THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1859.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*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 seems to us, that no other man in the history of letters lived so exclusively in the pursuit of truth for its own sake, and strove with such untiring energy, and such vast designs, to elevate the intellectual dignity of his country, as Sir William Hamilton. His whole life, from his earliest years, was governed by intellectual ambition. It will afford us an instructive lesson, to review the life of a man of such lofty aims.

Sir William was born in Glasgow, Scotland, on the 8th of March, in the year 1788. He was of aristocratic lineage; being the twenty-fourth male representative of the second son of Sir Gilbert, the founder of the noble house of Hamilton in Scotland. The ancestor, from whom he inherited his baronetcy, received his title in the year 1763, for the services of his father at the battles of Dunbar and Worcester. There is still to be seen, at Prestonpans, a noble ruin of the feudal residence of the family, which, by its massive towers and projecting battlements, serves to show, that the Hamiltons of Preston took their part in the fierce struggles, political and religious, that, for a

century, rendered the seats of the Scottish nobility only posts of watch and ward. Sir William's father, Dr. William Hamilton, was professor of Anatomy and Botany in the university of Glasgow, and died at the age of thirty-two, leaving behind him a high reputation. His grandfather, Dr. Thomas Hamilton, had occupied the same chair, and with Dr. Cullen founded the medical school of Glasgow. Both the father and grandfather inherited the high qualities, physical and mental, which their ancestors had displayed, rendering the house of Hamilton so conspicuous in Scottish history. They were distinguished, like their ancestors, for a commanding form, prompt and fearless intellect, perfect self-reliance, and a hearty manly nature. The baronetcy had lain dormant for some time, when Sir William, in the year 1816, formally established his right to the title.

From his boyhood Sir William manifested a great intellect, a fine sense of honour, and a frank and manly bearing. When only twelve years of age, he attended the junior classes at the University of Glasgow. But it seems, to his great mortification, he was turned to a mere schoolboy again, by being sent to the school of Dr. Dean, at Bromley. After remaining a year or two at Dr. Dean's, he returned to the University of Glasgow, taking a high position in the senior classes, and carrying off the first prizes in philosophy. The Rev. Dr. Summers, who for several years had the oversight of Sir William's early education, in a letter a few years afterwards, said, "For perseverance and depth of research into any subject that has occupied his mind, as well as for ingenuity of conception, I have perhaps never met with any one that equalled, and certainly have never known any one that excelled him. . . . . Respecting his moral and religious character, it has uniformly been such, even from his earliest years, as would do honour to the purest heart, and such as the most scrupulous could not fail to approve."

From Glasgow Sir William proceeded, on the Snell foundation, to Balliol College, Oxford, in the year 1809, just after the introduction of a new system, by which a powerful stimulus had been given to the whole course of study, and great rivalry excited amongst the colleges. The degree examinations had,

therefore, become more severe. The candidates for honours were required to profess a certain number of books in history, poetry, and science. But Sir William in going up for his degree, took with him into the schools, not only far more than the usual average of books in poetry and history—in fact, every classic author of mark, whether poet, orator, or historian; but in science he professed all the works extant in Greek and Roman philosophy—including not only the whole of Aristotle, but also the works of his earlier commentators; and not only all of Plato, but the Neo-Platonists, Proclus, and Plotinus, and the fragments of the earlier and later philosophical doctrines, preserved by Laertius, Stobaeus, and the other collectors. Sir William's examination in philosophy occupied two days running through six hours each day. "He was examined," (says an eye-witness, the Rev. A. Nicol,) "in more than four times the number of philosophical and didactic books ever wont to be taken up even for the highest honours, and those likewise authors far more abstruse than had previously been attempted in the schools." A fellow-collegian, another eye-witness, the Rev. Mr. Villers, says: "In the department, however, of science, his examination stood, and I believe still stands alone; and it certainly argued no common enthusiasm and ability for philosophical pursuits, that in a university like Oxford his examination should not only remain unequalled for the number but likewise for the difficulty of the authors. It contained every original work of antiquity difficult or important in logic, on the philosophy of the human mind, on ethics, politics, and other branches of practical philosophy, on rhetoric, and poetical criticism; and after a trial of many hours, beside the honours of the university, he received the thanks and public acknowledgments of the examiners, that he had never been surpassed either in the *minute* or *comprehensive* knowledge of the systems on which he had been examined. . . . In fourteen of his books on Greek philosophy he was not questioned, the greater part of these being declared by the masters to be too abstrusely metaphysical for examination." There are other testimonies to the same effect, and perhaps stronger, from persons who were present at the examination.

At this early age, Sir William had not only carefully studied

the leading Greek commentators on Aristotle—Themistius, Alexander, Ammonius, Simplicius, and Philoponus; and the works of his Arabian expositors, Averroes, and Avicenna; but also the more philosophic of the Latin fathers, especially St. Augustine, of whom he always retained a high admiration; and the chief of the schoolmen, St. Thomas and Scotus in particular. He had also, at this time, formed an acquaintance with the less known authors of the Revival—Cardan, the elder Scaliger, Agricola, Valla, and Vives; and had studied diligently the earlier modern philosophers, Des Cartes and Leibnitz, both in their own writings and those of their followers; and was deeply interested in the new speculations on the continent of Europe, which had, as yet, not found their way into Britain. Sir William had, in fact, before he left the University of Oxford, gone over those vast researches into philosophical opinions, which he afterwards made so complete. It is marvellous how, even with his powerful intellect, resolute will, and iron constitution, he had accomplished so much.

In the year 1812, he left Oxford, and went to Edinburgh to pursue the profession of the law, and in the following year was admitted a member of the Scottish bar. He at once began practice as an advocate. But besides, that the business of a young lawyer is not generally very engrossing, and, therefore, Sir William had leisure for his literary pursuits, he, like Bacon, could not confine his great powers within the narrow limits of a profession, but explored the amplitudes of science, especially searching into the hidden mysteries of the intellectual world. So ardent a student was he, searching into libraries for forgotten learning; and often perplexing bibliographers and scholars by his inquiries about unobserved first editions of books, and his ready and extensive knowledge of rare manuscripts, that he was looked upon as a prodigy of erudition in the circles of Edinburgh. Mr. De Quincey visited Edinburgh in the year 1814, and there, for the first time, met Sir William. The impression made upon him by the polyhistor as he called Sir William, was given by him a few years since, in a flashy article in a Scottish journal.

"In the year 1814 it was (says De Quincey,) that I became acquainted with Sir William Hamilton, the present Professor

of Logic in the University of Edinburgh. I was then in Edinburgh for the first time, on a visit to Mrs. Wilson, the mother of Professor Wilson. Him who, at that time, neither *was* a professor, nor dreamed of becoming one, (his intention being to pursue his profession of advocate at the Scottish bar,) I had known, for a little more than five years. Wordsworth it was, then living at Allan Bank, in Grasmere, who had introduced me to John Wilson; and ever afterwards I was a frequent visitor at his beautiful place of Elleray, on the Windermere, not above nine miles distant from my own cottage in Grasmere. In those days, Wilson sometimes spoke to me of his friend Hamilton, as one specially distinguished by manliness and elevation of character, and occasionally gazed at as a monster of erudition. Indeed, the extent of his reading was said to be portentous—in fact, frightful, and to some extent even suspicious; so that certain ladies thought him 'no canny;' if arithmetic could demonstrate that all the days of his life ground down and pulverized into 'wee wee' globules of five or eight minutes each, and strung upon threads, would not furnish a rosary anything like corresponding, in its separate beads or counters, to the books he was known to have studied and familiarly used, then it became clear that he must have had *extra* aid in some way or other, must have read by proxy. Now, in that case, we all know in what direction a man turns for help, and *who* it is that he applies to when he wishes, like Dr. Faustus, to read more books than belonged to his allowance in this life."

Mr. De Quincey gives also the following picture of Sir William's appearance and manners:—"I was sitting alone after breakfast, when Wilson suddenly walked in with his friend Hamilton. So exquisitely free was Sir William from all ostentation of learning, that unless the accidents of conversation made a natural opening for display, such as it would have been affectation to evade, you might have failed altogether to suspect that an extraordinary scholar was present. On this first interview with him I saw nothing to challege any special attention beyond an unusual expression of kindness and cordiality in his *abord*. There was also an air of dignity and massy self-dependence diffused over his deportment, too calm and

unaffected to leave a doubt that it exhaled spontaneously from his nature; yet too unassuming to mortify the pretensions of others. Men of genius I had seen before, and men distinguished for their attainments, who shocked everybody, and upon me, in particular, nervously susceptible, inflicted horror as well as distress, by striving restlessly and almost angrily, for the chief share in conversation. Some I had known, who possessed themselves in effect pretty nearly of the whole, without being distinctly aware of what they were about. . . . In Sir William on the other hand, was an apparent carelessness whether he took any conspicuous share, or none at all in the conversation. It is possible that, as representative of an ancient family, he may secretly have felt his position in life; far less, however, in the sense of its advantages than of its obligations and restraints. And in general my conclusion was that I had rarely seen a person who manifested less of self-esteem, under any of the forms by which ordinarily it reveals itself—whether of pride, or vanity, or full-blown arrogance, or heart-chilling reserve."

Sir William, about this time, became acquainted with Dugald Stewart. Mr. Stewart always welcomed him to his house; and listened with admiration, as Sir William descanted of systems of speculation of which he had scarcely even heard. Mr. Stewart, in a letter, a few years after this, took occasion to say that he was "indebted to Sir William for much curious and valuable information about later philosophers of Germany," and that he regretted, "that he had not an earlier opportunity of forming his acquaintance, as he has no doubt that he would have profited greatly by his assistance in the pursuit of his favourite studies." At Mr. Stewart's, Sir William met Dr. Parr, and is said to have astonished him with the range and accuracy of his scholarship. The erudite Doctor, at first, perhaps, because he was in the house of a philosopher, discoursed of Greek philosophy, his knowledge of which was extensive: but finding that in this walk, he was no marvel to his young auditor, he went into some less known field of learning—the later and less read Latin poets, with their imitators at the revival of letters, and in still more recent times, but still his unknown companion was at home; in fact, turn as he would in

the diverse paths of erudition, the young advocate could not only keep pace with him, but could continue his quotations and correct his references, until the Doctor was startled into the abrupt inquiry, "Why, who are you then, sir?"

In the year 1820, the chair of Moral Philosophy, in the University of Edinburgh became vacant by the death of Dr. Brown. Sir William became a candidate for the place. John Wilson, his friend and fellow-advocate, was his competitor. Sir William's superior qualifications were urged in testimonials of the greatest weight; even Dugald Stewart wrote, "I look forward with peculiar satisfaction to my future connection with him, if, fortunately for the University, he should succeed in attaining the object of his present ambition." Political feeling ran high at this time; and, therefore, every one was counted a Whig or Tory, whether he meddled in politics or not. Wilson was a Tory; and, as a majority of the electors were Tories, Wilson was, of course, elected to the vacant chair. He proved to be an able professor; but, with all his genius for letters, astonishing us in his criticisms, and transporting and bewitching us in the "Noctes," he was, as a philosopher, far in the distance behind his friend Hamilton.

There was a chair of Universal History in the University of Edinburgh, with a small salary. The Faculty of Advocates had the control of it; and in the year 1821 they offered the chair to Sir William. He delivered a short course of lectures, to a small class, on the character and history of the classic nations of antiquity, with the influence of their literature, philosophy, and laws on modern civilization. The lectures were distinguished for sagacity, learning, eloquence, and philosophical spirit.

At this time, Phrenology, by the endeavours of George Combe, was exciting especial interest in Edinburgh. The claims of this spurious science, like all charlatanry, were supremely presumptuous. It claimed to be at once a system of philosophy furnishing a sure index of mental endowment, and indicating a course of education infallible in its efficiency, while it gave a new clew to the moral nature of man, and even furnished new sorts of evidence in the administration of criminal law. Cranial topography had come to be put in the place

of consciousness as the source of mental philosophy. Sir William Hamilton had inherited, from his father and grandfather, a predilection for anatomy and physiology, besides being naturally led, as something cognate, to these studies as furnishing an insight into the material organs of the mind, and showing, if any, the relations between physiology and psychology. "Already in 1814 (says De Quincey in the account before quoted from) I conceive he must have been studying physiology on principles of investigation suggested by himself." For the purpose of testing, on its own ground of physiological facts, the pretensions of this intruder into the field of science, Sir William went through a laborious course of comparative anatomy, dissecting with his own hand several hundred different brains. He also sawed open a series of sculls of different nations, of both sexes and all ages, to ascertain the facts in regard to the frontal sinus on which the phrenologists had founded so much. He also instituted a series of most sagacious experiments for ascertaining the relative size and weight of brains. The results of these investigations were embodied in two papers by Sir William, and read before the Royal Society of Edinburgh, in the year 1826. They proved the assertions of fact, by the phrenologists, to be utterly false in every fundamental particular. And some traditionary errors in physiology, which the medical profession itself had credited and taught in their writings, were rectified by some of Sir William's experiments. The points, in which Sir William had convicted the phrenologists of fatal errors, were reproduced by others both in Britain and on the continent of Europe, and contributed to arrest the progress of this demoralizing charlatanry.

But there were errors of a more intellectual cast, than this offspring of sensualism, to engage the attention of Sir William. Schelling and Hegel had propounded in Germany, each differing a little from the other, a scheme of human omniscience as a system of philosophy. A doctrine so extraordinary and of such high pretensions, upheld as it was by powerful talents, could not but arrest the attention of speculative minds. Victor Cousin, disciplined in the school of Des Cartes, where the supremacy of consciousness is the fundamental tenet, could only admit the omniscient doctrine of the German philosophers

as modified by the fundamental dogma of his own school. And this he did; and proclaimed it to the world in a course of lectures distinguished for rare eloquence, and great speculative genius well nurtured in the literature of philosophy. But a doctrine of human omniscience, however modified, can never escape being challenged by the common sense of man. And of all countries in Europe, Britain is the one least likely, from the course of its speculation for centuries, to let such a scheme of thought elude its criticism. Accordingly, in the year 1829, on the retirement of Lord Jeffrey from the editorship of the *Edinburgh Review*, his successor, Professor Napier, a personal friend of Sir William Hamilton, being desirous of signalizing his first number, induced Sir William to give him a philosophical article. While at Oxford, Sir William had, even then, scrutinized this portentous continental doctrine, with profound interest, and now determined to weigh it in the scales of criticism, and show to the world its real worth, both in its French modification and its native German originality. Adopting, therefore, the lectures of Cousin, then lately published, as the basis of his criticism, he put forth, in the *Edinburgh Review*, the most powerful, subtle, and effective polemic ever urged against a doctrine, since man began to speculate. The exhaustive statement of the necessary conditions of the problem supposed to have been solved, and of all the possible forms of its solution, enabled him, by the use of the dilemma of which he was such a master, to expose the utter baselessness of a doctrine of human omniscience. His analysis of the notions of the absolute, the infinite, and the unconditioned, opened up a new vista in the province of speculation, and led to a more comprehensive, and, at the same time, more accurate apprehension of the limits of the knowable. His own countrymen had so long crawled on the lower level of physics that they could not understand this masterly article, either in the doctrine exposed, or the criticism by which it was dissected. Indeed, Sir William himself was hardly known to any of them. In the sublime solitude of the serene heights of speculation, he had lived above the busy world of mere action, and now for the first time, at the age of forty-one, he came forth into the arena of science with a doctrine, more potent than the fire of

Prometheus, to inspire the philosophical genius of his country. Victor Cousin was notified, by a correspondent from England, that he had been hewed to pieces, in the *Edinburgh Review*, by some unknown writer. It was, therefore, with eagerness that he received and read, at first, only an extract from the article, contained in his correspondent's letter. "An extract from it (said Cousin) which I have received has singularly struck me. I did not believe that there was an individual beyond the channel capable of interesting himself so deeply in metaphysics, and I regard this article as an excellent augury for philosophy in England. I am, therefore, thankful to the author and wish he knew it. You will please me by information as to his true name." When Cousin had read the whole article, and had learned the author's name, in a second letter, he wrote: "Sir William Hamilton's article has arrived, and I have read it. It is a masterpiece. Mr. Brougham has good reason to speak highly of it. For my part I have done the same here; and I affirm that the article is so excellent that there cannot be fifty persons in England competent to understand it. It is truly to be regretted that such talents have not produced more." He subsequently adds: "The information you are to send me regarding Sir William Hamilton, is expected with so much the more impatience, as I wish to push my chivalry towards him to the point of having his article translated." And this Cousin did accordingly; thereby showing the generosity of this great philosopher, who has done so much to drive sensualism out of France, for which we praise him, while we dissent from his fundamental doctrine of human omniscience.

Now that Sir William had appeared before the world as a writer, he contributed two or three articles a year to the *Edinburgh Review*, for the next seven years. In his philosophical articles, during this time, he examined all the central problems in metaphysics, psychology, and logic, and showed that he was master of all the literature of philosophy, as well as possessed of a powerful genius for original speculation. He made it manifest that he had, after examining the doctrines of his predecessors, laid speculative science on broader and securer foundations. In another of these articles, Sir William showed, that he had carefully studied the various systems of tuition,

both in ancient and modern times; and indicated a scheme of educational reform. He proposed to release the national education from the trammels of sects and professions, and enlarge it to the broad culture, in which there is a harmonious development of man's whole nature. After examining more particularly the mere organizations of schools, in a subsequent paper, he attacked with tremendous force of dialectic, backed by overwhelming authorities, a cardinal heresy in education, then lately put forth at Cambridge, by Dr. Whewell, *that mathematics is a better logical discipline than logic itself.* This is another error resulting from too exclusive thought on physics. But even in the field of physics, mathematics is only an assistant to logical induction, and not, in the truest sense, an instrument of discovery. It was the *regulæ philosophandi* of Newton, and not his mathematics, which led to the grand induction of universal gravity. Mathematics calculated the forces, and weighed and measured the magnitudes necessary to prove the induction. Mathematics was only a wheel within the broader reasoning, all moving under those laws of thought which it is the business of logic to expound, and by examples to discipline us to a mental dexterity. Dr. Whewell's doctrine seems to us little less absurd, than it would be to recommend the tread-wheel as better than the open plain to train the courser for the race. At all events, Sir William's polemic is unanswered to this day; although when he republished it in the Discussions, he taunted Dr. Whewell that he had not fulfilled his promised refutation of it, notwithstanding he had had seventeen years to do it. And Sir William dealt not in generalities, but, as he always did, threw out special propositions to test his general doctrine. He gave the mathematicians to understand, that he was ready to maintain, that, as a mental discipline, it was better to have mastered the *Minerva* of Sanctius, a Latin grammar by a Spanish Jesuit, than the *Principia* of Newton.

In 1836 Dr. Ritchee, the professor of logic and metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh, resigned his chair, and Sir William at once declared himself a candidate for the post. It seems difficult to suppose that it was possible for any, who might have the choice of a professor for the chair in question, to be otherwise than enthusiastic in desire to place Sir William in a

post for which he had such pre-eminent qualifications. But in the workings of social and political machinery, reason, justice, and truth are not the only motive powers. Ignorance, prejudice, passion, selfishness, jealousy, and all those impulses which scandalize our natures, enter more or less into all human transactions. Sir William's pretensions were more than challenged, so that even George Combe, the phrenologist, was actually one of the candidates for the philosophy chair against Sir William Hamilton. And, indeed, it was for some time very doubtful whether Sir William could be elected at all to the chair. M. Cousin, who was sick in bed at the time, on hearing, with surprise, that there was a difficulty about Sir William's election, wrote a letter of mingled surprise and urgency to Professor Pillans, in which amongst other remarks, he says: "Sir William Hamilton is the man who, before all Europe, has, in the *Edinburgh Review*, defended the Scottish Philosophy, and posted himself its representative. In this relation the different articles which he has written in that journal are of infinite value, and it is not I who ought to solicit Scotland for Sir William Hamilton; it is Scotland herself who ought to honour, by her suffrage, him who, since Dugald Stewart, is her sole representative in Europe." Again, "He is above all, eminent in logic. I would speak here as a philosopher by profession. Be assured that Sir William Hamilton is the one of all your countrymen who knows Aristotle best; and were there in all the three kingdoms of his Britannic Majesty a chair of logic vacant, do not hesitate—make haste—give it to Sir William Hamilton." He concludes, "In short, my dear Mr. Pillans, were there not too much pretension and arrogance in the request, I would entreat of you to say, in my name, to the person or persons on whom depends this nomination, that they hold, perhaps, in their hands, the philosophical future of Scotland; and that a foreigner, exempt from all spirit of party or coterie, conjures them to recollect that what they are now engaged in is to give a successor to Reid and Dugald Stewart. Let them consult the opinion of Europe." Professor Brandis, the great authority in ancient philosophy, writes from Bonn: "I am happy in having an opportunity of acknowledging the high respect and admiration which I have long felt for Sir William

Hamilton's great talents. Possessed with uncommon acuteness, penetration, and real philosophical genius, Sir William Hamilton, according to my opinion, is almost unparalleled in the profound knowledge of ancient and modern philosophy, and enjoys the advantage of great clearness in explaining the most difficult and abstruse subjects of philosophical discussion. Every University in Europe certainly would be proud to possess a professor of such high and acknowledged reputation; and no man in Great Britain, as far as I can judge, could venture to enter into competition with Sir William Hamilton for a professorship of logic and metaphysics in any British University." Other testimonies to Sir William's wide fame were laid before the electors.

Sir William's chief competitor was Mr. Isaac Taylor, who was urged with great zeal by his friends, believing, it seems, that the University would gain as much in religion by electing Mr. Taylor, as it would lose in philosophy by rejecting Sir William Hamilton. The sole ground for doubting Sir William's orthodoxy in religion, was his known familiarity with German speculation; not taking into consideration, that he had already assailed this very German speculation, and vindicated, on the highest and unassailable grounds, the essential harmony of philosophical and revealed truth. But Sir William was allied with no party either in church or state. He was above sect in his religion and above party in his politics; the being simply a Christian and a patriot, was narrow enough for his great ends as a philosopher. Sir William was elected by a majority of four votes; and his country was saved from the disgrace of rejecting the best qualified man in the whole world, for the vacant chair in her leading University.

