity of blessedness, his perfect happiness has more worth than any that can come into competition with it. If then the mind does not *primarily* love the highest blessedness of God, and his perfect character as the means of this end, and this on account of its perfect fitness or adaptation as *the means* of producing this end, it does not love his character on account of its *intrinsic loveliness or excellence*—does not love it at all." Vol. ii., p. 196.

How exclusively this founds all on quantity, rather than quality of being and happiness, and derives all quality from quantity! See the application of this utilitarian arithmetic, to calculate the decrease of love to God in proportion to the temptation it surmounts. Says our author, "Perfect holiness in a moral creature consists in loving God as much as he can love him, while he is under a necessity of loving an inferior good in some degree. At the same time he has but a limited power, or capacity of loving all objects of affection. Suppose this capacity in a perfectly holy being to be the capacity of loving fifty degrees, and that being under a necessity of loving the inferior good ten degrees, he loves God with forty degrees, or with perfect love. Let us now suppose the temptation increased; in other words, the value of the inferior good increased, so that it becomes necessary to love the inferior object fifteen degrees. The consequence is, that he must love God so much the less, as he loves the inferior object more, &c." Vol. ii. p. 365. By this calculus perfect love will soon be differentiated down to zero. Is not the statement of such a system its refutation. As well might we measure fragrance by squares and triangles, as moral quality in this way. Who does not shudder at the bare suggestion of merging the holiness, righteousness, and truth of God, in mere boundless "sentient capacity," or sinking them into mere instruments for gratifying it? Does it terminate in anything short of absorbing his moral perfections, all that can be a ground of love and trust to his rational creatures, in mere physical or metaphysical

infinitude? We stop here. We will not hurl back those epithets which we might justly employ, and which Dr. Taylor applies so freely and gratuitously to the God exhibited, as he maintains, in the scheme of his adversaries. But really, is bare amount of sentient capacity irrespective of its quality, the measure of worth and claim to regard, as this scheme requires? And who would not slaughter thousands of rams, if he had them and it were necessary, to soothe the anguish of a suffering babe? And are not all bodily sufferings, however intense and protracted, less to be deplored, reprobated, and shunned, than one pang of remorse, however faint or transient? And is the agony of the Son of God no more momentous than an equal amount of agony in a sentient being of any species?

But if benevolence be the only virtue, because it is a means of happiness as the only good, should not each one seek for himself this only good? and can he be under obligation to be benevolent or anything else, on any other ground, or in any greater degree than as it is seen to be conducive to his own happiness? Says Dr. Taylor:

"Were the agent wholly unsusceptible to happiness from the happiness of others, and as therefore he must be wholly indifferent to their happiness, he must be wholly indifferent to benevolence on his own part, as the means of their happiness. Benevolence in such a case could possess no worth or value *to him*, either directly or indirectly. . . The worth *to him* of the highest happiness of all other beings, is its fitness to give him the highest happiness of which he is capable from any object of action; and the worth to him of benevolent action is its perfect and exclusive fitness to produce the highest happiness of all other beings, and *herein* its perfect fitness to secure to him the highest happiness of which he is capable from any object of action." Vol. i., p. 32. In the same manner he proceeds to argue that, "selfishness would be no evil to the moral agent, were he entirely unsusceptible to misery from the misery of others; that the *evil* of this kind of action to the agent, is equal either to the evil *to him* of the highest misery of all other beings, or to the evil *to him* of his own misery from their highest misery." P. 35.

There can be no mistake as to what all this, and much more

of the like means. The only obligation to benevolence is the constraint we are under to pursue our own happiness; but does not the author maintain that men are bound to do right and avoid wrong? Assuredly. But then, what is right and what is wrong? Let us hear him. "The word *right* denotes *the fitness* of that to which it is applied, to produce or accomplish some given end; and the word *wrong* denotes *the fitness of that to which it is applied to prevent the same given end.* . . . Of course, the same general ideas of fitness to produce or prevent the end, or the great end of action on the part of moral beings (i. e. happiness,) are denoted by the words right and wrong, when applied to such action. To deny this, is to deny a fixed and universal principle in the use of words. It is to deny in the language of logic that the genus is predicable of the species, or that the same word has one and the same general meaning as applied to different things, to which it can truly be applied in that meaning. It is the same as to deny that the word *black* or *white* has the same general meaning when applied to a bird and a horse of the same colour." Pp. 63, 64. This must be the answer which, on page 135, he says he has already given to those who say that the "idea of moral rectitude or rightness is a simple idea, an idea incapable of analysis and definition." And what an answer! If this is all that Dr. Taylor's astuteness could devise, we may safely say they are unanswerable. Right as commonly understood means conformity to a standard as fitness to an end, of which Dr. Goodrich shows himself well aware in his edition of Webster's Dictionary. It means not only conformity to a standard, but, as often, the very standard idea, or law to which we ought to conform, or the characteristic element of that to which we ought to conform, i. e. moral goodness. Thus used, it denotes a simple idea. As such it may be indicated by synonyms. But it cannot be logically defined. For it is incapable of analysis into genus and differentia. It is itself the differentia of morally right action. But its own genus and differentia cannot be found, any more than those of black and white. Says Dr. Taylor, usage is "that only which gives to words what may be called their *proper* meaning, and their only fixed and permanent meaning so far as they have any. It is, of course, the only criterion of decid-

ing what that proper meaning is." Vol. ii. p. 213. This is just. How absurd then to attempt to settle one of the greatest questions in psychology, ethics and divinity, by erecting a partial and secondary meaning of the word *right* in some of its applications into a generic sense which must pervade all its applications, and settle all questions depending on its meaning, as a moral term! Does any thing but usage decide this meaning? When then men use the word right in reference to a moral act or state, do they, or do they not mean something else than is implied in the phrase, "a choice of the highest happiness of the sentient universe as a means of my own happiness?" This is a psychological question which each one must answer for himself, looking to it that his answer does not contradict the consciousness of the human race, as shown by their words and their deeds. What that answer must be, is not a matter of doubt. And it directly contradicts the assumption which runs not only through the above argument, but through these two volumes, that there is no good but happiness or the means of happiness.

We have seen it recently stated by an apologist of Dr. Taylor's ethical theory, that he was accustomed to say in his lectures somewhat as follows: "We hold that virtue and vice are respectively good and evil in themselves. We do not allow our opponents exclusively to appropriate this language. We attach great importance to it." The following quotation shows in what sense he adopted this phrase. "There are, generally speaking, two things and only two, each of which may properly be said to be *evil in itself*. The one is *suffering*, including unhappiness or misery, and the other is the *direct means* of suffering. Each is truly and properly said to be *evil in itself*, in distinction from being evil as *the indirect* means of suffering." P. 132, vol. ii. What is this but a dexterous word-play? After all, the evil of sin is not intrinsic, but lies solely in its being the means of suffering—precisely what his adversaries charge—and what the above language is not even an attempt to parry, and only a very poor attempt to disguise. In this sense destitution of food and raiment, foul air, close confinement, are evils in themselves. They are the direct means of

suffering. Have they, therefore, the intrinsic evil of blasphemy, perjury, and malice, i. e. intrinsic moral turpitude?

One other evasion, which is put forward in defence of this scheme by its abettors, with all the pomp and circumstance of demonstration, whenever they find themselves *in extremis*, we must notice. It is shadowed forth in the passage already quoted from pages 32–35. It is there maintained, that if a moral agent were unsusceptible to happiness from the happiness of others, and to misery from the misery of others, he would be indifferent to them, would not choose or refuse them, and they could be neither good nor evil to him. In short, the familiar axiom of moral liberty, that in all free choice we choose as we please, is the virtual premise for proving that if we choose at all, we must choose our own pleasure or happiness. To which we reply,

1. This confounds the subjective impulse which impels or determines choice with the object chosen. Because I choose as I please, it by no means follows that I may not be pleased to choose goodness, truth, beauty, as such, on account of their perceived intrinsic excellency, and irrespective of any perceived relations to my own happiness. Nay, does not the possibility of delight in the highest objects to a noble mind, depend on their perceived objective intrinsic excellency? How does it appear that a man may not be pleased with other objects as well as his own happiness, or things considered as the means thereof? Does not every man's consciousness attest that he may be pleased with the noble, the beautiful, the true, irrespective of their perceived relations to his own happiness?

2. This destroys all differences in voluntary action. The argument is, that virtue must consist exclusively in the pursuit of happiness, because men cannot choose objects in which they feel no interest, or which they are not pleased to choose. In this sense, and to the fullest extent, vicious and virtuous choices are alike. They are so, simply because they are choices, and it is the nature of choice to choose as we please. It is the nature of the *objects* chosen, and in which we find pleasure, not the mere subjective choosing as we please, that determines the moral character of the choice and of the man choosing.

And he alone who loves the good *as good*, is a good man. Indeed, the argument now under consideration, obliterates not only all moral, but all other distinction between choices.

Another source of plausibility in many of the statements of Dr. Taylor, and the whole Epicurean and Utilitarian school, is found in the intuitive conviction of the whole human race, that there is, under the government of a holy God, an inviolable nexus between holiness and happiness, sin and misery; and, moreover, that aside from positive rewards and punishments, in their own nature, the one gives peace, no matter what present suffering it may involve; the other gives torment, no matter what transient pleasures it may procure. But though in moral beings, sin and misery, holiness and happiness, always mutually suppose each other, it does not follow that they are identical, or are so regarded, in the universal judgments of the race. Solidity supposes figure, colour, extension. These are not, therefore, identical. The rational and animal natures coexist in man. They are not, therefore, the same. The practice of holiness is the sure road to happiness. Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness. It does not, therefore, follow that pleasantness or the pursuit of it, involves all that is implied in wisdom. Nay, the pursuit of happiness, except in subordination to holiness as a good to be sought in some measure for its own sake, is the inevitable forfeiture of it. He that seeks his life shall lose it; he that loseth his life for Christ's sake shall find it. But those who make happiness the only good, often employ the same language as those who make holiness the supreme good, and all the more readily, since happiness follows moral goodness, as the shadow the substance. In aid of this comes the *petitio principii*, which runs through these volumes, that nothing is good but happiness or the means of happiness. This is the very thing to be proved. It is simply assumed without proof. But when Dr. Taylor asks, in innumerable forms, as if concluding all debate on these subjects, whether that action can be virtuous which does not seek some good, he asks a self-answering question. The answer is conclusive for his purpose, if we grant his postulate, that there is no good but happiness or the means thereof. But it is wholly in a circle and irrelevant for the purpose of proving this, the spinal

principle of the happiness scheme, without which it falls helplessly and irremediably.

The exhibition of this theory which we have thus given at great length in the words of its author, is its refutation. On its own showing it subverts the first principles of morals, the intrinsic difference between virtue and vice; and enthrones a shifting expediency in place of eternal and immutable morality. All but seeking the highest happiness of the sentient universe, is classed among things indifferent; good or evil not in themselves, but according to circumstances. In support of this view, Dr. Taylor refers to our Saviour's doctrine in regard to the Sabbath, Matt. xii. 1–13, to prove "that the greatest good is to be done in all cases, notwithstanding the unqualified language of particular precepts." Vol. i. p. 58. The Sabbath is a positive institute as regards the time and form of its observance. Like all positive institutes, the manner of its observance is a thing in itself indifferent, and becomes good or evil according as it promotes or hinders the higher moral and immutable interests to which it is auxiliary. All this is determined and varied, and made binding by the express command of God, according to his infinite wisdom. But does all this serve to show that there is nothing intrinsically good or evil, but a benevolent or selfish purpose—that there are exceptions at the behest of expediency to the intrinsic obligation of veracity, justice, &c.? Believe this who will.

We cannot forbear adding, that if the quality of moral action lies not in its nature, but its perceived tendencies, or consequences to the highest happiness or misery of sentient being, then it must be for ever impossible for men to know the moral quality of their actions further than as they are taught it by the authority of revelation. Says Dr. Taylor: "In respect to the most momentous agency in the universe of causes, *moral action*, he (the agent) knows what is true, what is false, what is good, what is evil, according to the eternal and immutable nature of things. Act as he may, he acts with a just and adequate view and comprehension of all that need be known, that the great end of all being, of all existence may be accomplished or defeated." Vol. i. pp. 36, 37. Now this is true, if the moral quality of actions be intrinsic and seen to be so.

This quality may be as surely seen by the moral faculty in actions, as beauty or colours in objects by the eye, at the first dawn of intelligence or moral agency. But on the supposition that the right or wrong of actions depends upon their consequences to the happiness or misery of the sentient universe, who of men can calculate the consequences near and remote of his conduct? Or, if it were possible for any man, at what age does the intellect become sufficiently developed and comprehensive for this purpose? When, if ever, can moral agency begin on this supposition? What did Joseph's brethren or Christ's crucifiers know about the bearings of their nefarious deeds on the happiness or misery of the "sentient universe?" They meant it for evil, but God meant it for good. Gen. l. 20. Does the child, when committing the most common sin of childhood, and conscience-smitten for it, know or think of its bearings on the happiness of the sentient universe? If he did not know that it was wrong in itself, could he ever know that it was wrong at all? And what is the testimony of the universal consciousness of men on this subject? Do they undertake to compute, if this were possible, the consequences of most actions to the happiness or misery of the sentient universe, in order to adjudge, approve or condemn them as worthy or unworthy, noble or mean, right or wrong? Are veracity, fidelity, magnanimity, self-sacrifice, piety, falsehood, treachery, sordidness, selfishness, estimated by this arithmetic? Would it ever be possible to know right or wrong, whether they were doing good or evil that good might come, on such a theory? So far as we can see, it puts moral action beyond the range of possibility.

We omit other comments which this scheme invites, except so far as they may rise collaterally in our observations upon those modifications of Christian doctrine, urged by Dr. Taylor, with which they are implicated.

Deists and Universalists, however, are not silenced, if this whole scheme be conceded; if it be granted that the Divine goodness consists exclusively in benevolence, and that benevolence requires the utmost possible punishment of the wicked, both as regards intensity and duration. The question still arises, if the one exclusive desire of the Almighty be the high-

est or the perfect happiness of the sentient universe, why does he not effect it? Dr. Taylor is not at a loss for an answer. He says, "can human ingenuity devise an answer, or even be authorized to say there can be any other reason, except that a perfect God cannot prevent all sin, even under the best conceivable system, or in other words cannot prevent all sin for ever without destroying moral agency?" Vol. ii. p. 366. He more than intimates that the denial of this inability in God leads logically to "Atheism, Infidelity and Universalism." Vol. i. p. 324. It might be rejoined, why does not God make a delighted sentient universe, without this intractable element of free-agency to destroy or impair it? Or if it be said, that free-agency is an indispensable requisite to high and rapturous enjoyment, how does it appear that God cannot control without destroying it? Says Dr. Taylor, "moral agency implies free-agency—the power of choice—the power to choose morally wrong as well as morally right, under every possible influence to prevent such choice or action." Vol. i. p. 307. "Moral beings, under this best moral system, must have power to sin, in despite of all that God can do under this system to prevent them; and to suppose that they should do what they can under this system, viz. sin, and that God should prevent their sinning, is a contradiction and an impossibility. It *may be true* that such beings in this respect, will do what they can do—that is, will sin—when of course it would be impossible that God, other things remaining the same, should prevent their sinning without destroying their moral agency." Vol. i. pp. 321, 322. This Dr. Taylor argues does not limit the power of God, because the accomplishment of contradictions has no relation to power. It is not within the province of power to make two and two equal to five. "No more does it imply any deficiency in power on his part, that he cannot prevent in supposable cases, beings who can sin in despite of his power, *i. e.* moral beings, from sinning under the best moral system." P. 322.

Probably this dogma of Taylorism has contributed to its discredit quite as much as the ethical theory we have examined. To solve the mystery of evil by investing man with a power of contrary choice, superior to divine omnipotence, is hardly more consonant with the feelings of devout Christians, than to restrict

his power of choice to happiness as its object, and self-love as its inward motive. However demonstrative Dr. Taylor's argument may be, to show that we cannot maintain God's benevolence and sincerity, unless we admit his inability to prevent sin in a moral system; Christians will yet believe that there is some flaw in the argument, whether they can detect it or not. The consequences of such a principle are too radical and subversive of the first principles of religion, to allow of its being entertained at all. These consequences are—

1. The annihilation of God's providential government. The highest class of creature agents are above his control. No power that God can exert can prevent their acting in opposition to his decrees. There can be no certainty or stability in his administration of the government of the universe. A single uncontrollable free agent may turn all his counsels to confusion, and frustrate the plans of infinite wisdom in the realms of providence and grace. The greatest events may often be traced to the will, or even caprice of single persons, insignificant as well as great. No one knows how vast a network of providential events may be complicated with his most trivial acts. Every one can call to mind insignificant circumstances which have apparently shaped his sphere and his destiny. One of the decisive battles of the Revolution was turned in favour of the American arms, because the British commander chose to finish a game in which he was engaged before reading some dispatches sent to him. Says Dr. Taylor, "the annihilation of a single particle of matter would *instantly* cause some change throughout the material system; nor can it easily be told how long before the world would rush to chaos." And is not any act of a free agent more in itself and its relations than a material atom?

2. On this system prayer must be, to a great extent, "empty breath." All spiritual blessings, and nearly all temporal blessings require some action of free moral agents, either in their bestowment or realization. But these are endued with a power to frustrate God's will and purpose. He is dependent upon their permission, which he has no power to ensure, for the privilege of executing or conferring any good which involves their agency.

3. On this system, it is not God who makes Christians to differ from other men. They make themselves to differ. The theory is that God is doing all he can to make men good and happy, but is defeated with regard to a portion, by the exercise of a power to sin, which is an over-match for all the power he can exercise to subdue it. Others do not so frustrate the effort of God to draw them to himself. To whom then are they indebted for the difference between themselves and the ungodly? Surely, if this theory be true, to themselves; and there is an end of the sovereignty of grace.

4. It is impossible on this scheme for God to work or implant holiness in the soul. It is for a power to act despite all God's power, to decide whether and on what conditions omnipotence itself shall induce it to be holy. There is no room nor possibility for the creation of a new heart and right spirit by the immediate exercise of a divine power upon the soul. The work of the Spirit must be essentially like that of the preacher, *suasory*, by the objective presentation of truth and motives. Says Dr. Taylor, discussing this subject, "the direct prevention of sin, or which is the same thing, the direct production of holiness in moral agents by dint of omnipotence, is an absurdity." Vol. i. p. 308. This is a great deal for a Christian theologian to say, but no more than this theory requires him to say. But how does such a view quadrate with those scriptural representations which exhibit God as creating a new heart, quickening those dead in trespasses and sins, as exerting the exceeding greatness of his power upon those who believe, even according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead? Eph. i. ii.

5. It is obvious that this scheme involves plenary ability to obey God perfectly without divine grace. This is not disguised, but earnestly maintained by Dr. Taylor, against what the church has understood to be the plain averments of the Bible, and every historical creed of Christendom.

6. No man's salvation is sure on this theory. Whatever may be his present strength of faith, who will dare ensure himself against apostasy, by virtue of any goodness within himself? And while he cannot ensure himself, he has a power

within him which is liable to fall, despite all that men, angels, or God can do to prevent it.

7. For the same reason, there is no security against the fall and revolt of holy angels and redeemed men in heaven.*

For these and other like reasons, this theory can never command the faith of God's people. No apparent conclusiveness of metaphysical demonstration can establish it in the face of those elementary Christian truths which it subverts. The judgment of the church will still be that there must be some flaw in the supposed demonstration, whether it can be detected or not. Even Universalists cannot be brought to believe that God cannot control the acts of moral agents. If eternal punishment can only be vindicated by such a theory, they will regard it as incapable of vindication. They will be confirmed in their soul-destroying delusion. We doubt whether a soli-

* Dr. Taylor argues on the supposition that the only alternative to his theory is, that "sin is the necessary means of the greatest good." This is the alternative adopted by Emmons and some New England theologians. It is the logical alternative, if we take for our "point of departure," the utilitarian scheme, or Dr. Taylor's form of that scheme of ethics. That "sin is the necessary means of good," is for them to maintain who avow it. This is no part of our theology, or of church theology, whatever individual polemics may have promulged. In regard to the permission of evil, we are glad to take refuge in "mystery," notwithstanding Dr. Taylor's protest that such a course will not satisfy atheists.

It is proper, however, that we should recognize what God has been pleased to reveal on this subject. It is quite certain that redemption is the grandest outshining of the perfections and glories of God: and that it was his eternal purpose, that by the redeemed church should be made known unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God. Eph. iii. 10. It is equally certain that redemption, and God's declarative glory therein, are impossible without sin. Redemption from sin without sin, is indeed a contradiction. The preservation of moral agents from sinning, is not a contradiction. This may throw some light upon the Divine permission of sin, not enough, however, to clear it of all mystery. However this may be, it is no proper use of language to call "sin the necessary means of the greatest good." That cannot be good, or the means of good, which is itself evil and evil only, and requires to be counteracted and frustrated in order to any good whatever. The pollution of our great cities is the occasion of much Christian and philanthropic self-sacrifice for its abatement. This is a great good, which would not otherwise exist. Is this pollution, therefore, properly the means of good, because it is the occasion of noble efforts to neutralize it, which otherwise would be impossible?

tary instance can be found of an Atheist, Deist or Universalist, reclaimed by means of this scheme.

We do not, however, for a moment admit that there is even a respectable show of even a seeming demonstration that God cannot prevent, or that it may be that he cannot prevent sin, without the destruction of moral agency. The alleged demonstration, as we have seen, is that since moral agents must have power to sin, to suppose them prevented from sinning, supposes them dispossessed of the power which makes them moral agents—which is to suppose that moral agents are not moral agents—a contradiction, the accomplishment of which is beyond the range of power.

This could not assume even the look of a demonstration in the view of one who did not overlook distinctions which Dr. Taylor elsewhere and abundantly makes. It is one thing to have the power to sin in every sense requisite to moral agency—that is, the power to commit sin, if the agent is pleased to do it. It is quite another, that it should not be made certain that he will not exercise this power in sinning. The former by no means involves the latter. But unless it supposes the latter, it is unavailing to support the conclusion built upon it. Has not the Most High consummate powers of moral agency? Yet does not the holiness of his nature make it so certain that he will never do evil, that it is declared without hyperbole, that he cannot deny himself, and that it is impossible for him to lie? Are not the holy angels and glorified saints free moral agents? And is it not made certain that they will never sin without infringement of their moral agency? Will not the saints on earth be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation without infringement of their moral agency? There is no contradiction then in supposing that it may be made certain that a being who has the power to sin will not sin—*i. e.* should be prevented from sinning without prejudice to his freedom.* What freedom can be conceived but that of

* This whole conception of freedom as involving in its very nature, a state of equilibration between good and evil, and so a liability to contrary and sinful choices is a superficial, empirical induction from the phenomena of our fallen state. It is contradictory to the normal and rational idea of freedom as it is realized in the most perfect moral agents. For God, for holy angels, for man

doing or choosing as he pleases? Would it lend any new finish or grace to moral agency, to suppose him endowed with a mysterious uncontrollable property of doing or choosing the contrary of what he pleases, or would he be in any manner responsible for the actings of such a power—a whit more so, than for the beatings of his pulse? And is it a contradiction that it should be made certain what it will please a moral agent freely to choose and do? Cannot God do his pleasure among the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of earth, without impairing their moral agency? At all events, what has been done, it can be no contradiction in the nature of things to do. The contradictions which are no objects of power, are in the expressive phrase of Dr. Taylor, "mere thought-things," whose actual existence is neither possible nor conceivable. The making it certain that free-agents will use their freedom in a given way is alike conceivable, possible, and actual.

2. The ground we have taken is fully sanctioned by Dr. Taylor himself. In arguing the universality of God's purposes, (which must inevitably be subverted by the hypothesis we have been refuting,) he says, "who can doubt that physical propensities may be so strong toward a given action or course of action, and the motives or temptations so powerful, that such action will be certain? But if this may be so in one case, it may be in all . . . None will deny that the voluntary acts of the Divine being are certain, nor that the divine nature is the ground of such certainty. Is it not equally undeniable, that there is in the nature of things a ground or reason why a being of such a nature as God, chooses and acts in every instance as he does choose and act? If so, then the real ground or reason of the certainty of his acts is substantially

restored to heavenly perfection, evil has no attractions. There is in them no oscillation or equipoise between sin and holiness. Perfect freedom even up to the point of perfect spontaneity on the one hand, and immovable continuance in good on the other, are different phases of the same moral perfection The very fact of a propensity to wrong, having power to act upon the will so as to produce any hesitancy in it between good and evil, or to render an evil choice practicable, is itself a symptom of an inward lapse from perfect rectitude. This view was one of the strong points made by Augustine against Pelagius.

the same with what we affirm to be the ground or reason of the certainty of human action . . . God in this respect made man in his own image." Vol. ii. p. 313. "Every one who acts voluntarily or as a free agent, knows why he acts as he does. But whatever be the reason why one acts in a given manner, is the reason of the certainty of such action. Now that this is a matter of human consciousness, supersedes the necessity of further argument." Pp. 314, 315. "If it be asked, what gives this certainty of the wrong moral action, we may, or may not be able to assign some one antecedent as the cause, ground or reason of this certainty in all cases. It may be the nearness of the inferior good, or it may be the peculiar vividness of the mind's view of it, or it may be any one of many other possible circumstances." Vol. i. p. 195. But is it not clear that all these antecedents which fix the certainty of moral action right or wrong, are within the control of the Most High? And so far as we can see, might they not have been so shaped as to prevent all sin? Is it then asked why he did not prevent it? We do not know. We can only say, "even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight!" Dr. Taylor says, "it is vain, and worse than in vain, to cry out '*mystery*,' in answer to Atheists who plead the existence of evil against the being of God." Be it so. We yet deem it safer, more reverent, and more likely to benefit even Atheists, than to deny God's sovereign power over moral agents.

3. Dr. Taylor's ethical scheme is utterly inconsistent with this alleged power to act, despite all opposing power. As has been abundantly shown, it is part of this scheme that nothing can be an object of choice but happiness or the means of happiness. Nothing can be an inward spring or source of volition but self-love, or the desire of happiness. If this be so, how plain is it that those objects must be chosen which are deemed most conducive to happiness in preference to all others. Suppose two objects offered to the mind's election. One is deemed more, the other less conducive to happiness. That by which the former differs from the latter, therefore, is its tendency to happiness. According to this scheme, therefore, it must be chosen, or else choice is made without a motive. What becomes

then of this stupendous power of contrary choice, with power to act despite all opposing power?*

Our readers have, of course, already seen that the plenary ability of sinners to perfectly keep the whole law, is implied and expressed in the parts of the treatise we have already considered. But as this is a chief feature of his scheme, to which in various ways other parts are subsidiary; as the author deemed it indispensable to the due power of the gospel for parrying the cavils of sceptics and unconverted men; as he avows himself most unmistakably in the statement of his own dogma of ability, and in denunciation of the theology of the whole church on this subject, his deliverances upon it deserve more special attention. The following passage reveals his mind with emphasis.

"And here I am constrained to ask, whether in all this theology both Catholic and Protestant, theologians in maintaining the doctrines of grace, have not extensively maintained opinions—philosophical dogmas, unscriptural principles—and held them as essential doctrines of the word of God, which are palpably inconsistent with, and utterly subversive of, God's authority as a lawgiver? Without referring to more remote incongruities on this subject, may it not be said to be a prevalent doctrine of the Christian church from the time of Augus-

* We find at the end of a recent volume, entitled "Evil not from God," by John Young, LL.D., of Edinburgh, and republished in this country by Mason Brothers, of New York, the following note. "While these sheets were going through the press, the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for last January, was shown to me by a friend. Amongst others, there is an article on sin, containing a review of a recent work by Dr. Squiers, of America. That work it is my misfortune never to have seen. But it delights me to learn from the review that in one point, the impreventability of sin, Dr. Squiers maintains the view which is put forth in this volume." This is a book of vastly higher ability than that which it refers to as authority. The theory in question has often appeared in past ages, and has as often been repudiated by the church. It is amusing to see these sepulchred heresies unearthed from time to time, and given forth, in all simplicity, as new discoveries. Especially is it amusing to see Transatlantic writers referring to obscure authors in this country, who feebly reflect the opinions which have been alternately broached and refuted by our ablest divines for thirty years, as if they had been equally fortunate with themselves in discovering a new principle in theology, and were lending to it the weight of their authority.

tine, and emphatically in the two great divisions of the Reformed church, known as the Calvinistic and Arminian, that 'God commands what man *cannot* perform;' 'that man by the fall lost all ability of will to anything spiritually good;' 'that God did not lose his right to command, though man lost his power to obey?' 'The error of Pelagius is, not that he maintained man's ability to obey God without grace, but that man does *actually* obey God without grace." Vol. ii. p. 132.*

Before proceeding farther, we remark just here,

1. The foregoing is an explicit admission, nay, charge, that the doctrine of man's inability without grace to obey God, is and has been the settled and universal faith of the Christian church. It is, therefore, one of the fixed cardinal doctrines of Christianity, which if anything can, may be regarded and treated as past dispute among Christians, and not fairly to be called in question, except among outsiders.