Now begins a new era in Sir William's life, and in the academical life of Scotland. The great champion of Scottish philosophy, who had with a resistless dialectic dealt destruction to the proud system of speculation that had, for a time, overshadowed the humble doctrine of his own country, and which his own country itself had repudiated, is installed as a teacher of philosophy in the leading University of Scotland. Sir William entered upon his professorship with the very highest qualifications. His personal appearance was the very finest.

Above the middle heigth, of a sinewy and well-compacted frame, with a massive head, decisive and finely cut features, a dark, calm, piercing eye, perfect self-possession and reliance, and finished courtesy of manner, and a voice remarkably distinct, silvery and melodious, he stood before you the perfection of a man in every physical endowment. "Never shall we forget the day of his inauguration (says an eye-witness) as Professor, and his opening lecture. His ancient and successful rival, John Wilson, had volunteered, as a mark of respect, to 'keep the door' of the class-room, which was overcrowded, many boys and men standing impatiently outside. Sir William was personally unknown to almost all his hearers, who evidently were not prepared to see such a distinguished face and head; for when he entered, the applause was unacademically uproarious, and was renewed again and again for several minutes. Wilson had placed his back against the inside of the door, waiting for the first sentence of the lecture, when a terrible pressure from without pushed in the door and drove Wilson violently against the crowd in the passage. He turned like a roused lion, rushed out, and for a few seconds pursued an elderly man whom he considered to be the offender. But his good-humour quickly checked him; and to a band of humanity boys, who had gathered around him in a circle, he addressed a few jocular words about the inability of "Cerberus himself" to have held the door against such a siege. He then placed himself within hearing of the lecturer, who proceeded to give an exposition of the aim and end of philosophy equally profound and brilliant." Such was the inauguration of Sir William Hamilton as professor of logic and metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh.

Though Sir William had already methodized all his views on logic and metaphysics into a system, still he had now to put them into a form suited to academical instruction, and that for very young persons. The difficulty of doing this cannot be easily estimated. Consciousness with all its riddles has to be explained; the phenomena of which are not clustered like constellations in the firmament of thought, as those imagine who think of the mind as a congeries of faculties; but the phenomena are confluent in all exercises of thought. Even

intuition and reflection are not separate elements, but combine in the acts of consciousness. Neither is there pure passivity or pure activity in any operation of mind; but the passive and the active combine in all mental life. Then again, the subject presents from beginning to end a grand antithesis. The knowing mind and the thing known—and that thing especially the mind itself—in all the phases of psychological phenomena, present never-ceasing antitheses that are to be made known to the self-conscious mind of the pupil, both as contrasts and as unities. This dual character of the phenomena must never be lost sight of in the greatest subtlety of discussion; both the subjective and the objective must ever be realized in the pupil's self-consciousness as he reproduces the thinking of the teacher. To effect all this, not only must the language be so fashioned as to exhibit this duality in separation and in unity, but the whole scheme and order of the lectures must be planned so as to exhibit what in actual thinking is confluent and inseparable, as though they were distinct, and yet realizing at the same time their inseparable character. These syntheses and antitheses must ever be realized in the self-consciousness of the pupil. All these requirements Sir William has accomplished in the lectures now before us. The gradual opening of the subject, the increase of distinctness at each step, the exhibition of the successive phenomena without any commingling of phases, the different orders of discussion determined by the diverse orders of the topics considered, the judicious recapitulations at the beginning 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, all presented in a flexible, idiomatic, masculine diction as clear as light, constitute these lectures a masterly academical lesson in philosophy. As a scheme of discourse to teach young men *to philosophize*, they seem to us to be devised with consummate skill. These lectures were written during the session of 1836 and 1837. "The author (say his editors) was in the habit of delivering three lectures each week; and each lecture was usually written on the day, or more properly, on the evening or night preceding its delivery. The course of metaphysics, as it is now given to the world, is the result of

this nightly toil unremittingly sustained for a period of five months."

But let us turn from the printed lectures, to Sir William in the class-room. We will borrow, from the Edinburgh Essays for the year 1856, the description of Sir William in the class-room, given by Mr. Thomas Spencer Baynes, for seven years his class-assistant. "On looking around the class-room, several things strike one as rather peculiar. In the first place, the benches are all lettered in alphabetical order; the thinly-peopled letters such as U, V, having a bench between them, while the more populous, such as M (from the number of *Macs*) require two. Then in front, over the chair, and just below the ceiling, the eye is arrested by a large board painted green with a gold border, bearing two inscriptions, one in Greek, the other in English (in gold letters on a green ground), the latter being the well-known motto prefixed by Sir William to his edition of Reid's works—'On Earth there is nothing great but Man, in Man there is nothing great but Mind.' Below this are a number of long narrow boards ranged in order on a line, with dates of different sessions, and lists of from twelve to twenty names in gold letters on a green ground as before. These are names of students who have taken class prizes in successive sessions since Sir William has occupied the chair. On the wall opposite are other boards of the same kind, only not so numerous and with fewer names—lists of those who have gained the summer prizes offered by the professor for extra study and special essays.

"Sir William's manner naturally struck one, on his first entrance, by its native dignity, perfect self-possession and genuine courtesy; but soon the attention was irresistibly attracted to his person. It was impossible, indeed, not to be impressed with the commanding expression of that fine countenance and noble bust; the massive well-proportioned head, square and perfectly developed towards the front; the brows arched, full and firmly bound together, with short dints of concentrated energy between; the nose pure aquiline, but for its Roman strength, and a mouth beautifully cut, of great firmness and precision, with latent sarcastic power in its decisive curve. But the most striking feature of all to a stranger, was Sir

William's eye; though not even dark hazel, it appeared from its rare brilliancy absolutely black, and expressed beyond any feature I have ever seen, calm, piercing, sleepless intelligence. It was in a peculiar degree the self-authenticating symbol of an intellect that has read the history, traversed the unknown realms, grasped the innermost secrets, and swept with searching gaze the entire hemisphere of the intelligible world. Though naturally most struck with this at first, one soon found that it but harmonized with the perfect strength and finish of every feature, nothing being weak, nothing undeveloped in any. Whatever the previous expectations of Sir William's appearance might be, they were certainly realized if not surpassed; and however familiar one might afterwards become with the play of thought and feeling on that noble countenance, the first impression remained the strongest and the last —that it was perhaps altogether the finest head and face you had ever seen, strikingly handsome and full of intelligence and power.* When he began to read, Sir William's voice confirmed the impression his appearance and manner had produced. It was full, clear, and resolute, with a swell of intellectual ardour in the more measured cadences, and a tone that grew deep and resonant in reading any striking extracts from a favourite author, whether in prose or poetry—from Plato or Pascal, Lucretius or Virgil, Scaliger or Sir John Davies, whose quaint and nervous lines Sir William was fond of quoting.

"The new comer naturally listened to the lecturer with interest and some curiosity, knowing perhaps little or nothing of the subject, and having his own misgivings, notwithstanding Sir William's fame, whether anything could be made of it or not. After hearing a few lectures, the impression produced was probably one of mingled surprise and admiration, wonder and delight. The subject had been described as abstruse. He

* The writer of this article has a portrait of Sir William Hamilton, presented to him by Lady Hamilton, as "not only a very beautiful but a very faithful likeness." It represents the lineaments of the finest head and face we have ever seen. The engraved portraits of Sir William, circulated in this country, have not the least resemblance whatever to the original. They are not even caricatures.

fancied it must be dark, mysterious and uncertain, and that perhaps it would be impossible to understand the lecturer at all. On the contrary, the exposition was found to be clear, forcible, and even vivid in its distinctness—the thought striking the intellect as sharply as near objects the eye on a bright day; and the style a perfect mirror of the thought—exact to a nicety, every word the right one, and each in its place, giving in fact quite a new idea of the precision of which language is capable. This naturally excited surprise, and awakened unexpected admiration. The lecturer's whole tone and manner, too, at once, powerfully stimulated curiosity, and inspired confidence. The pupil was conscious of breathing a fresh intellectual atmosphere, as bracing to the mind as sea air to the body, and already began to feel a new and vivifying sense of elasticity and power. The appetite for knowledge was suddenly sharpened, and he felt at the same time that he had found one who could satisfy it to the full. It is difficult to say exactly how this feeling of exhilarating confidence, of glad but undefined expectation was produced; partly, no doubt, by what was said, but chiefly from the manner of the speaker. There was much in it strictly personal; the instinctive feeling naturally awakened in listening to one who spoke with the serene insight and authority of a master, both in history and science. When, for example, he referred to the older philosophers, the sages who walked with their disciples in the Lyceum and the grove, who taught in the marble stillness of the porch, or amongst the green shadows of the garden, it was at once perceived that the lecturer was speaking of thinkers he had held familiar intercourse with as an equal, even in their abstrusest walks; nay, and that having accompanied them to the furthest point in the fields of speculation, and looked with clear intellectual vision from the last Pisgah height, where their eye grew dim and their strength began to fail, he could at once recognize and complete the imperfect description they have left us of objects whose form and outline fell obscurely on their failing sight. The same effect was produced in dealing with the phenomena of the science. While expounding the mental faculties, their order, laws, and development, it was felt that the speaker had verified for himself every fact referred to;

that he spoke but of what he knew, and testified of what he had personally seen. Not, of course, that the listener understood and recognized at once everything spoken of, but this was obviously not from want of clearness in the description, but simply because the right point for seeing the object had not yet been gained, while, at the same time, there was the clear conviction, that by following the prescribed course, he would soon be able to see and judge for himself. Thus the first effect produced in listening to Sir William Hamilton, was a feeling of mingled confidence, admiration and delight."

Mr. Baynes next shows how the attention of the student became fixed upon the matter of the lectures, realizing that there is "a world within as full of wonder and mystery, of secret activities and unknown powers, as the material earth and heaven around and above us." This intellectual world was gradually unfolded to the student after the manner we have indicated in our analysis of the lectures just now given. Mr. Baynes continues: "Such teaching naturally produced in the pupil the most vigorous and intense intellectual activity. A desire to pursue the new paths opened, seized him with the force of a passion, and no effort that contributed to this end seemed wearisome. Books that might fairly be considered hard and dry, flavoured by the appetite brought, were read with avidity and positive enjoyment. Preparation for the class examination scarcely seemed an effort. Conscious of new powers, he delighted in the exercise; and learning the use of new weapons, it became a pleasure to test their value, and at the same time increase his own skill by constant practice."

Besides lectures, the class was severely disciplined by examinations, on Tuesday and Thursday—Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, being lecture days. This twofold mode of tuition, Sir William had, in his letter offering himself as a candidate for the chair, foreshadowed in these words: "I have only further to repeat in general, what I have formerly more articulately stated, that in the event of my appointment to this chair, I am determined to follow out my convictions of the proper mode of academical tuition; that is, I shall not only endeavour to *instruct*, by communicating on my part the requisite information, but to *educate*, by determining through every means in

my power, a vigorous and independent activity on the part of my pupils." At these examinations the class sat in alphabetical order. There was placed on the table before the professor a vase containing the letters of the alphabet printed on millboard. Sir William mixed the letters together in the vase, and taking out the uppermost one, say W., held it before the class, inquiring whether any gentleman in W. was prepared to undertake an examination. Some one of that initial then rose, bowed to the class, and began where the last examination left off. There were always three or four or more lectures in arrear, any part of which the student must be prepared to take up at a moment's notice. The students took full notes of the lectures; and were thereby aided in preparing for the examinations. The professor cross-examined the student on the most difficult points. And besides the examination on the lectures, the student was examined on subjects connected with them. The pupil might give the views of any writer on questions directly or indirectly discussed in the lectures; or might give the biography of any philosopher, poet, critic, or historian who had been mentioned. Sir William, in conclusion, asked of the student what books he was reading, gave hints as to the best course of study, and information out of his own vast erudition in regard to the matter in hand. The examinations thus acted as a powerful stimulus and guide during the whole course of study.

The class also wrote essays on subjects connected with the lectures. Parts of the essays were read by the pupil before the class, and criticised by the professor. Special essays on particular subjects were also prescribed to competitors for prizes. And as all these exercises were before the whole class, at the end of each session, the honours of the class were awarded by their fellow-students to the successful candidates.

Sir William's personal intercourse with his pupils is thus depicted by Mr. Baynes: "Always accessible to his students, none ever found him pre-occupied or engaged when they entered his private room to submit a doubt, ask a question, or make a request. He listened not only with patient courtesy, but with real interest to the detail of their elementary difficulties, adapted his explanation to their point of view, encouraged

and guided their inquiries, and freely offered them any assistance in his power—the use of his invaluable library even to those wishing to pursue an extended course of private reading; so that the admiration which the peerless intellectual qualities of the Professor, as thinker and critic, had excited, was soon blended with feelings of personal reverence and regard for his noble simplicity of character, high moral worth, and true kindness of heart. These feelings became stronger and deeper with the opportunity of knowing him more intimately. Sir William Hamilton, indeed, appeared to the greatest advantage in the unrestrained intercourse of social and domestic life. Devoted to severely abstract pursuits during the hours of study, he enjoyed the fullest relaxation amidst his family and friends, entering with hearty relish into all home pleasures and pursuits, keenly appreciating a good story or capital joke, interesting himself in the occupations of the young people about him, nay, even sympathizing with the children, delighting in their toys and books, and not unfrequently sharing with them their games, tales, and fireside amusements."

Before Sir William's death, we had, from the mouth of one of his pupils, just such an account of him as we have quoted from Mr. Baynes.

In the year 1846, ten years after his election to the chair of philosophy, Sir William published his edition of Reid's works. The work was undertaken immediately upon his election, as a book for the use of his class. The foot-notes were written in the years 1837 and 1838, as the text passed through the press; and the supplementary dissertations were written between the years 1841 and 1842. The impression which this edition of Reid produced in Scotland, may be inferred from the following extract from a letter of Lord Jeffrey's to Mr. Empson, the then editor of the *Edinburgh Review*:—"I have been looking into Sir William Hamilton's edition of Reid, or rather into one of his own annexed dissertations, 'On the Philosophy of Common Sense;' which though it frightens one with the *immensity* of its erudition, has struck me very much by its vigour, completeness, and inexorable march of ratiocination. He is a wonderful fellow, and I hope may yet be spared to astonish and overawe us for years to come." These supplementary dissertations,

together with his previous writings, at once placed Sir William on the highest elevation, as a man preëminent amongst philosophers, for the exercise, on the most magnificent scale, of an intellect the most comprehensive, acute, subtle, vigorous, elastic, and pure, combined with the greatest mastery over all the resources of learning in philosophy, science, and literature, all exercised through the medium of a style for force, precision, elegance, and expressiveness, perhaps as perfect as can ever be formed by man.

Sir William, in his admiration of Victor Cousin, dedicated to him his edition of Reid's works, as appropriately and preëminently due to the first philosopher of France, who, as Minister of Public Instruction, had made them the basis of academical instruction in philosophy throughout the central nation of Europe.

The last of Sir William's literary labours was his edition of the complete works of Dugald Stewart. After Sir William was far advanced in this work, we saw a private letter from him, in which he said incidentally, that it was more an amusement than a labour to him. Sir William completed the task, with the exception of a life of Stewart, which has been supplied, in an able manner, by Mr. John Veitch, one of Sir William's pupils, and a cöeditor of his Lectures.

For ten years Sir William had been enfeebled by a severe paralysis, but yet had never relaxed his labours as a teacher, and only lessened them as an author. He finished his lectures of the session of 1855 and 1856, and distributed the prizes to his class; and after an illness of ten days, Sir William died at his residence in Great King Street, Edinburgh, at seven o'clock in the morning, on Tuesday the sixth of May, in the year 1856. "Notwithstanding (says a private letter,) the gradual increase of his physical infirmities, he suffered no pain; and the mind retained its acuteness, though not its energy, almost to the last."

In the year 1829, Sir William married a daughter of Hubert Marshall, Esq., an advocate at the Scottish bar. This lady's rare intellectual accomplishments and womanly virtues gave to Sir William's home the grace of courtesy and the warmth of love. And the affection, which gave a balm to the philoso-

pher's life, now regards, with an intelligent discernment and careful solicitude, the fame which has cast so much lustre on his family. Sir William and Lady Hamilton had four children: William, now Sir William, an officer in the Bengal artillery, born in 1830; Hubert, a student of law, born in 1834; Elizabeth; and James, a youth of sixteen. By the world, Sir William was only thought of as the learned man and profound philosopher, but one of his family has written to us, "*We* rarely or never thought of him in these characters, living as he did, so simply and quietly in the midst of his family, accepting thankfully our trivial services, and taking a share and interest in all our little domestic pleasures and troubles."

The death of Sir William Hamilton cast a shadow, from the firmament of thought, over the civilized world. It was seen that a great light had gone down beneath the horizon. And men began to think more earnestly about him, as one of recognized superiority. It is under the common influence that we have now sketched an outline of the life of this great man. The facts, which we have stated, show that he was actuated, through life, by the noblest motives, and the loftiest aims; and his performances seem almost incredible. Neither Alexander, Cæsar, nor Napoleon, pushed their conquests with a more insatiable ambition: but theirs were the conquests of brute force, ending in despotic sway over their fellow-men; his, the conquests of thought, releasing men from the bondage of ignorance, to the liberty of intelligence. Hamilton, perhaps, died a martyr to his ambition: but it is far nobler to die upon the battle fields of thought, than upon those of slaughter. When he gave to his country his first lesson in philosophy, we have seen that there was hardly one to understand it. But, by his labours as a teacher and writer, his philosophy is not only understood by thousands, but is influencing all the thoughtful literature of those who speak the English language. As the inventor and framer of logic, in its true sense, he stands next to Aristotle himself; and as the philosopher of logic, elevating it to the dignity of the science of the laws of thought as thought, he must be placed far above Aristotle and the logicians of all ages. When his academical lectures on logic are published, they, together with what he published on logic during his life, must

sooner or later degrade to their proper level such corruptions of logic as the ponderous and muddy treatise of Mr. J. S. Mill, and banish from the schools such shallow treatises as Whately's, and the still shallower treatises to be found on our college catalogues. As a critic of systems, as a master of the older schools, and of the classic sources of speculation; and as a tactician in philosophical polemics, Sir William stands without a compeer in the great historical assembly of philosophers.

But Sir William's influence upon the age must not be estimated by his philosophy alone. His vast erudition, while it furnished a model for imitation, has quickened the scholarship of the world, by hints which will elicit investigation in the same directions; and in his admirable disquisition on the "Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum" he has given an example which even the Germans stared at.

Neither must we overlook Sir William's physiological labours. His polemic against phrenology in the several papers appended to the first volume of his Lectures, rivals in experimental sagacity any inquiry in human physiology from John Hunter to Richard Owen. His paper in the *Edinburgh Review*, reprinted in the Discussions, on the life of his grandfather's friend, Dr. Cullen, deserves notice as evidence how thoughtfully he had read the history of medical doctrine.

But the most important of his writings, next to those on philosophy, were his papers on educational reform. The stunning power with which, in the *Edinburgh Review*, he attacked the abuses which had destroyed the true character of Oxford, and damaged all the other schools of Britain, accompanied as it was by such comprehensive views of what education ought to be, together with such erudite researches into the history of the educational institutions which had nurtured the civilization of Europe, opened the eyes of the British public to their ignoble condition, and has led to the University Commissions, which are reforming the education of the United Kingdom. There are no papers upon public matters within the whole compass of British history, that for fierceness of hostility, fulness of information, profound intelligence and resistless dialectic, can be favourably compared with them. Other political papers were directed against matters of shifting policy;

but these were about the greatest of all institutions, except the family—the schools where men are educated to truth or error, to a noble and catholic spirit, or to the bigotry of sect and party.

We must not close this statement of the influence which Sir William Hamilton has bequeathed to the world, without a few remarks on the relation of his philosophical doctrine to theology. We have met with criticisms, both American and British, which imply, if they do not explicitly state, that the philosophy of Sir William Hamilton in its relation to theology is, at best, only negative. And since the publication of Mr. Mansel's "Limits of Religious Thought," the valuable first fruits of Hamilton's philosophical doctrine, we have seen the same criticism reiterated, somewhat envenomed by the *odium theologicum*. We propose, therefore, to examine the validity of this criticism.

David Hume it was, who by the most subtle, lucid and potent skepticism of modern times, strove to show that the fundamental notions on which theology is based are mere negations—not notions at all—but fictions of the imagination conjured up to support a vain credulity. This artful skepticism startled the powerful and systematizing speculative genius of Emanuel Kant from its credulous confidence in what was the current doctrine. Kant pondered over Hume's criticism of the prevalent doctrine, and saw that a new version of these notions must be given. Clinging, however, to the fatal dogma then universally received, that the mind can know nothing but modifications of itself; that in fact all knowledge is subjective; he adopted the fallacious method, called the critical, which is confined in its scope to testing truth by a criticism of the mind itself, finding truth in the harmony of its notions, and error in their contradictious relations. Kant wholly ignored objective knowledge; and maintained that the mind has a faculty of pure reason which hypostatizes its fictitious products as objective ideas, which serve as poles on which legitimate reasonings turn, but are in themselves wholly null. The logical understanding, Kant further maintained, was regulated by these illusive ideas, and takes cognizance of phenomena that are merely appearances wholly different from the realities. Thus

the skepticism of Hume was displaced by a system of negations in which appearances are declared to be all we know, and that these are utterly different from the reality of which we can know nothing. It is true, Kant tried to save theology and morals, by endeavoring to prop them up by the mere feelings of the heart in what he calls the practical reason. But this was a sheer evasion of the speculative difficulties. Kant's speculative perplexity arose from the contradictions which his criticism of reason elicited. These contradictions seemed to him to be affirmative deliverances of human reason, therefore showing human reason, in its normal exercise, to be speculatively a liar. Fichte developed Kant's doctrine of hypothetical idealism into absolute idealism; and maintained that there is no objective world at all. There could not but be a recoil in speculation against this absurdity. Schelling and Hegel therefore strove to regain the objective world in speculation, and to know something more than illusive appearances. They claimed, though in different ways, to have a direct knowledge of the absolute or infinite. And all the contradictions in thought were reconciled by Hegel in his consummate paradox, *that contradictories are one;* and *being* and *nothing* are the same; consequently *God* and *nothing* are the same. This monstrous paradox was not, by any means, meant for skepticism, but for a positive doctrine of human omniscience.

It was in this condition of the metaphysical problem of theology, that Sir William Hamilton undertook its solution. The prominent feature—the special phenomenon—which had to be dealt with, was the contradictions in all our thinking about the problem of God. These had to be reconciled so as to save human mental veracity, and also objective truth. For if in attempting to think legitimately about God, we necessarily contradict ourselves, then, either there is no God, or else our minds lie in affirming, indirectly through its contradictions, that there is none. But Sir William clearly seeing that the laws of thought, the forms of the understanding, must be of supreme authority in all human speculation, discerned that all these contradictions, the Hegelian paradox included, result from attempting to think from under or away from these laws, and thereby transgressing the limits of the understanding.

These attempts were therefore mere impotencies resulting in no thinking at all—mere negations; and the making these negations positive, necessarily involved a contradiction. These negations, therefore, only showed that the human mind is limited, but not mendacious. The mind never contradicts itself within its legitimate sphere, except by mistake—never necessarily.

It results from this doctrine, that the human mind thinks between limits. What then, comes up the inquiry, is the character of these limits? Sir William, by attempting to think either of them, found it incomprehensible—that is, unthinkable: if it were thinkable it would not, of course, be a limit. Now this doctrine is only a fuller development of the doctrine of opposites, which has a distinct recognition in Aristotle, and must have manifested itself to all thinkers, with more or less distinctness, from the earliest speculation, as it does in Plato, in its least developed form, of contraries. If we think of time, it is between time infinitely great and time infinitely small, either being incomprehensible. The omniscience and omnipotence of God, and the free agency and moral responsibility of man, are opposites in attempting to solve the problem of God's justice in his dealings with man. Think as we may, we always find two truths staring at us as opposites, each claiming from us special consideration. These truths have very lately, in a private letter to us from Dr. Francis Lieber, of great force and originality, been called anti-current or binomial truths. We will borrow this appellation.

Anti-current truths result from the limitation of our mind which necessitates us to think between two opposites. Relativity, the universal condition of our thinking, necessarily implies two terms or opposites. This results from the fact, that we can comprehend a notion or thing, only under the relations of identity and of difference, as being that which it is, and as distinguished from that which it is not. These opposites, when considered as absolutes, are incomprehensible; and it is only partially, and in their relation to each other, and their mutual relation to our understanding, that we can comprehend them. We can never comprehend the absolute harmony of anti-current truths until we can think from under

the relations of identity and of difference, and can comprehend the absolute—the all. It is only when we attempt to comprehend these opposites absolutely, that they present themselves to us as contradictories and nullify our thinking; otherwise they are not mutually exclusive, but relatively true.

Now, it can be *demonstratively* shown, that the doctrine of anti-current truths does not impugn the doctrine of God; but that with a *partial knowledge* of God, we are necessitated to *believe* of him as incomprehensible, but yet existing as the supreme moral Governor of the universe, whose ways are not as our ways, but yet sufficiently like our ways for us *to know* to some extent his ways, and *to believe* of his ways, still further than we know. To circumscribe *belief* within the limits of knowledge, or to extend *knowledge* to the compass of belief, is to violate the constant experience of consciousness; and therefore nullifies itself. Is then a man an atheist because he cannot know God absolutely, when the very condition of all his knowledge is, that he cannot know anything, not even himself, absolutely? And because this is also the condition of our moral thinking, and man cannot, therefore, harmonize omnipotence and free agency in a knowledge of absolute justice, must he, on that account, pronounce what he cannot *know*—God a tyrant and man his victim? Or are we not left, as Hamilton maintains, to our partial or relative knowledges and our beliefs, for a valid theology, recognizing the limits of the human understanding? Indeed, as for ourselves, our knowledges and beliefs are so much more satisfactory than our religious practice, that we do not feel the need so much of light as of strength. And in our weakness we cannot curse God, but only condemn ourselves. Our wickedness we feel to be our own. This much *we know*, and what *we know* we know as well as if we knew all. For absolute knowledge cannot convert our partial or relative knowledge into a lie.

Let it not be objected to a demonstrative proof of a God, that only mathematics, which invents itself by its own definitions, and has no facts to account for, is a demonstrative science, because the demonstration of which we speak rests upon the fundamental data of consciousness, which cannot be denied *as facts*, without involving a contradiction of the denial,

and therefore indirectly affirming the data. These data, by legitimate ratiocination, lead to theism by the necessitation of the laws of thought.

It only remains, in showing that Hamilton's philosophy is not negative, to inquire briefly into the doctrine of relativity. Some of his critics, who have hit at him over the shoulders of Mr. Mansel, have said, by way of showing the negative character of Hamilton's philosophy, that he should rather be called the *great relativist*, than a *natural realist*, as Hamilton calls himself. Now, this criticism mistakes the import of *the relative*. It is not the opposite of the *real*, as the criticism implies, but of *the absolute*. The relative is as real as far as it goes, as the absolute. So also is the phenomenal as real as far as it goes, as the absolute. The relative and the phenomenal mean the same, but from different points of view. Now, the doctrine of Kant, as we have shown, was that the phenomenal or relative was different from the real; but this is not the doctrine of Hamilton and the Scottish School, who not only believe in the reality of the objective, but that it is immediately known, and are therefore called *natural realists*. The philosophy of Reid originated in the attempt to demonstrate this very doctrine—to regain the worlds of matter and of mind which Hume showed had no existence on the doctrine which denied the immediate knowledge of the external world. This doctrine Hamilton laboured all his life to expound and supplement, making it the central doctrine of all philosophy. The supposition that his doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, impugns this doctrine, needs not a serious refutation.

From the foregoing considerations, it is sufficiently manifest, that the philosophy of the conditioned, as maintained by Hamilton, only relegates theology to our partial or relative knowledges and our beliefs, circumscribed by those limits to human knowledge which the laws of identity and contradiction impose upon us. And there can be no alternative to this doctrine, but that of Hegel which ignores these two laws, and makes affirmative and negative, identity and difference one and the same. The critics of Hamilton are necessitated, as it would be easy to show, to choose either the doctrine, *that God is*

nothing, and nothing is God, or that, *we know only in part.* There is no middle between the Hegelian and the Hamiltonian creed.

We hope our sketch of Hamilton will enable our readers to peruse his lectures with more interest, and that our criticism will vindicate the validity of his metaphysics. The editors of the Lectures deserve all praise for the judgment and learning with which they have executed their task.

ART. II.—*A Nation's Right to Worship God.**

WE propose, in this article, to discuss some of the principles and laws of social progress, in the endeavour to elucidate the relations between civil government and religion, under American institutions. There are grave questions connected with this subject, which, we are persuaded, must soon be re-opened in this country, and come to engage the most earnest thinking of our time.

To prevent misunderstanding, however, we would observe at the outset, that we are firm believers in human progress; the faith and hope of which are interwoven with the very fibres of parental affection. We find it easy to persuade ourselves that our children will reflect honour upon us; and that we shall be comforted, with respect to our own errors and failures in life, by their successes and happiness. On a certain occasion, a good and wise father called his son into his presence, on the day he came of age, and said, "My son, you are no longer a child; you are now a man. From this time you have no master but God. God and your country now call you to liberty

* The substance of this article is taken from an address before the Cliosophic and American Whig Societies of the College of New Jersey, at the last Annual Commencement. This will explain some of the peculiarities of style.

and to duty. I wish you to remember, my son, that it was ever the aim of your father to be a man, to act a man's part in life; and that his honour is now committed into your hands. You will not betray, nor tarnish it." That was all he said to the young man, but as he turned away, with a tear of parental hope and pride, he softly added, "It is an honest lad; the boy will not discredit his name; he will do *better* than his father has done."

A single generalization from this fact gives us the faith and hope of the human heart in that physical, mental, and moral development of the race, which we call by the name of social or historical progress. This faith we hold to be indestructible. It is true, indeed, as every thinking man must be well aware, that much of what is called by the name of progress is miscalled. If the destinies of humanity were in the hands of many who vociferate this word, but who are only camp-followers to the army, intent on plunder, no victory could ever be gained, organized society would soon be dissolved, and the world engulfed in perdition. Notwithstanding, from the times of the Hebrew prophets, in whose glowing predictions it finds its most sublime utterances, this has ever been the faith and hope of all the great and good of mankind. It is, indeed, the light of human life, without which life itself would be intolerable. We cannot believe in a permanently retrograde movement. No, the deep and fervent aspirations of our hearts, and the faithful striving of our hands, are not doomed to end in disappointment. The succeeding do enter into the labours, and profit by the experience, of preceding generations. Human reason is a nobler endowment than the instinct of the beaver.

A little attention, however, to the phenomena of history reveals the striking fact, that this progress is never in a direct line, but in a zig-zag movement, like that of a ship beating to windward: which may well illustrate the actual condition of our fallen humanity. From the social evils of a given system of philosophy, or prevailing solution of the great problems of life, a reaction sets in, under the influence of which the course of human thought shoots far over into the opposite extreme. When the evils of this extreme begin to make themselves exten-

sively felt, and others, more grievous, are threatening us, like "breakers ahead," a similar reaction takes place; again the word is passed, "About ship! helm hard down!" when we come up into the wind, and if we do not miss stays, and fall off upon rocks or quicksands, we go about, and lie over on the other tack. But head as close to the wind as we possibly can, we soon find ourselves, not indeed in the same, but in a similar extreme to the first. In the meantime a certain progress has been achieved, yet by no means so great as he imagines, who watches only the motion of the vessel through the water, but does not lift his eyes to the guiding constellations of heaven.

Sometimes, where the wind is dead ahead, and the channel very narrow, as in France for the last hundred years, these courses are very short. There we have the apotheosis of despotism under Louis XIV., the experience of the evils of that extreme, the subsequent reaction, and the subversion of that ancient and renowned monarchy. Next the opposite extreme of Jacobinism, the Reign of Terror, the reaction, and the consequent overthrow of the first Republic. Following this we have the military throne of the first Napoleon, under whom the course of national thought ran on in the same direction, through the sorrows of France depopulated by incessant wars, and of Paris occupied by the allied armies, reaching at length the extreme point of the restoration of the ancient dynasty, with most of its obsolete traditions. Hence, again, a similar reaction towards republicanism, stretching through the second expulsion of the Bourbons, and the reign of the Citizen King, to the provisional government, and the second Republic. And yet, again, a reaction set in against this movement, not so much, as it would seem, because of any extremes which it had actually reached, nor from evils actually experienced, but from those which were apprehended as impending and inevitable. For during the brief continuance of the second Republic, the socialistic ideas had made such rapid advances as to threaten the rights of property, the integrity of the nation, and civilization itself. This was well understood at the time by the first minds in France. Cavaignac himself, that staunch republican and most incorruptible of Frenchmen, is known to have de-

clared, that, although he would not forfeit his own consistency, yet, if Louis Napoleon, or any other capable man, chose to put himself at the head of a reactionary movement, he would not draw his sword in defence of republican ideas. This was the secret of that great man's virtual acquiescence in the *coup d' état* which established the present order of things. He could not disguise from himself that a change was indispensable to save society from dissolution. And now, if we compare the second Republic with the first, and the present condition of the French people with that under the first Napoleon, and still farther, with that under the legitimate despotism of the old monarchy, it becomes quite evident that the result of all these conflicts has been a true and living progress.

Thus it has always been in the history of the human race. For if, to the generalization of this construction of particular facts, it be objected, as we sometimes hear it said, that French nature is not human nature, and such proceedings are never seen but in France, we are not to attribute the least force to this expression. Its wit is the chief element of its life and currency. Human nature everywhere is numerically one, and identically the same. We meet similar phenomena in Greek, Roman, and, as we shall see hereafter, even in Jewish history. In fact, throughout all past time, wherever any life and movement at all have been manifested, this progress by reaction from extremes has been going on, in more or less striking forms, through longer or shorter reaches of thought, according to the peculiarities of each several people.

The reason of this is obvious to reflection. For the life of humanity consists, in great part, of the development under logical forms, and of the realization in action, of intellectual conceptions, principles, ideas. Facts, *res gestæ*, are the phenomena and the body of which thought is the law and the soul. History is crystalized thought. Not that principles in their abstract forms, are first apprehended by the mind; on the contrary, facts are first in the field. Some leader of human activities becomes conscious of a common want, and therefore immediately takes action. In order to justify such action, to induce others to unite with him in sharing its responsibility and

its benefits, reflection is brought to bear upon it, and the principle which it contains is abstracted from it and defined. This principle now enters into a course of logical development; its contents are drawn out of it, and applied in various directions, according to their capabilities; and thus it passes into history. In so far as any such given principle or idea is both true and fruitful, the nation or people over whose history it presides for the time, is animated with a vigorous and flourishing life. The time during which it supplies impulse and energy, norm and corrective, to the human activities, is marked as an historic period: which is of longer or shorter duration, and more or less rich in grave and important events, according to the fulness and truth of the ideas by which it is inspired and governed.

Thus it is that all great movements of mankind are movements of thought in course of evolution and application to the affairs of life. And wonderful it is, to see with what vigorous, logical procedure such developments march. For although each individual be capable of but little thought, and that little may often wander, and load itself with inconsequent deductions, yet, as in orchestral music, the discords of the various instruments are assimilated and absorbed in the full tide of the harmony, so the errors in the reasoning of individual minds are either neutralized by each other, or taken up and borne along in the vast sweep and volume of national thought, so that the mass movement follows, in the main, a logical direction. Of this our own history, as we shall presently see, affords many striking illustrations.

In order now to comprehend why such movements cannot run on for ever in the same direction, we must here take into consideration the infinite nature of the truth, and the finite capacities of the human mind. Consequently these ideas which are developed in history, are never absolute. In so far as they are true, they are but glimpses into the infinite of truth, which are liable, in the course of time, to be exhausted of their contents, so that, torture them as we may, they will yield no more consequences capable of being realized in act; whence they cease to inspire the life and energies of the people, and give place to other ideas which turn the current of history. Human

life, moreover, is manifold and many-sided. No one idea, however great and fruitful, can be adequate at any time, to fill out its whole circumference. The life of each individual, much more that of a nation or race of mankind, consists in the development and realization of many different and often conflicting ideas, which have relations to each other, and will yield consequences which never can be foreseen or predicted. For it is only in life, through actual historical development, that the logical contents of any great principle can ever come to be fully known. Hence it follows that when such principles continue to be fruitful, they are liable to be pushed on to unforeseen results, which not only clash with each other, but are pernicious in themselves. For there is no principle which is capable of definition, development and realization, that is to say, there is no historical principle which will not yield, by perfectly legitimate processes, *extreme results*, which practical wisdom will steadfastly refuse to adopt and act upon. Every such principle is necessarily, to a certain extent, contingent upon circumstances, in some of which its legitimate consequences are true and valid, in others, false and pernicious. However incontrovertible it may be when abstractly stated, however beneficial its consequences when realized up to a certain point, others are sure to be evolved out of it in the course of time, with respect to which it will require to be severely limited in its application to the affairs of life.

Now where this is ill understood or neglected, where a people do not stop to apply these necessary limitations, but push on the great ideas, which animate and inspire their energies, to the remotest results of which they are capable, these extreme consequences, as they are unfolded and realized, become productive of intolerable social evils. Then it is that reaction sets in; the ship goes about, and lies over on the other tack.

The most sharply defined and typical forms of this whole procedure we have found in French history. The reason of this lies in the obvious truth, that the most striking characteristic of the Gallic national mind is logic. The French are eminently a people of ideas, in this sense, that they carry out their social theories, as if they were absolute, to the most extreme logical results of which they are capable. Your true

Gaul follows his logic "down Niagara." Hence the rapidity with which they run through their historic periods: hence the frequency, and strength, and violence of their reactionary movements. The English, on the contrary, are not a people of ideas, that is to say, of theories. The grand trait of their national mind is common sense. Above all men whom we know, whether of ancient or modern times, the English are clothed with the power of arresting extreme consequences, of limiting the development of one idea by that of another. They understand the necessity of checks and balances in every human arrangement. Hence those long reaches of thought through which their historic periods run, and the permanency of their social institutions.

In such views as these we may find ample justification of that maxim of the people's wisdom, which we take to be essentially of English origin, "It is very good in theory, but will not hold in practice"—a maxim, however ridiculed by sciolists, both sound in itself, and of extensive application. For here we see that the wisdom and safety of any act, or course of action, do not wholly rest upon its being a legitimate consequence of some received, and, in the main, sound principle. In order to demonstrate a safe practical judgment, each separate result of our guiding principles must be brought to the test of other ideas, as also of experience, and of common sense.

In the light of these principles and laws of social progress, we may now endeavour to understand ourselves, and to determine through what stage, whether of healthful action, or of extreme results, we, as a nation, are now moving in the development and realization of the grand ideas which inspire and govern our history.

And here it is necessary to ascend to the fountain head of that which only, as we think, can properly be called modern history. The historic period through which we are now moving, begins—in so far as any part of what is necessarily an organic whole, can be said to have a beginning—in Luther's first act of rebellion against the authority of the church of Rome. The principle which was contained in that act, we take to be this, that the mind and conscience of the individual are responsible to the truth and to God alone—the principle of INDIVIDUAL

LIBERTY, AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY. The history of the Protestant nations, from the sixteenth century to the present time, chiefly consists of the progressive development, the further and more widely extended realization, of this idea. This mighty truth, this vast and fruitful principle, according to the strength with which it actuated Martin Luther, and according to his agency and influence in opening to it a career of development in the world, is that which constituted him, truly and properly, an epoch-making man. With all our known reverence for the other great Reformers, especially for Calvin and Melancthon, it seems no way unjust to them to say, that the relation which they bear to Luther is like that of La Place to Newton.

Now this principle of individual liberty and responsibility, as all other ideas which have exerted a regenerating and transforming influence upon the world, had its birth in a fact of religion. Consequently, it was first applied to doctrinal and church reforms. Hence we have the Reformation, the Reformed Religion, with all that is signified by these words. But it was self-evident that this principle could not be limited to the sphere of the religious life. Immediately, therefore, it began to be applied to literature, science, and art, in all other directions, and to all other human affairs. Hence came Oliver Cromwell, Puritanism, the English, American, and even the French revolutions, together with all their fruits and consequences in modern history. Hence the freedom of the press, universal education, and all free institutions. Hence all freedom of scientific inquiry, experiment, and publication, and that riches and bloom of Protestant literature, science and philosophy, especially that stupendous growth of the physical sciences, in their application to the industrial arts, in the midst of which it is our happiness to live. The immeasurable superiority, with respect to all these things, of the Protestant over the Papal nations—except France alone, emancipated, to a great extent, from Papal influence by the revolution—is proof that they belong to the germinal principle of the Protestant Reformation.

But it was on this continent, in this new and vast country, and by reason of the character, antecedents, and objects of our forefathers, that this great religious, political, and social prin-

ciple found a wider and more favourable sphere, than it had ever before enjoyed—its true and proper home. Consequently our history, as no other in the world, consists of its more and more extended development and realization. This we now proceed to trace.

Taken as the right of private judgment, it is this principle of individual liberty and responsibility which has given us much of that intense individualism, self-reliance, directness of thought, abounding energy, restless activity, and daring enterprise, which in religion, politics and business, are so strikingly characteristic of the American mind. Hence, also, we derive our prevailing mode, to question, examine, discuss and criticise, rather than to believe. In all the departments of thought and life—in science, art and philosophy; in theology, morals and religion; in the church, the state, and the family—there is nothing too great or too small, too high or too low, too sacred or too profane, for individual criticism. This also places us in constant and powerful resistance to the authority of the past, the deliverances of tradition, prescriptive right. But since fashions always tend to extremes, and no less, as we have seen, in philosophy than in dress, it would not be surprising if those who come after us, should reject much that we have retained. It is certain, that if the habit of mind should continue to grow upon us, it must in time lead to the rejection of many just and true ideas; of many sound maxims and wholesome customs. The principle from which it springs, therefore, requires to be checked or limited, at least to some extent, by reverence for the past, the experience of the human race, and common sense.

The application of this idea to civil affairs, has given us the right of self-government, with all its priceless advantages over all other forms of government ever known to mankind. Hence we have our central, state, county, township, and municipal organizations; the whole country being divided and subdivided again and again, that the idea of self-government may be the more perfectly realized. But it is evident that the principle admits of a still further development, in the entire separation of the North from the South, of the East from the West, and of each state from all the others, into so many disconnected and absolute sovereignties. Nay, its remote consequences would

displace the very idea of a state or sovereignty, and constitute each individual the supreme law, and sole arbiter of his own life and conduct. Here, therefore, the principle requires to be limited by that of national unity, of which we shall have more to say hereafter.

Nor is there anything in this idea to restrain any man from marrying as many women as he can persuade to become his wives. Hence we have lived to see United States officials exercising, in a perfectly valid and recognized form, all the functions of territorial government, with harems of women around them, more numerous than that of the Grand Turk. This is a significant fact, and well worthy of being understood in connection with the principle from which it springs, and by which it is justified. Hence, also, our communities of free lovers, and the impunities they enjoy; together with the enormous multiplication of divorces among us. For where all parties freely consent to such arrangements, the idea of individual liberty is the more perfectly realized, without violation of the civil rights of any. Here again the principle requires to be limited by that of the Christian character of our nation, of which also we shall have more to say.