2. Is it not absurd to assert that a doctrine is utterly subversive of God's authority as a lawgiver, which confessedly has been embraced by the whole Christian church, all the good and holy of earth, all who have recognized and obeyed his authority as a lawgiver? Ought not this decisive fact to suggest to a considerate inquirer that he probably misconceives the doctrine in its import and influence, before he ventures such unmitigated denunciation of it? Is not this proof that it is not so evidently monstrous and repugnant to the intuitive convictions of men, as he maintains?

3. In view of the foregoing, and other statements, we not only regret with his eulogist, Dr. Dutton, that Dr. Taylor should have spent so much of his "precious time" in trying to show his orthodoxy according to the symbols of the church. We are astounded at the courage which could have attempted it.

Dr. Taylor founds much on the statement of the divine law as given by Christ, as "measuring man's duty by his ability,"

* We suspect that Pelagius would hardly have troubled himself to combat such a doctrine as this. Let any one study Neander's analysis and exposition of the Pelagian controversy, in its doctrinal issues, and the inner spirit and aim of Pelagius and Augustin, and he will find himself in little doubt as to the respective sides with which our American New and Old-Schools respectively class. See *Neander's Church History, Torry's translation*, vol. ii. pp. 5, 64, 626.

when it says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself." Vol. ii. p. 7. This argument is put in a variety of forms elsewhere. His plausible exegesis of this is that it requires man "to love God as much as he can love him." P. 137. That it means all our capacity of love absolutely considered is one thing. Our ability to direct this entire absolute capacity of love upon a particular object for which we have a dislike, is another matter. Suppose that one should command another to love a neighbour whom he abhors with all his heart, mind and strength. If he "loves him as much as he can love him," *i. e.* not at all, or slightly, does he come up to the meaning of the precept? Does he love him with all his heart? As we have already intimated, this command makes ability the measure of obligation, only so far as the absolute capacity of loving at all is concerned. It does not require men to love with angelic faculties. It requires that amount of love which he would be capable of, were he not disabled by his sin. But it does not recognize as the love of all the heart, mind and strength, such affection as a sinful unrenewed heart can render to God. Can the carnal mind, which is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be*, love God with all the heart, mind, soul and strength? But wherein lies its disability? Simply in its condition of enmity against God, *i. e.* its sin. The inability of the unrenewed soul is its sin. God requires nothing which we could not perform, if our sin did not disable us. Our sinful lusts enslave us. Are they their own excuse? or do they excuse the non-performance of duties to which we should be adequate without them, or do they annul God's right to command the discharge of such duties?

This inability which all Christendom asserts in its creeds, its literature, and still more strongly in its devotions, is simply the inability of sin to conquer and extirpate itself. Of this inability every awakened man is intimately conscious. And he is no less conscious that he is culpable just in proportion to the rooted, invincible strength of his sinful lusts. Dr. Taylor is good authority for the principle that speculation weighs nothing against consciousness. But it is claimed that man is conscious

of power to will either way as he pleases. This is not denied. But sin lies deeper in the soul than these merely phenomenal acts of what is here called will, even in the covetings, the lusts, desires of the flesh and the mind—the HEART. Who does not know that he cannot expel or mortify the deceitful lusts of his soul, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, covetousness, ambition, wordliness, ungodliness, by merely willing to do it? that when he *would* do good evil is present with him? Who does not know that he cannot, by a mere act of will, or by any power within himself, or by any resource short of supernatural grace, fill his soul with faith, love, hope and joy in God? But what Christian is insensible that he ought to have these feelings and affections, and that it is his sin to be partially or wholly destitute of them? That the affections and desires are not immediately under the control of the will is indeed admitted by Dr. Taylor himself. Speaking of other objects besides God, he says, "man cannot extinguish all affection in his heart for each and all of them." Vol. ii. p. 192. Indeed, his whole theory of the will implies its inability to overcome and extinguish that "self-love or desire of happiness," which he maintains prompts and determines all voluntary action. But it may be said that these affections, which it cannot suppress, are innocent. That is another matter. Still it proves none the less the impotence of the will to control the affections, and the certainty that the affections—the deeper seat of moral character, as we maintain—control the will. Let one whose soul cleaveth to the dust, will that his affections shall be set on things above. Does this volition set them there, *propriis viribus?*

Dr. Taylor, however, represents all the appetencies of the soul which are not acts or products of will in the narrow sense of a power of choosing between two objects, as "constitutional susceptibilities" to good from different objects, in themselves void of moral character. Accordingly he says, "if it be said that God in regeneration gives man *the power* to will morally right, or to obey, or produces some other constitutional change in the mind, called a *new taste* or *relish*, diverse from right moral action; I answer, that to create any new mental power or property, is not to produce a new moral character, nor that which necessarily ensures such a character; that such

a change in man is never taught in the Scriptures; and further, the Scriptures have not only never taught that man is unable to do his duty perfectly, *i. e.* to act morally right, but the contrary, in the express terms of the divine law," etc. Vol. ii. p. 21. We regret that this, and all else that we have quoted from the first thirty pages of the second volume, is from a lecture, written as the editor informs us, only six months before his death. The words taste and relish were used by Dr. Dwight and some others to denote what has been commonly indicated by disposition, principle, habit, or by affection and inclination. But they are in no sense "constitutional." It is, no doubt, a property of the human constitution to have some tastes or dispositions. But their being towards good or evil, holiness or sin, God or the world, is not "constitutional." Human nature —the human constitution—remains in its essential properties and faculties, whether any given dispositions which are accidents of it, be present or absent. And is it to be seriously maintained by a Christian theologian, that no such relish, taste, or disposition is wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost in regeneration, disposing and empowering it to holy exercises, of affection and of choice? On what pretext can it be denied, in the face of those manifold declarations of Scripture, which speak of God's giving, creating a new heart, shedding abroad his love in the heart by the Holy Ghost, of his quickening those dead in trespasses and sins; of our being his workmanship, created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works; of our being born of God, born of the Spirit, etc.? Do not these and innumerable other passages assert a work of God's Spirit in the soul, disposing and enabling it to obey the gospel? It is to no purpose to say, as our author does, that regeneration is a moral change, and therefore must be an act of the will of the subject of it; that the love of God shed abroad in the heart is an act of the person loving, that if God works in us to will and to do, we will and do. Pp. 20, 21. That there cannot be a change in our moral state which is not an act of our own will is the very thing to be proved, not taken for granted. That we love is true; but this is in consequence of God's putting in us the disposition or heart to love. And we will and do what is pleasing to him, when he works in us that disposition

which inclines and enables us thereunto. The truth is, Dr. Taylor and his adherents persistently confound regeneration and conversion—the work of God renewing the soul with the act of man, flowing from this renovated state, in which he believes, repents, turns to God, and does works meet for repentance. Surely when men are turned they repent. When God gives faith, they believe. When he begets them unto a lively hope, they rejoice in hope. This is something far higher than Dr. Taylor represents it—"no other than a change by a sinful moral being, of his own moral character." P. 22. Nor is it, as he would have us understand, "to transform the trees of the forest, or the stones of the street, into moral agents; or to change the physical properties, or physical laws of things created—things, including man himself, pronounced by their Creator to be very good." P. 23. Such language exposes nothing but its author's ignorance of orthodox doctrine. It is not trees or stones, upon which God puts forth this "working of his mighty power," but rational, voluntary, sinful, immortal men. Nor does he make them herein moral agents. They are such already, although "corrupt according to deceitful lusts." Nor are the physical, or other laws of man's being changed. This change, though supernatural, is not a miracle contravening the laws of nature; it is wrought in harmony with the laws of our corporeal and spiritual, our rational and voluntary nature. Much less does it change aught that God pronounced very good. It simply eliminates the corruption and blight with which man's sin has degraded and deformed that which God pronounced very good. It does not create new "constitutional" faculties which did not before exist—faculties of intellect, sensibility or will, in which sense Dr. Taylor often uses the word "power"—but it removes the moral vitiosity, which disorders and depraves the action of these faculties, whereby they are "indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good."

Truth is very apt to assert itself even in the thought and speech of those who impugn it. The doctrine of the church has been that sin is self-perpetuating. "He that committeth sin is the servant of sin," and can only be liberated from his bondage, even though it be a willing bondage, by Divine grace.

Dr. Taylor describes the "selfish preference," as "alike ceaseless in its activity and duration." Vol. i. p. 28. He maintains that the moral agent is called upon "to choose God, or an inferior good as his portion *once for all.* The transgressor does in his first act of sin become *ipso facto*, an eternal rebel against God." Vol. ii. pp. 230, 231. Again: "It is true indeed, that the natural man, the man enthralled by grovelling appetite and passion, discerneth not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them. Such a man under such a mental tyranny, must be a miserable interpreter of the lively oracles of God. His very intellect, by the bad dominion of this state of mind, is not only unfurnished with the first principles, the very elements of successful interpretation, but is stupefied and cramped as to all vigorous action on such subjects. The soul's constitutional discernment is peculiarly blunted in respect to the beauty, and weight, and excellence of Divine realities, and disqualified for that perception which is necessary to give them their practical influence. In this state of sinful enthralment, the man cannot appreciate, nor apprehend, nor successfully judge of the things of God's revelation." *Ib.* p. 216. To our view, there is more of vital truth in this simple statement than in all the rest of his toilsome reasonings about ability. We only wonder at his life-long efforts to rear a fabric which he so unceremoniously strikes down at a single blow.

Of course, the denial of native sinfulness and of all sin, until the age of developed moral agency, when the moral agent can see the consequences of his act to the happiness or misery of sentient being, is implied in the theories we have been considering. But as this topic is not emphasised or elaborated in these volumes, we omit specific comment upon it.

On no subject is Dr. Taylor more earnest or denunciatory of standard theologians, than atonement, justification, and connected topics. We have already seen features of his ethical system, which must of themselves undermine the doctrine of the church on this subject. If there is no good but happiness and the means thereof, no evil but misery and the means thereof; if holiness has no intrinsic desert of approbation and favour, and sin no intrinsic demerit; if God's moral government is administered solely for the purpose of accomplishing

the highest happiness of the universe, requiring obedience and prohibiting disobedience, solely as a means to this end; if the innocent, without their own consent, and the guilty might rightly be made to change places as to reward and punishment, provided this would enhance the happiness of the sentient universe; if justice is only a specific form of benevolence; of course, the very fundamental ideas on which the received doctrine in regard to Christ's atonement rest, and by which alone it can be explained, are utterly subverted.

We have no space for a minute examination of Dr. Taylor's positions on this subject. His theory, with some modifications, is the governmental scheme introduced by the younger Edwards. The distinctive characteristic of this scheme is, that it treats the atonement exclusively as a device of state, to render the pardon of penitent believers consistent with the authority of law, and the highest happiness of the universe, and not at all as a provision required by the inherent turpitude and ill-desert of sin in discharge of the demand of justice, and the threatening of the law. The scheme is reasoned out mostly on the principles which underlie human governments, between which and the government of the infinite God there is a partial analogy, and, at the same time, an immense difference. The very idea of satisfaction for sin seems abhorrent to Dr. Taylor, and he devotes pages to the denunciation of it, or rather to a figment of his own imagination than to any recognized idea which this term is employed to indicate. He reasons that the claim of the law is obedience, and that this can never be satisfied in case of disobedience. "It is inconceivable and impossible, that a perfectly benevolent lawgiver should be *satisfied* with sin, and with the infliction of the legal penalty on transgressors, as a substitute for their perfect obedience and consequent perfect blessedness." Vol. ii. p. 141. Is it really necessary to say, that it is no part of the doctrine of satisfaction that God is satisfied with sin? It is because he abhors it, that when it is committed the very rectitude of his nature impels him to manifest that abhorrence by visiting upon it its proper deserts of indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish. If it go unpunished, if it be treated like innocence and virtue, our intuitive judgment is that injustice is done, that there is a lesion in the moral

system, a derangement of moral relations. The criminality of sin, of course, cannot be obliterated. The only possible compensation or reparation of the evil of it is punishment. This justice demands. Without it, it is unsatisfied. So the law—the articulate expression of eternal justice—is not satisfied with sin; but if sin be committed, it is unsatisfied without the infliction of the penalty it denounces. This punishment the sinner owes to the law and justice of God, to him and his kingdom wronged by his sin. So it is due *from* him. He deserves it. So it is *to* him. The claim of justice is satisfied with its infliction, and with nothing else, certainly not with the sin which deserves it. So it is styled a debt, *i. e.* a thing due. Satisfaction in this sense is rendered when this penalty is discharged, either by the offender or a satisfactory substitute. These conceptions harmonize with the representations of Scripture. It tells us of every transgression receiving its just *recompense of reward*, Heb. ii. 2; that it is a righteous thing in God to *recompense* tribulation to them that trouble his people, 2 Thess. i. 6; that he will recompense; that he will repay fury to his enemies, Isa. lix. 18; vengeance is mine, I will *repay*, saith the Lord, Rom. xii. 19. If such language does not import the intrinsic ill-desert of sin, and that God will visit upon it the penal recompense which is its due, then it seems to us impossible for language to express these ideas.

Consonant with this is the constant representation in the Scriptures of the effect and intent of Christ's death. They tell us that he suffered the just for the unjust; that for the transgression of God's people he was stricken; that he bare our sins, and became sin and a curse for us; that he purchased, redeemed, ransomed us with his own blood. If these phrases do not import that he bore the punishment, and discharged the obligation to, or debt of suffering, which our sin had incurred, then how can language do it? And why did he this? "That God might be JUST, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Dr. Taylor allows himself to say more than once, that the punishment of sin on account of its intrinsic demerit, or for any purpose except the promotion of happiness, is "beyond the capacity of infernal malice." Vol. ii. p. 278. And is it "more than infernal malice" to render to sin its just

recompense of reward? If it be wicked to punish sin for its intrinsic demerit, can it be right to punish it for the public good—to do that which is in itself evil, that good may come?

But not only does Dr. Taylor say that God cannot be satisfied with sin, which, in the sense of approving it, we know to be impossible; he indicates that God cannot be "satisfied with such results of a moral government," as are finally developed under the present administration; that sin "impairs his blessedness," that he has been "crossed and thwarted in this highest, greatest design by sin." *Ib.* pp. 142, 146, 147. We shrink from this limitation of the power and blessedness of God. Our God hath done whatsoever he pleased—his counsel shall stand and he will do all his pleasure. Even the Eternal Son, after all the crying and tears of his earthly agony, shall see of the travail of his soul and be SATISFIED. He is blessed over all, for ever. Even to dwell at his right hand, is to receive the fulness of joy evermore. What! are the grasshoppers of earth, the nations that are less than nothing and vanity, to thwart the designs and impair the blessedness of their Maker? Is this the God of the Bible, and our God?

Dr. Taylor thus portrays the orthodox scheme of atonement and justification:

"It maintains that God, in his sovereign supremacy and right, constitutes a mystical union between Christ and the elect whereby they are *one moral person!* That in consequence of this constituted union, God imputes the sins of the elect to Christ, and in his sufferings and death inflicts the legal penalty of their sins on him; that he also imputes the righteousness of Christ to them; that by these acts of imputation and mystical union, the sins of the elect become as really the sins of Christ as if he had committed them, and the righteousness and obedience of Christ become as really the righteousness and obedience of the elect, as had they rendered it; that thus every justified sinner is regarded, and considered and treated, not merely *as if he had*, but as having really and truly—in *re ipsa*—in his own person never sinned, but perfectly obeyed the divine law; and thus every justified sinner having in actual verity fully met and satisfied and sustained every claim of law

and justice, can *meritoriously* claim, before God, justification and eternal life." Vol. ii. pp. 155, 156.

Dr. Taylor is unsparing in his invectives against the scheme above misstated. He speaks of "sovereign acts of necromancy, called constituting a mystical union, imputation," p. 173; of "the mystical absurdity of imputing and thereby making the righteousness or obedience of one subject of law, which could only satisfy the claim of law on himself, the righteousness or obedience of others," p. 144; of its making "known phantasms realities, and known realities phantasms." "Can an all-perfect lawgiver by sovereign prerogative make eternal truth falsehood, and eternal falsehood truth? Can he by sheer despotic authority set at defiance, transmute, abolish every principle of eternal immutable rectitude, and substitute its opposite in the actual administration of his government? Can he by his mere *sic volo* make myriads of beings one being, and yet each to retain his personal individuality—make one perfectly holy being to *deserve* the legal penalty due only to these sinful myriads, and make these sinful myriads perfectly righteous by the perfect righteousness of one, regard such an exploit and its effects as a reality, proceed to adjudicate the retributions of eternity on the basis of such transmutations, and yet reign in the glory of his justice and in the majesty of his authority?"

"Some may think that to ascribe such views and opinions to wise and good men requires an apology . . . I have no apology to make for these representations, except my own full conviction of their truth." Pp. 160, 161. By these weapons, and the stereotyped cavil that if the penalty of sin be discharged by Christ, there is no grace in the forgiveness of the sinner, twisted into manifold forms, and hurled with remorseless violence at the explicitly enounced doctrine of the symbols of the church, and as we think may be easily shown, of Scripture—the mystical union of believers with Christ, the imputation of his righteousness to them and of their sins to him are assailed. Our principal object is to show Dr. Taylor's attitude and animus unmistakably. While an entire article or volume might easily be written in reply to his extended arguments, our limits constrain us to the briefest possible refutation. This

will be for the most part accomplished by correcting his misrepresentations of the scheme on which he heaps such unmeasured obloquy.

1. He says that the mystical union he opposes makes Christ and believers "one moral person." If this phrase is used literally, the word *moral* is a pleonasm. A person *ex vi termini* is a moral being. But what is charged is that "mystical union" involves the contradiction that a plurality of persons are made numerically one person. What author or authors may have represented Christ and his people to be one person we know not—although we recollect some phrases quite analogous in Crisp and other Antinomian extremists—but we do not now remember such phraseology in standard divines or confessions. If used at all, by standard theologians, it is used in a metaphorical not a literal sense—a use for which we have the authority of Dr. Taylor himself, in an analogous but much weaker case of mutual relationship. He says, "as a matter of convenience in the use of language, we may conceive of the public or a community as a moral person." Vol. ii. p. 266. Surely no Christian will deny that the union between Christ and his people is more intimate and profound than that between the members of a civil community. And suppose that the advocates of mystical union had been unfortunate in their illustrations, is this more than what often happens with regard to important truths, or does it in any manner impair the overwhelming proofs of such union? There is not merely the natural union in that he took part of our nature of flesh and blood, and is our brother; not merely the federal union whereby he stipulates for us as our surety and with us that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish but have everlasting life; there is the mystical union constituted by the Holy Spirit, which dwelt in him without measure, dwelling in and vitalizing his people with a spiritual life, common to him and them, so that he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit: Christ is our life; he liveth in us; we are quickened together with him; he is the vine, we are the branches; he the head and we his body, yea, members of his body, his flesh and his bones. One form in which it is shadowed forth, is the marvellous union of husband and wife, whereby, "they two become one flesh." Let those who will,

stigmatize this mystical union between Christ and his church as a "mystical absurdity." It is the well-spring of our salvation and the life of our life. To us it is a great mystery. We speak concerning Christ and his church. Eph. v. 32.

2. Dr. Taylor sets forth that imputation implies that the "sins of the elect become the sins of Christ as really as had he committed them," and in like manner the righteousness and obedience of Christ become those of the elect. This language may mean more or less. But it is fitted and probably designed to convey the impression that imputation implies the contradiction that the moral acts and dispositions, whether good or evil, of one person, become those of another person; or are regarded and considered as those of another person, inherently. Now is it necessary to iterate for the thousandth time, that imputation means to reckon to the account, as a ground of judgment and treatment, not the transfer or infusion of personal qualities? Let any one examine his Bible from beginning to end, and he will find that the word *impute* always has and must have this meaning, and the words translated impute, are sometimes translated by the equivalent terms, "count," "reckon to the account of." "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Does not "impute" here speak its own meaning, which is not to transfer or infuse, but reckon to the account of? "The blessedness of the man unto whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works." Does this mean the communication of inherent righteousness? Or does it not mean, most indubitably, reckon righteousness to his account as a basis of judicial treatment? Whose or what righteousness? The man's own? How then can it be without works? Is it no righteousness at all? This is the contrary of what is affirmed. What is it then but the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe—that obedience of one by which many are made righteous? That righteousness of one which is to all men (who believe) for justification of life? This does not make his righteousness ours, morally or inherently; but ours only in its title to reward, or as a ground of justification. As well might it be said, when a surety pays the debt of his principal, either that the money with which it is discharged is the money of the principal, or

that it is not counted to him as a discharge of his debt; or that when a father pays a fine which his son has incurred by crime, and procures his discharge, the son really paid it, because it is reckoned to his account as if he had paid it; that thus "known phantasms are made realities, and known realities are made phantasms." Imputation in the above sense is plainly and undeniably taught in the Scriptures, word and thing. In this sense and no other, it is taught in our Protestant confessions, and by standard theologians. In this sense *the thing* enters into the faith, the spiritual life of the church, and is the foundation of her hope, whatever may become of the word. With a grief which we cannot express do we find the teachers of the teachers in Israel tasking powers worthy of a nobler service, to impugn and defame it.

And the demonstration from Scripture in regard to the imputation of the sins of believers to Christ is no less cogent. It is certain that he bare the sins of many; that knowing no sin he became sin for us; that on him was laid the iniquity of us all. How? By becoming morally sinful, or having our sins transfused into him, so that he partook of their moral taint and pollution? This will not be said. How then, unless they were reckoned to his account as a ground of his bearing their penalty in our place? Is it said this is unjust? So it would be, unless done with his full and free consent. Is it said, as Dr. Taylor maintains, that it is even then unjust to punish him as ill deserving? So it would be, if he were punished as morally ill-deserving. But if he assumes to himself voluntarily another's just obligation to punishment, out of love to him, what then? Or if this be assailed as unjust, what shall be said of the scheme substituted in its place, wherein all this fearful anguish, at which earth shuddered and the heavens darkened, was inflicted without regard to any sin inherent or imputed? If that is injustice, is not this the climax of injustice? But we cannot follow these tortuous cavils. The controversy is not with us, but with the word of God. Thither we remand the adversaries of imputed righteousness. Besides, whoever else may offer the old Socinian objection, that in this scheme innocence and sin change places, it is not for those who maintain the doctrine of expediency; who ask, as we have

already seen, and in a way which implies the absence of doubt, if "absolute and universal misery would follow, unless the innocent were to be punished, would it not be right to make innocence, now become the true and necessary cause of such results, the ground of punishment?" And are such theologians to charge the doctrine that Christ suffered penally, as voluntarily standing in the law-place of his people, and for their sins as having taken them upon himself, with confounding moral distinctions?

It will be said by some, that this explanation of imputation assimilates it essentially with the views of those who deny it, since they hold that sinners are treated as if they were righteous for Christ's sake. But the ground of the treatment is very different in the two cases. Imputed righteousness is quite different from mere putative or imaginary righteousness. It is a real righteousness reckoned to us, of which we have the eternal benefit. Trusting in this, we build on a sure foundation. On this our salvation rests secure without infringement of the law, justice, or holiness of God, but supported by these as well as by his love and mercy. In the other case, it is founded neither on our own righteousness, nor the righteousness of another imputed to us. It is in conflict with the law and justice of God which are both unsatisfied. In the one, mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. In the other we have the mercy and the peace, but where is the truth and the righteousness? But can there be a doubt, which sets the strongest foundations of mercy and peace, or to which a trembling sinner will most joyfully commit his perishing soul?

As to the objection, that if justice is satisfied, there is no grace in the sinner's pardon, put in endless forms, it has been answered a thousand times. It was mercy that provided a ransom for him, so that he could be saved without infringement of justice. Is it any the less mercy, because at a stupendous sacrifice it saves its object, without compromising the perfections, the law, the glory of God? Although it becomes righteous and just in God, to exercise forgiving mercy towards those for whom Christ has purchased it, and to whose faith he has stipulated it; is God any the less gracious because he is just,

while he justifieth him that believeth in Jesus? Is grace any the less grace because it "reigns through righteousness?" On this subject it is enough to quote from a document once, if not now required to be subscribed by the Professor of Theology in Yale College, a passage, nearly every sentence of which expresses what is vigorously impugned in these volumes: "Christ by his obedience and death did fully discharge the debt of all those that are justified, and did by the sacrifice of himself in the blood of his cross, undergoing in their stead the penalty due unto them, make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to God's justice in their behalf; yet inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for anything in them, their justification is only of free grace, that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners." *Confession of Faith of the Churches of Connecticut, adopted at Saybrook, A. D.* 1708, chap. xi. 3.

> Here the whole Deity is known,
> Nor dares a creature guess,
> Which of the glories brightest shone,
> The justice or the grace.

Dr. Taylor objects to this scheme, that according to it "the sinner can *meritoriously* claim before God, justification and eternal life." On the strength of whose merits? His own? Never. It is the merits of Christ then. Can any but a Socinian fairly complain of this? Or will any evangelical theologian venture to do it? But it is a "claim." How, and in what sense? Is it anything else than a claim founded on the merits of Christ, and in view thereof warranted to every believer by the infallible promise of God? And may not we poor sinners "lay this humble claim" for the salvation of Christ? If we may not, then wo is us—we are for ever without hope!

And what does Dr. Taylor give us as a refuge from sin, and the curse, in place of the strong tower which he would demolish? In order to escape the judicial relations of Christ's atonement, and consequent imputation, much of the second volume is devoted to proving that the law of God is a "rule of action

but not of judgment." What sort of a law is that which is not a rule of judgment? Is it any law at all, or mere advice? Says Dr. Taylor, "any view of God's sovereignty, of mystical union, of imputation or atonement, which separates from God's perfect law, its penal sanction in respect to a transgressor, annihilates that law for the transgressor's benefit." Vol. ii. p. 172. What hope then remains for the transgressor, unless that penalty can be discharged by an Almighty substitute and surety? This and all other merely governmental schemes say that Christ's sufferings serve the same purpose in the support of law and government, which would be answered by the eternal punishment of penitent believers; and that hence the sin of the latter can be remitted. But does not this separate "God's perfect law from its penal sanction in respect to the transgressor?" And how do Christ's sufferings sustain the violated law, unless they vicariously discharge the justified sinner's obligations to the law? The "absurdities and contradictions" of every kind, which Dr. Taylor so lavishly charges upon the church theology, find their true home and birth-place in his own.

There are various other eccentric theories advanced by Dr. Taylor, which appear to be maintained chiefly for the purpose of giving consistency to his cardinal doctrine, that benevolence as the means of promoting happiness is the only virtue; and that the penalty of endless punishment for sin is defensible, because benevolence requires the visitation of the highest possible misery upon sin as the antagonist of the greatest happiness. Nothing less would prove God's benevolence; hence his fitness to reign; hence prove his authority and establish his government. Punishment, we are taught, consists exclusively in natural evil or suffering, and the utmost possible degree of it. Vol. i. p. 160, *et seq.* Therefore spiritual death is not penal. Neither is temporal death, even under a legal dispensation, except as it is a beginning and constituent part of eternal wo. Vol. ii. p. 225, *et seq.* A long disquisition is written to show that no civil punishment except death is a legal sanction. P. 367, *et seq.* The robber who is punished, but not capitally, "is considered and treated as essentially an obedient subject. He is not considered as actuated by a

principle hostile to the welfare and existence of the state, nor as disobedient to the supreme law of the state. P. 377. The only degrees of punishment which this system admits, result from the varying capacity of the subject, not from variations in the positive infliction of penalty proportioned to varying demerit. Vol. i. p. 163.