The right of self-government, moreover, admits of an easy and perfectly sound translation into the received formula. All the powers of government are derived from the consent or concessions of the governed. But it is evident that a man cannot alienate from himself a right which he does not possess; and no man is possessed of the right to take away his own life, for any purpose, or in any circumstances. Consequently no man can surrender to government this right to take away his life. Government, under this formula, has no right to inflict the death penalty; and capital punishment becomes murder. Here we find the true explanation of those popular agitations against the death penalty which we experience from time to time; which have already excluded it from the penal code of some of the States; and which must ultimately abolish it altogether, if the idea from which they spring be not limited by the Divine right of civil government, and of society to protect itself.

In fine, the principle of individual liberty, carried out to its utmost consequences in civil affairs, is, of course, simply anar-

chy. And such was the actual condition of the Jewish people at the close of that historic period which is covered by the Book of Judges; when *there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes.* For what state of social disorganization those words were intended to describe, is plain from that horrid affair of the Benjamite's wife, in which a whole tribe of Israel were almost exterminated by their brethren, and which closes in that stormy period. Hence the uncontrolable reaction that followed, and the establishment of the monarchy to save society. Nor is there any other way, as it would appear, to escape precisely similar results in our own history, but by the limitation of the idea of individual liberty by the correlative principles of national unity, and of the religious character of the nation.

The application of this principle to matters of religion, has given us all our individual religious liberties, with all their unspeakable blessings. From it also we derive that vast multitude of different religious sects, with their advantages and disadvantages, by which Protestant Christianity is distinguished from the outward and formal unity of Romanism. And here it would seem that we have already reached extreme results in the development of the idea, which exert no little influence to undermine and weaken the faith of the people. The church, the body of Christ, appears to exist among us in a dismembered state, its mangled limbs violently torn from each other, and the life-blood, which is faith, pouring forth from its wounds in fatal streams. We cannot but think that the inward and spiritual unity of the church demands some outward and visible sign, in order first, that it should be a living unity, and secondly, that it should be so manifested as to convince the world that Jesus Christ is the Sent of God. This seems to be included in that repeated prayer of our blessed Lord, interceding for his people, in the words: *That they all may be one; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they all may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.* For how can the world, who cannot discern spiritual things, be aware that there is any spiritual unity in the church, so as to be convinced by it that Christ is sent of God, otherwise than

by its going forth, and expressing itself, in some outward manifestation and visible sign?

But not to insist upon this interpretation, it is evident that in the idea which has given birth to all these different denominations, there is nothing to restrain it from continuing to multiply them to an indefinite extent. Accordingly, we find it in full career of development and realization, up to the present time. Within the present generation it has given us Mormonism, the so-called Spiritualist Circles, and a number of new Christian sects; and it has rent in twain the Methodist Episcopal Church, North and South, the Presbyterian Church, and twice again, the New-school branch of it. Still it threatens other communions. Where will it naturally stop? Let it run on to the last extremes of which it is capable in logic, and it must subvert all creeds and confessions of faith, displace the very idea of church unity, and make each individual his own church, and thence, practically, his own Saviour and his own God. All that is needed to ensure this result, is that the very same mental processes and acts, which have broken up the Christian church among us into the existing number of different sects, should continue to repeat themselves without let or restraint. Here therefore the principle from which they spring requires, and it must find, limitation in catholic unity, experience and common sense. The last, and now the only hope of Romanism in the world, lies in the possibility that Protestantism, in this country, may not have the wisdom to apply these limitations in time to save the faith of the people.

We come now to consider the influence of this idea, of individual religious liberty, in moulding our governmental institutions. For in order that every individual might be not only absolutely free, but wholly unbiased by the influence of the government, in his religious opinions, the Constitution of the United States has rigorously abstained from all recognition of, and allusion to, Christianity, or to the being of a God; and all* our Constitutions prescribe and ordain "that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office

* The constitution of North Carolina, unchanged since its adoption in 1776, is an exception to this.

or public trust." Consequently they cannot require an oath in the name of God. What is called the oath of the President elect, which is the model of all others, whether of the general or state governments, is prescribed in these words: "I do solemnly swear or affirm," &c.; in which the officer elect is left free to swear by nothing at all, and thus to leave out not only all recognition of God, but therein also the very essence of an oath. Whenever the name of God is introduced in such cases, whether under the Constitution of the United States, or of any particular state, in any department of the government, executive, legislative, judicial, educational, or military, it is purely optional.* The practical effect, whether or not the original object, of all this, is the neutrality of the government with respect to all religions, so that no possible governmental influence can be constitutionally exerted for or against any form of religious belief.

This absolute neutrality in religion of the Constitution of the United States, is admitted and defended by the commentators. Says one of them: "It has been objected by some against the Constitution, that it makes no mention of religion, contains no recognition of the existence and providence of God. . . . But there were reasons why the introduction of religion would have been unseasonable if not improper. The Constitution was intended exclusively for civil purposes, and religion could not be regularly mentioned. The difference among the various sects of Christians is such that, in an instrument where all are entitled to equal consideration, it would be difficult to use words in which all could cordially join. . . . The purity of religion is best preserved by keeping it separate from government." For these and other reasons, he adds: "It was impossible to introduce into the Constitution even an expression of gratitude to the Almighty for the formation of the present government."† Such are the views of the commentators upon the Constitution of the United States, in which they manifest a cordial zeal for the purity of religion "by keeping it separate

* In some of the States, the form of the oath is in some cases prescribed by law so as to make a direct appeal to God, but this can always be evaded by substituting the affirmation.

† Bayard on the Constitution of the United States.

from government;" but unfortunately they do not inform us what is to preserve the purity of government after it has become sequestered from religion—has thus solemnly excommunicated itself. It were "devoutly to be wished" that some eminent statist of that school would speak to this point.

The same principle substantially rules in our state Constitutions. It is true that in some of the earlier of these there is still a faint recognition of God, and even of the Christian religion. In that of North Carolina there is even a Protestant clause. But from most of those which have come into existence under the further development of the idea of individual religious liberty, either all trace of religion has disappeared, or, as in those of Missouri and Texas, there are provisions of positive, though, no doubt, of unconscious hostility to Christianity. The Constitution of New Jersey is an honourable exception to this statement. As revised two years ago, under the influence of the eminent Christian statesmen of that Commonwealth, it exhibits a decided tendency to return to the idea of a Christian state. But the Constitution of New York is an admirable example of this perfect religious neutrality, the more significant in so far as the inhabitants of the Empire State are a typical people. For it guaranties the largest liberty to all mankind, with respect to all religions, in the words, "without discrimination or preference." That the true intent of that clause is to place all the religions, and all the infidelities of the world, upon exact level with Christianity before the government, we have the best possible evidence. For being well acquainted with the truly eminent and accomplished gentleman to whom chiefly that Constitution owes its present form, and happening to meet him soon after its adoption, we took occasion to say, "You, sir, have done what surely no other man in the state could have accomplished. Having yourself been born, and brought up, and moulded under the influence of the Christian church, you have given us a Constitution for the government of a great Christian people, which covers a vast extent and variety of topics, and yet which carries out one idea with such perfect logical rigour, that from no single word, or form of expression, could it ever be inferred that such a fact as the Christian religion ever existed." "Ah!" he replied, with mani-

fest delight, "how well you have understood it! That was just what we intended to do." Yet was he anything but an irreligious person. He was a regular attendant, and liberal supporter of the Presbyterian church, and, indeed, formerly a parishioner of the writer of this article. But this was his theory of civil government. A Christian person, even a Christian family, he could understand; but a Christian state was an idea totally inconsistent, in his mind, with that of the religious liberty of the individual.

Thus far we have actually realized this principle in our Constitutions. Its further development in the same direction, leads, by necessary sequence, to the abrogation of all our laws for the protection of the Sabbath, the punishment of blasphemy, and the like; also to the banishment of all observance of the Sabbath, chaplaincies, and religious services, from our legislative bodies, our army, and navy; and of all recognition of God, and of the Christian religion, from the messages of our presidents, and other executive officers, and from all other public documents, and governmental acts. Even the executive appointment of our thanksgiving days is contrary to the spirit, and many of the things mentioned, to the express letter of our Constitutions, because they are governmental acts with "discrimination and preference" in matters of religious belief, which is constitutionally repudiated. They exert a governmental influence to bias the minds of individuals in favour of Christianity against infidelity, and against all non-Christian religions; consequently against every man's position and success in public life, who is an enemy to the national faith. They are, in fact, the lingering remains of an obsolete system of ideas, with respect to which our governmental institutions are, as yet, but imperfectly purified from religion. Hence the agitation which, from time to time, calls for their abolition. They have been allowed to remain—the laws for the protection of the Sabbath, and the punishment of blasphemy, being merely a dead letter, often violated by the government itself—only because their religious influence is so ill defined, and ineffectual.

The influence of this jealous neutrality, with respect to all religions, of our supreme and state governments, upon our public men, political parties, and political life in general, is very

striking. For no government can be administered and carried on, according to its true intents and aims, but by men who are personally in sympathy with its character. And since our Constitutions do thus exclude from themselves all influences which could bias the minds of individuals either for or against any religious belief, they cannot but act, in a most subtle and powerful manner, to repel from their offices of trust, and from the political organizations under them, all men who have any religious character, and to attract those who have as few religious and conscientious scruples as possible. Accordingly, we observe, that our chief magistrates have hardly ever been professed Christians. Even when favourably disposed towards the Christian religion, commonly they have held themselves aloof from formal church-membership until their retirement from office. The like is true, with noble exceptions, of our legislators, judges, aspirants to office, leaders of political parties, and public men in general. And here we find the true and all-sufficient explanation of that almost total banishment of religious ideas and restraints from politics, and of that portentous, ever-increasing political corruption, which already perplexes and appals the nation. For it is manifestly impossible thus to shut out all religious aims and objects from any sphere of human life, without weakening, and ultimately destroying, the power of religious principle within that sphere. The inevitable result, in time, of this rigorous exclusion of religion from politics, is the irretrievable demoralization of the whole sphere of public life. The idea is yet indeed but imperfectly realized. But it can hardly be denied that we have been of late, and are daily making good progress. The principle is in full career of development up to the present hour. When it has reached its last terms, all appeal to religious motives in politics, will be held to be as much out of place, and illegitimate, as is now the appeal to political motives in religion. This idea is a two-edged sword, which cuts with equal keenness both ways.

It were possible, however, to bear all this, if it were not for still another consequence of this governmental neutrality in religion, which seems to us of deeper, and farther reaching significance, than all others put together. This is its influence upon our whole educational system.

For inasmuch as our public schools are strictly governmental institutions, organized and maintained under Constitutions from which all religious objects have been sedulously excluded, from these schools must also be excluded all religious objects, worship, instruction, and influence. Accordingly, it is one of the fundamental laws of this department of the government, that "no religious test shall ever be required of the teachers of our public schools; and no teacher shall be deemed unqualified for giving instruction in them on account of his opinions in matters of religious belief." One of the most eminent of American jurists* has officially decided, that "it is no part of the object of our public school system to give religious instruction." How otherwise could he honestly interpret our Constitutions and laws? Even the reading of the Bible in these schools, although in some of the states the school laws do specify that it shall not be prohibited, is in palpable conflict with this idea of governmental neutrality in religion: under which it is the constitutional right of the Romanist to object against the common version of the Scriptures, of the Jew against the New Testament, and of the heathen and infidel against the whole. Each and every religionist can rise up and say, You have no constitutional right to tax me for the instruction of my children in a religion which I do not believe. Nor at the point where we now stand in the development of the idea of individual religious liberty, is it possible to answer them. The logic of the case they have all their own way. And the carrying out, in good faith, of these provisions must ultimately banish the Bible, prayer, every vestige of religious worship and influence, and all teaching of morality which is peculiar to the Christian religion, from our vast and all-moulding systems of public education. This is the inevitable logical consequence of the principle, as it is already, to a great extent, the actual result. Who that has reflected upon the subject at all, can fail to see it?

What must be the effect of this extrusion of religion from the public schools, both upon education itself, and upon the national character, it is not difficult to foresee. For the three great ends of education are, to communicate the most important information, to train the mind, and to form the

* The late John C. Spencer.

character; and these three are one. It is not possible to attain any one of them apart from both the others. Consequently all sound education, whatever is worthy of the name, must needs be an organic process. For the knowledge which is of paramount importance is, of course, just that which pertains to the moral and spiritual world; the communication of this by right methods is the most effectual way to discipline and impart strength and steadiness to the mind; whilst these two, right knowledge and right discipline, with respect to the facts and truths of the moral and spiritual world, are the fundamental elements of a right character. By the knowledge of the facts and truths of the moral and spiritual world, and of the relations which these bear to each other, the mind is fed, and nourished, and invigorated, as the body by its appropriate food, and by healthful exercise. Ignorance is the want of intellectual food, the famine and starvation of the mind. If that which is communicated in education be of trivial importance, the mind is dwarfed, as the body by insufficient nourishishment. If the relations between the facts and truths communicated be not traced out, the mind is surfeited, as the body with an overloaded stomach, and without exercise. If in the tracing of these relations unsound processes be followed, the mind is warped, as the body by unnatural exercises and contortions. If that be given for fact or truth, which is neither, the mind is poisoned, as the body by unwholesome food. It is only when the matter of instruction in education is of the deepest significance, i. e., when it is just that which pertains to the moral and spiritual world, that which is revealed in the word of God, and when the relations of the things taught to each other, are traced out by sound processes, that the mind is adequately fed, and nourished, and invigorated, is broadly developed, and attains to the full growth and maturity of all its faculties and powers. In other words, the intellect of man is grafted in, so to speak, upon a moral and spiritual, that is to say, upon an infinite, exhaustless root, by which supported and replenished, it is rendered capable, as distinguished from the brute mind, of culture, development, and growth, from generation to generation, and from age to age. And it is necessary that it should be trained with special reference to this idea, in order that it

should uphold its highest and most plentiful blossoms, and should bear its golden fruit of true wisdom. This moral and religious training is indispensable from the beginning to the end of the whole educational process. To interest the minds and hearts of children at the dawning of their intellectual and moral life; to acquaint them with all things most necessary to be known, both for this world and that which is to come; to accomplish them in the most profound, abstruse, and infallibly correct processes and methods of reasoning; to imbue them with the knowledge of history, eloquence, and poetry; to quicken their perceptions of the true, the beautiful, and the good; to inform them with sound principles of right and justice; to purify their affections, and fix them upon the most exalted objects; to make of our sons, men, and of our daughters, women, in the highest sense of these words; in fine, to ennoble, transfigure, and glorify their whole humanity—to accomplish these sublime objects the Holy Scripture alone is adequate, and indispensable, throughout the whole course, as matter of instruction and principle of education.

All this, of necessity, is lost to the education of the masses by excluding the Bible and religious instruction from the public schools. Nor is it possible to provide a sufficient remedy by placing our children in private or select academies. For this great public school system is an all-moulding power upon the ideas themselves which are entertained of education, among all classes of society. The views of education which prevail in the public schools soon come to prevail in the nation. Religious instruction and influence driven from these, soon cease to form any part of the idea of education in the community at large.

Accordingly we find that the loss of this idea is working a revolution in the whole department of education, as also in the character of the teachers and instructors themselves. For the system, being without aims and objects, naturally attracts to its service a class of men who are personally in sympathy with it; in other words, who have as little of the religious character as possible; consequently, unconscientious, unscrupulous people, whose chief end of life is a piece of bread. Such teachers, themselves intellectually incompetent, and in order to flatter

both parents and children, are easily tempted to pass rapidly over elementary exercises, and to increase the number of studies beyond all rational limits, crowding one upon another, and hurrying on with such reckless speed, that learning, in any true sense of the word, becomes impossible. Hence it is already one of the most difficult things to find an instructor under whom a child can be placed, with any rational expectation that he will obtain such a knowledge of language as will enable him to read the classics, in after life, with any facility, pleasure, or profit. The same ineffectual methods, and abortive results, are equally apparent in other branches of education. In this way, children of the brightest intellect are soon discouraged. Thoroughly instructed in what they pass over, when it is light behind, they are easily interested in study, and learn to face, without shrinking, the darkness which lies before them. But when it becomes dark behind as well as before, they are utterly confused and disgusted; their minds are stupefied and enfeebled, instead of being educated. This evil is already enormous, and no less, perhaps even greater, in private than in public education. It is one of the greatest calamities that can befall any people. Hence the almost universal outcry from parents and guardians, What shall we do with our children? Send them where we will, they do not learn. They seem to feel no interest in study; and we cannot persuade our boys to go to college. For this is one of the chief causes of that relative decline in the number of our youth who aspire to collegiate, and the higher forms of education—they have no genial interest awakened in study, they are discouraged and disgusted with its blind and fruitless toil, in the lower departments.

The further influence of this whole system of education divorced from religion, upon the character of the young, surely cannot be misunderstood. It is already but too evident in that early loss of the simplicity and innocence of childhood, in that precocious development of subtlety and forbidden knowledge, in that disgusting manishness, which dwarfs the stature, enfeebles the mind, and, like the worm in the first ripe fruits, causes the premature decay and death of so many of our American youth. Some one has bitterly said, "There are no children in America; they are all pigmy men and women; and half of them

never grow up to full size." For how is it possible that the humanity in them should continue to grow through the ordinary length of time, and attain to the full stature of men and women, when it is deprived of that religious instruction in education which is its most necessary food.

The influence of this change in education we have begun to feel in every department of life. It extends even to the fundamental relation between parents and children. Formerly, as is well known, a certain religious character and dignity belonged to the father of the family, a certain prophetic, priestly, and kingly authority, was vested in the head of the household, in virtue of which he felt obliged to assert for himself, and for the mother of his children, a Divine right to their reverence and obedience; and to set apart some portion of the week to instruct them in their relations and duties, "as inferiors, superiors and equals." How little of all this is found among us now! How indeed could it remain after it had ceased to be a self-evident truth, that education is essentially a religious training!

In a few generations this influence must extend to the whole population of our country, and recast in its own likeness, our national character, which already tends to the merging of its original Anglo-Saxon depth and seriousness in a certain French levity and frivolity. There is no less of truth than of wit in the saying that, "Good Americans, when they die, go to Paris." For it may be safely affirmed that all other influences which go to determine our national character and destiny, are scarcely superior to that of our all-comprehending, all-moulding systems of governmental education. As are the public schools of this land, such will be the great and governing masses of the people. If they are Christian, the nation will be Christian. If the Bible shall be driven from them, it can never maintain the place it has hitherto occupied in the nation.

These are some of the extreme consequences, logically derived, already extensively realized, and in full course of realization up to the present hour, of the principle of individual liberty, taken in its widest sense. This is the course we are steering with full sails. Is it not plain to reason that if we pursue it long enough, we must find ourselves in perilous

waters? And when the mast-head watch shall call out, "breakers ahead—and close under the lee bow!" there will be no time to trim the vessel. Then a sudden and violent change in our course will be our only and doubtful possibility of escape from disastrous shipwreck. If the principle, by which we are now guided, be not limited, and its extreme consequences arrested in time, by some other principle of historical development, of equal validity, fruitfulness and power, a violent reaction against it is inevitable. And the longer this is delayed, the greater the lengths to which the now dominant idea shall yet go, the more sudden and violent that reaction must be, and the greater will be those evils of the opposite extreme, into which the American mind is as sure to run, as that it has not escaped from under the laws which have governed all preceding history. It seems plain that there is no other way to save and perpetuate the innumerable and priceless blessings which we owe to this great principle of individual liberty, but faithfully to apply these limitations in time.

And now what is that other principle of historical development, no less valid and true, no less fruitful, and no less evident, than this of individual liberty, by which it can and ought to be limited, and restrained from rushing on to these, and even greater, extremes. It is of this only that we have yet to speak; and we answer, it is the principle of NATIONAL UNITY, NATIONAL LIBERTY, AND NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY. It remains to develope this idea.

Let us observe, then, that what we call a nation, is not to be conceived of as a mere aggregate of individuals, a bare collection or collocation of men, women and children, having no other than personal relations to each other, and to God. A nation is properly an organism, with a unity of existence and life, distinct from all others, and from the individuals of which it is composed. Such an organism is a tree which, though capable of being grafted with the buds and branches of other stocks, has yet a life of its own, distinct from others, and from all the different parts of which it is composed. In like manner ethnic life must needs be conceived of as a unity, else it could not be life at all; for life is one. As the vital force in the human body is one, and not many, so that if you wound the

feet it is felt in the head, and if you kill the head the feet also die, so every body politic has a distinct life of its own, which is not many, but numerically one and the same in all its members. Hence it is that nations follow, to a certain extent, the analogy of individuals in the phenomena of infancy, childhood, youth, growth, and maturity—of decline, old age, decay and dissolution.

But it is worthy of observation, that this oneness of ethnic life does not wholly depend upon unity of race or tribal descent. *For God hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth;* (i. e., of one life: for the blood is the life.) So that in other combinations than those of tribal descent they are capable of forming new organisms or states, which soon become as conscious of their own separate unity and identity as if they were all derived from one subordinate branch of the great family of man. There is no doubt, however, but that, even in such cases, there must be one predominant race, to which all the others are as grafts to the original stock of a tree, by whose life both the native and grafted branches are alike supported and nourished. Of this we, as a people, are now giving to the world a remarkable proof and illustration. For there is hardly any country in which the national life is more unique, or the national character more distinct and sharply defined, than in our own. The word *American* is altogether as precise in signification as the word French, or Spanish, or English, and far more distinct than the word German. Our nation, made up of all heterogeneous varieties of mankind, already, whilst yet in its infancy, manifests an organic life so different from all others, so full and strong, that, as a vast galvanic battery, it easily disintegrates, assimilates, and Americanizes those dense masses of alien populations, which, like the ocean waves that bear them, are incessantly rolling in upon us, and losing all separate form and identity in breaking upon our shores.

This principle of ethnic unity is fully recognized by nations themselves, in all their dealings with each other, and in all their sovereign acts. For the national sovereignty resides in the nation as such. It is a pernicious fallacy to speak of each American citizen as a sovereign. Individual sovereignty is

anarchy. The nation as such, and that alone, is vested with sovereign authority and power. And this national sovereignty manifests itself in constitutions, laws, the coining of money, in matters of peace and war, in governments, and in all governmental acts. In these the nation acts as a unit, and expresses its nationality, in distinction from the individuals of which it is composed. These are the acts of the nation as such, in which no distinction of individuals is, or can be, made; by the wisdom and justice of which the bad, no less than the good, are benefitted; for the sin and folly of which those who dissent and those who assent, the guilty and the innocent, suffer together; for which the people as a whole are responsible. Thus England and America, and all other nations, deal with each other. A declaration of war between any two of them affects alike those who approve and those who disapprove of it; a treaty of peace binds every individual of both nations. In all this the unity of national life is fully recognized by the nations themselves.

Nor is it less evident that God deals with nations as distinct moral entities, than that they so regard and treat each other. There is a national character and conduct of which He takes account in the moral government of the world. For he is the God of nations no less than of families and of individuals. He creates them, *and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitations.* He governs them with supreme sovereignty. Hence he reveals himself as *the Governor among the nations*, as *the King of nations, the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords.* All government, of whatever form, exists, and derives its essence and authority, from God alone. For *there is no power but of God. The powers that be are ordained of God.* The civil magistrate *is the minister of God;* and *he beareth not the sword in vain.* And here it is another great fallacy to say that all the powers of government are derived from the people. Not one of them is thence derived. All the powers of government, its authority and very essence, are from God alone. As to its form only, it is from the people. It belongs to the people simply to determine and prescribe, according to the light given them, what those powers are which God has vested in civil

government. They have no more right either to take from, or add to, these, than they have to increase or diminish the powers of the Christian church. The church and the state are equally Divine institutions. God is no less the head of the one than of the other. Consequently, and as a matter of fact and observation, God deals with nations no less obviously than with individuals, by a system of rewards and punishments. With blessings and prosperity he seeks to quicken the national gratitude; with afflictions and chastisement he calls to national humiliation and repentance. In the distribution of these national rewards and punishments he makes no distinction of individuals, whether they as such be innocent or guilty, precisely as nations themselves, in dealing with each other, must ignore such personal distinctions. In times of peace, health and plenty, these blessings are not confined to the good; nor are the wicked alone cut off by war, pestilence and famine. In all this God himself fully recognizes the distinct entity, and moral unity, of nations.

From these truths it follows of necessity, that nations, as such, have a moral character, and are clothed with a moral responsibility, of their own. In other words, nations, in distinction from the individuals of which they are composed, have relations and duties to the God of nations and Supreme Ruler of the world, no less than individuals themselves. And it is evident of itself, that these duties, and this moral responsibility, if they exist at all, cannot be conceived of as requiring anything less than some national acknowledgment of themselves. For as our individual responsibility requires recognition and acknowledgment from each individual, by his own act, so the valid acknowledgment of national responsibility must be the act of the nation. In other words, our national responsibility requires, and cannot be conceived of as being satisfied without some national acknowledgment of the being, providence, and government of God, in those acts which are the most solemn and significant, the highest, not to say, the only acts of the nation itself—the acts of government. But moral responsibility implies moral freedom. Whatever a nation is morally obliged to do, that, as a nation, it is of right free to do. Consequently, it is an inalienable right of nations to acknowledge the being and government of God, to worship, honour, and obey him, in

their national and governmental acts. Such is the idea of national unity, liberty, and responsibility.

In applying this general principle to our own case, we may assume what surely does not need proof, that, in our moral and religious character, we are not a heathen, nor a Mohammedan, nor an infidel, but a Christian nation. For the emigrants from the Old World, in whom our national existence was first constituted, were, as a body, eminently religious and Christian people. It was chiefly a religious and Christian movement which brought them to this continent. Driven from their country and wealth, from their kindred, homes, and churches, they brought with them hardly anything but their religion. They sought and found in these western wilds a refuge for their persecuted faith, where they might worship God in freedom, and freely educate their children in the saving truths of the gospel. And they were not only the founders of our nation, but also of the national character. Even so far as mere numbers can have any bearing on such a question as this, it is safe to say, that a vast preponderance of our population has always been on the side of Christianity. The great mass of our people have always been, as they still are, at least speculative believers, carrying with them into all their new settlements, as a sacred palladium, or rather as the ark of their national covenant and safety, the word of God, the preaching of the gospel, and the Christian church.

Here we would gladly arrest this argument, without any discrimination among all those who call themselves Christians. But the plain truth of the case carries us further. For our national character is no less Protestant than it is Christian. Our civil and religious liberty, all our free institutions, even our civilization itself, are, as we have seen, an outbirth and growth of Protestant Christianity. We are eminently a Protestant nation. Nor is this truth even limited by the fact that Romanism is found among us. For this is nothing properly American. It it an exotic, a purely foreign growth, not yet assimilated or Americanized. The members of that communion, in a vast proportion, are foreign born. Its head, whom both priest and people are sworn to obey in all things, both temporal and spiritual, as lord paramount, with full power to

absolve them from their allegiance to the governments under which they live—a power which he has actually exercised again and again—is a foreign prince. Whilst they remain subjects to him, they cannot enter into our American and Protestant nationality. As they become Americanized they cease to be Romanists. And this is a process which is continually going on. For incredible numbers of their children, in spite of the perfection of their organization, and of all they can do to prevent it, cease to be Papists. They can no more escape from the all-transforming influence of our American institutions, the enormous assimilating power of our Protestant nationality, than from the effects of the American atmosphere and climate. Accordingly, as we learn from the statistics of the Propaganda, the Papists who have emigrated to this country, have lost thereby full one-half of their numbers; that is to say, they would have been twice as numerous as they now are, if all the emigrants, with their children, had remained in their own communion. But inasmuch as they are now grafted into the stock of a Protestant nationality, the life which nourishes them, and circulates in all their veins and thoughts, is a Protestant life; which ensures that they shall cease to be Romanists in becoming Americans.

If then we are indeed a Christian and a Protestant nation, in the name of the people, in the name of the truth, in the name of God, we have the right to say so in our Constitutions and laws, in our national and governmental acts. It is the chief element of our national religious liberty, that we should be allowed, and we are bound by the most solemn of all moral obligations, to acknowledge, worship, and obey our God, not only as individuals, but also as a free Christian and Protestant nation. For no moral creature of God, no creature which is subject to his moral government, such as we have seen a nation is, can refuse or decline to honour its Creator by public and solemn worship, with impunity. As the individual, and the family, so the nation that neglects this, must bring upon itself His sovereign displeasure, and a grievous punishment. And since all our national institutions and blessings, yea, our civilization itself, are the fruits of Protestant Christianity, in the name of the people, in the name of the truth, in the name

of God, we have the right, and we are morally bound, to recognize and honour, in our national acts, the source from which, and the channel through which, they have been derived to us. For it is contrary to the constitution and order of nature, it is evidence of a base mind, and can never come to good, when the child, for any reason, or to gain any object, refuses to own its parentage. And we are bound to vindicate this right at all hazards. To yield it up, is to renounce our national parentage, birthright, and character; it is to dishonour our national religion, and the God of our fathers; yea, it is to betray ourselves, blindfold and manacled, as our children will find to their sorrow, in the very citadel of our religious liberties.

But does not all this imply some form of Erastianism, or at least some modified union of church and state, which American institutions have repudiated bodily? We answer, that it implies nothing of the kind. For Erastianism makes the church the creature of the state, which is abomination in the sight of God and man. The union of church and state, in any right acceptation of the words, either gives the state some sort of control over the church, and makes the church, to some extent, dependent upon the state, as in England; or reverses the relation, and gives the church some control over the state, making the state, in some degree, dependent upon the church, according to the Papist theory. Both of these ideas we cordially repudiate, not only for ourselves, but also in the name of every branch of the Protestant church in this country. We do not believe there are any Protestants among us who can tolerate either of them. The doctrine here advocated is, that as the different branches of our national government, the executive, legislative, and judicial, are coördinate, each supreme within its own sphere, and independent of the others, but all alike responsible directly to the people, so the church and the state are coördinate institutions, totally independent of each other, each, in its own sphere, supreme with respect to the other, but both alike of Divine appointment, having one and the same head and fountain of all their powers, which is God. Whence both alike are bound to acknowledge, worship, and obey him. It is as great a solecism for the state to neglect this, as it would be for the church. Many

seem to think that the complete separation of church and state, implies that the state, as such, has no duties to God, and no religious character. As logically it could be inferred from the family's independence of the church, that the family has no religious character, and no duties to God. The family, the church, and the state, these are all coördinate institutions, severally independent of each other, yet all alike having one and the same Head, which they are equally bound in solemn form to acknowledge, worship, and obey. When the state, for any reason, declines to do this, it falls into a gross anomaly, and exemplifies that which is described in the second Psalm: *Why do the nations rage, and the peoples imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against Jehovah, and against his Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; Jehovah shall have them in derision.*

But even if this doctrine of church and state could be refuted, we ought not to forget that there are two extremes to this question, no less than to every other, both of which are equally removed from the only practical truth. For one of these extremes king Charles lost his throne and his head; and we lose what is dearer than life, our national religious liberty, while we rush to the other. *In medio tutissimus ibis:* the golden mean is ever the path of safety.

All that for which we here contend, requires but the least possible change in the words of our Constitutions; which, moreover, would express nothing but an obvious truth: "We, avowing ourselves to be a Christian and a Protestant nation, do ordain and establish this Constitution." That change would leave all denominations calling themselves Protestant Christians, whatever liberty they now enjoy, to follow their natural developments, and to exert all the influence of which they are now capable; it would complicate no question between them severally; and it would give them all a great advantage in prosecuting that glorious work in which they are all co-labourers with the fathers of the Reformation, and of all civil and religious liberty. That constitutional change would open its true channel to the current of our national life and history,

and allow it to flow with perfect freedom in its natural course. And it would give us the constitutional right to worship the God of our fathers, in our legislative bodies, army and navy; to require an oath in the name of God in our courts of justice, and of our officers elect; to observe, as a nation, and to protect by law, our Christian Sabbath; to punish blasphemy, adultery and polygamy, and to protect the unity of marriage; to inflict the death penalty for murder; and to make the word of God the matter of instruction, and the principle of education, in our all-moulding public school system.

Whatever in the idea of individual religious liberty is inconsistent with such an avowal of the Christian character of our nationality, and inconsistent with these its immediate logical results, is to be regarded as an extreme and baleful consequence of the principle from which it flows. Not long ago a California judge—and we happen to know this to be a fact—undertook to elicit the truth from a Chinaman by swearing him on a cock's head, instead of the Bible. The foolish magistrate had been instructed by some wag that this was the idolatrous sanction of witness-bearing among the Chinese, although the whole procedure must have been as incomprehensible and absurd to the witness as it was to the spectators. But the idea of the court was that the government having no religious character or preference of its own, could easily accommodate itself to those of the individual, whatever they might be*—a perfectly sound inference

* It is objected to this illustration, that it is an old English law maxim, and a plain dictate of common sense, that the witness must be sworn upon what he holds sacred. But the writer of this article is constrained to adhere to it. In a Christian state the principle of the objection must have its limitations. For example, the worshippers of Sheitan, or Satan, visited by Mr. Layard, could take no other oath than one by appeal to the devil himself. Could a Christian court accept such an oath? And the Scriptural view of all idolatry is, that it partakes more or less of the nature of devil worship. Whilst the theory of a Christian state recognizes God as the Supreme Judge, and invisibly present in all its courts of justice, it implies that justice is administered in his name and by his authority. It is his justice which is dispensed. In such a court none but those forms of witness-bearing which are agreeable to his mind are admissible; and nothing can be valid which does not acknowledge his authority. Surely, now it is not possible to conceive of Him, the Supreme Judge, administering an oath in which there is an appeal to the devil, or to any heathen god, or which is accompanied with any idolatrous rite. In such an oath the witness

from the principle. Upon the same ground the Mormon denies our authority to punish him for his loathsome polygamy, and insists upon his constitutional right to sit in our legislative bodies, and to fill our highest judicial and military offices, in the very eye of the nation, with all his harem around him. Upon the same ground the Papist denies our right to the reading of the Bible, to religious instruction and worship, in our public schools; and the Jew, our right to observe as a nation, and to protect by law, our Christian Sabbath. Upon the same ground, and with equal reason, the infidels, of every name, deny our right to require an oath by the name of God, in our courts of justice, and of our officers elect; our right to the appointment of chaplains in our legislative bodies, army and navy; and our right to worship or acknowledge the God of our fathers in any of our governmental or national acts. If we yield to this brazen cry of a very few in every thousand of our Christian population, we accept all those evil results to religion, morals, education, politics, and liberty itself, from which we now suffer, and which unchecked are certain, in the end, to overthrow all our free institutions, and even our national existence. If we admit these extreme consequences of the idea of individual religious liberty, we give the death-blow to national unity, liberty, and responsibility. The nation, as distinguished from the individuals of which it is composed, is deprived of every vestige of religious liberty. Yea, the first principles of national existence itself are subverted.

The doctrine for which we here contend, will give us an answer to these brazen demands. Children of the Papacy, do we not know you, in all your historical antecedents, as the sworn enemies of both civil and religious liberty? When did you ever concede, where you had the power to withhold, either the one or the other? Who can number the martyrs of both you have slain? Having fled from your own countries, where,

would insult and repudiate the authority of the court itself. The difficulties which would grow out of this theory of a Christian state, in such a government as that of the English in India, exhibit only one of the many anomalies which are inseparable from the subjection of a conquered people to the rule of foreign masters, and render more certain the ultimate triumph over the whole world of the great "cause of the nationalities."

ground to the earth by the despotism of your priests and princes, you had neither liberty, nor bread, nor hope, you have taken refuge in the protecting arms, and fostering bosom, of a free Protestant nation. We have received you to liberty, plenty, and a new life, the fruits to us of two centuries of a Christian and Protestant education in all our institutions of learning. And now you demand, in the name of religious freedom, as a right of your consciences, that we banish the word and the worship of God from all our public schools, which, as you yourselves avow, through your highest authorities, must inevitably result in making us a nation of infidels. If this, indeed, is the freedom of conscience which only will content you, once for all, you cannot be gratified. Set your hearts at rest. And if without this you cannot be contented, return to your own nationalities, to the Italian priest who is your temporal prince, and ask him for rights and liberties, and see what he will give you.

Enemies of Christianity, by whatsoever name, Jew, Pagan, Mormon, Mohammedan, or infidel, you are called, we did not receive our free institutions, nor any of the priceless blessings which distinguish us above all other nations, from you, but from our God, and through the channel of the Christian religion. We are a Christian nation. As such, we are one, free, and responsible to God. You dwell among us. Whatsoever rights, liberties, and blessings you can enjoy in consistency with this our Christian character as a nation, are freely yours. We will defend them with our blood, as promptly for you as for ourselves. But you demand in the name of religious freedom, as a right of your consciences, not only that we banish the word and the worship of God from our public schools, but also from our legislative bodies, army, and navy; that we abolish all legal protection of our Sabbaths, and of marriage; that we expunge all acknowledgment of our Christian nationality, and even the name of our God, from the sacred roll of our Constitutions and laws; and that we thus repudiate the source from which, and the channel through which, we have derived all our national institutions and blessings. This, as you are well aware, would soon bring us to your ground, and make of us an infidel nation. Now, if this be the liberty of

conscience which only will content you, it is time you were given to understand, that we also have a conscience, which binds us by the most sacred of all obligations, to worship our God in our most solemn and significant national acts, and to educate our children in our Christian faith. We will defend and maintain our sovereign right to do this against the world in arms. Beware how you touch it. You cannot be gratified in this thing. Set your hearts at rest. And if you cannot rest, go form a nation and a state where you can find a place, and see if infidelity will do for you what the Christian religion has done for us.

Such answer the great palpitating heart of our nation already feels to be most just and right; it needs only to be interpreted and justified to the intellect of the people. Even now it begins to make itself heard in no uncertain sounds. We hear it in the popular determination expressed from time to time, as of late in Boston, and later still in the city of New York itself, that no quack theories of government shall be permitted to drive the word and the worship of God from our public schools; and it speaks in that mighty reaction which has taken place all over this country, in the last fifteen years, in favour of religious education. We hear it in the throes of our great cities, whose governments are clutched and held by obscene harpies, that eat up the property of the citizen, whilst they afford no protection to life. We hear it in the muttering of national perplexity over corruption in political life, which is already prodigious. Inarticulate, as yet, but full of a vast meaning, like the thundrous tramp of armed squadrons, like the ground swell of the ocean, or the heavings of the earthquake —it is the indignation of a mighty people, awaking to the conviction that they have been deceived by political quackery, into the surrender of the most precious rights of a free, Christian, and Protestant nation.

The immediate practical duty, which devolves from this great principle of national unity, liberty, and responsibility, upon all good men and true patriots, is plain. In whatever situation of life they may be—in the workshop, on the farm, in the counting-house, on the mart, in the walks of literature, science, and art, in the professor's chair, in the pulpit, at the bar, on the

bench, in our state and national councils, as members of conventions to form and revise Constitutions, in our highest executive and military offices, and in all the places of trust and influence in this land—it is their duty to cherish this principle in their hearts, and to advocate such constitutional reforms as may be necessary to realize it in our national life.

The motives to faithfulness and energy in the fulfilment of this sovereign obligation, are all-constraining. It opens the path of honour to the greatest abilities. For the time is not far distant, as we are persuaded, when some capable man, putting himself at the head of a movement which is already making itself felt, to vindicate our national religious liberty, our inalienable right to worship God as a nation, will become the most popular candidate for the presidential chair. A Christian and Protestant people, whose patience has become exhausted by intolerable political corruption, and indignant at the demoralization of its educational interests, will stand by him. Raising his voice in behalf of a nation's right to worship God, his words will speak into clear consciousness their own struggling thoughts; and they will hasten to crown him with their highest honours. But if this motive were wanting, the worldliness and mockery of the age have not been able to quench the sacred flame of patriotism in the national heart. For this is the true Promethean fire which cannot be extinguished, whilst an honest and brave man, or a virtuous woman, continues to exist. My fatherland, let me honour thee with my life: my mother country, I will defend thee with my blood—there is no true heart which does not thrill with the power of this great mystery. And the Christian religion, the Protestant church, which has made us what we are for good—by this faith we live; for this faith we are ready to die. It is more to every one of us than husband or wife, father and mother, than kindred, home, and country. We will not betray our religion. In the strength of these all-powerful motives, we will defend and maintain, on all occasions, against all opponents, our inalienable right to avow ourselves, in our Constitutions and laws, in our national and governmental acts, a free, Christian, and Protestant nation. And the ages to come will bless us, the preservers, as we now bless the authors, of all civil and religious liberty.

ART. III.—*The Old Testament Idea of a Prophet.*

THE books of the prophets form a large and most important part of the Old Testament. They contain a revelation of the Divine will made to Israel, during a succession of centuries, which is still in its essence universally obligatory; they exhibit to us in the spirit which they embody, and the duties which they inculcate, the religion of the former dispensation, and in the doctrines which they unfold, the theology of that dispensation in its most advanced stage; particularly they contain the clearest and fullest disclosures, made prior to his appearance, of the coming and work of the great Redeemer, thus holding him up as the object of faith and hope to their own generation, carrying forward the work of preparation for his advent, and furnishing the materials for his recognition when he did appear; and they further supply us with a most powerful argument for the divinity and truth of our religion, by the evidence of supernatural foresight afforded by the fulfilment of their predictions.

In order to a just appreciation of the labours of the prophets, and a correct understanding of their writings, it will be necessary to institute a preliminary inquiry as to their proper character and functions. What then is the true idea of a prophet under the Old Testament?

This may be learned, 1. from the formal definition furnished by Deut. xviii. 9–22, which is the classic passage upon this subject. The terms, in which the promise of the prophet is made, indicate with sufficient explicitness, the nature of that which is promised. The application of the language of this passage to Christ by the Apostle Peter, in Acts iii. 22, 23, does not prove that it was spoken exclusively of him. It rather embraces all the prophets whom God would successively raise up for his people, including Him who was the last and greatest of the series, the seal of the prophets, the prophet by way of eminence, in whom the promise finds its highest and most complete fulfilment. In fact the ministries of the prophets who preceded the advent, form, in a sense, part of Christ's own

prophetic work. It was his word that they spake. It was his Spirit that was in them, (1 Pet. i. 11,) that inspired them, and spake through them. And a prediction of Christ as a prophet, to be complete, must naturally comprehend all that he was to do in this character under both dispensations. Whatever interpretation be given to this passage, however, it is equally adapted to our present purpose. Whether it be understood generically of all the prophets, or specifically and individually of Christ as the prophet in the highest sense, it in either case teaches what a prophet is. And this it does both positively and negatively.