These and other like crudities ground out by subtle logic from one-sided premises, we must leave to dispose of themselves. It is this process of twisting familiar words and phrases, which bear an established and recognized meaning, to be the vehicles of his peculiar philosophy, which has caused much of the difficulty and embarrassment felt by so many in understanding Dr. Taylor's system. The words justice, due, right, wrong, penalty, legal sanction, good, etc., are illustrations of this, some of them being subjected to an elaborate process of this kind. The difficulty did not arise from any studied reticency, or politic reserve, or from his having an esoteric as distinguished from his exoteric system. Our quotations show, what was so evident to all who knew him, that he was perfectly frank and out-spoken in his opinions. There is no difficulty in understanding his system, for those who are capable of apprehending tenuous distinctions and abstract trains of thought.

We think the foregoing analysis of his system makes it sufficiently evident, why, since it first flowered out in a sudden promise of triumph, it has been steadily withering and dying out of the theological life of our country. As an antidote to the rationalistic revolt of Universalists, Unitarians, and unbelievers generally, against the gospel of God, it is itself too rationalistic. It concedes too much, and endorses too many of their objections to the evangelical system. Instead of disarming them, it puts weapons into their armoury. Rationalism will not yield to a lower potency of itself. It rather feels itself endorsed and largely invigorated by the new theology, and instead of conceding to it, boasts of it as a substantial victory.*

Apologetics constitute an important side of theology. Still, they are only its outworks. Their proper function is to show that the Bible is the word of God, and as such, entitled to im-

* See Ellis' Half-century of the Unitarian Controversy.

plicit faith and obedience. It may also very properly be shown, that what is thus revealed, is worthy of God, and suited to man. But when we proceed as if we were bound to dispose of all philosophic and sceptical cavils, till the rationalistic mind of unbelief is satisfied, and to rationalize the gospel till this result is achieved, we attempt what is a sheer impossibility, unless we explain away the Gospel itself. We let ourselves down from the high vantage ground of speaking by divine authority, truth which commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God, to the level of mere disputants with the sceptical understanding, which will never want the sagacity to put questions a great deal faster than any body can answer them. Instead of conquering opposition by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, piercing the heart and conscience of adversaries, we lay aside our divine armour, and go to making terms with them in their own way. The dilutions and modifications of the clear teachings of Scripture, for the purpose of conciliating sceptics, have often emasculated it and invigorated them. When divines sink the authoritative in the apologetic aspect of Christianity, nothing is gained; much is lost. We may well ask in regard to some of these attempts, that "Christianity be defended from its defenders."

This system has been steadily losing ground among evangelical Christians, because it rationalizes some of the first moral truths and Christian doctrines into forms that antagonize with the moral and Christian consciousness. This has been all the more so, as the precise points of collision between this system and the older theology have come to be more fully developed, defined and apprehended in this consciousness. The resolving all good, all right, into happiness and the means thereof, and all our inward impulses to action ultimately into self-love, contradicts, and even nauseates, not merely the Christian, but the moral consciousness. The assertion of plenary ability, the denial of any inability which is not innocent, conflicts with the most constant and intimate experience of the Christian, and with manifold representations of the word of God, which are written, sealed, witnessed on the heart, in that experience. The notion that creatures, by virtue of moral agency are, or are liable to be an overmatch for the Almighty, shocks every

reverent feeling, and unsettles the very foundations of confidence in the stability of his throne, and the security of his people and kingdom. The pillars of heaven tremble. The Christian knows that the roots of his sin and of his spiritual life strike deeper than the mere choices of the will, into the desires, covetings, affections and latent dispositions of his soul; and that all achievements of his mere power of choice are perfunctory and unreliable. And he knows that it is in a Saviour who has borne our sins, and taken their curse upon him, in whose righteousness he can stand, and in whose life, by mysterious union to him, he lives, he has peace, hope, holiness and strength, —the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting. Ingenious tirades and hair-splitting cavils against mystical union and imputation are constantly losing the respect of Christian people. We anticipate, therefore, that the publication of these lectures will accelerate and consummate the downfall of the peculiar system they advocate. We say this in no disparagement of their power, acuteness, and even eloquence. They show all these in a degree even unexpected. It is not because they lack ability fully commensurate with the author's fame, but because they reveal clearly and beyond a peradventure what his system is. That system clearly apprehended, the church never has accepted, and never will accept. These volumes will justify, confirm and invigorate the immovable opposition which has so long and decisively arrayed itself against Taylorism.

Much more it is in our hearts to say on this subject, but stern necessity forbids. We will only add, that there are many passages in these lectures in the line of practical application, which are not only highly eloquent, but just. Some of these are majestic and alluring representations of the love of God, fitted to soften hearts of stone. Even in these we miss that fulness of Christ, which wells up from the theology he rejects. They are mostly, however, passages directed to Deists, Universalists, and godless philanthropists, who feign for themselves a God too tenderly benevolent to punish sin, and who ignore or repudiate judgment and eternal retributions. Much sentimentalism and "rose-water philanthropy," are exposed with graphic power, and rebuked with indignant eloquence.

The terrors of the Lord, with other lines of moving appeal, are arrayed with power before the ungodly and thoughtless. It would give us pleasure, if we had room, to transfer some of these passages to our pages. But they are passages having no special relation to his philosophic or theological peculiarities. They would at least, be quite as fully developed from the system he impugns. They are not the new things which are not true; but the true things which are not new. To these we could wish he had devoted himself, instead of developing a new philosophy of moral government by which to explain them. Here lies the fontal source of his errors. And so must it ever be with our human excellency of speech or wisdom. One word which the Holy Ghost speaketh, one ray of divine light shot by him into our sin-darkened souls, is worth more than all that wisdom by which the world never knew God.

We have believed, therefore have we spoken; plainly indeed, but with all that respect for the dead which is consistent with fidelity to the living, and to that, in our view, inestimably precious truth which is attacked in these pages as our readers have seen, in no soft or honeyed phrase. Dr. Taylor has passed beyond these conflicts, and is not under our review. His works are now given to the public for the purpose of moulding its opinions. They are of course on the same footing as other publications, amenable to the bar of impartial and faithful criticism. They compel the defence of what they assail.

ART. V.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly met, agreeably to appointment, in Indianapolis, Indiana, on May 19th, and in the absence of the Rev. Dr. Scott, the Moderator of the preceding Assembly, the Rev. Nathan Rice, D. D., was, on motion of Dr. McGill, chosen to preach the opening sermon, and to preside until a Moderator be chosen. Dr. Rice preached from 2 Cor. v. 7, "We walk by faith, not by sight."

The Stated Clerk reported, that he had received official

information of the organization of ten new Presbyteries, viz. Lewes, which was organized by order of the General Assembly; Potomac, Synod of Baltimore; Roanoke, Synod of Virginia; Omaha, order of Assembly; Western Reserve, Synod of Ohio; Hillsboro', Bloomington, and Saline, Synod of Illinois; and Siam, to be connected with the Synod of Albany. This is a misionary Presbytery in the country of the same name in Asia. These Presbyteries were ordered to be enrolled, and their Commissioners present received.

The Rev. WILLIAM L. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, was unanimously chosen Moderator, and the Rev. J. R. MANN, of New York, Temporary Clerk. Rochester, New York, was selected as the place for the next meeting of the Assembly.

Demission of the Ministry.

The Assembly of 1858 had sent down an overture to the Presbyteries, proposing an additional section to our Book of Discipline, providing that in certain cases a minister in good standing, might be permitted (or required) to demit the exercise of his office. Dr. Rice, as chairman of the Committee to whom the responses of the Presbyteries to this overture were referred, reported that one hundred and seven Presbyteries had replied, of which twenty-two were in the affirmative, and eighty-three in the negative. The overture was, therefore, rejected. Whether this decision expresses the mind of the church as to the whole question of demission, or simply as to the propriety of adopting the particular overture submitted to its judgment, we do not know. We hope the latter. We, although in favour of the recognition of the right and duty, under certain circumstances, of a minister's laying aside his office, should have voted against the adoption of the overture in question, because, as it appeared to us, it was inconsistent with itself, and failed to accomplish the desired end. At some future time, we hope, the question may be submitted to the church in its simple form.

Church Extension.

During the entire period covered by this report, the Committee laboured under great embarrassments, arising from the heavy liabilities with which they began the year, and the unpre-

cedented influx of applications. In 1857–8 only one hundred applications, calling for $45,000, were received; while in 1858–9 there were one hundred and forty-one, calling for about $62,000. These one hundred and forty-one applications were from churches in the bounds of thirty-one Synods, eighty-one Presbyteries, and twenty-nine States and Territories. During the year the applications of thirty-two churches, amounting to $13,370, were stricken from the file, because the applicants had failed within two years to furnish the Committee with the necessary information. There remained on the file, April 1st, 1859, awaiting the receipt of additional facts, ninety-one applications, calling for at least $41,000. Including sixty applications brought forward from the previous year, two hundred and one applications, calling for $87,000, were before the Church Extension Committee, during the twelve months ending April 1st, 1859. Only five applications were declined during the year.

Notwithstanding these embarrassments, God prospered the work of church building, through the Committee, during their fourth fiscal year. Every appropriation was *paid* as soon as it became due without borrowing a dollar. Appropriations amounting to $20,504.90 were thus *paid* to seventy-six churches, or eleven more than during the preceding year. Appropriations amounting to $23,970.15 were *made* to eighty-three churches, or seven more than the year before. These eighty-three churches were in the bounds of thirty Synods, sixty Presbyteries, and twenty-five States and Territories. Apart from special donations, the average appropriation to each church was $239.90. The receipts were $29,342.34, or about $4,600 more than during the previous year. The expenditures were $23,538.68. The liabilities incurred, but not yet fully matured, exceed the means on hand, April 1, 1859, $1,234.41.

The average cost of two hundred and fifty-five different church edifices to which the Committee have voted aid on their own responsibility since July, 1855, is $2,097 each. The average number of members in the different churches aided, is thirty-four to each.

The Committee has continued to distribute the funds entrusted to them, as equitably as possible, over the whole church. In addition to the fact that the eighty-three appropriations of

the fourth fiscal year were scattered over thirty Synods, sixty Presbyteries, and twenty-five States and Territories, another fact ought to be mentioned, viz. that since July, 1855, the Committee have declined to make an appropriation to only *five* of the 280 different churches that have furnished the necessary information. Four of these five asked for sums entirely beyond the ability of the Committee, and one was a Union church.

Your Committee have continually felt it to be very important to obtain a full view of the destitution and wants of the church, in their department of labour. This information they have sought repeatedly, and in different ways. Finding all other methods inadequate, they, during the year under review, addressed a circular to all our churches with whose condition they were unacquainted. This circular contained, among others, the following inquiries, viz. Does your church own a house of worship sufficient for its present wants, and free from debt? In building your house of worship, (if you have one,) did you obtain aid outside of your own community? If you are without a suitable church edifice, can you secure one without the aid of the church at large? The replies we have received, and the information we have derived from other reliable sources, enable us to report the condition of two thousand two hundred and sixty-seven churches, or of about *two-thirds* of the whole number of churches now in connection with the General Assembly. Of these 2275 churches, five hundred and fifty-three, or nearly one in four, have no house of worship. Twenty-six churches worship in Union houses; one hundred and sixty-eight report their houses of worship as insufficient for their present wants; one hundred and ninety are in debt; seven hundred and seventy-seven had aid from abroad in building their church edifices; and three hundred and seventy-three cannot build without aid from the church at large. We have the names of all these different churches on file in our office.

These simple but startling facts show, more clearly than anything else, the magnitude of the Church Extension work, and we commend them to the earnest attention of the Assembly and the church.

Secretary Coe addressed the Assembly, asking, Will this

Committee likely be able to supply all reasonable demands of the church in the manner for which they were created? He thought it would, for there has been a constant healthful advance in the contributions of the churches—in the first year about $10,000, the second $23,000, the third $25,000, and the present year about $30,000. This work systematizes the contributions of the church, and turns them to the best account.

In four years 275 churches have been aided at an average cost of $2,097 each. Such a work seems greatly needed, for about one hundred new churches are organized every year; and out of 2,267 edifices belonging to our church, 937 are more or less crippled by debt, or in insufficient houses. The churches aided lie about equally north and south of Indianapolis.

The Rev. H. J. Van Dyke introduced the usual series of resolutions in the commendation of the Committee, and of the important work to which their labours are devoted. These resolutions were supported by the Rev. Dr. Palmer and the Rev. W. W. McNair. Mr. Van Dyke then proposed another resolution, intended to restrict the application of feeble churches to the Committee on Church Extension, and to discountenance the solicitations of aid for special enterprises. The Presbyteries of New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Allegheny City, had sent up memorials calling the attention of the Assembly to this subject. This resolution gave rise to an animated and protracted debate, and was finally rejected. As might be expected, the pastors and churches to whom these applications are made, were in general disposed to urge the adoption of the resolution, while the representatives of the feeble churches took the opposite side. There can be no doubt that our city churches are very much annoyed by the frequency and importunity of applications for aid. Nor can it be questioned that some of these applications are unreasonable. But on the other hand, there must be many cases which cannot be met by any established organization, and where the alternative is assistance or death. It is the prerogative of poverty to beg; the privilege of wealth to give, and its right to refuse. It is best to leave the door open. It is far more that weak churches should be preserved from perishing, than that strong

ones should be spared annoyance. There are many humble spires pointing heavenward through our western wilds, which never would have raised their heads, had it not been for other aid than that which comes through the regular committee.

Foreign Missions.

The Rev. Dr. Wilson, Chairman of the Committee on the Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions presented their report.

The Rev. Dr. Lowrie, Secretary of the Board, said that we should consider that our Boards are as much a part of the business of this Assembly as is the North-western Seminary, which, like Aaron's rod, threatens to swallow up all others. It has more than once, in times past, been asked that at least one entire day of each session should be given up to this great work of Foreign Missions. He firmly believes that such a usage would exert a most happy influence on all subsequent proceedings. A great deal of labour is expended in our Annual Report; and yet, after all, it presents very inadequately the subjects treated of. They cannot be satisfactorily disposed of in a brief notice. A missionary's sailing, new fields of labour, &c., thus briefly touched upon, often really deserve to be brought far more fully before the Assembly. He feared we were disposed to put off this great subject with a mere routine show of duty and respect. He wished to call particular attention to the cause for thanksgiving for success afforded us. The work is progressing as never before. Never have there been such indications of the favour of God's providence, and of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on missionary labour. There is India, which was in such a deplorable condition at the last meeting of this body; that country is now at peace, and the missionaries are sending loud calls for more labourers. Yet on account of the return of missionaries, ill health, &c., the number of our missionaries there is about sixteen less than one year ago. When the field is wider open than ever before, this deficiency is greatly to be lamented. Dr. Lowrie mentioned several interesting facts, indicating the operations of the Spirit of God on natives who had never seen a missionary. They had merely received the Scriptures—one had been studying

the word of God for six years, and they had come to the conclusion that this was the true religion. Is not this a wonderful indication of the presence of God's Spirit preparing for a great work among that people? What an opening! What a call to the church!

Look, too, at the opening of China—the greatest event of the age. The last intelligence received before he left the Mission House brought information of the conversion of twelve of the Chinese at Ningpo. Look, too, at the opening of Japan. In our Indian missions, too, in our own land, there is much to encourage. But there are missionary brethren here who can speak of these things. He wished the members of this Assembly could be present at the meeting of their Executive Committee, to see the straits in which they are sometimes placed when new missions are called for, or reinforcements, and the state of the funds apparently forbids it. He rejoiced to say that notwithstanding the hard times, the receipts from the churches had been larger somewhat than last year. But the coming year is the year to test the question as to what our church is willing to do to meet the claims of this great object. More young men are offering themselves than ever before, and it will not do merely to give to this Board as much as heretofore; much more is needed. And is there not an imperative claim upon us to listen to the "sound of the going in the mulberry trees," in the signs of the times? He was glad to say that this cause had been steadily growing in the hearts of our people. Twenty-six years ago this Board received but about ten thousand dollars. But still, what are we even now doing compared with what we might do, and ought to do? The greatest discouragement to the Board as to the churches, is found in looking over the tables in the Appendix to the Annual Report, and seeing some of our largest and oldest churches, with able ministers, which are sometimes doing little or nothing for this cause in a whole year. This Board should at least have a hearing before God's people. He would ask, is it not reasonable that this cause should be presented at least once a year, and the opportunity given to contribute to this cause? There have been individual cases of benevolence, which in some instances have been very marked and touching. One of these

occurred lately in the contribution of twenty dollars by the poor widow of a minister. This spirit is a token for good, showing that the Lord is among his people. He hoped that even if the Assembly should dismiss this subject from the house after a short consideration, they would by no means dismiss it from their hearts.

Rev. Mr. Speer, late missionary to China, said when Jesus Christ had shed his blood on the cross, and had risen from the dead, he spake, during the forty days preceding his ascension, about the "things pertaining to the kingdom." Let us do the same. Other subjects here are important, but none more important than this. He had been twice called back from his field of labour by such ill health as he had thought would before this have taken him to the Assembly above.

How changed the aspect of the mission field in late years! When he first went to China some years ago, the first words were, "Kill him!" He never spent such a night of anguish as one of the first he spent in Canton. But that city has since reaped its recompense, and cannon balls have opened the way there for the gospel. He would remind the Assembly that the Chinese are not savages. Even in San Francisco there have been Chinese gentlemen of education and culture, who will compare favourably with any member of this house. Mr. Speer then read an extract from the paper of a Chinese merchant there, remonstrating against the effort to drive them away from California, or interfere with their rights, and protesting against their being degraded in public opinion to the level of negroes and Indians, the article evincing great intelligence and ability. He also remarked upon an appeal he held in his hand, from the Chinese of California to Congress, referring to the teachings of our religion as reason for our showing them as strangers more leniency and kindness, and reminding us that material progress is not everything. You have in this small paper evidence of the high mental character of this people.

Brethren, let us ask what response will be given by our church to the appeals of Providence in the signs of the present times. He rejoiced in the revival, because of the promise it gives of increasing the supply of missionaries, and he rejoiced in that Elders' Prayer-meeting which is held here day after

day. It was cheering to see this awakening amongst our laymen.

The Rev. Mr. Gardiner said the eyes of the church, and, to some extent, of the world, are upon this Assembly, and our action on this, as well as other subjects, cannot fail of great influence. He believed there is an increasing interest in this cause, and he believed this results, in some measure, from the diffusion of more intelligence on the subject among our people. We have learned more and more to sympathize with our brethren in foreign lands. He could not refrain from bearing his testimony to the labour and zeal of our brethren who conduct this Foreign Board. The present report he considers the most interesting ever presented to this body. It brings unmistakable evidence that God is doing at least a great work of preparation among the nations for the reign of the Redeemer. He alluded to several of the different countries and stations where the Board's operations are presenting increased encouragement.

Mr. Spring said his heart had been stirred within him as he had listened to the call from our brother, the Secretary.

The Rev. Mr. Wilson, missionary from Africa, said he would read a resolution from the Presbytery of Western Africa, which, whether it was written by a negro or not, he knows there are negroes there who can write in a manner comparing favourably with the papers by Chinese read here this morning. He then read several very well written resolutions from that Presbytery, expressive of deep interest in behalf of the advancement of Christ's kingdom, giving thanks for the revival in America, hoping for its extension to Africa, &c., and calling on their white brethren beyond the waters to come over and help them. This, said Mr. Wilson, is the voice of Africa. Shall we not listen to it? They appeal particularly for the 200,000 within the boundary of Liberia, but there are millions of heathen around them. And what are we doing? We have nine missionaries in that vast population! According to a like ratio, if carried out in this country, we should have but three ministers of the Old-school church in these entire United States! And there is the same destitution throughout the heathen world. We, as a church, have but seventy-three missionaries in all the pagan nations—about ten millions to

every missionary of our church! God has brought us into peculiar relations to Africa, and that country into a peculiar relation to us. We are bound to no other heathen land by such ties. There are sons of Africa rising up amongst us to go back with the gospel to their fatherland; but this is not enough. We cannot, as yet, leave the work entirely in their hands. There is an imperative need for white labourers, especially to take charge of the education of coloured missionaries on the spot.

The Rev. Mr. Mattoon, from the Siam Mission, said: This work of Foreign Missions has become the great work of our church. That work is no longer to be kept up by mere sympathy with the sufferings of the missionaries, nor by reports of progress. The duty of the church does not rest upon such considerations, but upon the revealed will of God to his people. He wished he could lay before this body some of the difficulties which are to be encountered in carrying the gospel to heathen lands. Take his own place of labour as an illustration. Imagine a city of 300,000 in the midst of 4,000,000 inhabitants, and with no Christian land bordering on it, with no Christian churches, no Bibles, no Christian publications, and no people of God; but even then you will not have completed the picture. You must imagine also in that city 250 heathen temples, with their 10,000 priests, and their thousands and thousands of images. He had been in a temple containing 16,000 idols. He had seen an idol 145 feet long, surrounded by 900 smaller ones. Yet among this whole people of Siam you, as a church, have but *two missionaries!* That people have no proper conception even of the terms in which we attempt to convey to their minds the principles of our religion. With this great work of spreading the gospel devolving upon a few, you need not wonder that they cannot at once come back with victory perched upon their banners. A British statesman has gravely stated that you cannot induce the Chinese to give up his "tail," or the Siamese the tuft of hair on his head. How much less will they readily give up their superstitions and religion! But still we believe God's promises and purposes, and we sow in hope. With God a thousand years are as one day. But the great work is to be instrumentally done by the church.

He asks the sympathy and prayers of this Assembly and this church in behalf of the few labourers he had left behind him in the missionary field. Those brethren look with eager eyes for the doings of this Assembly, to see what is said and done here to cheer and help them in their arduous work.

The resolutions of the Committee were then unanimously adopted, and the Rev. Dr. Thornwell was called upon to lead the Assembly in prayer for the cause of Foreign Missions.

Domestic Missions.

Rev. Dr. Musgrave, Corresponding Secretary, spoke with reference to the Report. The receipts for the past year were more than $11,000 above the average of the previous five years. The financial year was closed, exhibiting a balance of some $26,000—being about $8000 greater than the previous year. Under the most favourable circumstances the Board did not expect to close the year with a balance exceeding $16,000; but, under the providence of God, the sum stated was the unprecedented amount. The appropriations were more uniformly greater than during the five previous years. The receipts were larger than anticipated, yet they were not larger than was desirable. Though God had blessed the labours of the Board, being kinder to us than our fears, let us pray for his continued and increasing favours. It had been the invariable custom of the Board to pay promptly the salaries of missionaries immediately upon their reporting themselves. It was desirable to add a little more to the salaries of missionaries, and to increase their number. In some sections of the country, on account of the failure of the crops, missionaries will need more money, and to plant new missions the resources of the Board must be strengthened. It was proposed to locate an Executive Committee of the Board at New Orleans, and a like one at some point in the North-West. In that case we shall have a Secretary at Philadelphia, to superintend the work in the East; a Secretary at Louisville; a Secretary at New Orleans, and a Secretary at Chicago, or at some other North-western point—each superintending the work of his especial region. The Board was not in want of machinery—it was in want of men. The demand for home missionaries was greater than the sup-

ply. We must pray to the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth more labourers. The number of candidates for the ministry was increasing, for which he thanked God. He proposed that the Board pledge themselves to commission every man recommended by a Presbytery. We can only use what we have got. We cannot distribute $200,000 when we have only $100,000. We can only give what the churches enable us to give, and pledge ourselves to give employment to every man who comes recommended. To be sure, we could not say to A B, Go to Texas, or go to Oregon. He would reply that he would choose his own place. The Board could only offer fields of labour to those who, in the service of their Master, would avail themselves of them. But if every minister was employed, still there would not be enough. The average salaries of the missionaries during the past six years had been increased forty-three per cent. A man in ordinary business who had made this addition to his income would probably consider that he was doing very well. Besides, the Board had increased the number of missionaries, and had a heavy balance in the Treasury. The Board had been instructed by the Assembly to dispense with collecting agents. The plan inaugurated in 1854 had worked admirably. The number of contributing churches had increased fifty a year for the four years preceding the past two. The check during the last two years was certainly to be attributed to the failure of the crops and consequent financial embarrassment. In seasons of prosperity the increase will be renewed. The Board, to fulfil its mission, needs the sympathy and co-operation of the pastors of the church. Let them go practically to work, with earnest prayer to God, and next year we shall have a large advance in our funds to devote to domestic missionary purposes.

Rev. Dr. Humphrey, Chairman of the Committee on the Annual Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, presented their report. They respectfully invite the attention of the General Assembly to the topics which follow.

I.—The Progress of the Work.

This has been gradual but steady. During the last six years, the number of missionaries has risen from 515 to 600, and the

annual receipts at the treasury have increased from $81,000 to within a fraction of $100,000. Within this period, the Board, in conformity with the prevailing doctrine of the church touching the divine ordinance of almsgiving, has dispensed with the agency system, and placed its reliance for funds wholly upon what is known among us as the Plan of Systematic Benevolence. Nothing in the history of the Board is more satisfactory than the successful conduct of its affairs through this transition period.

II.—THE LIMITATION OF ITS PROGRESS.

It must be continually borne in mind, that one of the most serious limitations imposed upon the progress of the work, is the want of labourers. It becomes us humbly and reverently to acknowledge our absolute dependence upon the Lord of the harvest, and then to give thanks to his blessed name, for the recent effusion of his Holy Spirit on our congregations and schools of learning, whereby we have good hope that the Master is about to multiply labourers for his vineyard.

III.—THE OVERTURE FROM THE SOUTH-WEST.

An overture from the Synods of Texas and Mississippi, respecting the missions in that region, laid before the last Assembly, and referred to the consideration of the Board, is on the table of the Assembly, and this Committee submits herewith a resolution on the subject.

IV.—INVESTIGATION PROPOSED.

It is now thirty-one years since the Board received its present organization. In the meantime, changes, every way remarkable, have occurred, in the state both of the country and the church. The territorial limits of the Republic have been enlarged, so as to include Texas and the Pacific coast, and the intermediate region. Many new states have been admitted into the Confederation; vast regions which in 1828 were almost unknown to our geography, have become inhabited by our people; the population of the country has more than doubled. The church also has been multiplied two-fold in all its outward elements, to wit, in the number of its Presbyteries, Synods, ministers, congregations, and communicants. The faci-

lities for the spread of the gospel, moreover, were never before so numerous, nor the fields so broad and inviting. And more than all, the repeated effusions of the Holy Spirit have imparted vigour and purity to the inward life of the church, and are so preparing it for its work.

In the judgment of the Committee, the time has now come when the General Assembly should examine thoroughly and carefully the Constitution of the Board of Domestic Missions to the end, that it may, if possible, be more closely adjusted to the present posture of our affairs, and be inaugurated and equipped for the immense work now before the church in the home field.

The Committee, therefore, submit to the consideration of the Assembly the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. The General Assembly gratefully recognizes the blessings of the Head of the church upon its Domestic Missions, and upon the labours of the Board to which the care of these missions has been entrusted.

Resolved, 2. The Assembly finds in the history of the Board every reason to cherish the settled conviction of the church respecting the ordinance of alms-giving, and its proper administration by the office-bearers; and it exhorts all the congregations under its care to maintain this ordinance as a part of religious worship.

Resolved, 3. The Board is instructed to establish in the city of New Orleans an Advisory Committee, with a District Secretary, whose duty it shall be to set forward the work of missions in the South-west—the details to be arranged by conference between the Board and said Committee.

Resolved, 4. The Board is also empowered to make a similar arrangement at the North-west, if, after consultation with the brethren in that region, such a measure shall appear to be advisable.

Resolved, 5. The attention of the Board is particularly called to the Pacific coast as a field of missions.

Resolved, 6. A Committee of ——— members shall be appointed by this Assembly, with instructions to confer with the Board, and report to the next Assembly what changes in the organization and methods of the Board are necessary, in

order to its greater efficiency and wider usefulness. This Committee is particularly charged to report on the expediency of the following measures:

The reduction of the number of members in the Board, and its organization somewhat after the form of the Committee on "Church Extension."

The removal of the Board to some place nearer the centre of the Western missionary fields.

The establishment of several Executive Committees and Corresponding Secretaries in different parts of the church, these officers to be invested with co-ordinate powers; or,

The establishment of a single central Executive Committee, with Advisory Committees and District Secretaries, as provided herein for the South-west.

The Committee will consider the question as to how many officers will be needed in the Central Board, and the division of labour among them.

The Committee will also report upon any other matters which they may find within the range of this inquiry.

This report led to a very protracted and interesting debate. The third resolution, directing the appointment in the city of New Orleans of an Advisory Committee, and of a District Secretary, was met by a resolution recommending, or requiring, the appointment of a similar Committee in the North-west, and of another in California. This of course brought up the whole question of the organization of the Board, and of the best method of conducting its operations. In a matter of so much importance, and involving so many interests, personal and ecclesiastical, hundreds of missionaries and their families being directly concerned in the success of the Board, and hundreds of destitute places, each having special claims in the estimation of those immediately cognizant of their wants, two things would seem to be inevitable. First, that some places should think themselves slighted, or unfairly dealt with; and, second, that new plans of operation should suggest themselves as remedies for the deficiencies or neglects which were found or felt to exist under the present system. It is wonderful, therefore, that the Board of Domestic Missions has not been pulled to pieces by these conflicting forces long ago. Our other Boards

go on comparatively unobstructed. They sail in a calm and open sea. But the Board of Domestic Missions has to navigate amid a thousand islands and shoals. Every member of the Assembly has a right to be a pilot, and every one tries to get his hand on the wheel. This is natural and unavoidable. The good sense and piety of the church have hitherto, by the grace of God, preserved the Board from being shipwrecked, and from the necessity of altering its principles and modes of operation at every successive meeting. Every little while, however, there is more or less of a storm. Now California is neglected, or the South is overlooked, or the claims of the North-west inadequately met. Sometimes the Board goes too fast, and gets into difficulties, so as to be unable to meet its obligations; sometimes it goes too slow, and fails to spend even the money in its treasury. Some propose to meet all difficulties by removing the seat of the Board; others by destroying all centralization, and having independent committees, north, south, east, and west, and north-west, and south-west. Others again think the Board a nuisance, and insist that all we need is a committee. Some seem to believe that five men, if called a Board, will do nothing; but if called a Committee, will astonish the world by their efficiency. We cannot think there is so much in a name. Our missions, whether foreign or domestic, are really conducted by the executive committees of the Boards. The Boards themselves might well be dispensed with, for two-thirds or four-fifths of the time; but occasions must now and then occur, when a body larger than the committee and smaller than the Assembly is desirable or indispensable. When such occasions do occur, if you have no Board, *i. e.* no body capable of being called together, and devoting days, or weeks, if necessary, to investigation and deliberation, you will be forced to create one, *pro re nata.* It is impossible that the Assembly can discharge this service. To abolish the Boards, and commit everything to executive committees appointed by the Assembly, is in effect to make those committees in a great measure independent and irresponsible. In Scotland, they have committees, and no Boards, intervening between them and the Assembly; but they have a standing commission of the Assembly—a body not larger than one of our Boards—always ready to exercise a

supervising and controlling power over these committees. If we do away with Boards, we hope we shall carry the matter through, and have a commission.

It is very natural that brethren, living in the midst of our destitutions, should think that a committee near at hand would be more efficient, and more ready to listen to their applications, than one located a thousand miles distant. The appointment of such committees, as it appears to us, would tend to the following results: 1. To supersede the Presbyteries in their appropriate work. Those Presbyteries are on the ground; they know their own necessities, are alive to their own wants. To place over them a committee appointed either directly or indirectly by the Assembly, is to take out of their hands their proper duty, and lay the burden upon a body not so well able to bear it. 2. These committees must be either advisory or self-determining. If the former, they are unnecessary and cumbrous; if, on the other hand, they have authority to commission and locate missionaries, and determine their compensation, then it will be impossible to have a common treasury. No one committee can know what resources are at its command, or how far other committees have drawn on the common stock. All unity of action must be destroyed. A committee in one district may expend or promise five or ten times the sum to which it is entitled on a fair division of the resources at command. 3. This must inevitably lead to each committee being thrown on its own resources; and the very idea of a common life in the church, and a common obligation pressing all parts equally, must be given up. The West must depend on the West; the South on the South; and the East on the East. Instead of these committees, with their several organizations, involving a great outlay of time and money, we see not why every desirable object may not be attained by the appointment of exploring agents. Agents for the mere collection of money are unpopular and unnecessary, under the operation of an effective plan of systematic benevolence; but agents may be needed, whose duty it shall be to explore each an extended district, assist in the organization of churches, in exciting and directing efforts for the raising of funds, and especially in reporting to the executive committee of the Board the most

eligible places for missionary labour. If the church is one, it must act as one; and this supposes a central administration, a common treasury, and an equalizing distribution, so that the abundance of one part may supply the deficiencies of another.

Besides these objections which had reference to the organization of the Board, there were others bearing on its mode of action and the conduct of its officers. These were urged with a great deal of warmth, not to say acrimony. Of the justice of the charges thus presented, we know nothing more than can be learned from the report of the debates on the floor of the Assembly. And we think it due to the Board and its officers to say that, judging from the data thus afforded, the charges were triumphantly met by the Secretary, Dr. Musgrave. The power of that gentleman in debate, which has so often been exhibited in our ecclesiastical bodies, as well as his energy, diligence, and skill in the discharge of his official duties, prove that he is one of the ablest men in the church. His title to be thus regarded was fully vindicated by his speech in the last Assembly.

Any man who occupies a public office in the church, whether as pastor or secretary, may easily satisfy himself what are the moral principles which should govern brethren in bringing charges against one of their own number. He has only to ask himself what would, in his estimation, justify a man in arraigning him before the public or an ecclesiastical body, for his official conduct. He would doubtless say—1. That the charges should be grave and specific. He would feel aggrieved, should any one rise in Presbytery, and charge him with want of wisdom in his dealing with this or that inquirer, or with neglect of preparation for some particular duty, or with the vague and general fault of lack of energy, diligence, zeal, &c. If a congregation is dissatisfied with a pastor on such general grounds, they can obtain redress by requesting him to resign; or if the church is convinced that one of its executive officers is deficient in ability or diligence, it is easy and proper to put a more efficient man in his place. But any pastor, professor, or secretary, would feel in his own case that charges, which are either trivial or indefinite, should not be publicly presented. 2. He would also feel that any charge thus exhibited, should

be well ascertained and authenticated. 3. That not only should all proper means be used to ascertain the truth of the charge, but to redress the evil complained of, before an appeal is made to the church, or to the public. These are not arbitrary rules; they are moral principles, and their violation must work manifold evil. So far as the accuser is concerned, it injures his character and his reputation. It is not enough that he is a member of the Assembly, having a right to call its Boards and officers to account. That is not the point. The question is, How does he exercise that right? Does he submit to be guided in the exercise of his admitted prerogative, by those moral principles which he expects and demands should be observed by others in their conduct towards himself? Nor is it enough that he disclaims all unworthy motives, and professes his attachment to the Boards, and his zeal for their purity and efficiency. All this might be said by any one who should rise in Presbytery and deliver a harangue against the inefficiency, want of zeal, or success of one of his fellow-pastors. Such professions are altogether inoperative in arresting the judgment which every fair-minded, conscientious man pronounces on him who indulges in a public assembly in trivial, uninvestigated charges against the ministers and officers of the church. This is not the only evil. Such charges tend to weaken confidence, and thus to cripple the Boards in all their operations; and must tend to drive from their service men of ability and feeling. How far these principles were violated by some members of the last Assembly, every one must judge for himself.

Dr. Musgrave was not a member of the Assembly, but was permitted to speak in reply to the accusations directed against his policy and conduct. The following is the report of his remarks as found in the *Presbyterian.*

Rev. Dr. Musgrave expressed thanks to the house for the courtesy extended to him, in permitting him to address the Assembly. He had not expected to speak again, and therefore had not taken notes of the speeches that had been made, and would have to depend upon his memory; and if he had mistaken, or did not remember aright, he begged to be corrected. He was reminded of a saying of Dr. Nevins, that if Christianity had not been of God, it would long ago have been destroyed

by its friends. He could apply the same remark to the Board of Domestic Missions; if it were not of God, it had long ago perished under the attacks of its friends. He was glad, however, that the brethren had delivered themselves so freely. They doubtless feel *better*, and I do not feel *worse*. Indeed, he sympathized with much that had been said; and with those who had said it. He knew that our missionaries who have come here with complaints, and with a little disposition to find fault, are honest and earnest in all they say. They have difficulties and trials, and are apt to think that more might be done for them. But it is our grief, as well as theirs, that we are not able to do for them all that they need. We would fain increase their number in every field, and increase their allowance to their entire satisfaction; and if the Board had it in their power to do so, it would be done. But the means are not forthcoming.

He would have to pay his respects to the speakers one by one; not that he meant to be personal, but as he had taken no notes, he would have to aid his memory by associating the several persons with what they said. He had no personal feelings to gratify; he felt no resentment at the somewhat severe criticisms that had been passed upon the Board. He doubted not the brethren honestly felt that they ought to say what they did; and he should reply to them with candour and frankness. And first, as to the brother from Minnesota, (Mr. Riheldaffer,) who complained that that field had been neglected, and that a due proportion of funds had not been allowed them. He would simply state the fact, that owing to the importance and alleged expensiveness of that brother's particular field of labour, the Board had allowed six hundred dollars—just three times the usual amount to that brother—and continued all he asked till his church became self-sustaining. And in no instance that he knew of had the Board failed to do for other parts of that same general field all that, in the circumstances, and with the means at their disposal, it was possible to do.

He next paid his respects to the gentleman who sat just here (near the speaker,) the gentleman from Brooklyn (Mr. Van Dyke.) That gentleman, in a *tone* which the speaker could not interpret, had said that we had not granted all the

applications that had been *duly* made; he gave particularity to the phrase "duly made." So far as he recollected, there was no application refused which had been *duly* made. The brother denies this, and referred to cases to substantiate his denial. The brother took exception to the use of the phrase, "so far as I recollect." Now, he had a frank explanation of this. You will remember that we have two Executive Committees, one at Louisville, and one at Philadelphia. Applications are made for missionary aid to both, and it is difficult for the members of one Committee to have such intimate knowledge of the details of the transactions of the other, as to be at all times able with certainty to recollect, so that we had to speak with the caution used. And you will remember that we expect the Presbyteries to recommend all the appointments made within their bounds, and no application is *duly* made unless made through the Presbytery, and according to the rules laid down for the direction of the Board, and approved again and again by the General Assembly. So that it will be perceived the phraseology which was repeated with such mysterious peculiarity, is just such as our rules and circumstances render proper. He had met Dr. Hill, of the Louisville Committee, to-day, and inquired of him whether he recollected of any application having been rejected by that Committee, and he assured him that he believed none had been rejected. There was another thing in that speech that needs explanation. It was that we had tied up that big balance at the end of the year, and had accumulated it by refusing to appoint missionaries upon proper application, and by curtailing the allowance of missionaries. Now, he had to say that neither was *true*. It was impossible for such a state of the case to be true, as the books will show. Dr. Musgrave went into an explanation of the receipts of the Board, to show that at one part of the year the receipts had fallen off. During the first two months they had fallen off between $6000 and $7000, and during the first ten months had fallen off $14,000 up to January. And, indeed, the balance which we are blamed with hoarding, was accumulated during the last two months of the fiscal year, and mainly during the last.

Now in this connection he wished to say another thing—that the impression was attempted to be made, that whilst we had

that large balance on hand the Board had rejected three or four applications to go to California, and had stinted the missionaries this side of the Rocky Mountains. Now, that there were so many applications was news to him. He did not know it before, and believed it not to be true. There was but one, a student in one of our Theological Seminaries, who applied to the Board to be sent to California, at the time the receipts had so fallen off as to embarrass our operations. He was not yet through his theological studies, and we said to him, If you will wait until about January, and the funds will warrant, we will send you. Some time after we got a letter from this young man, informing us he had a prospect of settlement in New Jersey, and that he wanted to know whether he was to be sent to California, or had better accept a call in New Jersey. In view of our circumstances, and in view of some things personal to the young man, the Executive Committee advised him to stay in New Jersey; and this is the case out of which so much has been made. He adverted to the criticism upon that part of the Report which referred to the operation of the plan of Systematic Benevolence. It had been laid to the charge of this Board by the brother from Brooklyn, that there were seventeen hundred churches that had not adopted that system, and that in our report we alluded to the financial crisis as accounting for a falling off in receipts a part of the year. But is the Board of Missions to blame if the recommendations of the Assembly are not adopted by the churches in regard to Systematic Benevolence? Why single out the Board of Domestic Missions, and blame us for the fact that the plan of Systematic Benevolence has not done all that could have been desired? Why hold out the idea that the Board of Missions is unpopular because so many churches have failed to contribute to its treasury? Do not other Boards make the same complaint? Did not the Board of Publication make a similar reference to the monetary crisis? Is it candid, is it fair, to draw such an inference—that because so many churches have failed to contribute, it is because of dissatisfaction with the administration of the Board, whilst other Boards complain of the same thing? Is not the number of churches that do not contribute to the other Boards as great as that which fails to

contribute to this Board? Why not give the statistics of all the Boards in this behalf?

Let me pay my respects, said Dr. Musgrave, to the gentleman from Wisconsin, (Mr. Heckman.) There was a gentleman living in the State of New York who wished to go to Wisconsin. The Synod applied to the Board to appoint him the itinerant missionary of the Synod. They asked the Board to give $600, and he was to gather $200 from the field; but we were to underwrite for the whole $800. We demurred to do the latter, but finally consented, upon being assured that we would be asked to pay only the $600. We were obliged, however, ultimately to pay the whole amount. The Synod asked his re-appointment next year; the Board declined doing it on the same conditions; but at the request of a Presbytery, commissioned the same man as a missionary at Stevens' Point, with a liberal allowance. Dr. Musgrave gave a full detail of this matter, which the reporter could not catch entirely. He proceeded to show that, of all the States within our bounds, Wisconsin had a larger proportion of men and funds bestowed upon her than any other State. And it was hardly grateful for them to come up in such a fault-finding spirit. And yet he could not much wonder. Living out there, and seeing the destitutions around them, they were so absorbed in their own field and their own work, as to forget that there were other fields equally destitute and needing aid. They were zealous, hard working brethren; they were ardently desirous to win souls and spread the cause, and their own field seems so big that they cannot so well see any other. Such earnest asking for more men to be sent he had never heard, and such importunate beggars he had never met. He admired their zeal; but must remind them that the Board cannot give them all the men nor all the money. It is the duty of the Board to *equalize*, as far as possible, the distribution of the funds; and not withhold from one part of the wide field in order to give more than their share to another.

Now, he would say a word in regard to the suggestion, modestly put forth, doubtless, by brother McNair, that the action of a Presbytery should be *final;* and that the Board has no right to review the recommendations of the Presbyteries.

Now, it so happens that some of the Presbyteries are almost entirely composed of missionaries. He proceeded to show the practical operation of the adoption of this principle in such cases. The members of Presbytery are voting the amount of salary, not of other men, but of themselves. One brother thinks he cannot get along without so much, and another without so much; and thus they agree to fix the amount of their own allowance from the Board; and if the Board has no discretionary power, it will easily be seen, that so long as there is human nature in man, each Presbytery would be likely to demand more than their proportion of the funds, and if their request is yielded to, others must be left without any. We are willing, perfectly willing, that the committee which has been proposed may be appointed, and may suggest something that may increase the efficiency of the Board. He cared not what modifications the Assembly might make, if they were only wise and practicable. He and the other members of the Board had no selfish interests to subserve; all they wanted was to have the Lord's work in this great enterprise well done.

Let this plan of Systematic Benevolence be adhered to if you think it best. It is of the Assembly's inauguration, and if worked well, will accomplish all you wish. But we are not wedded to it; and if the Assembly can make any improvement either in the constitution or the efficiency of this Board, we shall most heartily rejoice. He had like to have forgotten an amendment offered by his beloved brother Smith, requiring the Board to appoint every suitable man that applies to go to California. If the Assembly deemed it wise and equitable to adopt it, the Board would obey; but he respectfully asked the house to calculate the results of such an order. If the Board shall be ordered to commission all that the Presbyteries in California might ask, and at the rates of allowance which they might think necessary, there would be a trying deficiency, he feared, for the missionaries on this side of the Rocky Mountains, unless vastly larger receipts can be had. Twenty or thirty thousand dollars sent to that State, would leave but a small dividend for the remaining States. To send but fifteen or twenty missionaries to California, would abstract a large sum. We all love the Board of Domestic Missions; even the brethren who have

severely criticised it. Let us show our love by telling of its good deeds, as well as of its failures—by coöperating and building it up, rather than pulling it down.

If, instead of coming here to find fault and complain of the Board for inefficiency, these missionaries had come and gratefully told us of what the Lord had done through their instrumentality; told us of their trials and successes; told us of what the Board had done for them, as well as what they had not done; if they had stirred our hearts by describing the crying wants of their field, and reciting what had already been accomplished, how they would have encouraged and strengthened us, and how much benefit might have been reflected upon them and their labours! But, doubtless, they do feel a cordial love for the Board; and if some of them have seemed to complain, it is rather to be attributed to their earnest zeal to accomplish more, than to any lack of grateful sentiment for what God has done. He thanked the Moderator and the Assembly for the courtesy extended to him, in permitting him thus to defend the Board, of which he is one of its officers; and expressed the hope that the whole discussion would result in good to the cause we all love.

Of the specific complaints against the Board, the two which seem to have been most strenuously urged were, first, that too large an unexpended balance was left in the treasury; and, secondly, that a young man who had applied to be sent to California, was refused. As to the former of these, it was answered, first, that the sum constituting that balance was in great part received during the closing months of the financial year, and could not safely be counted upon as the ground for enlarged operations; and, secondly, that it was already needed to meet the obligations of the Board. As to the other complaint, it was answered, that the appointment of the young man in question was only deferred at the time of application, and not refused; that it was a personal, and not a presbyterial application; and that there were, subsequently, doubts created as to his fitness for that field of labour. It is perfectly obvious that the Committee cannot be called upon to appoint every one who may offer his services for any particular field, even when such offer is sustained by the recommendation of a Presbytery, much

less when it comes only from the man himself. The Presbytery looks at its own wants; the Committee has to look at the wants of the whole church, and therefore cannot be made the organ of recording and executing the decrees of each separate Presbytery.

The recommendations of the Committee on the report of the Board were substantially adopted. One of their recommendations was, that a committee of investigation be appointed to examine into the organization and operations of the Board, and report to the next Assembly. We wait with no little solicitude for the action of that committee.

Board of Publication.

Rev. Dr. Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on the Board of Publication, presented the following resolutions, which were adopted:

Resolved, 1. The Assembly desire to record with gratitude the favour extended to this enterprise by the Great Head of the church. They would reiterate their sense of the high value of the Board in counteracting the pernicious effects of a useless, vicious, and infidel literature, by disseminating far and wide the seeds of a true theology and vital piety. In these respects the Board of Publication is a valuable arm of the church, and has proved itself to be an efficient and honoured instrumentality in the hands of God's servants.

Resolved, 2. The great object of the Board's organization and efforts is the widest possible circulation of the pure, undisguised, complete truths of God's blessed word. It would use the press as a mighty agency in sending abroad on moral wastes the pure and refreshing streams of light, knowledge, and salvation. It aims to furnish the church and the world a literature through whose pages shall gleam the great and precious doctrines of our Confession and Catechisms—doctrines which have cheered the church in the past, and which constitute the hope of the world in the future. Its publications, whilst cultivating charity, liberality, and the largest measure of love to all who bear the Master's image, still display a cordial, affectionate, tenacious adherence to the distinctive principles which have ever marked us as a church.

Resolved, 3. It gives the Assembly great pleasure to mark and record the increased evidence which God is rolling on the world, of his favour toward the colportage effort. These humble and self-denying men are doing God's work; they deserve and should receive the aid and the sympathy of God's people. With the books of the Board in their hands, and with the love of Christ and of souls warming their hearts, they often, as pioneers, go before the missionary and the minister, preparing the way of the Lord. Thus greatly do they aid in diffusing, amid regions of moral darkness, Christian light and knowledge. The Assembly would therefore earnestly urge on the churches under their care, the importance of this arm of the enterprise, exhorting them to increased liberality in their contributions, that the operations of colportage may be enlarged, and that the publications of the Board may, through their instrumentality, be more widely diffused.

Resolved, 4. The General Assembly with great pleasure notice, among other publications of the Board, "The Letters of John Calvin." They doubt not that this rich and varied correspondence will throw new light and increased brilliancy upon the labours and character of that distinguished servant of God, and his illustrious compeers; that it will be a fruitful source of delight and information to all who are interested in the history of the great Reformation.

Resolved, 5. The Assembly rejoices in the opportunity of expressing its approbation of the efforts made by the Board to meet the wants of the youth of our land, as regards Sabbath-school Libraries. These have too often and long been carelessly, sometimes ignorantly chosen. The imprint of the Board is a guaranty of their merit and character. The publications of this kind are judicious, attractive, and sound. The Assembly recommend, that in the purchase of libraries, either for gifts to feeble churches or for use at home, these books of the Board should have the preference.

Resolved, 6. The Assembly would especially commend *The Home and Foreign Record* to a more general patronage throughout the church; trusting that in its diligent perusal, members of the communion might catch more of the spirit of

missions and of Christian benevolence so richly pervading its columns. They also recommend *The Sabbath-school Visitor* as a most excellent publication to be circulated through our Sabbath-schools, and among the children of our charge.

Resolved, 7. That in view of the reasonable representations of the Board of Publication, in their Annual Report, the Assembly consider that the performance of the order of the last Assembly, for expunging hymn 336, and inserting some other, had best be postponed till the way may appear clear for a careful revision of the whole book of Psalms and Hymns.

The Committee recommend the approval of the Annual Report of the Board of Publication, and that a copy thereof, with these resolutions, be handed to the Executive Committee for publication.

Rev. Mr. Schenck, Corresponding Secretary of the Board, said—The Board of Publication is engaged in a great work, though a very quiet one. Its publications go all over the country, and to other countries; yet who can adequately trace them? Probably nearly 4,000,000 souls annually are reached by the truth from the pages of this Board. In the brief period of its existence it has circulated publications enough to have given the gospel to every man, woman, and child in this country. And this truth is the sound, substantial system which we believe, as a church. We do not, indeed, teach our people to be bigots; but we do desire that our children and young people shall be taught to understand and love their own denomination and its doctrines. These publications are also doing a great work in our families. What pastor has not felt their influence in strengthening his hands? How many doubts and difficulties do they meet and remove, which can hardly with propriety be brought into the pulpit! And what an assistance do pastors themselves derive from these publications, in enriching their sermons and elevating the tone of their preaching! The work accomplished by the tracts alone, too, is a most important one. The number of these little messengers sent abroad the last year has been doubled—doubtless owing to the glorious outpouring of the Spirit throughout the land.

As to Colportage, it was reported last year that it had

become necessary to reduce the number of colporteurs, on account of the hard times. The number is now being again enlarged, and he could say the quality of the colporteurs was improved by having dropped some of the more inefficient in the reduction.

As to the receipts, there has been a diminution of *sales*, owing to the reduced number of colporteurs and the pressure of the times; but the receipts by donations to the Board from the churches exceed the last year nearly $6000. A larger number of churches have contributed than ever before—the increase over the previous year being somewhat over one hundred. This is very cheering.

The Secretary then earnestly called upon the Assembly, through the churches, efficiently to co-operate in the Board's measures, through contributions, seeking out proper colporteurs, purchasing and recommending the books, and by sincere and humble prayer. Those engaged in this work feel sometimes that it does not receive that share of the prayers of God's people which it should have. How seldom do we hear prayer offered for the press! The power of God's Spirit is indispensable to the efficacy of printed truth, as well as of that which is preached.

The Rev. Drs. Smith and Anderson, and the Rev. Messrs. Graves and Banks spoke in support of the report of the committee.

Rev. Dr. Edwards said he had in his mind some things which he thought ought to be said and heard by this Assembly. We are all here to deliberate as well as to vote. He wished to say that he fully responds to the words of commendation of this Board spoken here to-day. He hopes it will be taken for granted that the Board of Publication is not only desirable, but indispensable. He loves and honours the Board of Publication. He is not a member of that Board, a fact which has some meaning when you remember that a Committee is a *transparent* body, whilst Boards are *screens* through which the public cannot always see. His knowledge, therefore, is only that of an outside observer. What he had to say would be simply in the way of suggestion. He regretted to say that some things are omitted in the Annual Report which he would like to have

seen in it. He would like to have known the number of contributing churches, compared with the whole number of churches. He would like, also, to have known the fiscal concerns of this Board in more detail. But he would take the best facts he could find, and say something upon them. Here is a Board calling for benevolent contributions. It receives from $20,000 to $25,000, and in disbursing this it spends about $12,000!—about sixty per cent. is thus laid out in working the machinery. Could or would any private publishing concern stand this? Look at some of these expenses. Here is the Corresponding Secretary, who receives $1000 for general services, and $1500 more for supervising Colportage; and yet another gentleman is reported as receiving $1500 per annum as Superintendent of Colportage. Might not the office of Corresponding Secretary and that of Superintendent of Colportage be merged? Then there is a Treasurer at a salary of $1000 per annum. His work was formerly performed gratuitously. Now we give $1000 for it, although the service requires but three-quarters of an hour a day. Might not this office and that of book-keeper be also merged.

Then there is the *Home and Foreign Record*, which has a circulation of only eighteen thousand in our whole church. He would ask whether there may not be private interests willing to clog the wheels of this *Record*, on purpose the better to promote their own ends? There is also the *Sabbath-School Visitor*, published in one city, and edited in another—a paper whose character, as well as that of the *Record*, he deplores as unworthy of the church. Can we not have an editor to take charge of these papers, and make them what they should be?

But there is another point. The Report asks leave to add certain doxologies to the Hymn Book. Now there was an overture offered in the Presbytery of Philadelphia to the General Assembly, asking for this very thing; when, strange to say, the Board of Publication opposed it, and defeated it. Now that same Board comes here, and asks permission to do it themselves. What is the meaning of this? Does the Board intend to *edit* our book of praise? Yes, sir; they have already done that. They have tampered with the doxologies, and placed

them under a new arrangement. These are things which should be looked into. It should have the serious attention of this Assembly, and we should know how this great institution is managed, and how the funds of the church are used. Is this Board of Publication administered with due economy, and with that judgment and wisdom which it demands? The impression is very distinct on his own mind, that the Board of Publication claim to be the peculiar proprietors of our Hymn Book; claiming to edit and alter it at their pleasure. He referred to the several changes that had been made in the doxologies, and endeavoured to support his impressions. The Board, even when the General Assembly direct them to make an alteration in the Book, and specify the change, reply that it will cost something to do it; and instead of yielding obedience to the last General Assembly, they come up to this one with reasons why the former should not be obeyed. He thought this assumption of power and responsibility was incompatible with the control which belonged to the Assembly. He cared less for the matter to be done; the change proposed was not a thing of vital importance, but the principle involved is one of vital importance. If the Assembly is only to be obeyed when its recommendations and directions are agreeable to the Board, the control of the Assembly is at an end, and a wholesome responsibility can never be preserved.

There is another thing. The manner in which the Board manage their distributing operations is not satisfactory. While other similar institutions have a very efficient system of dispersing their books and tracts, by establishing depositories, and employing the trade, this Board concentrates upon the bookstore in Philadelphia almost all their force, so that the efforts to push the publications of the Board into the remoter cities and parts of the country are not such as the exigencies of our cause demand. We ought to spread our publications more widely and rapidly throughout the country, and use all the agencies and means which other booksellers do, to render these publications accessible, and put them before the people. Now, he would do his own summing up. He had spoken of things that had fallen under his own observation, and had not relied upon mere reports. It was with regret that he felt called upon

to say what he had; but when duty was imperative, he could not shrink from it.