The positive definition is found, verse 18, "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." It hence appears (1) that he must be one of the chosen people. It was from among their brethren that the prophet was to be raised up. Immediate communications of the Divine will, made directly by God himself, had so much of terror about them, that, at the people's request, the Lord promised henceforth to speak to them through the instrumentality of men. And as one of the principal objects for which Israel was selected to be the Lord's people was that they might be for the time the theatre of Divine revelation, it was quite in accordance with this design that the revelations of God to them should come through an Israelitish channel. Balaam is no exception to this rule; though, if he were, his would be an isolated case. He is called a prophet, 2 Peter ii. 16, but in a connection which shows that it was given to him only in an improper sense. He is nowhere so called in the Old Testament. He was a soothsayer, Josh. xiii. 22; he used enchantments, Num. xxiv. 1; and it was in this capacity that his aid was sought by Balak, for his messengers departed to fetch him, having the rewards of divination in their hand, Num. xxii. 7. It was hoped that his potent influence could charm away Jehovah's protection from Israel. The Lord made use of him to serve a purpose of his own, by making the chosen refuge of his people's foes speak their own discomfiture, just as he afterwards made use of the witch of Endor, to foretell the ruin of the apostate king by whom she was consulted. But in so doing he neither sanctioned their wicked

arts, nor constituted them his prophets. Divine communications were also made to Abimelech, Gen. xx. 3; to Pharaoh, Gen. xli. 1; to a man in the host of Midian, Judges vii. 13, 14; to Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. ii. 1; but these, like the prophecies of Balaam, delivered to the king of Midian, were designed to accomplish some end on behalf of the chosen race, and were confined to the extraordinary circumstances which called them forth. None of these were prophets.

The prophet is further (2) made such by direct Divine agency. The Lord says, "I will raise them up a prophet." He is not to intrude into this office at his own will, therefore, nor to receive it by lineal descent, nor by human appointment, but by the sovereign choice of God, who raises him up when and where he will, guided solely by his good pleasure, and the exigencies of that scheme of grace which he is conducting. The expression, "I will raise them up," however, probably includes more than the simple investiture with the office. It is not as though the Lord found men ready to his hand, so to speak, and simply designated them to this work. God raises up the men, as well as makes them prophets, and both their original needful endowments, and the preparatory providential training by which they were severally fitted for their respective tasks, are promised here. And so he says to Jeremiah, i. 5, that he was set apart and ordained before his birth to be a prophet. Comp. Isa. xlix. 1, 5. The Lord first prepared, on each occasion, an instrument suited to the end he had in view, and then engaged him in his proper work. The supernatural agency of God, it must be borne in mind, did not eradicate nor supersede, but guided and employed, the natural capacities and characteristics of the prophets. (3) "I will put my words in his mouth." The prophet was inspired of God, and this not merely in the sense of elevating, clearing, and assisting his native powers, so that he could see the truth himself, but in the sense of a direct impartation of definite instructions. (4) He was charged with the authoritative communication of Divine messages to others, which they were bound, under the severest penalties, to receive and to obey. "He shall speak unto them all that I shall command him; and it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require

it of him." One other characteristic remains, viz., (5) likeness to Moses. It should be as if the great lawgiver were revived or perpetuated in the persons of these his successors, who would carry forward the work which he had begun, and in the same spirit. The prophets were consequently not to be isolated phenomena, springing sporadically, so to speak, from the supernatural soil of the old economy, but having no vital connection with each other, or with the revelations that preceded them. They belong to one closely related scheme, initiated by Moses, and continued by them in likeness to him. Their teachings must accordingly not only harmonize with, but be built upon his, containing the same essential principles further unfolded, and with fresh applications. Combining these particulars, a prophet is defined to be one from among the chosen people, who, raised up by God for the purpose, and acting under his inspiration, delivers his messages to the people, his work being engrafted upon or unfolded from that of Moses, and of like tenor with it.

The prophet is in this passage further described negatively, by being set in opposition to two classes who profess somewhat similar functions to this, but with a total contrariety of character. (1) Heathen diviners and prophets of idols. These, of which several varieties are here enumerated, sought to prognosticate the future, or to discover the unknown by their respective arts based upon the observation of omens, or by the pretended inspiration of false deities, after the manner of the responses of the ancient oracles. This mode of prying into secrets and of consulting the Divine will, is denounced as heathenish, and strictly prohibited to the covenant people as an abomination to the Lord. (2) False prophets, professing to speak in the name of the Lord, but who have not been commanded so to speak, who in the language of other Scriptures prophesy out of their own heart, Ezek. xiii. 2, Jer. xiv. 14, xxiii. 16, 21, 26. The two tests proposed here and elsewhere for distinguishing false prophets from the true, are first, the non-fulfilment of their predictions, Deut. xviii. 22, 1 Sam. iii. 19, 20, Jer. xxviii. 9; and, secondly, teaching idolatry or error, Deut. xiii. 1–3: so in 1 Kings xiii. 18, the falsehood of the old prophet in Bethel to the man of God from Judah was sufficiently evidenced by its

contrariety with the charge already received by the latter, verse 9. In like manner the test of false teachers given in the New Testament was inconsistency of doctrine with that already received upon Divine authority. Gal. i. 8, 9; 1 John iv. 6; 2 John verse 10.

Idolatrous diviners were of heathen origin and were introduced into Israel from abroad, from the ungodly nations by which they were surrounded. False prophets were of native growth, the caricatures or apes of the true. The former are met with more frequently in the earlier stages of the people's history, before the Canaanites were quite extirpated, or while the influence of contiguous pagans was powerfully felt in the life and spirit of Israel. The latter sprang up, or at least were most prominent, at a later period, enticed by the consideration and influence, which the true prophets enjoyed, and courted by a degenerate people and their rulers as prophesying "smooth things."

2. The Old Testament idea of a prophet of the Lord may be gathered from the names and epithets applied to them, and by which they are characterized. These are of three sorts, viz. such as describe them (1) absolutely, (2) relatively to God, and (3) relatively to the people. The first class comprises the names נָבִיא prophet, and רֹאֶה or חוֹזֶה seer, and הָרוּחַ אִישׁ spiritual man. Their most common designation is נָבִיא, to whose root נָבָא the best authorities attribute the same radical signification with its cognate נָבַע to bubble out or pour forth as a spring or fountain pours forth water. Then if the noun be taken in the active sense of the root, as most Hebraists prefer, it will signify one who pours forth or utters (נָבַע in this sense, Ps. lxxviii. 2, cxix. 171, cxlv. 7); or if it be taken in a passive sense, it will signify one upon whom is poured *i. e.* the Spirit of God (נָבַע in this sense, Prov. i. 23); or both may may be virtually combined by adhering to the strict force of the figure of the root, one who pours forth under the influence of an inward excitation, as a spring impelled by a hidden internal force pours forth water. The proper signification of the word is particularly evident from Exod. vii. 1, where the Lord says to Moses, "See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy prophet." Here it plainly

means one who speaks on behalf of another, or utters what is communicated to him by another. In its emphatic and technical sense it must therefore mean, one who is the mouth-piece of God to men.* It seems most probable that this is also the original import of its Greek equivalent προφήτης as employed both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. This, it is true, is commonly explained as though πρό in composition meant beforehand, and πρόφημι were simply to predict; but the primary sense of πρό appears to be not temporal but local, and this may be retained here, as it certainly is in some other compounds, one who speaks before or in the presence of another, as his messenger and interpreter. "In this sense it is applied by classic authors to the official expounders of the oracles, and to poets as the prophets of the muses, *i. e.* as speaking in their name, at their suggestion, or by their inspiration." Alexander on Isaiah, p. ix.

Seer, רֹאֶה or חוֹזֶה, designates not the mode of the Divine communications to him who was so called, as though he were a recipient of visions, for this was not always, perhaps not usually the case; put it implies the possession of the faculty of sight in a higher degree than belongs to ordinary men. The seer had an inspiration which enabled him to see what lay hid to others. This name, descriptive of the Divine illumination of the messengers of God, is said, 1 Sam. ix. 9, to have yielded to "prophet" in current usage, when the function of the public utterance of the will of God came to assume a new regularity and prominence.

The spiritual man אִישׁ הָרוּחַ, lit., man of the Spirit, used as a synonym of prophet, Hos. ix. 7, designates one who is characterized by his possession of the Spirit of God, who is controlled by this indwelling Divine agent, and acts and speaks under his influence. These names are applied to false as well as true prophets, inasmuch as the former claim to be what the latter truly are. Micah iii. 5, 7; Hosea ix. 7.

The second series of names describes the relation of the prophets to God. They are men of God אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים, 1 Samuel ii. 27, servants of the Lord, עַבְדֵי יְהוָה, 2 Kings xvii. 23, the Lord's

* So Virgil Æn. iii. 358, 359 uses *interpres Divûm* as the equivalent of *vates*.

messengers, מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15, 16, since they wait upon God ready to be employed as he may require them, are engaged in doing his work, and in bearing his messages. These titles, unlike the preceding, are from their nature inapplicable to those acting in the service of false gods, or to mere pretenders to an agency on behalf of Jehovah with which they have not been entrusted. They have, however, in their generic sense a much wider extent of meaning, and are consequently not restricted in their application to the specific form of service discharged by the prophets, but may be used of those who are employed by God to do any work relating to his earthly kingdom, or even who do his bidding in his providential administration of the universe. Thus Nebuchadnezzar, Jer. xxv. 9, and the material universe, Ps. cxix. 91, are called God's servants; and the angels are his messengers; this is in fact their common name in both Hebrew and Greek.

The third class of epithets describes the functions of the prophets relatively to men. They are watchmen. This is the English equivalent of different Hebrew words, which vary somewhat in their primary signification, צֹפֶה, מְצַפֶּה, Isa. xxi. 6, lii. 8, those who are set upon a lookout to descry distant objects, and שֹׁמֵר, Isa. lxii. 6, guardians stationed upon the walls, or going about the streets of a city, to detect and give warning of existing or impending evils. The prophets are thus set to watch for the earliest indications of the Divine will, Hab. ii. 1, or to sound the alarm to the wicked of the threatened penalty of their sins, Ez. iii. 17. They are shepherds, רֹעֶה Jer. xvii. 16, appointed to protect, guide, and feed the flock of God, a designation which they share with the rulers and the priests, Jer. xxiii. 1; Zech. xi. 8. They are the people's interpreters, מֵלִיץ, Isa. xliii. 27, the medium of communication to explain to them the otherwise unknown or unintelligible will of God. Combining these various names we arrive again at the definition of the prophet, as one who, possessed of the Spirit of God, sees and utters what is undiscoverable by others, under a commission received from God, for the welfare and instruction of men.

3. The true idea of a prophet under the Old Testament may still further be gathered from the expressions currently em-

ployed respecting them. (1) Their Divine call and commission is declared when it is said that God raised them up, Amos ii. 11, took them from other occupations and bid them prophesy, Amos vii. 15, sent them, Jer. vii. 25, and that not barely in the general, but on special errands, 2 Kings ii. 2, 4, 6, and commanded them, Jer. xxiii. 32. (2) Their inspiration is taught by such statements as that the Spirit of God came upon them, 2 Chron. xv. 1, xxiv. 20 (lit. the Spirit of God clothed Zechariah,) fell upon them, Ezek. xi. 5, rested upon them, 2 Kings ii. 15, the pouring out of God's Spirit upon men makes them prophets, Joel ii. 28; and the powerful nature of this Divine influence appears from such language as the hand of the Lord was upon them, Ezra i. 3; fell upon them, Ezra viii. 1; was strong upon them, Ezra iii. 14; Isa. viii. 11; the spirit within them constrains them, Job xxxii. 18; they are full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, Micah iii. 8. (3) Divine communications are made to them; the Lord speaks to them, Isa. viii. 1, 5; 1 Sam. xvi. 7; answers them, Hab. ii. 1; shows them what to do, 1 Sam. xvi. 3, and what will happen, 2 Kings viii. 10; makes himself known to them in visions, and speaks to them in dreams, Numb. xii. 6; wakens their ear to hear, Isa. l. 4; reveals himself to them, 1 Sam. iii. 21; reveals things in their ears, Isa. v. 9, xxii. 14; revcals his secret to them, whatever he designs to do, Amos iii. 7; his word comes to them, Hos. i. 1; is in them, Hosea i. 2 (word of the Lord בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ lit. in Hosea); they hear God's speech, Hab. iii. 2; hear hin speaking to them, Ezek. ii. 2; hear a rumour from the Lord, Ob. ver. 1; hear the word at God's mouth, Ezek. iii. 17; have understanding in the visions of God (lit. in seeing God,) 2 Chron. xxvi. 5; find visions from the Lord, Lam. ii. 9. (4) They are God's agents in making known his will; they stand before God, i. e., are in an attitude of readiness to do his pleasure, 1 Kings xvii. 1; speak in the word of the Lord, 1 Kings xiii. 2; in the Lord's message, Hag. i. 13, i. e., as commanded and sent by him; they are as the mouth of the Lord, Jer. xv. 19; he speaks by (lit. by the hand of) them, Isa. xx. 2; uses similitudes by their ministry, Hosea xii. 10; gives them a tongue to speak, Isa. l. 4; they prophesy in the name of the Lord, Jer xxvi. 20, i. e., by his authority and as his representatives, and are contrasted

with the false prophets who speak a vision of their own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord, Jer. xxiii. 16; they declare what they have heard from the Lord of Hosts, Isa. xxi. 10; give warnings from him, Ezek. iii. 17; inquire of the Lord for others, Jer. xxi. 2; in consulting a prophet the people inquire of God, 1 Sam. ix. 9, Ezek. xiv. 7, xx. 1, 3; their utterances are the word of God, 1 Sam. ix. 27, the voice of the Lord, Jer. xxxviii. 20, the answer of God, Micah iii. 7; and are constantly prefaced or followed by such phrases as "thus saith (כֹּה אָמַר) the Lord," Amos i. 3, etc., saith (נְאֻם) the Lord, Isa. xiv. 22, the Lord hath spoken it, Isa. xxii. 25, the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it, Isaiah i. 20: what they say the Lord speaks, Isa. vii. 10; not hearkening to them the people are charged with not hearkening to God, Jer. xxv. 7, and not hearing his words, Jer. xxv. 8. In the light then of these constantly recurring expressions which grow out of and interpret for us the radical idea of an Old Testament prophet, he is a man who, raised up and commissioned of God and inspired by him, receives revelations of his will and authoritatively declares it to others. And with this agree the current representations as well as the explicit statements of the New Testament, e. g., 2 Peter i. 21. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

It will be perceived that the three several definitions reached by these different methods are essentially identical. A prophet is an inspired revealer of the will of God; and in so far as he belongs to the scheme of Old Testament revelation he must, as we are taught by Deut. xviii., be one from among the chosen people, and build upon the foundation which Moses has laid.

We are now prepared to estimate aright the various erroneous conceptions which have been entertained upon this subject. 1. The inspiration of the prophets was not the mere product of native genius, or of exalted holiness. It will not satisfy these repeated scriptural statements which have been recited, to regard them simply as enlightened and holy men, who were so far lifted above the mass of their contemporaries, and of mankind generally, as to discern truths which lay hid to others, and to make their views and apprehensions a standard author-

ity for the rest of men. They had a direct Divine commission, received immediate communications from heaven, were the mouth of God speaking to men, and their words the very words of God. Their teachings are not simply an approximation to the will of God, as those of any human teacher, however excellent, must be; they are the absolute expression of that will. They deliver not what they have had the ability to discern, but what has been supernaturally imparted to them. The prophets were indeed holy men, and many of them highly gifted; for it would have been incongruous had the immediate messengers of heaven been otherwise. But their inspiration was a thing entirely distinct from their sanctification. There was no necessary connection between them, and neither had any inherent tendency to beget the other, as is shown by the case of Balaam, who, though a heathen seer, and a godless man, was inspired for a particular occasion, Numb. xxiii. 16, xxiv. 2; by the case of Saul also, and his messengers, sent to take David, who prophesied, 1 Sam. xix. 20–24; though the character of the former was such as to give rise to the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" and by the analogy of miraculous powers, which is another form of the direct supernatural agency of the Spirit of God, and may be possessed by unsanctified men, Matt. vii. 22, 23. Such, at least, is the conception which the prophets themselves had of their own inspiration, and which is perpetually presented throughout the sacred writings. This cannot be evaded without bringing against them the charge of enthusiasm, if not fanaticism, in fancying themselves to have a Divine commission, which they really did not possess. But this charge would be in the face of all the evidences of the supernatural character of the Old Testament revelation, and is contradicted by the nature of many of the prophetic disclosures of the future, and their exact fulfilment.

2. The prophets were not a power in the state, nor were their aims political and patriotic. Their acts and words are not to be viewed as having simply a political aspect, nor can they be estimated at all from this point of view. It is true, that we find them at times confronting kings and rulers, haranguing them or the people touching public affairs, opposing contem-

plated measures, and pointing out the ruin which would ensue upon their adoption. Elijah came into repeated conflict with Ahab. Elisha sent a young man of the prophets to anoint Jehu for the overthrow of his ungodly house. Hosea and Isaiah denounced the entangling and dangerous alliances with Assyria and Egypt. Jeremiah opposed the fatal policy of Zedekiah and his princes. But in all this they were acting the part not of politicians, but of religious teachers and ambassadors of God. They never sought to build up a political party; they neither possessed nor desired official power or station; they were not demagogues in a bad nor in a good sense. What they opposed was not on the ground of impolicy, but sin; what they maintained was for the sake of the honour and the law of God. It must here be borne in mind, that the government of Israel differed from that of any other people which ever existed. It was, in the true sense of the word, a theocracy. God was their king, and governed them, not indirectly merely, but by direct and constant manifestations of his will. God gave them laws, appointed their rulers, who were simply his vicegerents, while he reserved the supreme jurisdiction to himself. This gave a religious complexion to all their national affairs. The idolatry of Ahab's house was a violation of the fundamental constitution of Israel as the covenant people of God, and called for the interference of the prophets as the immediate representatives of the Most High. Alliances with the heathen, and a dependence upon them which should be reposed in the Lord alone, were crimes against God, and are dealt with as such by the prophets; and the evils which they predict as following them, were not held up as inevitable political consequences, but as the just judgment of God. And when they were consulted by rulers in difficult circumstances, and their advice solicited touching public affairs, their response is not directed by political wisdom and forecast, but by the direct revelation of the will of God.

3. The prophets were not reformers, much less antagonists to the Mosaic law. The only colour to this misrepresentation is derived from their opposition to false glosses put upon the law, and to prevailing evils whose advocates sheltered them-

selves behind perversions of its language. Just as our Lord, who came not to destroy the law but to fulfil, swept away in his discourses the accumulated pharisaical traditions without touching the substance of the law itself. When Ezekiel says, xviii. 20, that the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, he does not contradict the declaration of the law, Exod. xx. 5, that God visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children. He is opposing the false interpretation put upon it by his contemporaries as though descendants suffer for the crimes of their ancestors, irrespective of their own character and conduct, whereas the law expressly says that this imputation occurs only in the case of them that hate him. Those who perpetuate from generation to generation an organized rebellion against God, justify the evil deeds of their predecessors and are rightfully answerable for their crimes. But the righteous children of ungodly parents enter into no such combination, and are not answerable in the true intent of the law, as the prophet shows by appealing to and partially quoting Deut. xxiv. 16: "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin."

Again when the prophets, as Isaiah i. 11–14, Jeremiah vi. 20, vii. 21, 22, declare the worthlessness of the ceremonial observances of the people, and assert in spite of their outward conformity to the statute that they are wholly unacceptable in the sight of God, they are not aiming at an abolition of the ritual and seeking to substitute a more spiritual form of worship. It is the profane spirit of heartless formality, joined with ungodly living, which they rebuke. Sacrifices which were acceptable when expressing true devotion and accompanying lives of obedience, became insufferable when offered as the price of lives of sin, and in a spirit at variance with all that the law required.

The prophets were divinely commissioned reformers of the people, but the law needed no correction. With a uniform voice they recall their hearers, like Isaiah viii. 20, to the law and to the testimony: and bid them, like Malachi iv. 4, remember the law of Moses which was commanded him in Horeb for

all Israel. They, throughout, base their instructions upon the law, and incorporate its language in their discourse to an extent which will astonish those who have not made this point a subject of distinct and careful study.

An opposition on the part of the prophets to the divinely revealed laws of Moses, which was fundamental to the covenant character of the people, and to their existence as the people of God, is entirely insupposable and impossible. The prophets, as has already been seen, were contemplated in the law, and one of the prime qualities of a true prophet, as there defined, is his likeness to the great lawgiver in spirit and in work. The revelation of God, conducted by Moses and the prophets, was one self-consistent, closely related scheme.