1. That this Board is the *costliest* of our Boards in proportion to the work done and the money received and disbursed. If he understood the statistics published, the per centage was very large. At the same time it least fulfils its mission as an aggressive institution of the church. Whilst other societies are flinging their publications broadcast over the land, we were proceeding at so slow and cautious a rate as to make very little advance year by year. This may be the effect of our maladministration, or it may be attributed to other hindering circumstances; but it became the Assembly to ascertain, if possible, where the deficiency lay. 2. They ought to extend their system of colportage, so as to make it more efficient than it is. So far from doing this, the Report shows that, with increased resources, they have really been contracting this important department. 3. They ought to make a full exhibit of their accounts annually to the General Assembly. As presented, it is difficult or impossible to understand them. They should present a balance sheet, so that the Assembly could be fully satisfied in regard to receipts and expenditures. This, he thought, had not been done, and he thought the Assembly should insist upon it. 4. The Board of Domestic Missions had been blamed for having a working balance in their treasury, to meet the current exigencies of that Board; and yet this Board, with no such prospective demands upon their treasury, had a balance on hand of $22,000; and he would ask why such a balance should be accumulated by this Board? We must instruct them to trust the Assembly with an accurate and full account of their receipts and expenditures. This only can quiet apprehension, and make the reports of the Board satisfactory. He read some resolutions which, at a proper time, he proposed to introduce, and said he would not further trespass on the patience of the House at present. Brethren had come to him, asking him to embody in his remarks the statements which he had made. He had spoken with the utmost frankness, and with a sincere desire to bring about the more efficient operation of this important arm of the church. It appears that the Board of Publication had been formally apprized that their proceedings did

not meet with universal approbation; and that some inquiries would probably be made during the sessions of this Assembly. A Committee was appointed by the Board to prepare a statement to meet these inquiries, but he had not heard what the Committee had done. He called upon Mr. Charles Macalester, a ruling elder upon the floor of the Assembly, to make some statements of facts in regard to the accounts and transactions of this Board, and he trusted he would give such information as he possessed.

Mr. Macalester said he had been called upon by Dr. Edwards unexpectedly, and at this stage of the discussion he did not design to say much. At a proper time he might go into some detail, but at present he would forbear. In regard to the appointment of a Treasurer, he could explain:—There had been a shock given to the public mind by the defalcation in the American Sunday-school Union; and the Board, in view of the large amount of funds passing through their treasury, deemed it wise to ask security of the Treasurer, and we thought it not right to ask him to give security to such an amount, and at the same time offer him no compensation. The Treasurership demanded a measure of personal attention which we could not ask gratuitously. The concern had been honestly managed, he believed; whether prudently and economically was another question. He hoped Mr. Schenck would be able to make a satisfactory explanation; and if so, he (Mr. Macalester) would have nothing more to say; but was unwilling to be held to silence, unless duty permitted it.

At a later period in the debate Rev. Dr. Edwards said, It has been the tactics of those who have occupied the floor to consume time so as to leave no opportunity for him to speak, exhausting the patience of the House, so that they will spring the previous question. (The Moderator called Dr. Edwards to order for personal reflections.) He protested against the imputation that he has made an attack on the Board of Publication. This is not true. He had merely asked for information, which, as a member of this Assembly, he had a right to. He is behind no man in his love for the Boards, nor in his determination, unflinchingly, to inquire into their faithfulness. As to giving the Board notice of the inquiries he has made here, they are

entitled to no such notice. Are we to be precluded from asking information from them when and where we choose? It has been said that he could have made these inquiries in the Board's office, where he would have been politely received. Yes, they are polite, studiously, *ostentatiously* polite. They answer questions, though sometimes they may intimate that their responsibility is to the Assembly. We have had a very entertaining speech here this morning by a former Secretary of this Board, (Dr. Smith) against the reduplicated hymns. What connection had all this with him? He had said nothing about these hymns. Something had been said to make the impression that this is a personal controversy. He would say that between the Corresponding Secretary and the members of that Board and himself there had been the most friendly relations. As to his requesting the Treasurer's place for a ruling elder of his church, he had made that application before he knew what he now knows about that office and its salary. For the discarding the *Sabbath-School Visitor* from his Sabbath-school he must not be held responsible, though he would confess he thought it an inferior paper. As to the matter of the doxologies, he had never received from the editor any such note as has been alluded to. He had received one from the Publishing Agent in the editor's behalf, asking for assistance in making up the deficient doxologies, to which he had replied that his state of health would not permit his attending to that subject, and that the editor was probably more familiar with the matter than himself. He had not entered upon these inquiries in any bad spirit. But after seeing what a flutter he has occasioned, he could not help thinking what a disturbance would be created were he to go to work in good earnest. If his approaches to it are so terrible, what will it be when he takes hold of it? He wished the Assembly to assert the responsibility of these Boards.

After these remarks from Dr. Edwards the vote was taken, and the first resolution of the report, which is highly commendatory of the Board and of the manner of conducting its operations, was adopted *unanimously*. This vote seems to preclude the necessity of reference to the refutation of the above charges, as presented by Dr. B. M. Smith, a former

Secretary of the Board; by Mr. Schenck, its present Secretary; by Dr. Mitchell, J. B. Mitchell, Esq., and others. 1. As to the charge that the Board claimed to be proprietors of the Hymn Book, and to edit and alter it at pleasure, it was shown that all the alterations made was in the arrangement of the doxologies, and supplying some to suit the different metres; and that this matter had been specifically referred to the Board by the General Assembly. 2. As to the complaint that the Board had failed to obey the direction of the last Assembly to substitute some other hymn for the 336th of the present book, it was said that the Board did not refuse to obey that injunction, but simply represented to the present Assembly the difficulties in the way of the proposed alteration, and asked for further directions. It is enough that the Assembly, by a separate vote, approved of the action of the Board in this matter. 3. In reference to the charges of extravagance, it was shown that the salary of one thousand dollars, given to the Treasurer, was not merely in compensation of his services, but the condition of the security for the safe custody of the funds entrusted to his care—a very cheap arrangement, considering the magnitude of the trust. It was further shown that it was unjust to graduate the expense of a colporteur by that of a pedler of books, inasmuch as the former is a missionary, whose object is to instruct, exhort, and pray with the families whom he visits. Mr. Mitchell proved that out of one hundred and seventeen thousand dollars contributed for colportage, sixteen thousand dollars had been spent in the outlay of that sum—less than twelve and a half per cent., instead of sixty, as Dr. Edwards said. He further showed that the books of the Board were printed and sold at a cheaper rate than those of other establishments; that the "brown stone store" in Philadelphia was built by special contributions for that object, and was now worth more than it cost, and could be sold at a profit. The plan of uniting the offices of Corresponding Secretary and Superintendent of Colportage, to save expense, was shown to be impracticable. The latter officer had not only to keep the accounts of all the colporteurs, but to receive their reports, assign their fields, watching the balances of books left to be transferred to their successors, &c.—duties which could not be

discharged by the Corresponding Secretary. 4. The complaint that the books of the Board were not distributed in depositories, was answered by showing that such depositories had been tried and abandoned, as both useless and wasteful; and that the experience of other publishing societies corresponded with that of the Board as to the impolicy of that system.

Whatever may be thought of the propriety of thus arraigning the Boards and officers of the church before the public, on uninvestigated charges, the action of the last Assembly will doubtless convince most men of its inexpediency.

Board of Education.

Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer, Secretary of the Board of Education, addressed the Assembly in reference to the Annual Report of that Board, as follows:

Mr. Moderator, the Board respectfully present to the General Assembly their *fortieth* Annual Report. During this period of twice a score of years, how many scores of ministers, and of candidates for the ministry, have entered the eternal world!

The Board are happy to report, by God's blessing, a prosperous condition of their affairs. The total number of candidates on the roll is three hundred and ninety-one, which is *six* more than last year. The total number of *new* candidates recommended by the Presbyteries, is one hundred and forty-one, which is *thirty-eight* more than last year, and is the largest number since the division of the church. This latter increase is the true exponent of the success of the church's work in this department; because, as the sources of supply increase, the aggregate of operations must necessarily expand. This expansion will not always be in exact proportion to the supply, inasmuch as disturbing causes may exist at one time more than at another; but, as a general rule, the index of present and of future prosperity consists in the annual increase of new candidates.

1. This large increase of new candidates, amounting this year to more than a quarter above that of last year, is owing to the *grace of God* in the outpouring of His Spirit upon our youth. The church is indebted to infinite mercy for each, and for all, her sons. The ministry exists by the power of the

Spirit. The ministry increases by the power of the Spirit. For all these new candidates, let the church praise God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

2. This increase of candidates is, instrumentally, owing in a good degree, under God, to *parental dedication and training.* There is power in the family covenant and family work, which God sanctifies, has sanctified, and will sanctify, from one generation to another. Sir, I yesterday saw in this Assembly a venerable and lovely Christian matron, a mother in Israel, who has four sons in the ministry of Jesus Christ. Every one of the sons whom God gave to her she consecrated to God, and trained up for God, in the work of the ministry; and behold, the honour that God has set upon her in her maturing old age! Mr. Moderator, when I saw her, I felt like bowing reverently at her feet, and, as one of the sons of the church, exclaiming in her presence, "*Mother!*" Who shall ever know the covenant power of parents, and perhaps especially of mothers, in bringing their sons to Jesus, and in introducing them, as preachers of the cross, into the waste places of the earth?

3. God has so largely increased the annual supply of new candidates, in answer to the *prayers* of the churches. Many supplications have ascended to the Lord of the harvest. The churches have remembered this cause in their religious devotions, and have asked God in public and in private, with more than usual importunity; and He has heard their cry. O that this Assembly, and all our congregations, may be stimulated to plead for richer and richer donations of the ascension gifts of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ!

In regard to the *State of the Treasury*, I am thankful that the Board can make a good report to the Assembly. The total amount received in the Candidates' Fund is $52,077.92, which is $4974.85 more than were received last year, whilst last year was $3730.76 in advance of the year before, making an increase in *two* years of nearly *nine thousand* dollars. And this increase has been attained during the two severest years of financial distress known to the country; and it is also worthy of remark that, during the last year, no special appeal whatever was made to the churches.

Mr. Moderator, have you never observed on a river, that,

when four or five vessels are sailing along, one of them sometimes catches the wind, whilst the others are almost becalmed? The difference is not owing to the pilot's skill, but to what some would call chance, but which we call providence. In like manner, the superior financial condition of this Board, above that of the other Boards, this year, is owing to Providence. And as we are always at liberty to interpret providence with reverence, and with an acknowledgment of our own ignorance, and a reliance upon Divine light, so I will venture to suggest some interpretations of this providence to this Assembly.

1. In the first place, it is an *encouragement* to the churches to continue their co-operation in the work of ministerial education. See how good it is for them to send in their donations, however small; for everything contributes to the prosperity of a good cause; and its very prosperity reflects back happiness upon those who have promoted it. If God has made so much out of the church's gifts this year, and enriched the churches with all the good done, is it not an encouragement to persevere another year, and to the end of time, in helping young men in the great work of their education?

2. In the second place, God seems to be wiping away the reproach of "unpopularity," which the Board of Education has had to contend with. He has condescended to set us in a high place. Whilst some of the other Boards, who sometimes insist upon their superior popularity, have mysteriously declined in their receipts this year, the Board of Education has made a large advance. I respectfully suggest whether this does not look as though the churches were taking a higher interest in assisting young men into the ministry. Are not the objects of the Board of Education gaining favour among the churches? I do not wish to press the interpretation too far; but I respectfully submit whether it has not the appearance of substantial truth.

3. In the third place, our financial prosperity is an encouragement to *the hearts of candidates*, in showing them the care of the churches in their behalf. If the funds come in slowly, and doubtfully, how many painful anxieties would be stirred up among those who have already an abundance of pecuniary solicitude! But the church, during the year, has anticipated

every want; and by a cheerful and liberal and *quiet* response, (for our candidates do not like the noise of too many special appeals) has verified to them all her promises of temporal aid.

4. In the fourth place, the financial prosperity of the Board, as seen not only in the increase of funds but of candidates, shows that the addition of the department of Schools, Academies, and Colleges, to the work of the Board of Education does not interfere with its old work of assisting candidates. This was an objection in some minds; but Providence does not seem to sustain it. Whilst the Board continue to make the candidates' department their chief work, their interest in institutions of learning is secondary only so far as that it must not be at the expense of their old work. It sometimes happens that an increase of labour only stimulates a workman to do better what he has already undertaken. In fact, my own personal plans for the candidates' department, during the coming year, mark out a greater amount of correspondence and of visitation, than in any year since my connection with the office. The Board of Education do not pretend to say that they have conducted either department with the efficiency that might have been put forth. But the Secretaries have done the best they could, or as nearly so as human depravity will allow; and it is their conviction that all their efforts for schools, academies, and colleges, so far from interfering with the increase of candidates and the means of sustaining them, have precisely the opposite effect. The two departments are harmonious, co-relative, and mutually contributory to each other's prosperity. At least, the operations for candidates have continued to flourish more and more. In regard to the other department, and the best way of raising funds for it, I shall say a few words when I come to that subject.

Proposed Report to the Presbyteries.—It will be seen that the Board suggest the wisdom, on the part of the Presbyteries, of requiring from the teachers and Professors of institutions of learning, a report to the Presbyteries, at least annually, on the attainments and general standing of all the candidates under their care. Such a report is designed to include *all* candidates, whether aided by the Board or not. The benefits of this proposed arrangement are threefold. 1. A

report to the Presbyteries will bring the candidates into more intimate relation with the Presbyteries, and thus give them the opportunity of a more parental and faithful supervision. 2. In the second place, it will call into stronger exercise the responsibilities of the instructors of candidates for the ministry, and render their knowledge of their character and qualifications more available to the church. 3. And, in the third place, it will promote a healthful sense of responsibility on the part of the young men to their Presbyteries. It will also contribute to remove among candidates for the ministry the distinction between those who are aided by the Board and those who are not aided; a distinction which is sometimes unduly magnified. The Board do not propose to the Assembly to *enjoin* upon the Presbyteries the adoption of this new regulation about reports, but simply to recommend the subject to the consideration of the Presbyteries, and leave each to act as may be judged best.

Hints on choosing a Profession.—At a time when so many young men are brought to the knowledge of Christ, and the world is so active with influences to claim their services, the Board have ventured to present some considerations to the youth of the church, in regard to the principles which should guide the determination of their course in life. I will barely mention the principles brought to view.

1. A leading principle in the choice of a profession, is to follow the one best suited to a young man's gifts and endowments. 2. Another principle is that that profession is to be chosen which God seems the most to approve. 3. Consider the claims of that profession which offers the widest field of usefulness. 4. Another principle worthy of consideration in the choice of a profession, is to notice the direction in which Providence points. 5. A preference may be wisely given, other things being equal, to a profession that admits and nurtures personal improvement, and does not give a prominence to sordid temptations. 6. A young man should keep in sight the rewards of eternity.

Department of Institutions.—The Board of Education have been enabled to do much good, in sustaining feeble institutions of learning. The number of *parochial schools* is not large—probably about one hundred; but they are a great blessing to the

children attending them; and their influence upon other schools is important; and they assist in keeping before the community the great principles of Presbyterian education. A revival occurred in one of these schools, in which eight of the older youth were hopefully converted.

The number of *Presbyterial Academies* is fifty-eight, and these higher institutions, scattered all over the land, are accomplishing important results for Christian education. Their number ought to be largely augmented, and every opportunity embraced for establishing them which Providence may offer. A number of conversions have taken place during the year in our Academies. The greatest religious awakening of the year occurred in the Academy at Waveland, Indiana, under the care of the Presbytery of Crawfordsville. In this revival twenty-three of the students united with the church.

Colleges are great instrumentalities in advancing the kingdom of Christ. The church should not establish them too fast, but fast enough; not ahead of Providence, nor too far behind Providence; but according to the providence. In some sections of our church there are too many colleges—in others too few; in others, the number is just right. The report of the Board contains various suggestions about the collegiate policy of our church, entitled "Plain Words on Colleges." The discussion is on the following points: The number of colleges; their location; the right time for establishing them; buildings; endowment; debt; trustees and professors; standard of scholarship; discipline; religious instruction; and the relation of each college to the character of the whole church. Hints on these topics may be of some use, perhaps, to thoughtful educators. Revivals of religion occurred during the year in three of our colleges, viz. Davidson College, North Carolina; Westminster College, Missouri; and Centre College, Kentucky. The number of students converted is from thirty to fifty. To God be the praise for these and other glorious results.

Funds for this Department.—A few words more, about sustaining our operations among these institutions of learning. Many of them need help for a period, and they ought to have it. The Board of Education could advantageously spend fifteen or twenty thousand dollars a year in estab-

lishing, maintaining, and invigorating institutions of learning. But how shall we get funds? The Assembly has, as yet, taken no definite measures to secure collections. Hitherto, these important operations have been chiefly sustained by the benevolence of two of the ruling elders of the church. One of them set the department in motion by a donation of three thousand dollars, and has kept it in motion with an annual munificence transcending all just claims upon his liberality. The other elder maintained all the needy parochial schools for four or five years by similar gifts; but has latterly felt constrained to withdraw, or at least suspend, his donations. This position of things is unworthy our church. If this department ought to be sustained at all, it ought to be sustained on some general, systematic, efficient plan, in which the great body of our churches can co-operate. The plan which the Board respectfully submit to the General Assembly, is that of taking up collections on the last Thursday of February, and of uniting on that day *alms with our prayers*. This plan is scriptural, simple, economical, practicable and efficient. As to its efficiency, the Board have great hopes, and are willing, with God's blessing, to assume the responsibility of its working. We think that we have a right to ask the Assembly to give the Board a plan for raising funds. The present plan was first suggested to the Board in their consultations with that wise, devoted and able minister of our church, Dr. Phillips, of New York, who, with his brethren in that city, have always exhibited the deepest interest in both departments of the operations of the Board of Education. The Secretaries had often thought of a collection on the Sabbath, before or after the day of prayer; but the idea of selecting the day of prayer itself belongs, as I have said, to Dr. Phillips. It is worthy of trial, and it is believed will prove sufficient. If any pastor prefers the Sabbath before or after the day of prayer, let him by all means use his own discretion.

The Board wish to make progress in their efforts to sustain institutions. They cannot do so without some plan. They would rather resign this branch of their work to the General Assembly than remain stationary, and unable to meet the urgent demands upon their help. They would rather

ask you to choose some other agency to do this work, or if not agency, agents, than to have it falter under their care. This is not the age to lag behind. It is not the period of the world to take steps backward. "Forward," as in the days of Israel, is the true Presbyterian motto. Our standard should know no retreat. Carry it onward, carry it on! Place it in the thickest of the fight! Rally around it, men and brethren, in the name of Christ's crown and covenant; and the old banner of blue will win its victories, as in ages that are past, so now, and in ages that are to come.

Theological Seminaries.

Dr. Palmer read a report from the Committee on Theological Seminaries. It spoke of Allegheny and Danville in most favourable terms, and also of Princeton. Several slight changes were recommended and adopted.

A re-adjustment of the titles and departments of instruction, conforming them as near as possible to the distribution and arrangement which formerly existed, to wit: that Dr. Hodge shall hold his present chair without change; that Dr. McGill be styled Professor of Church History and Practical Theology —the latter to include all the functions of the ministerial office, viz. Church Government, Preaching, and the Pastoral Care; that Dr. Green be Professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature; and that Dr. Alexander be Professor of Hellenistic (or Biblical) Greek, and New Testament Literature.

Relative to Allegheny, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the General Assembly change the time of closing the session to the Wednesday preceding the fourth Tuesday in April.

Dr. William L. Breckinridge was nominated to fill the vacant Chair in the Seminary at Danville, the election to be held on Saturday. The Assembly engaged in prayer for direction, according to the standing rule.

On the day appointed, Dr. W. L. Breckinridge was unanimously elected to the office for which he had been nominated. The distinguished position which that gentleman has long occupied, his many amiable and attractive qualities, and his eminent religious character, will, we doubt not, render this appointment

universally satisfactory to the church. His acceptance of the office is somewhat doubtful, as we gather from the following remarks which he made when his name was first proposed. Rising from the Moderator's Chair, he said:

"I ask the indulgence of my brethren, under the new and extremely delicate and embarrassing circumstances of this moment. If I allow the Assembly to go into this vote without saying anything, and it result in your choice of me to the vacant chair, I might be held to have consented to such result; and thus be pledged to undertake the service. On the other hand, it seems hardly becoming to express an unwillingness to take a position to which it may not be your pleasure to call me. Our brethren in immediate charge of this Seminary have thought proper to make known to me their wishes about this matter, and to assure me that these would not be unacceptable to this body, and to the church at large; but while I have not felt myself at liberty to put it absolutely from me, I have not been willing to say one word, or to take a single step, that might imply a consent to what has now been proposed. You must do what you think well, on the subject, and I must be left free in regard to it. If it shall be your pleasure to choose another, I shall be so far from regarding it as an unkindness, as to feel myself greatly relieved."

We rejoice that the Assembly so cordially assented to the change proposed in the titles and duties of the Professors in the Seminary at Princeton. The union of the departments of Church History and Polity has the sanction of usage and long experience in its favour; and the appointment of one Professor for the language and literature of the Old Testament, and another for the language and literature of the New Testament, is so obvious and natural, that it early commended itself to general approbation. These departments are distinct, comprehensive, and in the highest degree important. Much also, in such matters, may be wisely conceded to the taste and preferences of the Professors themselves. They can most effectually serve the church in the departments to which they have been led to pay special attention. We believe that the change above mentioned will subserve the best interests of the Seminary.

The NORTH-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY commanded greater interest and occupied more of the time of the Assembly than any other subject brought forward for its decision. In 1830, the Synod of Indiana established a Theological School in connection with the College at South Hanover. In 1838, a convention, composed of delegates from the Synods of Indiana, Cincinnati, and Kentucky, determined to found a Seminary on a wider basis at New Albany, which went into operation under a Board of Directors appointed by the Synods of Indiana and Cincinnati, November, 1840. Subsequently, the Synods of Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Northern Indiana, and Illinois, coöperated in the enterprise. In 1853, the majority of the Synods concerned in the operations of this Seminary, united in a proposition to transfer it to the care of the General Assembly. The same year proposals were presented for the foundation of a Seminary by the Assembly, for the West, and St. Louis, New Albany, and Danville, were severally named as its location. The majority of votes were cast for Danville. This left New Albany under the care of the Synods which might choose to continue to it their patronage. In 1854, the Assembly passed a resolution, declaring that in establishing a Seminary at Danville, the Assembly had "no intention to interfere with the Theological Seminary at New Albany, nor with those Synods which shall continue to be united in the support and control of that Institution, nor with any of the churches under the care of such Synods." The Seminary, therefore, continued in operation under its former Professors. Subsequently, seven of the North-western Synods united, and appointed a Board of Directors for a North-western Seminary. The Institution at New Albany was by them transferred to Chicago, and Drs. MacMasters and Thomas, Professors in the old Seminary, were elected to corresponding chairs in the new Institution. Diversity of opinion soon manifested itself among the friends of this enterprise, and it was finally determined to transfer it to the General Assembly, leaving to that body to determine its location and organization. When this subject came up, the Rev. Dr. Palmer made the following report:

The Committee on Theological Seminaries, to which were referred certain papers touching the proposed transfer to the

General Assembly, of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-west, beg leave to report, that upon examination these papers are found to be:

1. An overture from the Board of Directors of said Seminary, proposing a transfer of the same from the several Synods united in its control, to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States.

2. Papers detailing the action of eight Synods, viz. the Synods of Cincinnati, Indiana, Northern Indiana, Illinois, Chicago, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Southern Iowa, authorizing the above-mentioned transfer, and instructing the Board of Directors to present the overture touching the matter to this General Assembly.

3. Two printed documents, being the Constitution of the North-western Theological Seminary, and the act of incorporation by the General Assembly of Illinois.

4. Certain papers, stating the opinions and wishes of twenty-nine Presbyteries in connection with these eight Synods.

5. A statement of the assets of the New Albany Theological Seminary, now in possession of the Board of Directors of that institution.

6. Papers containing proposals for the endowment of the Seminary, upon the condition of its acceptance by this Assembly, and located at Chicago or at Indianapolis respectively.

7. A statement of the present indebtedness of the Seminary of the North-west.

These papers have been carefully considered by the Committee, and their contents may be briefly stated: Of the eight confederated Synods, five—viz., Cincinnati, Chicago, Indiana, Northern Indiana, and Illinois—urge the transfer *simpliciter*, without any opinion or desire expressed upon any matter connected with it.

Two Synods, viz., Wisconsin and Southern Iowa, connect with this transfer, a request that professors shall not be chosen till there is a sufficient endowment secured to warrant it.

And one Synod, viz., that of Iowa, in a paper from its abridgment not perfectly clear to the committee, seems to desire that the Assembly shall exercise only a negative control over the appointments in the Seminary.

It is clear, however, that all these Synods except perhaps the last, desire the Assembly, during the present session, to accept the direction of the Seminary, and to hold and exercise all powers at present vested in themselves.

As to the financial condition of the institution now offered to this Assembly, it claims the assets of the New Albany Theological Seminary, amounting in all to $39,430, which the trustees of that institution seem authorized to transfer. Of this amount, however, the sum of $25,000 is not at the disposal of the trustees, but is acknowledged to be in the control of the General Assembly, and which it is hoped the Assembly will put to the service of this institution, it having been originally contributed for theological education in the West. In the judgment of the committee, the wishes of the donor may be easily ascertained, and should be decisive upon this point.

Against the remaining $14,430 must be placed a debt incurred by the Seminary of the North-west, of $5,241, which the board has ordered to be paid out of the assets of the New Albany institution in the hands of its trustees.

Should the Assembly agree to accept the donation and control of this Seminary, in accordance with the overture of these eight Synods, two distinct proposals are made, looking to its endowment. On the one hand, if Chicago shall be selected as the seat of the new institution, Mr. C. H. McCormick gives his written obligation to pay to the directors who shall be appointed, the sum of one hundred thousand dollars payable in four annual instalments, and drawing six per cent., from the opening of the Seminary, that is to say, $25,000 for each Professor whom this Assembly shall appoint in the same. In addition to this promise of Mr. McCormick, and upon the condition that within the period of two years, buildings costing not less than $50,000, shall be erected upon a designated site, certain persons make a grant of forty-five acres of land, definitely located, the market value of which is not stated.

On the other hand, if Indianapolis shall be selected for its location, certain persons connected with the Synods of Indiana, Northern Indiana, and a part of the Synod of Illinois, pledge the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars toward the endowment, drawing six per cent. interest, from the opening of the institu-

tion. Also $25,000 more is subscribed by citizens of Indianapolis for the erection of suitable buildings on a site given by Rev. W. A. Holliday, which is itself valued at $10,000.

In addition to these two amounts, there appears to be a reliable subscription of $6,000 in another place, making a total of money subscribed, and grants of land, of about $66,000.

Upon a deliberate survey of all the facts thus comprehensively stated, and in view of the promise given of an early endowment of the institution, and especially in view of the unanimity and earnestness with which so large a portion of the church as that represented by eight distinct Synods, express their conviction of the need of a Theological Seminary of high order in the North-west; your committee unanimously concur in recommending the two following resolutions to the General Assembly:

Resolved, That in accordance with the overture emanating from the above named eight Synods, this Assembly does now accept the direction and control of the Seminary known by the corporate name and style of "The Presbyterian Seminary of the North-west."

Resolved, That the present Assembly, during the present session, will decide by a majority of the votes of its members, what place within the limits of these eight Synods shall be selected as the site of said Seminary.

The matters of detail, as to the organization and equipment of the Seminary, the committee are of opinion, can not well be considered, until these preliminary points shall be decided, and they make, therefore, no report upon the same.

A protracted debate ensued in relation to the location of the new Seminary. Chicago and Indianapolis were the places nominated. In favour of the former it was urged that it was remote from existing Seminaries of our church, and geographically central to the vast region whose wants the new institution was intended to supply; whereas Indianapolis was so far south as to render certain the call for another Seminary further northwest in a few years, if that place were fixed upon as the location. This seems to have been admitted by the friends of Indianapolis, as they advocated the propriety of numerous theological seminaries. They assumed that no such institution ought to have

more than one hundred students. On the other hand, it was urged that this multiplication of seminaries was likely to become a crying evil in the church and country, scarcely less burdensome and impolitic than the multiplication of universities, colleges, and banks, which now crowd the land. This geographical consideration, together with the liberal pecuniary offers in behalf of Chicago, seems to have had most weight with the Assembly. The vote was two hundred and forty-two for Chicago and sixty-four for Indianapolis. The Rev. Dr. Palmer then presented, from the Committee on Theological Seminaries, the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That this General Assembly do hereby accept the donation of $100,000, made by Mr. McCormick to them for the endowment of four Professorships in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-west, about to be established by this Assembly, and upon the terms and conditions therein mentioned.

2. *Resolved*, That the thanks of this General Assembly be tendered to Mr. C. H. McCormick for his munificent donation, and that a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to Mr. C. H. McCormick by the Stated Clerk.

3. *Resolved*, That the offer of forty-five acres of land from other gentlemen of Chicago, under certain specified conditions, together with similar offers, be referred to the Board of Directors, to be accepted or not, at their discretion.

The following constitution is submitted by the Committee for the government of the Seminary, based as much as possible upon the old constitution, with only such changes as are necessitated by the transfer of the control of said Seminary from the Synods to the Assembly. (The constitution is somewhat long, and will probably be published in another way. It is understood to be very similar to those of Princeton, Danville and Allegheny. We omit, at least for the present, its publication.)

With a view to secure such amendments to the charter as may be required by this change in the direction and control of this Seminary, and to provide for the legal transfer of the property, the committee submit to the Assembly the following resolution:

4. *Resolved*, That the Board of Directors of the said Semi-

nary, for whose appointment provision is made in the Constitution herewith submitted, be, and they hereby are directed to take such measures as may be found proper and expedient to procure the legal transfer and safe investment of all the property of said Seminary; and for that purpose to procure from the Legislature of Illinois such legislation as may be necessary to effect this object.

Should the foregoing recommendations of the committee be approved by the General Assembly, the way will be open for the election of Professors of the new Seminary, in relation to which, the following resolutions are proposed:

5. *Resolved*, That it be made the first special order for Monday next to elect Professors to fill the four following chairs, viz.

The Chair of Exegetic and Didactic Theology.

The Chair of Polemic and Pastoral Theology.

The Chair of Church History and Government.

The Chair of Biblical and Oriental Literature.

Resolved, That nominations for the above Chairs be now received.

6. *Resolved*, That immediately after the election of Professors on Monday next, the Assembly proceed to elect Directors for this institution.

Some objection was made to the proposed arrangement of the Professorships, and that subject was referred to a special Committee, consisting of Drs. Smith, Humphrey, Thornwell, McGill, and Professor Wilson. The departments were subsequently arranged in the following manner. 1. Didactic and Polemic Theology. 2. Biblical and Ecclesiastical History. 3. Historical and Pastoral Theology and Church Government. 4. Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

When the Assembly were about to proceed to the election of Professors, Dr. E. D. MacMaster moved that the order of the day be postponed, in order to take up a motion to defer the election till next year. Dr. MacMaster delivered a long and earnest speech in support of his motion, of which we find the following brief abstract in the *Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.*

He had been ten years a Professor in the Seminary under

Synodical control, and felt it a duty to present the subject fairly to the understanding of the Assembly. His position was delicate. He had hitherto declined participating in the discussions, but now felt it a duty to speak. Providence called him to it, though painful. Justice to a public interest of the church, required the house to have patience, and give attention. He had committed to writing what he had to say, and would read it. He would make three preliminary remarks.

1. He did not appear as a party to a scramble for place. No one could point to any act of his, by himself or by his friends on his authority, seeking an appointment. He had three times vacated his place, with a view to changes, supposed to be beneficial. He never had been, and never would be, an aspirant for an office in the gift of the Assembly. He appeared here but as a member.

2. He had not been, and would not be a party to any personal controversy—unless as he had been pursued, for these last ten years. He had ever refused to reply to any of the attacks made upon him. His refusal to be drawn into anything personal heretofore, was a guaranty for the present.

3. He would speak, with reference to himself, only so far as it would be needful in discussing the subject. He would discuss this for the peace and edification of the church, and with all plainness and fidelity.

There was a great division in the churches on the subject. Since 1856, the whole movement toward the Seminary, had been distinguished by accusations, specially against the Professors. The accusations had reference to alleged opinions and designs on the subject of slavery. He did not intend to discuss the merits of the subject of slavery, only so far as an answer to wrongful charges made this necessary. No matter of accusation has been alleged against him, except what resolves itself into this. It has been alleged that it was the design of himself and Dr. Thomas to found an abolition Seminary, and divide the church—that they had attempted to accomplish this design, by concealment, fraud, trick, &c. To these, in the terms in which they are made, he would make no reply. He would treat them, as he had hitherto done, with silence. He would not attempt to prove that the charges were wrong; untrue as they are.

Some may have been deceived by the representations made. He would try to disabuse the Assembly. He would speak historically, quoting records.

1. The Seminary at first was established by the Synods in Ohio and Indiana. They sought the coöperation of those of Kentucky, Tennessee and Missouri. A union was formed; and the Seminary desired a *cordial* union.

The proposal in 1856 to extend the interest in the Seminary to other Synods, was not made to Missouri. This was because Missouri had withdrawn from the connection, years previously. Such was the general understanding, and there was abundant evidence of the fact of withdrawal. (Dr. MacMaster quoted from the Digest, prepared by S. J. Baird, and from sundry papers and documents, to sustain his position.) He gave these reasons to show the ground on which he and the Directors concluded that the Synod of Missouri did not desire an invitation to unite in the Seminary, and hence was not invited, when other Synods were invited.

The connection of the Synods of Kentucky and Tennessee with New Albany was dissolved in 1853, when the Seminary at Danville was instituted. And Missouri withdrew in the same year, and for four years appointed no Directors.

The Seminary had formerly sought a union with the Synods in the slave States on true principles, consistent with the safety and benefit of both parties. He believed that the free States will not be driven from their true conservative ground. The attempt to excite the odium of Abolitionism against the friends of the New Albany Seminary, is unjust, and to be deprecated. He had endeavoured to preserve the union of the Synods north and south of the Ohio, and yet he is stigmatized as an Abolitionist! It was not he, but others, who sought and effected division.

In August 1856, a circular was addressed to ministers and elders in the *seven* North-western Synods. In October, a constitution was proposed and adopted. It was adopted by all the seven Synods, with only one negative voice, in one of them. There was nothing about slavery in the circular, nor in the constitution, nor in the Synods, on the adoption of the Constitution. He was accused of plotting, because a constitution

had been offered to the Synods, and not to a Convention. But they, the Synods, had the right to act, and they exercised that right.

In 1857 he addressed a letter to the Directors of the new Seminary, stating his views on the subject of slavery, in which he declared his adhesion fully to the doctrines of the Assembly on the subject. (The speaker here read this letter. It is very long. We published it once.)

To the answer given to the question sent up to the Assembly in 1845, relative to fellowship with slaveholders, in any circumstances, he had always accorded. It was substantially right. Still, he thought the paper then adopted by the Assembly was liable to be misunderstood, both by slaveholders and abolitionists, and also by many good persons in our own church and in other churches. He considered that paper ill-advised, crude, and inconsistent.

Two private letters of one of the Professors (Dr. MacMaster himself,) had been discovered and brought forth as proof against him, of plots and intrigues. Of these he would say that they were his own. The other Professor, and the Directors, had no responsibility in relation to them. These letters, however, sufficiently explain themselves to the candid. He would print them in an Appendix to his present remarks. They maintain that slavery is a great evil; and this is sustained by the Assembly's action of 1818; and they speak in condemnation of the new doctrine, that slavery is a great good. They speak of certain persons who are endeavouring to introduce among us this new doctrine, and of the duty of resisting the encroachments of the slave power.

Taking slavery as defined—that is, as a system which makes human beings "chattels," "tools"—it should not come into the church, and should not be there tolerated. The pro-slavery power had come into this region to interfere with the peaceful efforts to establish a Seminary. It was not to be endured. The war had been waged to maintain the pro-slavery power. He had been proscribed, because he could not bow down to it.

An important question is to be decided. The eyes of the church and of the world are upon this Assembly. If the Assembly should decide wrong, he would still not forsake the

Church, but would yet contend for her purity and glory. Truth will prevail, but error will die and perish. He had discharged a present duty, one which he could not evade. He would print fifty thousand copies of his speech, and send them all over the church.

Dr. MacMaster has carried into effect his purpose to print his speech, and we have had the opportunity of reading it in pamphlet form. The perusal has impressed us deeply with the conviction of the author's ability and courage. It is an open and manly avowal of opinions which he knew to be unpopular, and which he must have been aware would place him out of sympathy with the body which he addressed. While we cannot help feeling respect for the man, and sympathy with him in the frustration of his cherished plans, we regard the speech as unsound in doctrine, and eminently inappropriate for the occasion. Dr. MacMaster was not called upon to defend himself. He had not forfeited the confidence of any part of the church, North or South. He had been accused of abolitionism, as Dr. Rice had been accused of being the advocate of slavery and the tool of a pro-slavery party. Neither needed any vindication. They had for years been arrayed on opposite sides on many questions of policy. Both had been assailed, with equal injustice it may be, with having ulterior and unavowed objects, and with prosecuting those objects by unfair means. Into the merits of these controversies the Assembly was not called upon to enter; and, as far as we can learn, was not disposed to take sides with either party. If we may confide in the statements of those who had the best opportunities of knowing, the Assembly was prepared to do full justice to Dr. MacMaster. Some of his best friends have publicly asserted that sixty members of the Assembly from the South had avowed their purpose to vote for him as Professor in the new Seminary, which would doubtless have secured his election. His claims were peculiarly strong. His long and faithful service as Professor at New Albany; his election to a chair in the Northwestern Seminary by the representatives of the seven Synods before its transfer to the Assembly; his having voluntarily resigned that chair in order that the Assembly might be unembarrassed in the selection of its officers, should they decide to assume the charge of

the institution; and his own eminent qualifications for the office, were considerations which no body of generous, right-minded men, would think of resisting. His speech, however, put his election out of the question, for two reasons. First, it could not fail to be considered as an avowal of opinions, feelings, and purposes in reference to slavery, which the Assembly could not sanction; and, secondly, it made it evident that he could not, and would not coöperate with Dr. Rice, whose claims, in the opinion of a large class of his brethren, were equal to his own. When the votes therefore were counted, it was found that two hundred and fourteen had been cast for Dr. Rice, and only forty-five for Dr. MacMaster. In saying that we regard Dr. MacMaster's doctrine on slavery to be unsound, we have reference to the form in which he has presented it in his speech. It is probable that he differs from the mass of his brethren on this subject, more in words and feeling than he does in principle. He insists on making a distinction between slavery and slaveholding, which is in the nature of the case untenable. If slavery be what he defines it to be, all slaveholding, under all conceivable circumstances, must be a crime. There can, according to his definition, no more be justifiable slaveholding, than there can be justifiable murder. He represents slavery to be a system which makes a man a chattel; a thing which denies to him the rights of a husband and father; which debars him from instruction and means of improvement. Slavery, however, is nothing but involuntary servitude—that is, the obligation to render service not conditioned on the will of the servant. There may be most unjust laws enacted by the State to enforce that obligation, and most unrighteous means adopted to perpetuate and render safe and profitable the condition of bondage, but these laws and means are not slavery. They do not enter into its definition; they are not essential to its existence. To approve of slavery in that sense of the word, is to approve of denying humanity to man; it is to approve of his degradation, and of the adoption of means designed and adapted to perpetuate that degradation; it is to approve of concubinage in place of marriage; it is to approve of denying to parents rights guarantied to them by the law of God. To do all this is as palpably to renounce Christianity as it would be to approve

of Mormonism or Mohammedanism. It is equally obvious, that no Christian can voluntarily assist in making or enforcing laws which give to involuntary servitude this character. It is this aspect or idea of slavery that the earlier declarations of our church evidently contemplated. The famous minute of 1818 is true of slavery in this sense, but it is not true according to the subsequent deliverances and uniform practice of the church, of slavery in the sense of involuntary servitude. Now as this latter is the sense in which the word is used in all the recent acts of our Assembly, and as it is the sense which is put upon it by probably nine-tenths of our brethren, the denunciations of Dr. MacMaster's speech directed against slavery will inevitably be understood of involuntary servitude. They in their apparent meaning bear against that great body of ministers and members of our church who are owners of slaves. They hold up those brethren as the advocates of a system which is at war with the plainest dictates of natural justice, and the clearest revelations of the divine will. His speech is mainly directed against slavery, against a slave party in the state, and a slave power in the church. Dr. Rice (by implication at least) is held up as a pro-slavery man. The inference, therefore, is unavoidable, that the slavery denounced is the slavery which Presbyterian ministers and members defend as not incompatible with the word of God. Although, therefore, no man in our church, so far as we know, has ever defended slavery as *defined* by Dr. MacMaster, yet as he denounces a class of men in the church as pro-slavery men, they cannot avoid considering his denunciations as reaching beyond his definition, and touching them and their avowed opinions. It is in this way that his speech placed him in a position antagonistic to the mass of the Assembly. The fact, also, that he represented himself as the object of persecution by the slave-power, and claimed that the true question which the Assembly were called upon to decide, was, whether that power should control the church or not, evinced a state of mind which boded no good. His own most intimate and constant friends regarded this as altogether a mistake, and refer to the readiness of sixty southern members of the Assembly, including some of the most influential men on the floor, to vote for him as a Professor in the new Seminary, as a

proof of the correctness of their opinion. Into the merits of the controversy, which has attended the origin of the institution at Chicago, we do not pretend to enter. As journalists, we candidly express our views of the action of the Assembly as exhibited in the reports of its debates. High as we estimate the gifts and claims of Dr. MacMaster, we cannot be surprised at the result of the ballot, after reading his speech.

The election of Dr. Rice to the Chair of Theology was the great point of interest. The Rev. Dr. Willis Lord, of Brooklyn, was chosen Professor of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History; the Rev. Dr. Halsey of Louisville, was elected to the Chair of Historical and Pastoral Theology and Church Government; and the Rev. W. M. Scott, D.D. of Cincinnati, to that of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. For the first time in the history of our church a Theological Seminary begins its career with a full corps of Professors, a competent endowment, and an excellent geographical position.

Revised Book of Discipline.

The revision of the Book of Discipline has not met with the favour which its authors confidently anticipated. The reasons of the coldness with which the new book has been received, seem to be the strong aversion to change, in the minds of many of the brethren; the fact that a few unpalatable changes had been introduced which created a prejudice against the whole thing; and the pre-occupation of the minds of the members of the Assembly by things of more immediate and pressing interest. We flatter ourselves that the time is not distant when a verdict will be rendered with great unanimity in favour of the majority of the alterations proposed by the Committee of Revision. Dr. Thornwell, Chairman of that Committee, delivered, when the subject was under consideration, an able speech in support of its report.

Rev. Dr. Thornwell, Chairman of the Committee appointed for the purpose, presented as their report a Revision of the Book of Discipline. Dr. Thornwell said he would not go over the report in detail. That report has been printed, and is in the hands of the members. He intended at present only to state a few general principles. Some of the changes proposed

are important; he would say radical. The committee have endeavoured to improve the old Book by striking out redundancies, by carrying out principles already implied or acted upon, and by, as far as possible, harmonizing the whole upon the three great principles which he would now state.

1. All our courts are regarded simply as courts, and not as parties at the bar. They are judges called upon in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and they are not counsel, or pleaders, or parties. According to the old Book the lower court is a party, and, as such, is invariably ruled out when it comes to the higher court. This he regarded as implying what is false in fact. The mere fact that a lower court has tried a case is no evidence of prejudice. It moreover contradicts the great principles of our government. Ours is a representative government. Such are our courts, and in these courts you ascend from a representative body covering a smaller space, to a representative body covering a larger space, until in this Assembly you meet the parliament of the whole church. The lower court often has important information, which is due to the larger one to which the case is carried. According to the old Book, you are not appealing from a smaller portion of the church to a larger part of it, but from one part of it to another part. The true principle is from a part to a larger part, or to the whole. In regarding your lower courts as parties, you actually do all you can to make them parties. Knowing they are regarded as such, they will naturally so consider themselves, and naturally act accordingly. But by right they should be placed in no such category. They come here as your equals; you exchange counsels with them, and thus mutually reach a just decision.

It has been objected, that by this means you give too much influence to the court below. You certainly do give an influence, but still not an unrighteous one. By the present mode you really bar a portion of the church from arriving at a just conclusion. For instance, in the Pittsburgh Assembly of 1836, in an important trial for heresy, the Synod of Philadelphia was excluded, and a decision secured which was not the true sense of the church, because the large Synod of Philadelphia was out of the house. And at the same Assembly a case

of the sort came up, which was decided just the other way, because the Synod of Cincinnati, a smaller body, was out, and the large Synod of Philadelphia was in the house. But it is also said, that sometimes one Presbytery in a Synod is so large as to make them a majority of the Synod. The very fact that they are so numerous is a presumption that they are right.

This proposed change simply goes upon the principle that each court, whether Session, Presbytery, or Synod, is always a court, and that superior courts, to be complete, must include their entire membership.

As to the influence of prejudice, said to be thus introduced, you really have more prejudice by excluding the lower court than by admitting it; for it is still on the ground. Indeed, we all know that every Assembly is composed of two classes of members, those *in* the house and those *out* of it—lobby members—the latter often more influential than the former. You must, after all, trust your judges, and take it for granted that they will be faithful and do their duty.

He came now to a point clear as the noonday sun, though one in which the committee has been severely criticised—he means the relation of baptized children to the church. He admits that it is a radical principle—the principle is, that the indispensable condition on which a man becomes subject to discipline, is the profession of his faith. It is objected that the committee are wanting in logic, in contending for the membership of baptized children, and yet not discipline them. These brethren take the ground that church-membership necessarily involves subjection to discipline. You might, with equal propriety, say it is inconsistent to admit that they are members, and yet *not* admit them to all the privileges and offices of the church—to the Lord's table, the eldership, &c. You debar them simply because *they do not believe professedly in Christ.* Carry out the remorseless logic of these brethren, and you seat at the Lord's table all baptized worldlings and hypocrites. Sir, you have two classes of church members—professing and non-professing; and herein is the reason for a difference of treatment. Want of faith incapacitates the non-professing from the sacrament of the Supper. The same thing incapacitates for subjection to judicial process. It is important that we under-

stand the true idea of discipline. Discipline is not penal; the purpose of it is not to indicate the magnitude of the offence, or as a vindication of justice; it is rather to produce repentance. These provisions are all penitential; it is to bring back and restore an erring brother. It is a healing remedy. And these censures are, of course, as utterly absurd in regard to a man who has never heard the voice of the Lord in his soul, as for him to sit at the Lord's Supper. In order to receive any benefit from discipline, it is absolutely necessary that he recognize the claims of the Lord upon him. You see, therefore, that this view necessitates the distinction between professing and non-professing members. He would say, therefore, that in the whole word of God you cannot find a single case where discipline does not depend on brotherhood in the faith. There is another aspect of the subject of great moment. What is the *ground* of the membership of baptized members? Shall we take the ground that they are members by profession? Why, sir, this would be the doctrine of sponsors. Our doctrine is, that they are members through their parents. We take them in organically by families. Do you not see, then, that the first step in discipline is through the parents? You act on this principle when you require parents to train them in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The parents, then, are the tie between the children and the church. The church governs them through their parents. Here is the discipline. What, then, is the precise position into which baptism brings a child? It makes him a child of the covenant. Baptism makes the broad separation as to the covenant of grace between the church and the world. It brings the child into such a relation that it can plead that covenant, and plead it with a power and a pathos that unbaptized children cannot. It gives the peculiar right of inheritance in these promises, and puts the baptized child in a near and blessed relation to God. It at the same time places the child under new and heavier responsibilities than rest on the world. And the parents' duty is to train up the children, pressing this obligation and privilege upon them.

But suppose they grow up and do not come to the Lord's table, what are you to do with them? Excommunicate them? as some suggest. No. Do as the Master would. If they turn

their back upon their birthright, still do not cast them out; but follow them with remonstrance, exhortation, prayers, &c. Bear with them. They bring no reproach. They are not professors. They are simply children who do not know their birthright, and we are continually persuading them to come up to their privileges.

But suppose you take the other course, and discipline them. What then? Why you are using your spiritual remedies on men who have no adaptation to receive them; or you fill your communion tables with worldlings and hypocrites. It is this which has filled the church of Scotland with moderatism, and other churches with formalists. The system proposed in the Revision is really that on which our church has always acted.

Our church may be compared to the temple. We see there, first, the *sanctum sanctorum*, all really spiritual persons; then second, the *sanctum*, separating all professedly spiritual persons from all without; then third, is the outer court, equally separate from the second. He recognizes in the church—1. True followers of the Redeemer. 2. Professors without true piety. 3. That vast congregation whom God has brought into the church by baptism, who are there to be trained, that they may be led at last into the *sanctum sanctorum*.

But why do not brethren carry out their principles? They go for confining discipline to baptized persons. What then will they do with that part of your Book which gives all children of believing parents a right to church membership? Will they not be required to discipline the children of believers, whether baptized or not? Certainly, if consistent.

The other point which has been objected to is allowing deceived church members to withdraw from the church, or, as it has been called, opening the back-door. For himself, so that we could get thieves and robbers out of our houses, provided they carry nothing with them, we were glad to have any door opened, whether it be a back or a front-door. It has been said that it assumes the right of members of the church to withdraw at pleasure, and that it thus renders the church a voluntary society. But what is a voluntary society? A mere thing of human invention and contrivance. Surely brethren will not say that we have made these truths on which the church is

built. But in another sense the church is a voluntary organization. We claim that all who come into the church from the world must come voluntarily. To those whose hearts are not with us, we say, Withdraw. But how shall we get them out? These brethren say, If a man gets into your house, who ought not to be there, you cannot let him out in any other way than by kicking him out. But, after all, though the revision proposes to open a mode of retirement for a church member, under certain circumstances, we still say the seal of baptism is on him, and never can be removed. We only pronounce him unfit for the communion of the *sanctum*, according to his own confession. We open the door, and put them back in their own outer court, where, by their own statements, their proper place is. We do not arraign young men and young women before the session, and prosecute them for not being converted.

The Revised Book of the Committee has been pronounced a failure. It may possibly not meet the concurrence of this Assembly, but he believes before God, it embodies the true principles of a spiritual church. What we are aiming at, and what we want, is a pure body. Our baptized children, our non-professing members, occupy a curious position. In heart they belong to the world, in covenant relation they belong to God; because of the latter, the church operates first upon these. Hence God comes with his blessing to you first, then to your children, and lastly to as many as are afar off, whom the Lord shall call.

Rev. Dr. Humphrey said he wished to refer to the history of our present Book of Discipline, in order to convince the Assembly that we should do the work of revision, if at all, only cautiously and carefully. It appears that when it was determined, in the old Synod of Philadelphia and New York, to form a General Assembly, a committee was appointed to prepare a Book of Discipline. That was composed of such men as John Rodgers, Robert Smith, Allison, Woodhull, Latta, Duffield—all known names. Two years afterwards, we find that this Committee reported "A Plan of Government and Discipline." The Synod of New York and Philadelphia, composed of only one hundred members, against three hundred in this house, were not then ready to adopt it. On the contrary, after thirteen

sessions, extending through eight days, their discussions only resulted in printing it and sending it down to the Presbyteries. The next year these Presbyteries reported; and then again, not until after six sessions, extending through four days, was it referred to the Presbyteries for adoption. So careful were our fathers in adopting this Book. Now, shall we change in a few hours what they have so carefully done, and make changes too, which our brethren themselves avow to be "radical"? Dr. Humphrey would here express his regret that he is compelled to differ from a Committee of names so honoured as the present one, but duty constrains him.

Well, this Book of Discipline, prepared with so much care, went into effect, and was used till 1816, when another revision was called for. Then Drs. Romeyn, Alexander, and Miller, (names he delights to speak,) were appointed to examine it, and report next year. The next year the Committee asked that Dr. Nott should be added to their number; and in 1818 they reported that they had "made some progress in the business." And at last, in 1819, after three years, the proposed revision was reported, and one thousand copies were sent to the Presbyteries for "examination and suggestions." He wished special notice to be taken of the extreme caution of these movements; and their changes, too, were not "radical," as at present. In 1820, this Committee reported that the number and contrariety of opinions had greatly perplexed them, but that they had endeavoured to harmonize them so as to make a proper and acceptable Book of Discipline. The Assembly, after six sessions, extending through four days, adopted it. Thus, after all this caution and care had this Book been adopted, which now, after forty years, we propose to alter in a few hours.

In the Committee's revision, we are asked to say that baptized children are not to be subject to discipline. Let us be cautious how we agree to this. In the year 1789, it was decided that baptized children are subjects of discipline. In 1821, see how the language is changed, so that instead of saying, "Inasmuch as all baptized children are members of the church," they say, simply, "All baptized *persons* are members of the church, and are subject to its forms and discipline." Now he believes that words are things. Some of the greatest heresies have turned

upon little words; and the words now proposed would, in his view, be replete with danger.

Let us take warning, too, from the obvious tendencies in this matter. In the year 1811, according to the statistics, there were one hundred and ninety-eight infant baptisms to one thousand communicants; but according to these same statistical tables, the proportion has been running down, till you now have but fifty-one to one thousand, and this has been a constant and gradual diminution. Now, he would ask, Is this a time to give up your principles, and take down the bars? No, sir, no! He was aware that it has been objected that these statistics are inaccurate; but you will perceive that the current has all the time been running in the same direction, which is surely significant. If we go on in this way, the next proposition will be, by 1889, to resolve that inasmuch as baptized children are not members of the church at all. A French philosopher has explained the method by which dogmas die out—the kernel is gradually extracted, and then any passer-by with his foot can crush the shell. Take care how you touch these rights which are so important. An article appeared, some two years since, in the *Princeton Review*, presenting startling statistics as to the decline of Infant Baptism, which it might be well just now to ponder. He differed from the brother (Dr. Thornwell) as to the ground of administering baptism. It is not descent from parents, but the covenant; and just in proportion as you lose your hold on the covenant, you will drift away until you become an Anti-pedo-Baptist church.

In conclusion, he would beg pardon, if he has been betrayed into intemperate warmth. He came from a cold clime in the old home of the Puritans; but he has been living so long in Kentucky, that he has perhaps acquired the habit of sometimes expressing himself with what may seem to some an undue warmth.

Rev. Dr. Thornwell said he concurred in the motion of Dr. Humphrey, and hoped that as part of the Theological Seminaries had been represented in the Committee, the others should also have a representation. He wished also to explain, that by radical changes, he by no means meant to apply that term to the essential principles of our system, but only to certain

usages which he deemed contradictory and illogical. He also placed the ground of infant membership through their connection with the parents most certainly on the covenant. He must say, too, that Dr. Humphrey's argument shows conclusively that a revision is imperatively demanded. For some years past we have had these stringent notions about infant baptism, and hence the decline. Let these notions continue to prevail, and in ten years we should have, perhaps, no baptisms at all.

Rev. Dr. Lowrie moved that the Revision be referred to the next Assembly. Let it be discussed, in the meantime, in our periodicals and newspapers. As to withdrawing from the church, the Assembly decided adverse to such withdrawal. And in the Assembly at Baltimore, under a judicial case, the same decision was come to, on the ground that the covenant of the church member is made, not with the church, but with his God; that you have no right to release him, but that you must.

As to the lower courts being parties, brethren forget that our present system is indispensable to the very idea of our government. In a session you do not allow the members of it to be challenged, because of prejudice. No, that is not your remedy. You allow the members of the court to sit, and if he feels injustice is done, you allow him to carry it up; and, to secure him the more fully, you do not allow those who have been liable to prejudice to interfere with an unbiassed and important decision; thus you have the pure court our brother so much desires.

Sir, let us steer clear of these radical changes. This Book has served us for forty years; it may probably do for forty more; and then let the Assembly appoint a new committee—perhaps consisting chiefly of pastors, with some legal gentlemen.

Rev. Mr. Platt said he thought this was the time and the place to discuss this report in detail. This should be done before sending it to the Presbyteries or to the next Assembly. We need light on these important subjects. We do not want merely anonymous publications. We wish to know who the men are that address the public, whose views are presented to us.