4. The prophets were not mere predicters of the future. This incorrect or partial notion has been and is much more prevalent than any of those before referred to. The Fathers* define a prophet to be one who foretells future events; and this is an idea very generally entertained upon the subject. Its error consists in mistaking a part for the whole, and a means for the end. Their disclosures of the future form so remarkable and important a part of their communications, that they have come to overshadow the rest, and the constant aim of these disclosures has been lost sight of beside their own inherent grandeur. But (1) it is observable that the foretelling of the future does not enter into the definition of a prophet, as that is furnished by the Old Testament in the various ways above exhibited. However conspicuous a place this may hold in their work, therefore, it cannot be essential to it. They were inspired to reveal the will of God, and bear his messages

* Basil Comment. on Isa. ch. 3, Προφήτης μέν ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ πνεύματος προαγορεύων τὸ μέλλον; a more comprehensive, but still a defective statement, is made in the preface to this commentary: Ὁρίζοι δε εἰ προφῆται οὐ τὰ μέλλοντα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν παρόντων τὰ λανθάνοντα. Chrysostom, Hom. 2, on Is. vi. 1: Οὐδε γὰρ ἄλλο τί ποτέ ἐστι προφητεία, ἀλλ' ἢ τῶν μελλόντων πραγμάτων προαναφώνησις. Synopsis Scrip. Sacr. Ὥστερ γὰρ τὰ μηδέπω γενόμενα καὶ ἀφανῆ ἔτι τυγχάνοντα, προφητείας ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν, οὕτω τὰ γενόμενα μὲν, κεκρυμμένα δε τῷ χρόνῳ, ταῦτα ἀνακαλύψαι καὶ εἰς μέσον ἀγαγεῖν τῆς ἴσης χάριτος ἐστιν. Ambrose de Benedict. Patriarch. II. 7, Prophetia enim annuntiatio futurorum est. Isidore Hispalensis, Etymolog. vii. 8, 1, Quos gentilitas vates appellat, hos nostri prophetas vocant, quasi præfatores, quia porro fantur et de futuris vera prædicant.

to men, whatever the substance of the communications made to them might be, and whether they had relation to the present, past, or future. (2) The revelations of the prophets do not in fact concern the future exclusively. Disclosures of things past or present, beyond the reach of their natural faculties, furnished an equally clear evidence of prophetic power. So when Samuel spoke to Saul of the loss and the discovery of his father's asses, 1 Sam. ix. 20; and blind old Ahijah detected the disguise of the wife of Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiv. 6; and Elisha told Gehazi where he had been, 2 Kings v. 26; or told the king of Israel words spoken in the king of Syria's bedchamber, 2 Kings vi. 12; and Ezekiel in Babylon announced the siege of Jerusalem upon the very day that it began, Ezek. xxiv. 2; and Daniel repeated to Nebuchadnezzar his dream, Dan. ii. 28, etc. Such an uncovering of secrets, however, present, past or future, as was falsely pretended to by heathen diviners, and really possessed by the Hebrew prophets, does not comprise the whole of the functions of the latter; it does not even include that which was the main and characteristic feature of their work. They were divine guides and instructors of the people. It was not to satisfy the curiosity, promote the material interests, or excite the wonder of men that they brought to light what was unknown, but to further moral and religious aims. When they gave responses about inferior matters, it was for the sake of higher ends to be answered by so doing, or to give proof of their possession of the spirit of prophecy. Their great function was to maintain in its integrity the covenant relation of the people to God, and to conduct them towards the end for which that relation was established, the coming of Christ, and his great salvation. Accordingly, their writings are chiefly occupied with the duties which the people owe to God, and the ultimate blessing which it was his design to bring upon them, and upon the world by means of them. The prospective nature of their work, as of the dispensation to which they belonged, gave prominence naturally to the predictive element in their discourses. But all that their inspiration taught them of the future was blended with lessons drawn from the present and the past, and brought to bear upon the reli-

gious training of the people.* (3) To regard the prophecies simply in the light of predictions designed to authenticate the Divine commission of those who uttered them, by affording evidence of supernatural foresight, would be to exalt a subordinate and incidental at the expense of the direct and principal end. Many of them would thus lose their meaning and value for the prophets' contemporaries, inasmuch as the evidence was not complete until after their fulfilment; others would be of doubtful weight, in consequence of their obscure and enigmatical character; and this aim would be frustrated entirely in the case of others still, by the failure of God's providence to preserve any authentic record of the events.

It will serve to define still more precisely the idea of the Old Testament prophets, if we consider them not only absolutely and by themselves, but relatively to their position both in the theocracy and in the general scheme of Divine revelation. We shall thus have to inquire how they stand related, in the first place, to other contemporaneous sacred orders, and, secondly, to antecedent and subsequent forms of Divine communication.

The priests, like the prophets, were by virtue of their office mediators, acting between God and men. But the priests acted on men's behalf before God, while the prophets were employed on God's behalf with men. And from this radical diversity spring their several peculiarities of functions and character. The priests became such by hereditary descent from a particular tribe and family selected as representatives of the rest; they constituted an organized body with gradations of rank, carrying the representative principle to its highest extent in the high priest, the head of their order; and they were supported by a legal income from those on whose behalf they acted. The prophets were without regular succession, organization or stipend; they were called to their office by the immediate agency of the Spirit of God, who selected them by no other rule than his sovereign pleasure. They might accordingly be taken from any tribe, and any part of the land, even Galilee, as appears

* The word *prophesy* is in the New Testament used in the triple sense of predicting the future, John xi. 51, revealing what had already occurred but was unknown, Matt. xxvi. 68, and inspired discourse irrespective of its relation to time, Luke i. 67.

from the case of Nahum and Jonah, notwithstanding the taunt of the Pharisees (John vii. 52,) from any rank and from either sex. Miriam (Exod. xv. 20,) Deborah (Judg. iv. 4) and Huldah, (2 Chron. xxxiv. 22,) were prophetesses. Comp. in the New Testament, Anna (Luke ii. 36) and the daughters of Philip, Acts xxi. 9. Descent from a prophet, while it was not essential, was, however, no disqualification, as appears from the case of Azariah, the son of Oded, the prophet, 2 Chron. xv. 1, 8, and Jehu, the son of Hanani, the seer. 2 Chron. xvi. 7, xix. 2. The main function of the prophets was to declare to the people the will of God; that of the priests, to obtain for the people the remission of their sins. And yet through their common mediatorial character it came to pass that each exercised to a certain extent both functions. It was, in a subsidiary sense, the province of the priest to teach the people the law (Mal. ii. 7,) and to declare the will of God in doubtful cases (Deut. xvii. 8, 12;) and it would appear from John xi. 51, that the gift of prophecy was a permanent prerogative of the high priest's office. It was also a subsidiary province of the prophet, in virtue of that familiar access to God with which he was favoured, to intercede with him on behalf of others (Gen. xx. 7; 1 Sam. vii. 5, 6; Isa. xxxvii. 4; Jer. vii. 16;) only they did this by the free offering of prayer, and the priests by the regularly prescribed symbolical ritual.

The judges were like the prophets the immediate representatives of God: and hence they too were called by the direct agency of the Spirit and were limited to no tribe, family, rank or occupation, and to neither sex. Judges vi. 4. The functions with which they were invested, however, were executive and administrative. They were extraordinary leaders or magistrates, possessed of unlimited powers, raised up in cases of special need for the deliverance and the defence or for the government of the people. They may be called divinely appointed dictators. The prophets on the other hand were teachers and expositors of the will of God, and for the most part exercised none of the powers or functions of the magistracy.

But while the prophets thus stood side by side with other divinely constituted classes of men in the theocracy, both ordinary and extraordinary, and had their own proper work distinct from

the rest, their office might be so extended as to comprehend all others. Inasmuch as they were the immediate representatives of God, their powers were limited only by their particular commission received from Him. The position which they occupied before the people implicitly involved from its very nature the right to perform any function or exercise any authority which the occasion might demand. Whenever the emergency required it, prophets might therefore act as priests and judges. This was the case, for example, in the degeneracy of all orders which marked the days of Samuel, and in the separation of the ten tribes from the true sanctuary and their open heathenism during the ministries of Elijah and Elisha. The ordinary officers of the theocracy, the priesthood and the magistracy, abdicated their trust or were virtually suspended from its legitimate exercise, and the prophets assumed their functions by right of the extraordinary powers with which they were clothed. Sacrifices were offered by Samuel, 1 Sam. vii. 9, 17, x. 8, xiii. 8, etc., and by Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. 30, etc.; the first fruits were brought to Elisha, 2 Kings iv. 42, comp. Deut. xviii. 4; and he was resorted to on Sabbaths and new moons, 2 Kings iv. 23. Samuel took the supreme direction of the affairs of the commonwealth, acted as judge, 1 Sam. vii. 15; anointed Saul and made him king, 1 Sam. x. 1, etc; then deposed him, 1 Sam. xv. 28; and anointed David, 1 Sam. xvi. 13. Abijah gave Jeroboam authority to become the ruler of the ten tribes, 1 Kings xi. 29, etc. Direction was given to Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 15, 16, to anoint Hazael to be king over Syria, and Jehu to be king over Israel. This was subsequently performed by Elisha, 2 Kings viii. 13, ix. 1, etc.; thus not only deposing and setting up rulers of the theocracy, but of heathen states likewise, as ambassadors of that God who is the supreme Governor of the whole world.

It only remains to consider the position occupied by the prophets among the methods of Divine communication. There is a growing fulness and nearness in the modes by which God reveals himself to men, just as there is in the extent to which his successive revelations are made, and in the contents of those revelations. The first method employed was the theophany, which is characteristic of the patriarchal period. God then personally and directly made known his will to such as he

designed to have informed of it. He spake by audible voice from heaven, as to Abraham at the offering up of Isaac; he spake in dreams, as to Jacob, Abimelech and Laban; or face to face in human form, as to Abraham under the oaks of Mamre. When the flood was to be sent on a guilty world, or a storm of destruction to overwhelm the cities of the plain, no human messenger was sent as God's herald, commissioned in his name to announce them, and to take a visible part in their production. God declared and sent them himself without the employment of any human agency.

When the seed of the patriarchs had swelled into a nation, and the will of God was no longer to be made known to individuals merely, but to a numerous people, a new mode of Divine revelation was needed and was afforded, viz., through the medium of prophets. The Spirit of God descended upon particular individuals, and made them the depositaries of Divine power and knowledge for the benefit of others. God no longer stood aloof and out of connection with men, so to speak, except as he appeared to them in the occasional visits of the preceding period. Divine virtue is now made resident in men; God no longer acts directly by himself; but if miracles are to be wrought or revelations made, it is through the instrumentality of these his accredited agents and messengers. In the language of Amos iii. 7: "The Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." In the solemn transactions of Sinai, when the fundamental covenant was to be ratified between himself and Israel, God spake once more by his own voice from heaven in the audience of all the people. But all his farther communications with them were made through Moses, and through prophets raised up like unto him. And so with the mighty works; the plagues of Egypt were sent and removed at the bidding of Moses, the Red Sea was divided at the lifting of his rod, at his word manna was sent and water given from the rock. The drought in the time of Ahab came and went at the word of Elijah. The host of Sennacherib was destroyed, but not until Isaiah had first foretold it.

This second or prophetic stage of revelation, while it is an advance upon the theophany, is not, however, the ultimate

and highest form of Divine communication. 1 Cor. xiii. 8–10. Like the economy of which it formed a part, it was preparatory to and emblematic of the future. All the gifts and offices of the theocracy were, as respects their outward form, temporary, but in their essence they were types and pledges of better things to come. The ideas, which they embodied, were destined to have a more complete realization, and that in a twofold form, the one individual, the other universal.

The prophetic idea found its consummation in the first place in Christ. He is the Prophet of God in the highest sense. Deut. xviii. 18; Isa. xlii. 1, etc., xlix. 1, etc., lxi. 1. etc. In him God reveals himself to men by becoming himself a man and dwelling amongst us. He now acts no longer remotely in heaven, nor merely selects ordinary men as the depositaries of heavenly gifts, to be through them dispensed to others, but comes himself in human nature, as a man amongst men, with all the plenitude of his infinite power, wisdom, and grace, to instruct and bless mankind. The infinite distance, which in the patriarchal period appeared in all its awfulness, and in the Mosaic dispensation was but partially closed up, is thus completely bridged; the ladder of Jacob is realized. The prophets were thus prognostic or typical of Him, who was to succeed them, and who would do perfectly that of which they might suggest the idea, and awaken the expectation, but which they could not adequately accomplish.

Again, the idea embodied in the prophets was destined to an universal realization in the entire body of the people of God. The prophetic office was not the inherent and original prerogative of those invested with it, to the exclusion of others, nor was it given to them, or exercised by them, for their own sakes. The prophets were taken from amongst their brethren; they belonged to the people; they possessed no inherent superiority over them. The office was established for the good of the people at large, though for the advantage of the whole its exercise was temporarily confined to a few. The Spirit belonged not to the prophets alone, but to all Israel. And when Moses devoutly wished, Numb. xi. 29, that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them, his wish was directed to a result of which he already

beheld the type and the pledge; and its fulfilment is the second form in which the idea of the prophets reaches its final consummation. The ultimate form of Divine communication is, when God not merely speaks to individuals, as in the case of the patriarchs, nor to his people through the medium of a few, whom his Spirit has made his organs to the rest, but when he shall come and abide as a teacher, no less than a sanctifier, in all of a regenerated world. Joel, ii. 28, predicts the day when God's Spirit shall be poured out upon all flesh, and sons and daughters, old men and young men, servants and handmaids, shall alike prophesy. And Jeremiah, xxxi. 34, declares that the time is coming when they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know him from the least of them unto the greatest of them. Then the necessity of all prophetic instruction shall be superseded, and the prophetic order itself be swallowed up in the indwelling of the Spirit in all believers.

Art. IV.—1. *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.* By James Seaton Reid, D. D., M. R. I. A., Professor of Ecclesiastical and Civil History in the University of Glasgow. Continued to the present time by W. D. Killen, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology for the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. London, 1853. 3 vols. 8vo.

2. *Historical Sketch of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.* By Rev. Thomas Witherow, Maghera. Belfast, 1858. pp. 48. 12mo.

3. *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, held at Dublin, 1859. Belfast, 8vo.

Several causes have conspired of late to fix attention on the Presbyterian church in Ireland. The great awakening of the present year, though not confined to that communion, seems to have originated in it, and to be still instrumentally promoted chiefly by the labours of its ministers and members. But

before the outbreak of this memorable movement, a new interest in that church had been here awakened by the casual visit of two eminent ministers a year ago, on their way home from the British Provinces, to which they had been commissioned by the Irish Assembly. The sympathy excited by their presence and addresses before several of our Synods, and in large promiscuous assemblies elsewhere, has not yet subsided, when we learn that another deputation, sent directly to this country, has already landed on our shores. Although Dr. Edgar and his colleagues would be sure of a cordial welcome to America in any case, it may add to the interest of their visit, in the minds of many readers, if we take a brief survey of the vicissitudes through which our mother church has passed. For such a statement an appropriate occasion is afforded by the circumstances just referred to, and abundant materials by the publications named at the beginning of this article. The first of these works was originally published in two volumes, five and twenty years ago, and was reviewed in this journal for the month of April 1844, by the late Dr. Archibald Alexander, who remarks in the beginning of that paper, that the immediate mother of our own church was not the church of Scotland, but the Synod of Ulster. This historical fact, together with a certain family likeness flowing from it, may afford another and a stronger reason for regarding that branch of the Presbyterian body with peculiar sympathy and friendly interest. Dr. Reid, the author of this history, began it, we believe, when pastor of the church at Carrickfergus, and continued it, in still more favourable circumstances, as Professor of Church History at Belfast, from which position he was afterwards removed by a government appointment to be Regius Professor of History at Glasgow, a situation which he still held at the time of his death in 1851. His papers passed into the hands of his successor at Belfast, by whom the additional volume has been brought down to the period of the Union in 1840, and edited together with a new impression of the previous volumes, which had long been out of print. A little more than half of the third volume is the work of the original author, his successor taking up the pen in the middle of the word "ministerial," on page 272. The former part is printed, without any change

whatever, from the autograph of Dr. Reid himself; and probably no manuscript was ever left in better preparation for the press. We can readily believe what is said of his orderly and punctual habits, especially as Clerk of the Synod while still resident in Ireland, from the scholarlike finish of the work before us, which in structure, style, and even in some minor points of order and arrangement, is a model of precision and completeness. This literary value of the work not only reflects credit on the author and his church, but will undoubtedly exert a highly salutary influence upon the taste and studies of a younger generation, by setting the example of laborious research, minute exactness, and elaborate working up, without a tinge of affectation or ambitious effort, or the least approach to that declamatory tone, which vitiates the form, if not the substance, of some kindred works, in other respects highly meritorious. In mentioning laborious research as one great merit of this writer, we refer not merely to the compilation of derivative or second-hand materials, however skilfully performed, but to the discovery and exhibition of unpublished facts from manuscript authorities, which constitute a large part of the matter, more particularly in the first two volumes. There was less occasion for this kind of labour in the third, and none at all in Dr. Killen's part of it, which, however, though on this account less learned and laborious, is in all respects worthy of what goes before it, and entirely homogeneous with it, the only difference perceptible consisting in a slight superiority in point of ornate diction, and a slight excess in warmth and strength of language, which could hardly be avoided in the record of events so recent, and so interesting to the writer's feelings.

We desire it to be clearly understood that the favourable judgment which we have just passed upon this history, is not founded on a hasty and perfunctory inspection, such as an uncharitable public often charges, either truly or falsely, on professional reviewers, but results from a deliberate and thorough study of the work in its connection and in all its parts, including texts, notes, and appendices. Another result of the same process is a feeling of regret, that a production so intrinsically valuable, and so full of interest to American as

well as Irish Presbyterians, should be placed, by its necessary bulk, and the minuteness which is one of its chief merits, entirely beyond the possibility or hope of an extensive circulation in this country, even if reprinted in a cheaper form. While, therefore, we should not desire to see it in the least reduced as an original and standard work, we do think that a readable abridgment, in a single duodecimo or thin octavo, would command a ready and continued sale among us, and contribute to preserve the memory of our Irish mother in the hearts, not only of her Irish children, but of her American descendants. In the meantime, public curiosity may at least be whetted by the circulation in this country of an admirable sketch by Mr. Witherow of Maghera, the materials of which are chiefly drawn from Drs. Reid and Killen, but selected, put together, and expressed, with a clearness and vivacity, not often found in mere abridgments or in condensations of so much matter in so small a compass. This interesting tract is one of a series on the form and order of the Christian church, by ministers of the Presbyterian church in Ireland. The only other specimen which we have read is a striking summary of "Presbyterian Privilege and Duty," by the Rev. Dr. Edgar, Professor at Belfast, and one of the three deputies now visiting this country. But we have before us also tracts on the Church of Christ, by the Rev. W. B. Kirkpatrick, D. D.; on the leading doctrines of the Presbyterian church, by the Rev. John Barnett, D. D.; on the Teaching Elder, by the Rev. William McClure; on the Ruling Elder, by the Rev. John Macnaughtan; on the Presbytery, by the Rev. J. G. Murphy, LL.D.; on Ordination, by the Rev. J. F. Porter; on the Sacraments, by the Rev. James Morgan, D. D.; and on Public Worship, by the Rev. John Moran. In addition to these, we see announced, as parts of the same series, a tract on the Advantages of Presbyterian Government, by the Rev. Richard Dill, and another on the Statistics of the Presbyterian Church throughout the world, by the Rev. William Gibson, Professor at Belfast, and Moderator of the last General Assembly. This gentleman, with Mr. McClure previously mentioned, has some particular connection, we believe, with the continental and colonial missions of the church, in consequence of which they

were last year commissioned to the Provinces, and thus enabled to visit the United States *en passant.* One other, if no more, of the authors just enumerated, has been seen among us, the Rev. John Macnaughtan, formerly of Paisley, now of Rosemary street church, Belfast, whose eloquent ministrations are still well remembered in New York, where he preached once, during a short visit to the city, for the late Dr. Alexander, and perhaps in other pulpits also. Before we leave the subject of the Irish Presbyterian tracts, we venture to suggest that if, as we have no doubt, those which we have read are fair samples of the whole, they well deserve a circulation in this country, either by the Board of Publication, or by being republished in the ordinary manner, or by simple importation of the original edition, sold in Ireland for a penny, excepting Mr. Witherow's tract, which, though uniformly printed (in a very handsome style,) is larger than the rest, and sells for threepence. Of this sketch, and the larger work from which its matter is derived, as well as of the minutes of Assembly, we shall now avail ourselves, without formal reference or quotation, in a few remarks upon the origin and progress of the Irish Presbyterian church. We shall not attempt anything approaching to a full chronological detail, nor even a direct continuation of the abstract given in our former notice of the larger work, but simply such an exhibition of the prominent features in the history, as may serve to give our readers some correct idea of its countenance or physiognomy, and far from satisfying their desire of information on the subject, may rather lead them to seek more, either in Mr. Witherow's masterly epitome, or in the ample stores of Doctors Reid and Killen.

Before proceeding further, we may add, however, that while the larger work before us is simply divided into chapters, (thirty-one in all) with accompanying dates and copious tables of contents, the smaller tract is made up of twelve paragraphs or sections, with descriptive titles, which considerably aid the memory in retaining the chronological specifications also added. As the best way of presenting the whole subject in its outlines to those previously unacquainted with it, we subjoin these titles, and shall afterwards comment upon them.

I. The Plantation (1603–1630.)

II. The Black Oath (1631–1640.)

III. Sir Phelim O'Neill (1641–1642.)
IV. The Confession and the Covenant (1643–1648.)
V. The Commonwealth (1649–1660.)
VI. The Restoration (1661–1684.)
VII. The Revolution (1685–1690.)
VIII. Struggles for Toleration (1691–1704.)
IX. The Test Act (1705–1719.)
X. The Non-subscribers (1720–1726.)
XI. The Seceders (1727–1769.)
XII. The Volunteers (1770–1800.)
XIII. The New Light (1801–1830.)
XIV. The Union (1831–1840.)
XV. Since the Union (1841–1857.)
XVI. Present Circumstances (1858.)

These divisions, it will be observed, are not arranged upon the principle of equal chronological dimensions, since in this respect, they vary from a single year to more than half a century, but rather upon that of choosing salient points or critical conjunctures, around which may then be grouped the incidents of the adjacent period, whether few or many. As we have not room for the entire tract, which we would gladly copy *in extenso*, we propose to give a brief explanation of the titles and divisions just recited. This will necessarily involve at least a slight and rapid presentation of the points and features, which determine the expression or the character of each successive period.

By the "Plantation," our historians mean the settlement of Ulster, in the reign of James the First, with colonists from England, and especially from Scotland, on the confiscated lands of those who had been outlawed in the great rebellion under Queen Elizabeth. The civil or secular effect of this great movement, was the gradual conversion of a terrible and wide-spread desolation into a scene of plenty and prosperity. The religious effect was an anomalous one, namely, the introduction of devoted Scottish ministers, not only into Ulster, but into the church of Ireland, by law established, without any dereliction of the strictest Presbyterian principles and practice. Their submission to re-ordination is only an apparent exception, having been attended by a formal disclaimer of what-

ever is offensive in that way, on the part, not only of the candidates, but also of the bishop. This strange admission of unbending Presbyterians into an episcopal establishment, with Presbyterian discipline, and even organization, as a sort of *imperium in imperio*, is perfectly unique in history, and could only have been practicable under the moderate and even lax administration of Archbishop Usher. It was overruled, however, as the providential means of introducing into Ulster such men as Blair, Brice, Hamilton, Livingston, and Welsh, under whose devoted labours, aided by the monthly meetings at Antrim, unless these were rather an effect than an occasion or a cause, began the first great awakening or revival, which adorns the annals of this highly favoured church, and which began before the close of the first quarter of the seventeenth century.