We fully agree with Dr. Thornwell in all he said about our ecclesiastical courts and other points in the new book which had been the subjects of criticism, except the relation of baptized persons to the church. As to this point, there were three views presented in the Committee of Revision. First, that which favoured the form in which the subject is exhibited in the old Book. It is there said: "All baptized persons are members of the church, are under its care, and subject to its government and discipline; and when they have arrived at the years of discretion, they are bound to perform all the duties of church members." This undoubtedly expresses the general conviction of the Christian world. It has been embodied in the principles, and carried out in the practice of all historical churches from the beginning, until the rise of the Independents. It undoubtedly expresses the faith and practice of our own church, from its organization until the present time. Some of the Committee were very strenuous that it should be allowed to retain its place in the Revised Book, without alteration. A second view, while admitting that baptized persons were in some sense members of the church, seemed to regard them as only under its fostering care, but not subject to its government or discipline. Third, as a compromise, it was proposed to say, as in the Revised Book, that while all baptized persons are members of the church, and under its care and *government*, yet the proper subjects of *judicial process* are those who have professed their faith in Christ.* In this form it was passed, but not unanimously—Dr. McGill not being willing to give up the clear statement of the old Book. In the new form, a distinction is made between *government* and *judicial* process; that is, between discipline in its wide and its narrow sense. And as the paragraph, in its revised form, asserts that baptized persons are subject to the government of the church, it was

* It is not to be expected that all the members of a large committee who may agree to its report are of the same mind as to all the principles which the report may contain. It is the report of the committee, because the act of the majority, and the minority agree to it as a whole, while they reserve their right to their own judgment as to its details. There is no breach of confidence, therefore, in any member of such committee, avowing his preference for some other form of expression than that which the majority of his brethren decided to adopt.

thought that the great principle involved remained intact. We are free to confess that the old form is, in our view, greatly to be preferred; and we are not surprised at the opposition which the change has elicited, although we voted for it, as a compromise. Dr. Thornwell's argument assumes that the indispensable condition under which a man becomes the subject of discipline, is his own personal and voluntary profession of faith in Christ. This is perfectly intelligible and inevitable, if a personal and voluntary confession of faith is the indispensable condition of church membership. If it is not, the principle is out of its place. It does not belong to the theory of infant church membership. One syllogism is, Members of the church are the proper subjects of discipline: All baptized persons are members of the church: Therefore, all baptized persons are the proper subjects of discipline. This is the old and common doctrine. The Independent frames his argument thus: Members of the church are the proper subjects of discipline: Only those who voluntarily profess their faith in Christ are members of the church: Therefore, only those who thus profess their faith are the proper subjects of discipline. Dr. Thornwell adopts neither of these syllogisms. He objects to the major proposition in the former of the two. He denies that all members of the church are the proper subjects of discipline. He distinguishes between professing and non-professing members, and makes voluntary profession indispensable to that relation to the church, which is the foundation of discipline. But this is contrary to all analogy. A Hebrew child was a member of the Theocracy by birth, and subject to all its laws, independently of all profession. So every Englishman or American is a member of the state, and subject to its laws, without any personal and voluntary profession of allegiance. We see not how this principle can be denied, in its application to the church, without giving up our whole doctrine, and abandoning the ground to the Independents and Anabaptists. If, as we all hold, the children of believing parents are, by the ordinance of God, to be regarded and treated as members of the church, this of necessity involves their right to its privileges and their subjection to its laws. Dr. Thornwell objects that, according to this principle, all baptized persons must be admitted to the

Lord's table, and that we should have our churches filled with hypocrites. This, however, is a *non-sequitur*. A person being a citizen of England, or America, subject to the laws of the state, does not give him the right of suffrage. That right is limited by the laws of the state. In England, and in some of the states of this Union, it depends on the possession of a given amount of property; in other states, on the attainment of the age of twenty-one; as to females, they never acquire the privilege. In every case the right is limited by what the state deems the possession of the requisite qualifications. So in the church, admission to the Lord's table, or to church offices, is limited by the possession of the qualifications which the word of God prescribes. It by no means therefore follows, that because baptized persons are subject to discipline, they are entitled to admission to the Lord's Supper.

The Doctor further objects, that as the object of discipline is not the vindication of justice, but to produce repentance, it is utterly absurd in regard to "a man who has never heard the voice of the Lord in his soul." This is surely a strange idea. Cannot the means of repentance be used in reference to the unconverted? Dr. Thornwell himself says, that baptized persons who do not act in accordance with their obligations, should be "followed with exhortation, remonstrance, and prayers." But are not exhortation and remonstrance means of repentance? Do they not as much suppose a recognition of the claims of God as the subjection to discipline? They are indeed forms of discipline; and we cannot help thinking that it is a contradiction in terms, to say that a man is a member of the church and not subject to its discipline. Whether he shall be subject to that particular form of discipline implied in "judicial process," might be a question. But as his amenability to such process is denied on grounds which, as it seems to us, involve the denial of his true relation to the church, we are decidedly in favour of the paragraph as it stands in our present Book.

Dr. Humphrey's argument is imperfectly reported. It seems to be directed to prove that our present Book is good enough; that having been prepared by eminent men, and long used in our judicatories, it does not require revision. The same ground was taken in a very elaborate paper published in the *Southern*

Presbyterian Review. It is evident that the church does not agree with Dr. Humphrey and the writer in the *Southern Review* on this subject. For if the Book does not, in the judgment of the church, need revision, why appoint a committee to do the work, at no small expense of time and labour. We think that Dr. Humphrey, when he found himself on the floor of the last Assembly, differing from Dr. MacMaster on the simple conduct of a judicial case, must have felt that if the Book was plain enough for him, it is not plain enough for other people. It appears that when the appeal of Alexander Fraser against the Synod of Buffalo came up, after reading the records, &c., "the not unusual embarrassment," says the *Presbyterian*, "arose in regard to the order of proceeding." The Moderator decided that the Synod was not a party; that there were no parties before the court except Mr. Fraser. Dr. Humphrey's doctrine, as we understand, is that every appeal is of the nature of a charge against the court appealed from, of having made a wrong decision, and makes it a party in the court above. This is the doctrine of the present Book. The Moderator, guided apparently by his good sense, decided otherwise, and the Synod was permitted to be heard. Then came a discussion how it was to be heard; whether by the members of Synod who happened to be members of the Assembly, or by the committee appointed for that purpose. When that was decided, then there was another discussion, whether the other members of the Synod present had a right to be heard. This caused great debate. The Moderator decided that they had the right. From this decision an appeal was taken. This did not end the matter—Mr. Towle, a ruling elder from a church within the bounds of the Synod, but not a member of the Synod at the time of the decision appealed from, wanted to know whether he was to be regarded as a member of Synod or not. Judge Kennedy moved that he be *not* regarded as a member of the Synod appealed from. Dr. Humphrey said, "If Mr. Towle is not a member of the Synod, then he is a judge in the case here. See, then, what a predicament you place yourselves in." Dr. MacMaster said, "But he is not a member of the court below." Dr. Humphrey—"That is new doctrine in the General Assembly." Dr. MacMaster—"But it is good doctrine." Dr.

Thornwell insisted that Mr. Towle was to be regarded as a member of the court below, and moved to lay Judge Kennedy's motion on the table. This was not all. When Judicial Case No. 2 came up, there was a renewal of the same trouble. Now, if this is not a lamentable, not to say disgraceful exhibition, we know not what can be so regarded. The fault is not in the Assembly, it is in the Book, which certainly is not understood, or is inconsistent with itself.

Colonization and Theory of the Church.

R. R. Read, M. D., (ruling elder,) offered a paper, commending the African Colonization enterprise.

It was moved to lay the paper on the table; but the Assembly refused to do so by a vote of 83 ayes to 160 noes. The question then being on the adoption of Dr. Read's paper, Rev. Dr. Thornwell said, That the ground upon which he voted to lay these resolutions on the table, was the conservation of a great principle upon which he had acted, and which he deemed of immense importance to the church of Christ. The church of God, said he, is exclusively a *spiritual* organization, and possesses none but *spiritual power*. It was her mission to promote the glory of God and the salvation of men from the curse of the law. She had nothing to do with the voluntary associations of men for various civil and social purposes that were outside of her pale. Ever since he had been a member of the church, he had believed this, and contended for this, and had steadily resisted associating this church with outside organizations. The Lord Jesus Christ had never given his church a commission to be identified with them. It was the church's great aim to deliver men from sin, and death, and hell. She had no mission to care for the things, and to become entangled with the kingdoms and the policy of this world. The question of colonization is a question of worldly policy. It is a question upon the merits of which he wished not to speak. But no man will say that Jesus Christ has given to his ministry a commission to attend to the colonization of races, or to attend to the arrest of the slave trade, nor to the mere physical comforts of man. It is not the business of *the church* to build asylums for the insane and the blind. The church deals with men *as men*,

as fallen sinners, standing in *need of salvation;* not as citizens of the commonwealth, or philanthropists, or members of society. Her mission is to bring men to the cross, to reconcile them to God through the blood of the Lamb, to imbue them with the spirit of the divine Master, and thence send them forth to perform their social duties, to manage society, and perform the functions that pertain to their social and civil relations. The church has no right, no authority, to league herself with any of the institutions of the state, or such as have for their object mere secular enterprises. "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's;" but let the church of God lend her energies directly to the accomplishment of her own high and glorious mission. She deals with the great interests of immortality! The blessings she sheds upon the earth and upon the temporal interests of men are incidental; and, although incalculable, are subsidiary to the higher aims of the church. He was willing that church members should coöperate with this Colonization Society, and other societies for philanthropic objects, if they see proper to do so. He was willing that they should try to do good through any agencies that their consciences may approve; but he wished the church, as such, to keep herself to her specific work. As a church of Christ, he desired her to know neither rich nor poor, high nor low, bond nor free—to know neither East nor West, North nor South. "Let the dead bury their dead, but follow thou me," was the mandate of our Lord to his church; and the very moment you undertake to implicate this church with any of the powers of the earth, you endanger her efficiency. At this very General Assembly, we have declined identifying ourselves even with the American Presbyterian Historical Society. We had voted it out; we had voted out the temperance societies, and he would have the Assembly vote out all the societies of this world, and keep to her proper sphere, and let the societies keep to theirs, and do good in their own way, without asking the church's coöperation. It is this principle that he deemed absolutely indispensable to the church's purity and success in her peculiar mission.

To this view the church has been steadily coming up; and in consequence, what a spectacle does she this hour present to

the country and to the world! She stands preëminent the great conservative power of this land; the great bond of union and witness for the truth—directly interfering with no temporal interests, but blessing and protecting all, whilst she aims only at the glory of her God in the salvation of the souls of the people. And why does our beloved Zion stand thus "the beauty of the land"? It is because the only voice she utters is the word of God; because no voice is heard in her councils but his; and because her only guide is the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night. He gloried in the position of this church.

He was once once attended by a young gentleman, a native of Great Britain, through the Tower of London; and we passed through the long apartments and corridors, in which were deposited the trophies which England's prowess had won in her many wars. As my companion pointed me, with becoming patriotic pride, to these trophies that attested his country's triumphs, said Dr. Thornwell, I raised myself to the fullest height my stature would permit, and replied, "Your country has carried on two wars with mine, but I see no trophies here won from American valour." Let our church lend herself, in the name of her Lord, and in his strength, and in her own proper sphere, to her own mission, and her enemies will never rejoice over trophies won from her. Sir, the salt that is to save this country is the church of Christ—a church that does not mix up with any political party, or any issues aside from her direct mission.

It was, on motion, resolved to refer the paper of Dr. Read to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, to report thereon.

On motion of Rev. Mr. Mann, Overture No. 28, on the subject of Colonization, was taken up. On the motion to adopt it,

Rev. Dr. A. S. MacMaster said he felt disposed to meet the question on its merits, and could not let this overture pass in its present shape without comment. If the Colonization Society be a good thing, or if it be a bad thing, let us say the one or the other. He considered the plea, that had been so eloquently made, that the church should never commend anything good because it was not strictly spiritual or ecclesiastical, as both preposterous and restrictive of the church's legitimate du ies.

He referred to the fact that for four-score years the Presbyterian church had always borne testimony in favour of good enterprises, even when not strictly spiritual. He alluded to the part borne by our church in the Revolutionary struggle of our country, and to her frequent testimonies in favour of the liberties and independence of our country. He cited cases to prove that it had been the uniform practice of this church to commend philanthropic enterprises; and contended that one so strictly missionary as this, was peculiarly entitled to her sympathy and encouragement.

Rev. Dr. McGill offered as an amendment, "That it is sufficient to refer to the past action of the General Assembly, in her frequent recommendations of the Colonization Society."

Rev. Dr. Thornwell said all he wished to do was to set his opinions in a true light. He thought it would hardly be denied that—1st. The church is a kingdom not of this world. 2d. That her authority is only ministerial and declarative. 3d. That the power which is given to the church is to be exercised for spiritual ends only. If the church will keep within her own bounds, she will be an agency that will purify and bless the world; but if she goes beyond her proper sphere, she will not only fail to accomplish her mission, but will do mischief. Like the ocean, she purifies even by her agitation, whilst acting within her bounds and banks; but like the ocean, too, if she break beyond them, nothing can be more destructive or desolating. Let the church work on at the very foundations of moral and spiritual influences, which are the foundations of society; let her do her appropriate and appointed work, and she will sanctify the world. But let her go out of her sphere, and affect interference with the temporalities of men, and she will fail. Whenever she forgets that her mission is to bring men to the cross, and to salvation, she comes down from her high vantage ground. Whenever the church speaks at all, she must speak in the name of the Lord; and she must speak what the Lord bids her. Show me, said he, that the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded the church to engage in the business of transferring men from one place to another and I will yield, and unite in the effort. But until you convince me that this is the business that the Head of the church has committed to her, I must

earnestly resist any proposal to identify her with such business. Dr. Thornwell concluded by moving to lay the report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures on the table, to take up a paper which he read. The motion of Dr. Thornwell prevailed by a count of sixty-four to fifty-four.

Dr. B. M. Smith moved to lay Dr. Thornwell's paper on the table, which was done.

We all know and admit that a vote of the Assembly does not always express even the settled conviction of that body itself. Such votes are often given hastily, without due consideration, or from motives not affecting the principle involved in the case decided. At the end of the session, to avoid discussion, or to save time, things are often passed, or passed over, which, under other circumstances, would have met a different fate. It is also to be considered that all who vote for a particular measure, do not commonly do so for the same reasons. A vote to lay a resolution on the table is not decisive evidence that those who joined it, sanctioned the arguments of the speakers by whom the measure was advocated. The sixty-four members who voted to lay the overture on Colonization on the table, are not to be presumed, for example, all to agree with Dr. Thornwell. And if they did, sixty-four is a small portion of an Assembly counting some three hundred members. These remarks are made with the obvious purpose to prevent the hasty assumption that the General Assembly gave its sanction to the new and startling doctrine on the church, which Dr. Thornwell so eloquently advocated.

The world is governed by ideas. The triteness of this remark is only a proof of its importance. It is wonderful also how ideas percolate; how they silently diffuse themselves, as heat, or electricity, until they animate the mass of society, and manifest themselves in the most unexpected quarters. They often lie dormant, as it were, in the public mind, until some practical measure, some foregone conclusion or purpose as to a definite mode of action, calls them into notice. If they suit the occasion, if they answer a cherished purpose, and give to the intellect a satisfactory reason for what the will has determined upon, they are adopted with avidity. The history of

every community will suggest abundant illustrations to every reader of the truth of this remark.

Great evils were long experienced in England from Erastianism. The intimate union of the church and state, and the consequent subjection of the former to the latter, led to all manner of corruptions and oppressions. To escape these evils, one class of the Puritans went to the opposite extreme. They represented the visible church as a purely spiritual body, consisting of the regenerated, united by special covenant for the worship of God, and mutual watch and care. This is Owen's idea. He says, believers are the matter of the church, and the covenant is the form. No one, therefore, is a member of the church but one, who giving satisfactory evidence of regeneration, voluntarily and personally professes his faith, and enters into a church covenant with a number of fellow-believers. All else are of the world, in no way amenable to the church or subject to its control. The sole object of church organization is the worship of God and the exercise of discipline; and consequently its sole prerogative is to provide for divine worship and to receive and exclude members. This leads to the distinction between the church and the parish. The former is the covenanted body of believers; the latter, the whole body of the community united in the maintenance of the ordinances of religion. There are two principles involved in this theory, the one, that each body of believers united by covenant for worship and discipline is a complete church, and independent of all others; and the other, that the church is a purely spiritual body having for its sole object the worship of God and the fellowship and purity of believers. The effects of this theory we see in the progress of development in New England. The church, there, is what Napoleon's army would be were it disbanded into independent companies, each acting by, and for itself; this is the effect of Independency; or what these countries would be, if every village were a separate sovereignty. The effect of the other principle, relating to the nature and design of the church, is utter inefficiency. Who ever heard of *the* church saying or doing anything in New England. It is muzzled, manacled and fettered. It exists there in spite of the theory, in the spiritual union and fellowship of the people of God, but

they have no means of organic action, and according to the prevalent notion, no right to act as an organic whole, nor to act even in its disjoint members, except for the purposes indicated above. If they have even to ordain a man to the ministry, found a seminary, send out missionaries, or do anything however intimately connected with Christ's kingdom, they must go out of the church organization to do it. The most desperate evils may prevail in the form of heresies or immoralities, the church as such can do nothing, and does nothing. We give full credit to the devotion of individual Christians in New England, and to the energy of their combined action in their voluntary associations of different kinds. But these are very poor substitutes for the natural and divinely appointed organs of church action. Experience is teaching a sad lesson on this subject.

Of the two principles involved in this form of Puritanism, the Independent element has had no access to our church. There is no susceptibility in our system of impression from that source. The two systems are antagonistic and repellent. They are incapable of combination. With regard to the other element, however, relating to the nature and prerogatives of the church, the case is far different. That element has long been silently diffusing itself through our whole body. It affects our modes of thought, our expressions, and our ecclesiastical action. With us, in common parlance, the church is the body of those who profess to be regenerated; to join the church is to come to the Lord's table. Our Book declares that all baptized persons are members of the church, and yet we constantly talk of such persons joining the church when they come to the Lord's Supper. Personal and voluntary profession of saving faith is regarded as the condition of church membership. The church has no right of discipline except over such professors. And now the doctrine is advanced by one of the very foremost men of our whole communion, that the church is in such sense a spiritual body that she has no right even to recommend a benevolent society. She must confine herself to a purely spiritual vocation. She cannot denounce evil or patronize good out of her pale. It is not her business to attend "to the colo-

nization of races, or to the arrest of the slave trade," or to any thing else but the immediate spiritual affairs of men.

There is always a half truth in every error. It is true that the church is not of this world; that it is not as such concerned in the affairs of the world; that it has nothing to do with politics, commerce, or agriculture, or any secular enterprise as such. All this follows from our theory of the church, as logically and freely as from the Puritan doctrine. There is no necessity to manacle the church to keep her hands off of politics.

In strong contrast with this whole Puritan doctrine is that idea of the church which is the life of our system, which has revealed itself in act in every period of our history. It is, that while the true church, or body of Christ, the *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα*, consists of the true people of God, yet by divine ordinance the children of believers are to be regarded and treated as included within its pale, and consecrated to God in baptism, and therefore, in the sight of men, all baptized persons, in the language of our Book, are members of the church, and under its watch and care.

This, of course, as remarked above, does not imply that they are all to be admitted to the Lord's table, any more than that they are all to be admitted to the ministry or eldership. God has prescribed the qualifications which the church is to require of those whom she receives to full communion or to office. Still, baptized persons are members of the visible church, until they renounce their birthright or are excommunicated, and consequently subject to its government or discipline. This body constitutes one whole, so that one part is subject to a larger, and the larger to the whole. To the church, in this sense, is committed not merely the work of public worship and exercising discipline, not simply or exclusively to exhort men to repentance and faith, but to assert, maintain, and propagate the truth. And by the truth, is to be understood the word of God, and all it contains, as the rule of faith and practice. This is the great prerogative and duty of the church. Her divine commission is, "Go, teach all nations." From this it follows: 1. That she has the right to preach the gospel. This is the first, most important, and pressing of her duties; and in the

discharge of this duty, she ordains ministers and sends forth missionaries. Hence your Boards of Foreign and Domestic Missions, and of Church Extension. 2. She has the right to administer discipline, which is one of the divinely appointed means of preserving the truth. 3. The right to educate. If she is to teach all nations, she must train up teachers; she must prepare the minds of men to receive the truth, and she must communicate that truth by all the means at her command. Hence your schools, colleges, and theological seminaries; hence also your educational institutions among the heathen, and your establishments for printing and distributing Bibles, tracts, and religious books. On this foundation rest your Boards of Education and Publication. 4. It follows from the great commission of the church, that it is her prerogative and duty to testify for the truth and law of God, wherever she can make her voice heard; not only to her own people, but to kings and rulers, to Jews and Gentiles. It is her duty not only to announce the truth, but to apply it to particular cases and persons; that is, she is bound to instruct, rebuke, and exhort, with all long-suffering. She is called of God to set forth and enjoin upon the consciences of men the relative duties of parents and children, of magistrates and people, of masters and slaves. If parents neglect their duties, she is called upon by her Divine commission to instruct and exhort them. If magistrates transcend the limits of their authority, and trespass on the Divine law, she is bound to raise her voice in remonstrance and warning. She has nothing to do with the state, in the exercise of its discretion within its own sphere; and therefore has no right to meddle with questions of policy, foreign or domestic. She has nothing to do with tariffs, or banks, or internal improvements. We say, with Dr. Thornwell, "Let the dead bury the dead." Let Cæsar attend to his own affairs. But if Cæsar undertakes to meddle with the affairs of God; if the state pass any laws contrary to the law of God, then it is the duty of the church, to whom God has committed the great work of asserting and maintaining his truth and will, to protect and remonstrate. If the state not only violates the Sabbath, but makes it a condition to holding office, that others should violate it; or if it legalizes piracy, or concubinage, or polygamy; if it pro-

hibits the worship of God, or the free use of the means of salvation; if, in short, it does anything directly contrary to the law of God, the church is bound to make that law known, and set it home upon the conscience of all concerned.

In many of our states, there are in force laws relating to marriage and divorce, in open conflict with the word of God. We hold that it is the duty of the church of every denomination, in those states, to tell their legislators, that while they have the right to legislate about matters of property and civil rights at their discretion, under the constitution, they have no right to separate those whom God has joined together, or make that lawful which God has declared to be unlawful.

A few years since, Dr. Thornwell preached an elaborate sermon, setting forth what he believed to be the true teaching of the word of God on the subject of slavery. What he had a right to do, and was bound to do as a minister of the gospel, the church has the right and obligation to do. If, on the one hand, Northern brethren would abstain from teaching, on that and other subjects, what God does not teach; and if, on the other hand, Southern brethren would clearly assert, in their capacity of ministers and a church, what they fully believe God does teach, great good and God's blessing, we doubt not, would be the result. They are as much bound to teach the truth on this subject, as a church, as they are bound to do it as ministers; and they are surely as much bound to teach the law of God respecting the duties of masters and slaves, as they are to teach what God says of the duty of parents and children, of saints and sinners. There is a great temptation to adopt theories which free us from painful responsibilities; but we are satisfied that the brethren must, on reflection, be convinced that the duty to testify to the truth, to make it known, and to press it upon the hearts and consciences of men, is as much obligatory on the church, in her aggregate capacity, as on her individual pastors. Her Confession and Catechisms are an admirable summary of that testimony; but she is no more to be satisfied with them, than the ministry is to be satisfied with reading the Confession of Faith, Sabbath after Sabbath, to the people.

The principle which defines and limits the prerogative and duty of the church in all such cases, seems to us perfectly

plain. She has nothing to do as a church with secular affairs, with questions of politics or state policy. Her duty is to announce and enforce by moral means the law of God. If at any time, as may well happen, a given question assumes both a moral and political bearing, as for example, the slave-trade, then the duty of the church is limited to setting forth the law of God on the subject. It is not her office to argue the question in its bearing on the civil or secular interests of the community, but simply to declare in her official capacity what God has said on the subject. To adopt any theory which would stop the mouth of the church, and prevent her bearing her testimony to kings and rulers, magistrates and people, in behalf of the truth and law of God, is like administering chloroform to a man to prevent his doing mischief. We pray God that this poison may be dashed away, before it has reduced the church to a state of inanition, and delivered her bound hand and foot into the power of the world. It is obvious that the same principle is applicable to ministers. They profane the pulpit when they preach politics, or turn the sacred desk into a rostrum for lectures on secular affairs. But they are only faithful to their vows when they proclaim the truth of God and apply his law to all matters whether of private manners or laws of the state. The whole history of the Presbyterian church in Europe and America is instinct with this spirit. The Presbyterians of Scotland told the government that it had no right to establish Popery or Prelacy, and that they would not submit to it. Our fathers of the Revolution took sides with the country in the struggle for independence, and protested against the acts of the British Government tending to the introduction of Episcopacy. Before the Revolution the old Synod remonstrated with the authorities in Virginia, for their persecuting laws. In 1830 the General Assembly raised its voice against the persecution of Christians in Switzerland. It has, over and over, remonstrated with the Government of this country on the laws enjoining the carrying and distribution of the mails on Sunday. While admitting that the Bible does not forbid slaveholding, it has borne its testimony in the most explicit terms against the iniquity of many slave laws. It has many times enjoined on the conscience of the people the duty of instruct-

ing the coloured population of our land, and patronized the establishment of schools for that purpose. It has never been afraid to denounce what God forbids, or to proclaim in all ears what God commands. This is her prerogative and this is her duty. With the Colonization Society, as a commercial enterprize, or as a mere benevolent institution she has nothing to do; but as a means designed and adapted to promote the progress of the gospel in Africa, she has over and over commended it to the favour of the people. It is only on the assumption that Presbyterians, neither in this country nor in Europe, have ever understood their own system, that the principle advocated by Dr. Thornwell can be admitted. Presbyterians have always held that the church is bound to hold forth in the face of all men the truth and law of God, to testify against all infractions of that law by rulers or people, to lend her countenance and support to all means, within and without her jurisdiction, which she believes to be designed and wisely adapted to promote the glory and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. This our church has always done, and we pray God, she may continue to do even to the end.

SHORT NOTICES.

Lectures on Metaphysics. By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Edited by the Rev. H. L. Mansel, D. D., Oxford, and John Veitch, M. A., Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London. MDCCCLIX. 2 vols. 8vo.

It has long been heralded over the civilized world that Sir William Hamilton was as marvellous a man in the academical chair teaching orally, as he was in the closet instructing by the instrumentality of written thought. This, from the peculiarly compact, concise and eminently logical style of his writings, we could not well understand. But the lectures before us have made manifest to us that Sir William was a great master in the art of teaching. As a scheme of discourse to teach young men *to philosophize*, the lectures seem to us to be devised with consummate skill. They are a series of mirrors exhibiting to the

self-conscious mind of the hearer the successive phenomena of his own consciousness, with a distinctness never before, we feel assured, even approached by prelections in philosophy. In estimating the sagacity and wisdom with which the course of lectures is adapted to the end to be accomplished, the peculiar nature of the subject to be discussed must be carefully considered. The subject from beginning to end is a grand antithesis. The knowing mind and the thing known—and that thing peculiarly the mind itself—in all the phases of psychological phenomena, present never-ceasing antitheses that are to be shown to the self-conscious mind of the hearer, both as unities and as contrasts. The dual character of psychological phenomena must never be lost sight of in the greatest subtlety of discussion. The scheme of discourse must be planned, and the language must be formed so as to exhibit this duality in unity. This peculiarity of his science Sir William had thoroughly considered; and in these lectures he has as completely overmastered its difficulties as an academic lesson. The gradual opening of the subject, the increase of distinctness at each step of progress, the exhibition of the successive phenomena without any commingling of phases, the different orders of discussion, determined by the diverse orders of the subjects considered, the judicious recapitulations at the beginnings of the successive lectures whenever the subject in hand is embarrassed with special difficulties, the apt introduction of the history and polemics in regard to cardinal doctrines, and other facilities in the great art of instruction, all presented in a flexible, idiomatic and masculine diction, which these lectures evince, prove that the author's faculties had retained their free and natural play under the severe rule of his disciplined logic. As a teacher, Sir William was not near so brilliant as Abelard or Cousin. But in this is one element of his vast superiority. Philosophical instruction should be addressed to the notions of the understanding, and not to the images of the fancy. The cognitive faculties should be evolved, instructed, and disciplined. To know, and not to imagine, is the legitimate end of philosophy. But it must not be supposed that Sir William Hamilton never employs ornate diction. It is far otherwise. No finer pictures of metaphorical language can be found in all literature than Sir William has employed in some of these lectures, when the use was best to exhibit the contrasts of negative thought. But, of course, the pictures are severely chaste and concise. And we need hardly tell our readers that in the hostile criticisms of cardinal errors, like that of representative perception, Sir William's diction

seems to burn with intellectual fire. The burning weapon of his logic gleams as the trenchant thrusts are given.

But to appreciate these lectures, as the instruments of that academical instruction which has opened a new era in British philosophy, it will be necessary for our readers to know something of Sir William as a man, both in his natural powers and his educational accomplishments. We propose, therefore, what our engagements forbid now, to consider, in a future article, Sir William as a man and as a teacher. The article will be the complement of what we have heretofore said of Sir William and his philosophy.

We must not omit to signalize the learning, faithfulness, and ability with which the lectures are edited. Mr. Mansel, of Oxford, had already attained the foremost rank as a philosopher by his published works; and Mr. Veitch, of Edinburgh, who was a first prize man, and also class-assistant to Sir William Hamilton, though a very young man, and who had already, by his life of Dugald Stewart, and his edition with notes of some of Des Cartes' works translated by himself, attained much eminence, is only on the threshold of the high career which his talents fit him to pursue.

On Civil Liberty and Self-Government. By Francis Lieber, LL.D., Corresponding member of the Institute of France, etc.; author of "Political Ethics," "Principles of Legal and Political Interpretation," etc., etc. Enlarged edition in one volume. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. MDCCCLIX. 8vo. pp. 624.

We heartily rejoice to see an enlarged edition, in such excellent type and such beautiful form, of this work, which we took occasion in our last October number to consider so fully in connection with the writings of De Tocqueville. In the judgment of the great merits of the work then expressed by us, we have since seen the most general concurrence both in Europe and America. This new edition is so great an improvement on the first, that it cannot fail to raise still higher the already unrivalled reputation of the author as a writer on politics. Besides improvement in the fuller discussion of many topics, every political experience, which the history of the world has furnished, since the first edition in 1853, is carefully considered, even to the fact that Michigan proposed in her Legislature, a few weeks ago, to abolish the Grand Jury. It would seem, from the intimate connection of Dr. Lieber's writings with the daily transactions of the world, that nothing, however small or out of the way, bearing in the least degree on the political life of society, occurs anywhere from whence knowledge ever comes at all, which does not come within his vigilant observation. Though

abounding in all the wealth of learning that history has gathered for the political philosopher, the writings of Lieber are instinct with the life of the very moment in which they are written. Lieber is no cloistered Academic, neither is he a stranger in our land: but born to an European education, in association with the greatest men of this century, and in the midst of the most instructive experiences of European political life, he lives in the midst of us, realizing all that is American with a native's zest; and with a discreet love of freedom, that, perhaps, nothing but his early experiences could have inspired. The book before us has the wisdom of a two-fold experience—the experience of despotism in Europe, and the experience of freedom in America. It has too, the wisdom which has known what political life is, when tried by the most terrible war that ever desolated nations, as well as what it is in peace. This wisdom founded on contrasts in the condition of society, and of the same society, is especially important in political science. We welcome the book as the most opportune, as well as valuable, political present which literature has ever given to our country. If the rising generation will but learn the great political truths it teaches, our country may become greater than any in past history. It is only our politics that we have to fear as the destroyer of our country. In these times, when it seems to be universally felt, that the greatest of all our political institutions —the judiciary—is sunk so low, that even the able bar which is still left, cannot give respectability to the administration of the law, our science, our literature, and our arts, are attracting the admiration of Europe. Where the nation thinks itself invulnerable, just there is its weakness. It thinks its political life possesses such vigour, such democratic immortality, that it must necessarily develope its energies into a nobler freedom in all the trials of future history. But this is a dangerous mistake, and may become a fatal one. We have no fear for the religion, the science, the literature, the art, and the material interests of the nation. In all these—if sinful man dare express any satisfaction about the first, his religion—we fearlessly assert, that our nation is more advanced than the past history of the human race had authorized any to hope. But of our political life, at this time, we surely cannot venture to utter much praise. If we disappoint the high expectations of our national instinct, it will be by the failure of our political institutions, the thing which we least fear. The father of human history has given us, with an unerring pencil, a sketch of the first act in the drama of nations in the antediluvian world. The mystery of that act, and which closed the scene with

universal desolation, is still the grand mystery of the drama—the mystery of the wickedness of the actors. In this awful mystery, the unity of the drama of nations is to be found. And while philosophy pronounces the mystery insoluble, it is still a practical reality, giving birth to the great polities which have been devised by man for protective and retributive justice. The polity of the antediluvian world wholly failed, and vengeance had the closing up of human affairs. On this side of that solemn gulf which divides us from the world before the flood, polity after polity has perished, until history is, for the most part, the grave-yard of nations; and it is a serious question, whether man has yet devised institutions which can secure the world from the catastrophe which closed the first epoch of human history. The book before us examines with great sagacity the principles on which these institutions are based; and it must be an incurious and ignoble mind which does not feel a desire to read its pages. It is in politics that the selfish ambition of man finds scope for its exercise—for gratifying its thirst for power and dominion. Hence it is through politics that nations march to the grave.

Eloquence a Virtue; or Outlines of Systematic Rhetoric. Translated from the German of Dr. Francis Theremin. By William G. T. Shedd. With an Introductory Essay. Revised edition. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

Professor Shedd, at present the able and accomplished incumbent of the Chair of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Theological Seminary, ten years ago was Professor of Rhetoric in Burlington College, Vermont. At this period he published this translation of Theremin's work on Rhetoric, prefaced by an extended and elaborate introductory essay from himself. The doctrine of the treatise is, that eloquence is distinguished from philosophy, poetry, and all other forms of expressed thought, in having for its object to move men to action, and that this is accomplished by exciting their active, *i. e.*, moral faculties: while in turn these are awakened by appeals to their moral ideas and sensibilities. For this purpose it impresses into its service philosophy, poetry, all forms of knowledge and thought, which can be made tributary to its great end. Hence the differentia of eloquence, as distinguished from other kinds of expressed thought, lie in its ethical element. From this fontal principle all the details of Rhetoric, as a science and an art, flow. The subject is ably unfolded according to this method in this compact yet thorough treatise of Theremin's.

What, however, is exhibited by him in a dry light in the form of naked philosophic statement, is displayed by Professor

Shedd, in his introductory essay, with that glow of life, beauty and force, which distinguishes his writings. Theremin gives a philosophic analysis of eloquence—Professor Shedd both analyzes and exemplifies it. His prolegomena let in a flood of intense light upon the subject, and are themselves worth the price of the volume.

The Great Concern: or Man's Relation to God and a Future State. By Nehemiah Adams, D.D., Pastor of the Essex street church, Boston. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

This volume is made up of discourses delivered by the author during the great awakening of 1857–8, and published at the request of his hearers, under the title of "Truths for the Times." They are mainly designed to parry the objections and cavils, which, at such seasons, must needs be rife, in communities largely made up of Unitarians and Universalists. The topics mainly treated are, Regeneration and Conversion, Atonement and Justification, Endless Punishment, Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures, and the Love of God. The orthodox view of these subjects is defended against the current objections of such sceptics, by decisive arguments skilfully and kindly presented. The book is admirably adapted to circulation in refined and intelligent communities tainted with the scepticism which has long infested eastern Massachusetts. There is a mingled fidelity and benignity, a calm earnestness and spiritual unction in this volume, which much enhance its value.

Anna Clayton: or the Inquirer after Truth. By Rev. Francis Marion Dimmick, A. M. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859.

From the preface we learn that a sister of the author had been rendered uneasy on the subject of infant baptism, by the proselyting arts of some Baptist friends. He was led to task himself in relieving her mind of the difficulties in which it had thus become entangled. He found many of these difficulties presenting themselves in forms which no extant manual on the subject sufficiently meets. Although, for substance, the answers may be found in different books, yet they are not so collected, arranged, and adapted to the present devices of Baptist proselytism, as to be available for the protection of many persons who are exposed to their influence. Hence the author has wrought into shape, in this book, the reasonings which he found effective in the case with which he had to deal. It is in the form of a narrative dialogue, purporting to give the successive conversations between the parties on both sides

involved in an adroit and persistent attempt to proselyte a pedo-baptist, which at first promised success, but was ultimately thwarted. The colloquial form adds to the vivacity and interest of the work. The argument is, on the whole, conducted with skill and effect. We observe an occasional expression which we cannot endorse. It is, however, a valuable addition to our means of resisting that annoying proselytism, for which it is designed to be an antidote.

First Things: or the Development of Church Life. By Baron Stow, author of "Christian Brotherhood," etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

The "First Things" here treated in a series of brief and lucid essays, are some of the principal events connected with the first planting of the church recorded in the Acts of the Apostles—such as the first prayer-meeting, first election, first sermon, &c. Of course, there is no logical method in the mutual relation of the subjects treated. Each is treated, not because of its relation to what precedes or follows it, but because it happens to be the first instance of the kind in the order of time. Of course too, each is, in its own way, an illustration of the earliest development of church life in that respect. And so far forth, Dr. Stow has expounded and applied it for our guidance and admonition. His observations are generally judicious and edifying. We observe a slight propensity occasionally to give a version to some of the facts with which he deals demanded by the Baptist theory of the sacraments and of church government. There is, however, as little of this as could reasonably be expected.

Promise of the Father: or a Neglected Specialty of the Last Days. Addressed to the Clergy and Laity of all Christian Communities. By the author of "The Way of Holiness," etc. Boston: Henry V. Degen. 1859.

The author of this work, Mrs. Palmer, has already published a number of books, which have been received with considerable favour by the public. The "Neglected Specialty," for which she pleads at great length, and with great earnestness in this volume, is that women be permitted and encouraged to seek and exercise the gift of praying, teaching and exhorting in the public assemblies of the church. Whatever may be admissible in an unsettled and abnormal condition of the church, the Apostle has decided the question as respects its ordinary permanent state. "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak . . . for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35. Mrs.

Palmer strives in vain to empty these declarations of their obvious meaning. The passage 1 Cor. xi. 5, may refer to occasions very different from promiscuous public assemblies of the church; or, even if it forbid a gross impropriety in the manner of public prophesying, this does not conflict with subsequent entire prohibition of it, and of all public speaking by females in the church, which he gives in words too plain for the most desperate ingenuity to wrench into any other meaning.

Popular Geology. A series of Lectures read before the Philosophical Institution of Edinburgh. With descriptive sketches from a Geologist's Port-folio. By Hugh Miller. With an Introductory Résumé of the Progress of Geological Science within the last two years. By Mrs. Miller. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

This work comprises much of the matter which the author had prepared for the great work, intense devotion to which doubtless hastened his untimely death. This work was to have been "the Geology of Scotland." The present volume has the incompleteness incident to posthumous publications. Still it has those characteristics, in an eminent degree, which have made Hugh Miller the most popular of scientific writers. Along with immense information, great speculative and scientific ardour, it is animated by that vivacity and freshness of style which lend to dry scientific details the charm of eloquence and poetry. Some of the opinions advanced in this volume we are by no means ready to accept. This does not, however, destroy its value or attractiveness; nor will it lessen the wide circle of readers it is sure to command.

Theology in Romance: or the Catechism and the Dermott Family. By Mrs. Madeline Leslie, author of "Home Life," and Rev. A. R. Baker, author of "The Catechism Tested by the Bible," &c. Boston: John P. Jewett and Company. Philadelphia: Wm. S. & Alfred Martien. 1859.

Mr. Baker's former works on the Catechism have done much to promote the intelligent study of it among the children of our country, especially of New England. We are glad to learn from the preface to these little volumes, that they have reached the enormous sale of two hundred thousand copies. They have been translated into several languages. "In the Sandwich Islands they are used, by government authority, as national text books, assisting to confirm those who were so lately idolaters in the faith which was once delivered to the saints." Is not here a lesson to some of our own constitution-makers, who sedulously rule all recognition of God out of our fundamental laws?

These volumes aim to further the influence of the Catechism

upon young children, by associating with each proposition an interesting tale, or anecdote, or conversation in illustration of it. We wish it all success, although we do not quite fancy the title, "Theology in Romance."

Igdrasil: or the Tree of Existence. By James Challen, author of "The Cave of Machpelah," and other Poems. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859.

Our readers will doubtless wonder what this strange title means. The author explains it by a prefatory extract from Carlyle, in which he finds the word Igdrasil and its interpretation,—at least after Carlyle's manner of elucidating—which in the present case seems very like *lucus a non lucendo.* "Igdrasil—the Ash Tree of Existence—has its roots down in the kingdoms of Hela, or death. . . . At the foot of it in the death-kingdom sit three Normas,—Fates—the Past, Present, Future, watering its roots from the sacred well. . . . What was done: what is doing: what will be done. The Infinite conjugation of the verb 'to do.'" This heathenish jargon doubtless has some esoteric meaning which is all luminous to the initiated. For us outsiders it is worse than worthless.

We are sorry that Mr. Challen should have chosen this wild conceit, as a thread on which to string many pearls of Christian thought and feeling, of fancy and imagination. Delivered from this dark association, the book contains much that is, at least, respectable. The publishers have done their part admirably. The heavy, clean paper, the clear, bright, broad typography, remind us of the best style of British publishing houses.

Frank Elliot; or Wells in the Desert. By James Challen, author of "The Cave of Machpelah." Philadelphia: James Challen & Son.

Another book by the same prolific author, which, through the medium of an entertaining story, aims to accomplish two objects: 1. To promote healthful zeal and activity in the cause of Christ among private Christians. 2. To advocate that portentous delusion, known as Campbellism, which has proved so formidable and disastrous to the interests of truth and godliness in the West. For this purpose it is plausible and adroit, and well adapted to poison the popular mind. We therefore desire to put our readers on their guard, lest they take for a harmless religious tale, what is really designed and fitted to unsettle the faith of the unstable and unwary.

Agnes Hopetoun's Schools and Holidays. By Mrs. Oliphant, author of "Katie Stewart," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

This is a well written story, adapted to interest young per-

sons, and insinuate into their minds wholesome moral and religious impressions.

Spontaneous Generation: An article from the "American Journal of Science and Arts," for March, 1859. By James D. Dana.

Anticipations of Man in Nature. By James D. Dana, Yale College. From the "New Englander," for May, 1859.

We are glad to see our distinguished Christian physicists directing their attention to the points of contact between science and religion. In the first of these pamphlets, Professor Dana brings to view new scientific proofs of the absurdity of the atheistic fiction of the spontaneous generation of living from lifeless objects.

In the second, he examines the theory propounded by Dr. Bushnell, in his late work on "Nature and the Supernatural," that the earth, in its geological structure, and its various adjustments before the creation of man, was formed in anticipation of and in special retributive adaptation to his sin. We think that Professor Dana disproves this, and shows that before the fall the globe was probably adapted to the uses of man as a holy being. This, however, does not prove that it suffered no change on account of man's sin, when it was cursed for his sake. Nor do we understand Professor Dana to maintain this. But we do not quite understand him, when he seems to deny that "pain and death are the wages of sin." So far as man is concerned, the Scriptures leave no room for doubt on this subject. Indeed, Professor Dana says, "The thousand ills that are ever near to prey upon his vitals, proclaim that he has left his first estate, and incurred the frown of his Maker." This is the plain scriptural truth. There are other points treated in this very able pamphlet, which we should be glad to notice, if we had room, especially his refutation of the pantheistic notion caught up by Dr. Bushnell, that sin and evil are necessary and unavoidable in the development of all created moral beings.

Mosaics. By the author of "Salad for the Solitary," etc. "We have been at a great feast of languages, and have stolen all the scraps." Shakspeare. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. London: Richard Bentley, 1859.

The enterprising publisher deserves well for the uncommonly beautiful style in which this volume is issued. The work itself is true to its title. It is on a great variety of subjects, which are skilfully and beautifully wrought into a harmonious whole. The author has gathered from a great variety of writers of the present and former days, and himself writes gracefully in combining his gems together, although there is hardly

a continuous page of his own writing in the entire book. Shakspeare, Sydney Smith, Shelly, Charles Lamb, Dr. Guthrie, Spurgeon, Bishop Ken, Pascal, Byron, Carlyle, Dickens, Goldsmith, Dr. Bethune, Milton, Humboldt, Longfellow, etc., etc., are made to contribute to these pages. And we are happy to say that we have observed nothing but the purest moral tone in them all. We heartily commend the volume.

The Convalescent. By N. Parker Willis. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. 1859.

A republication of Mr. Willis's letters to the Journal of which he is one of the editors. His advice to the invalid is that after paying reasonable attention to the symptoms and treatment of his disease, he "should ignore and outhappy it." He had been pronounced by many physicians an incurable case of consumption, but now finds himself in as fair health as may reasonably be expected, at the beginning of one's fifties. Judging from his letters, he was certainly a very joyous invalid. There is a dashing freedom in the style, which we believe characterizes all of Mr. W's prose writings. It is a volume of pleasant reading.

Sight and Hearing; How Preserved and how Lost. By J. Henry Clark, M. D. "Obsta principiis." Fifth thousand, carefully revised, with an Index. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. 1859.

This is designed as a popular hand-book. It is the work of a thoroughly educated physician, and contains suggestions and cautions which, if duly heeded, would tend to preserve those important organs on which the usefulness and happiness of men so greatly depend.

Rambles among Words: Their Poetry, History and Wisdom. By William Swinton. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. London: Sampson Low, Son & Co. 1859.

This work is somewhat in the same vein as Mr. Trench's "Study of Words." The chapters are entitled "Rambles," of which there are twelve. We could wish that the author's rambles had led him to discover the beauty of greater simplicity in the expression of his thoughts. The stilted, inflated style is not to our taste; it is, however, a curious and important department of study, in which every contributor deserves well of the public.

The Life of General H. Havelock, K. C. B. By J. T. Headley. Illustrated. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. 1859.

The late mutiny in India made us acquainted with one of the bravest and best of men in General Havelock. The atten-

tion of the world was concentrated for weeks on his movements and daring exploits, and then was saddened by the intelligence of his death. In him we have another proof that there is nothing in a truly religious character incompatible with the highest personal bravery, nor between a military and Christian profession. Mr. Headley has evidently laboured to prepare a faithful history; and on a subject so congenial to his taste, it will not be too much to say that his work sustains his former reputation.

The Pasha Papers. Epistles of Mohammed Pasha, Rear-Admiral of the Turkish Navy; written from New York, to his friend Abel Ben Hassen. Translated into Anglo-American, from the original manuscripts. To which are added sundry other Letters, critical and explanatory, laudatory and objurgatory, from gratified or injured individuals in various parts of the planet. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. London: Sampson Low, Son & Co. 1859.

These are satirical papers on society and affairs in New York, Boston, and Washington. Sarcasm is a difficult and dangerous weapon. It requires the highest justice and the purest morality, in order to be effective in the cause of virtue. Mere ridicule and contempt, of which we think we see too many traces in this volume, do not belong to successful examples in this species of writing.

Hours with my Pupils; or, Educational Addresses, &c. The Young Lady's Guide and Parent's and Teacher's Assistant. By Mrs. Lincoln Phelps, late Principal of the Patapsco Institute, Maryland, author of "Lincoln's Botany," &c. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. 1859.

This book is made up of the addresses of a pious teacher—a lady of varied accomplishments—to her pupils, from the year 1841 to 1856. They are on a great variety of important subjects. The volume is fitted to be highly useful to young ladies, parents, and teachers.

Science and Art of Chess. By J. Monroe, B. C. L. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. London: Sampson Low, Son & Co. 1859.

So far as we can judge, this appears to be a thorough treatise. The powers of the pieces, nomenclature, laws of the game, checkmate, its theory and examples, resemblance in the results of the action of unlike pieces, &c. &c., appear to be fully discussed.

Paul Morphy's great achievements have awakened just now new interest in chess-playing, and disposed those who are devoted to the game, to attach undue importance to it. To be an adept in it, is claimed as a proof of intellectual superiority.

But we greatly doubt whether devotion to it tends to improve the tempers, or the characters, or to repress the natural selfishness of men. We have no reason to question the justice of the following estimate of the game from the *Boston Courier:*

"The game of Chess is certainly an intellectual game; so is whist, with, to be sure, an element of chance superadded; so is checkers. But it is but a game, after all; and the best thing you can say of it is, that it is a very excellent contrivance to enable idle men to get through the lazy-pacing hours without damage to the pocket, the conscience, or the constitution. It is, for an amusement, the nearest possible approach to real intellectual work. But it is a barren tree; it bears the blossoms of entertainment, but no fruit of utility—'the rest of mankind' are very little benefitted, mentally, morally, or materially, by the diligent study of the game of chess by a limited circle. To our taste, the spectacle of two men, especially young men, crooking their spines for hours, and tying knots in their brains, over a parcel of figures cut in white and red ivory, is a little dreary; but this is merely a matter of taste, and we are far from insisting that others shall square their conduct by the line of our tastes."

Commentary on the Gospel of John. By Dr. August Tholuck. Translated from the German, by Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. New York: Blakeman & Mason. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1859. Pp. 440.

Tholuck's Commentary on John was published in 1826. As first printed, it was rather a slight and hastily prepared work. It has since passed through seven editions, and has been gradually enlarged and improved, until it has assumed its present elaborate form. Every production of Dr. Tholuck's pen wears the impress of his genius, learning, and piety; and perhaps his Commentary on John, as it now appears, may be regarded as the most generally acceptable of all his works. He has happily, so far as we can judge, met with a competent translator in Dr. Krauth, of Pittsburgh. The name of Tholuck, so dear in Europe and America, will secure to this Commentary a wide circulation.

Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Acts of the Apostles. By Melancthon W. Jacobus, Professor of Biblical Literature, &c., in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny City, Pa. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 430.

Popular commentaries on the Scriptures, written by learned men, seem to be one of the great necessities of our age. The

demand seems to be in a fair way of being supplied. This is the third or fourth work on the Acts, which within a year or two have appeared in this country, from the pens of distinguished scholars. This volume is constructed on the same general plan with the Notes on the Gospels, by the same author. It strikes us, however, as being more thoroughly elaborated, and more replete with useful information, than the previous volumes. It must serve to elevate the deservedly high reputation of Dr. Jacobus, and prove a very valuable aid in the study of one of the most important books of the New Testament.

India and its People: Ancient and Modern. With a view of the Sepoy Mutiny: embracing an account of the Conquests in India by the English, their Policy and its Results, also the Moral, Religious, and Political condition of the People; their Superstitions, Rites and Customs. By Rev. Hollis Read, American Missionary to India. Illustrated with numerous Engravings. Columbus: H. Miller. 1859. 8vo. pp. 384.

To Mr. Read's residence in India, are to be referred his special interest in that great country, and in no small measure, his special fitness for the task here undertaken. Few parts of the world, at the present time, are the object of such general and deep interest as Hindostan. It is the theatre of missionary enterprise as well as great political events. Statesmen and Christians are alike concerned in its past history and its present state. Such a work as the above extended title describes, coming from an author already so favourably known by his work entitled "God in History," written with the design of tracing the dealings of Providence in the fate of nations, and in command of adequate sources of information, cannot fail to attract general attention. It may be safely recommended as furnishing a great amount of important and seasonable information.

History of the Presbyterian Church in Trenton, N. J. From the first Settlement of the Town. By John Hall, D.D., member of the Presbyterian Historical Society, and of the Historical Societies of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 683 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 453.

This is a model work of its kind. It is the fruit of wide and diligent research, intelligently conducted and wisely used. The reader who takes up this work, expecting nothing more than its title indicates, will find himself most agreeably disappointed. Instead of a simple history of the Presbyterian

church in Trenton, it is not only a history of the town and of its principal inhabitants, but also of the early settlement of the whole of the central portion of New Jersey. As no part of the United States was the theatre of more important events in the history of the country, as well as of our church, than central New Jersey, the reader, whether his interests be secular or religious, will find here more to reward his attention than the modesty of the title would lead him to anticipate.

The Art of Extempore Speaking. Hints for the Pulpit, the Senate, and the Bar. By M. Bautain, Vicar General and Professor at the Sorbonne, &c. With additions by a Member of the New York Bar. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. 1859. Pp. 364.

Extempore speaking, in the sense of speaking without preparation, and in the sense of speaking without having written what is to be said, are two very different things. The former is unhappily the general idea attached to the term as illustrated in practice. It is the easiest and the poorest of all kinds of public speaking. It requires nothing but confidence, either natural or acquired; but to speak without having previously written out the discourse, but after having thoroughly mastered the subject and arranged a plan, is a high art. It is doubtless the most effective of all modes of public address. The danger is that when the labour of writing is dispensed with, the speaker will content himself with inadequate preparation, and pour upon his hearers a stream of crude thoughts or empty declamation. As this book is written by one of the greatest living orators in France, who unfolds the methods which have led to his own eminent success, it may be received as authority. The translation is free and idiomatic. The reader seems to himself to be reading an original book.

A Commentary, Critical, Expository, and Practical, on the Gospel of Luke, for the use of Ministers, Theological Students, Private Christians, Bible Classes and Sabbath schools. By John J. Owen, D.D. New York: Leavitt & Allen, 379 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 400.

The commentaries of Dr. Owen on Matthew and Mark have been some time before the public, and have met with a favourable reception. He has in an advanced state of preparation, a commentary on John, which with the present volume will complete his exposition of the four Gospels. Dr. Owen is a ripe scholar and a devout Christian, his writings therefore are imbued with learning and piety.

Lectures on the First Two Visions of the Book of Daniel. By William Newton, Rector of the church of the Holy Trinity, West Chester, Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: William S. and Alfred Martien, 606 Chesnut street. London: James Nesbit & Co. 1859. Pp. 250.

This book contains twelve lectures printed very much as they were delivered, in which the doctrines of the new prophetic school, as to the kingdom of Christ, are popularly unfolded.

Memoir of Robert Haldane and James Alexander Haldane. With sketches of their Friends and of the Progress of Religion in Scotland and in the Continent of Europe in the former half of the Nineteenth Century. American Tract Society. Pp. 278.

This is not an abridgment of the formerly published Memoirs of the Messrs. Haldane, but a work written for the Tract Society, from materials derived from various sources. It is a valuable contribution to the modern history of evangelical religion.

The Mother's Mission. Sketches from Real Life. By the author of "The Object of Life." New York: Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry street. Pp. 311.

The design of this work is to make "good mothers."

The Poet Preacher. A brief Memorial of Charles Wesley, the eminent Preacher and Poet. By Charles Adams. New York: Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry street. Pp. 234.

The Lord's Supper. By Rev. Samuel Luckey, D.D. With an Introduction. By Rev. Bishop Janes. New York: Carlton & Porter. Pp. 284.

Bishop Janes characterizes this work as a "plain, practical, spiritual treatise on the Lord's Supper." The sacred ordinance is considered as a memorial, as a passover, as a communion, and as a sacrament.

Christian Brotherhood. A Letter to the Hon. Heman Lincoln. By Baron Stow, D D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1859. Pp. 208.

In this letter the pious author treats, 1. Of the union which is desirable; 2. Of the considerations which render Christian union desirable; and 3. Of the means of promoting such union. As the union contemplated is one of faith and feeling, the means recommended are all of a corresponding character. We

doubt not the perusal of this work will tend to promote brotherly love among Christians of different denominations.

History of the Old Covenant. From the German of J. H. Kurtz, D.D. Vol. II. Translated by James Martin, B. A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1859. Pp. 429.

We have noticed repeatedly the works of Dr. Kurtz, who stands in the first rank of the orthodox theological writers of Germany. His book on the Old Testament is one of the most valuable of his productions.

Esther; the Hebrew-Persian Queen. By Rev. W. A. Scott, D.D. San Francisco: H. H. Bancroft & Co. 1859. Pp. 353.

Dr. Scott has an evident partiality for Old Testament personages and history, which he has the talent to present in a manner adapted to interest and instruct his readers. Those who are familiar with his "Daniel," his "Achan in El Dorado," and his "Giant Judge," will be prepared to receive with favour his "Hebrew Persian Queen."