We have thus far spoken of a Presbyterian church in Ireland only by prolepsis; for the instruments and agents in this great awakening were, as we have seen, Presbyterian members of an Episcopal establishment, allowed to partake of its advantages, and wield its influence for a time, but liable at any moment to be silenced or ousted by a change of counsels. Such a change began with Laud's ascendency in England, and that of his co-adjutor, Wentworth, (afterwards Earl of Strafford) in Ireland, with accompanying changes in the policy and spirit of the Irish bishops, leading to the deposition of the Presbyterian ministers, and culminating in the "Black Oath," by which Wentworth forced the laity to promise unconditional submission to the king's commands.

The second beginning of a Presbyterian church in Ireland was scarcely less extraordinary than the first, the Episcopal organization in the one case being followed by a military one in the other. The detection of the Popish Plot, headed by Phelim O'Neill in 1641, led to the occupation of Ulster by a number of regiments from Scotland, then rejoicing in its second Reformation. Each of these regiments became a Presbyterian church, with its chaplain for a pastor, and regular kirk-session of godly officers, and forming in conjunction the first Irish Presbytery, that of Bangor (June 10, 1642,) by which Down and Antrim were soon organized and furnished with relays of

preachers from the church of Scotland. Such effects of military occupation and invasion look like a realization of Samson's proverb: "Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness."

The hardy exotic thus replanted, both by physical and moral force, in Ireland, went on gaining strength through all the troubles of King Charles's reign, ending with his execution (1649,) until the Presbyterian ascendency in Ulster was checked by the rise of Independency in England. In the meantime, the standards of the Westminster Assembly, together with the Solemn League and Covenant between England and Scotland, had been formally extended to the sister kingdom.

During the first year of the English Commonwealth, the Irish Presbyterians, as determined Royalists, and equally opposed to the Papists and the Sectaries (or Independents,) were in every way discountenanced by government, and sometimes so severely treated that the greater number left the country, and the rest were in concealment. On the rise of Cromwell to supreme power, they were encouraged to return or reappear, and their ministers assisted by the State, but only in conjunction with the Baptists, Independents, and Episcopalians. In 1654 the Presbytery was divided into three, and three years later into five, a sufficient indication of returning strength under the wise and liberal government of Henry Cromwell, prematurely interrupted by the death of his father, and soon followed by the restoration of Charles II., in which the Presbyterians of the three kingdoms took an active part (1660.)

During the first part of this reign, the Irish Presbyterian church experienced another occultation or eclipse, only one-tenth of its ministers conforming to the state-church, and no less than thirty-six being ejected by Jeremy Taylor in a single day. But in spite of the prelates who opposed all toleration, this rigour was relaxed toward the middle of the reign, the imprisoned nonconformists were released, and a royal grant of six hundred pounds was paid for several years, as an unsolicited expression of the king's thanks for their former sufferings in his cause. With the usual recuperative power of the system, it began again to flourish, but was once more checked by a suspi-

cion of sympathy with Scotland, leading to oppression so intolerable, that a whole Presbytery (that of Lagan) formed the purpose of removing to America; and although this design was not accomplished, it is a fact to be remembered, that from this very Presbytery went forth about this time the very man who was to be the founder of our own beloved and now highly favoured church.*

The main facts in the history of the English Revolution, as connected with the progress of the church in Ireland, are King James's measures on his first accession, for excluding Protestants from public office; his subsequent deeper policy of general toleration, with its natural effect upon the spiritual freedom of the Presbyterians; their prompt and hearty acquiescence in the national appeal to the Prince of Orange; the famous siege of Derry, one of the most noted in all history; the landing of the Duke of Schomberg and the promise of protection from King William; his actual arrival and the first *Regium Donum*

* "From the minutes of the Lagan Presbytery, I find a Captain Archibald Johnston applying to them, in August 1678, to assist him in procuring a minister for Barbadoes; and, in December 1680, a 'Colonel Stevens from Maryland, beside Virginia,' wrote to the same presbytery for a minister to settle in that colony. It appears that, not long after, *the Rev. Francis Mackemy or Mackamie, who had been licensed by them in* 1681, *was ordained on this call of Colonel Stevens;* but, as their minutes are deficient at this period during several years, for the reason mentioned in a previous note, the precise date of his ordination and removal to America cannot be ascertained. *Mr. Mackamie was from the neighbourhood of Ramelton in Donegal, and was first introduced to the presbytery in January* 1680, *by his minister, the Rev. T. Drummond.* He settled in Accomac county, on the eastern shore of Virginia, where he died in 1708. He was the first Presbyterian minister who settled in North America, and with a few other brethren from Ulster, constituted the first regular presbytery that was organized in the New World. It is an interesting circumstance in the history of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, that it was the parent stock of the American Presbyterian Church, which now comprises nearly three thousand congregations." *Reid*, ii. 329. In a note upon this note the author adds, "I find Mr. Francis McKemy preaching for Mr. Hempton in Burt, April 2, 1682, from Luke xiii. 3, forenoon and afternoon. In the year 1675, he was enrolled as student in the University of Glasgow, as 'Franciscus MaKemius, Scoto-Hybernus.'" These two facts, and the two italicized in the preceding extract, are additional to any biographical account which we remember to have seen before. We regret, not only that the information still remains so scanty, but that our worthy founder's name assumes almost as many forms as those of Mani and Mahomet.

of twelve hundred pounds per annum to the ministers of Ulster; the decisive battle of the Boyne between the two kings, and the permanent establishment of William's power (July 1, 1690.)

But instead of the unchecked and undisturbed prosperity which might have been expected from this signal revolution, we find the Irish Presbyterians, for more than twenty years, involved in a series of "struggles for toleration," giving name to the next period of their history. The secret of this singular anomaly is furnished by the fact, that while they had the favour of the government, the letter of the law continued to proscribe their worship, and thus left them at the mercy of the bishops and clergy, who, provoked by the increase of this dissenting body to a general Synod (1691,) and excited by a controversy between two champions upon either side, not only defeated all attempts to change the law, but began a course of petty persecution by enforcing its most obsolete provisions, and finally succeeded in enacting a Sacramental Test (1704,) which had been hitherto unknown in Ireland; but all without effect upon the fixed predilections of the Ulster people. This oppression continued unabated for the space of fourteen years, during which the efforts of successive Lords Lieutenant (Pembroke, Wharton, and Shrewsbury) to put an end to it, were constantly defeated by the opposition of the High Church party, kept alive by the excitement of another paper war, in which the two sides of the question were defended, among others, by the author of Robinson Crusoe and the author of Gulliver's Travels! Encouraged by the accession of the Tories to power, (1711,) the clergy began to represent the dissenters as positively hurtful to the church-establishment, in consequence of which the Regium Donum was withdrawn, Presbyterian marriages were called in question as unlawful, and a whole Presbytery on one occasion was arrested for assembling to organize a church.

A change for the better was occasioned by the death of Queen Anne and the accession of George the First (1714,) who immediately restored the Regium Donum and promised other measures of relief, which were hastened by the conduct of the

Presbyterians in the rebellion of 1715, when they served in the army in defiance of the Test Act, and were afterwards indemnified by yearly acts of parliament, until the Test Act was itself repealed sixty years later; during all which time dissenters were excluded by it from the public service, though their worship received legal toleration as early as 1719. But, as if to show its native vigour and vitality, the church grew under all these disadvantages, so that in 1717 it consisted of eleven Presbyteries, and began a mission to the native Irish.

Thus far the troubles of the church had been *ab extra*, and soon after the beginning of the eighteenth century the doctrinal soundness of the body had been proved by the prompt condemnation of a preacher who avowed himself an Arian. But within a few years, a latitudinarian tendency began to show itself, promoted by the Belfast Society for mutual improvement, and its leader, Abernethy, whose discourse on Personal Persuasion as the basis of Religious Obedience (1719) opened a controversy on the binding force of creeds and confessions, which agitated seven successive Synods, and produced no less than fifty books and pamphlets which have never been reprinted. The practical question of subscription to the Westminster Confession was decided by a large majority against the latitudinarians, who were now called *Non-subscribers*, and after several vain efforts at conciliation, were first put into a Presbytery by themselves (1725,) and the next year withdrew and formed a new denomination, still existing as the "Non-subscribing Presbytery of Antrim."

This purgation of the body, being only partial, was followed not by a revival but an obvious declension, an increase of doctrinal laxity, and a loss of spiritual life. The ruinous effects of this defection were prevented by what seemed to be a very severe remedy, the introduction into Ulster of a rival body, the Seceders, or Associate Presbyterians from Scotland, who began to operate in 1742, and even after the Burgher schism, five years later, still continued organizing churches, Presbyteries, and ultimately Synods, in the North of Ireland. This is now regarded by the Irish Presbyterians as the providential means by which a pure religion was preserved amidst a general

defection, so that though their fathers counted it a sore affliction, they can now "thank God for the Secession."*

The next phase of the history is again a military one, but very different from that connected with the second introduction of Presbytery into Ireland. The extensive and formidable organization of the Irish Volunteers, which began in 1778, and lasted fifteen years, was occasioned by the dread of insurrection during our Revolutionary war, and continued by the threatened French invasion, but became a species of political association, under whose dictation the independence of the Irish Parliament was granted, Presbyterian marriages were legalized between Presbyterian parties, and the Seceders were allowed to swear with the uplifted hand. But the moral effects of the political and military mania were seen in the frequent desecration of the Sabbath and the church by public meetings, some of which expressed their sympathy with French revolutionary principles and movements; and at length the popular excitement reached maturity in the famous insurrection of the "United Irishmen," (1798.) In this rebellion all denominations were concerned; but the historians before us represent the leaders as connected with the Established Church and the University of Dublin, although both those bodies, as well as the Synod of Ulster, and the other Presbyterian sects, denounced the project as insane and ruinous. No seceding minister is known to have taken any active part in the rebellion; but some of the Non-subscribers, of the Covenanters, and of the General Synod, were more or less implicated. At the annual meeting of 1799 it was found that one minister had suffered death, two were still in prison, and three had been obliged to leave the country.†

* The Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, made their first appearance in Ulster a few years after the Seceders, i. e., just before the middle of the century.

† "The Rev. William Gibson escaped arrest, and fled to America. . . . . Messrs. Black and Wylie, two young men who had now completed their education for the ministry of the Covenanting church, found it necessary to remove to America. Dr. Wylie died in the autumn of 1852, in the eightieth year of his age, and fifty-third of his ministry. At the time of his death, he was pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian church, Philadelphia, and Professor emeritus of ancient languages in the University of Pennsylvania." *Reid*, iii. 424. "The Rev. James Porter, of Grey Abbey, was condemned by the sentence of a

In the meantime an addition had been made to the Regium Donum, first of eight hundred pounds (1718,) and then of a thousand, with a similar but smaller grant to the Seceders (1783.) On the union of the kingdoms (1801) a much larger annual addition, of above eight thousand pounds, was offered, in connection with a scheme of classified instead of equal distribution, which was reluctantly accepted by the Synod of Ulster, and a few years later by the two Seceding bodies (1809.) These financial measures led to the increase of the Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, but also to the fusion of the Burghers and the Antiburghers as the "Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders," and numbering at that time (1818) not quite a hundred ministers.

But while the rival bodies were thus gaining strength, the Synod of Ulster began to show symptoms of revival, in the increase of sound ministers; participation in the great missionary movements of the day; and improvement in the means of theological instruction, by appointing a Professor of Divinity in connection with the new Belfast Academy, a step which the Seceders had already taken; a decrease of ministerial communion with the non-subscribing Presbytery of Antrim; and a growing distrust of the kindred party in the church itself, which in the course of a hundred years had now become avowedly Arian. After several preliminary conflicts, and a public declaration by the Rev. Henry Cooke, that the Synod contained thirty-five Arians, its Clerk included, the crisis was at length brought about by a proposal of the same distinguished person,

court-martial held at Newtownards, and executed in his own meeting-house green, on the 2d of July, 1798. . . . . He possessed considerable ability as a writer, particularly as a wit and a satirist. The Hon. Alexander Porter, who died at Oaklawn, in the State of Louisiana, in 1844, and who was then the only Irishman in the Senate of the United States, was the son of this minister. Another of his sons was Attorney General for the State of Louisiana." *Reid*, iii. 428. "The Rev. James Simpson of Newtownards, the Rev. John Glendy of Maghera, and the Rev. Thomas Ledlie Birch of Saintfield, were permitted to emigrate to America." Of the gentlemen here named, Mr. Birch appeared before our General Assembly several successive years as an appellant from the judgment of one or more Presbyteries, which had refused to receive him as a foreign minister. Dr. Glendy was settled for some time in Augusta county, Virginia, and afterwards for many years as pastor of the second Presbyterian church in Baltimore.

(1827) that the members of the Synod should publicly profess their faith in the divinity of Christ, which was by a vote of nearly one hundred and sixty ministers to a little more than twenty, only six of whom, however, openly avowed their unbelief. After two divided and agitated Synods, in which Messrs. Cooke and Montgomery were recognized as leaders of the several parties, the Arians finally withdrew (1829) to the number of seventeen ministers, precisely the same number that had gone out as non-subscribers a little more than a century before (1726.) The new secession afterwards organized themselves as the "Remonstrant Synod of Ulster."

This happy expurgation was immediately followed by a new and healthful impetus in all directions; church extension, home and foreign missions, temperance, and education, general and theological. This last was promoted by the institution of two new chairs at Belfast, the biblical, first occupied by Samuel Davidson, and the historical, by James Seaton Reid, the author of the standard work before us. The requisition of unqualified subscription to the standards (1835,) and a new arrangement of the Regium Donum satisfactory to all concerned (1838,) removed the only obstacle remaining to the union of the Ulster and Secession Synods, one containing two hundred and ninety-two, the other one hundred and forty-one churches, which were at length happily united under the common designation of the "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland," (July 10th, 1840.*)

The first twelve years after the Union were distinguished by important movements, both belligerent and peaceful. An adverse decision in the House of Lords, respecting Presbyterian marriages, led to a long-continued agitation and discussion, which resulted in an Act of Parliament recognizing the validity of all such marriages when either party is a Presbyterian (1835.) An internal controversy as to education, after several years' continuance, ended in the institution of two Presbyterian Colleges, one at Derry for general as well as theological instruction, founded on a princely testamentary endowment,

* Both bodies, we believe, retain their corporate existence for the management of trust-funds previously committed to them.

and the other at Belfast for theology alone, the other branches of instruction being furnished by the new Queen's College, at that place, and the government supporting both the faculties. But even while these controversies were in progress, their unfortunate effects were in a great measure neutralized and counteracted by the spiritual and organic growth of the whole body, as evinced by its devotion to the work of missions, its aggressive movements in all suitable directions, and the systematic organization of these movements on a somewhat novel and peculiar plan, but one which seems to be fully justified by its results. A Board elected by the Presbyteries has a general supervision of the schemes or enterprises of the church; but over each great field of operation is a single minister, who makes that field his province and his study, and is looked to for information and for counsel with respect to its affairs. Thus Dr. Morgan has charge of the Foreign Mission, Mr. Hamilton of the Jewish, Mr. McClure of the Colonial, Dr. Edgar of the Home Department, and especially the Romish Mission, in behalf of which he is now visiting this country.

The last six years are described by Mr. Witherow as years of undisturbed peace, and of steady growth, distinguished by the energetic working of the old schemes, and the starting of some new ones, such as that for building manses, and another for increasing the salaries of ill-paid ministers; increased attention to the state of practical religion, the observance of the Sabbath, the reformation of manners, and the education of the people. With a pardonable pride, if we may use the term in this connection, the historian looks back, through the vista of two hundred and fifty years, to the time of the Plantation, and the military organization, and contrasts those weak beginnings, not only with the intervening lapses and recoveries, but with the present spectacle of one united Presbyterian body, made up of five Synods, six and thirty Presbyteries, and above five hundred churches, with an average income of one hundred and seventeen pounds to every minister, besides its representatives in many a home and foreign field of labour. "Never, at any period of the past, has the Presbyterian church of Ireland been more united in doctrine, more efficient in her ministrations, or more prosperous, socially and spiritually, than at present;

ready to enter on, and, with God's blessing, to carry to a successful issue any great and good work that lies fairly in her way. *And even yet she scarcely knows her own strength.*" A striking comment on these last words is afforded by the great awakening which has taken place since they were written, and in which the voice of God still says to his people in that suffering yet highly favoured island, "THE JOY OF THE LORD IS YOUR STRENGTH." We purposely abstain from all particular remark upon that wonderful event, as well as all statistical detail about the actual condition of the Irish church, and all prognostication of its future, because these are points on which the public mind is eagerly awaiting information from the delegates now visiting this country. If our hurried and jejune sketch of the past should serve to draw additional attention to the subject, and stimulate the appetite for more exact and ample knowledge, its most important end will be accomplished.

We must not conclude, however, without adding that the standard history of Dr. Reid, besides exhibiting the progress of his own church in minute detail, incidentally throws light upon some very obscure periods of our own. In addition to the facts already quoted in our abstract, with respect to the founder of our church, and several of its later foreign members, we have here a welcome explanation of a circumstance which our own historians have unavoidably left in the dark. We refer to the extraordinary Irish emigration to this country, in the second and third quarters of the eighteenth century, a movement which imparted both an Irish and a Presbyterian character to some extensive portions of the Union, and contributed immensely to the strength and increase of our own church. It has been the practice of most American writers either to leave the causes of this emigration unexplored, or to confound it with the earlier but smaller currents setting in from Scotland, and produced directly by religious persecution. But we here learn that the two things, although similar in kind and in effect, were quite distinct and independent of each other, and that although the Irish Presbyterians did, as such, sometimes suffer persecution, and did more than once resolve to leave the country in large numbers, these designs were never fully carried out; and the emigrations which did really take

place, within the period above defined, would seem to have been chiefly caused by physical and social rather than religious sufferings; such as hard winters, failure of the crops, unreasonable rents, and taxes, and oppressive landlords. These were often actuated, no doubt, by intolerant and party zeal; but this is something very different from the treatment which depleted Scotland in the reign of Charles the Second, and would probably have drawn its best blood from its veins, if the oppressors had not crowned their other arbitrary acts by finally and forcibly arresting emigration. We have no room to exemplify or verify this statement by detailed proofs, or even to indulge in any speculation as to the effects of the difference in question on the character and spirit of our own communion; but we hope that even these remarks may draw a still more general attention to the work by which they were suggested, and in which the most inquisitive curiosity will find abundant satisfaction.

Art. V.—*History of the Institution of the Sabbath Day, its Uses and Abuses;* with notices of the Puritans, Quakers, &c. By William Logan Fisher. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Philadelphia: T. B. Pugh, No. 615 Chestnut Street. 1859. pp. 248.

In a population embracing so many elements as go to make up the American people, it is to be expected that there should be great diversity of opinion on all religious subjects, and more or less opposition to laws which recognize the obligation of any form of religious truth. This opposition is directed specially against the laws for the proper observance of the Sabbath. It is in our cities that the most conspicuous demonstrations have been made, which, in some cases, threaten to give rise to serious difficulties. In some instances our magistrates, influenced by public sentiment, or rather by popular clamour, have allowed the public desecration of the Lord's day to pass with impunity. But in other instances, both magistrates and courts, recogniz-

ing their obligation to act, not according to their private judgment or outside demands, but according to the laws of the land, have interfered to suppress such desecration. The consequence has been that the public papers teem with remonstrances and denunciations; conventions have been held; exciting addresses delivered, and strings of formidable resolutions passed. It is important to notice the sources whence this opposition to our Sunday laws proceeds. It is admitted that there are men among these opponents highly respectable, both for intelligence and character. Some of our own church, and even ministers of high-standing, who not only believe in the Divine authority of the Scriptures, but in the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath, are so infected with the radical and infidel theory of civil government, as to throw all their weight against the laws for the proper observance of the Lord's day. There are others, who, in their own minds, have no objections to such laws, and who would be glad to see the community quietly submit to them; who, nevertheless, join in the opposition because they think that such laws are out of keeping with the spirit of the age. Others again are men of the world, whose convictions and conduct are not governed by religious principle, and whose interests are more or less enlisted in the abrogation of all restrictions placed on Sunday travelling and amusements. But with all these concessions it remains true that the opposition is, as a whole, an anti-Christian and irreligious movement. It is an outbreak of hostility to Christianity, and to all its institutions. We have just said that we do not pronounce every opponent of the Sunday laws, simply on the ground of that opposition, to be an infidel or an irreligious man. We cannot, however, resist the conviction that the movement itself is anti-Christian in its character and purpose. This is made manifest by the reasons commonly assigned for opposition to the Sunday laws—reasons which avowedly apply to all the institutions of Christianity; by the character of those who have rendered themselves most prominent in this movement, among whom the German emigrants are the most vociferous and violent; and by the character of the addresses made in anti-Sabbath conventions, and of the resolutions adopted in those assemblies.

In the *New York Spectator*, for September 13th, we find a

partial report of such a meeting, at which one of the speakers declared, that the purpose of himself and of his associates was, that "the free thoughts which they had brought with them from Germany should be established here." That is, that the laws and usages of this Christian and Protestant country, the convictions and principles of the great mass of its inhabitants, are to be disregarded and revolutionized, to make way for the "free thoughts" of Germany. A Dr. Gillot is represented as exclaiming: "Free Germans and citizens of America, let us join hand in hand with all other free citizens around us, to oppose a law which is unjust, and an infringement on our sacred liberty. The Sunday laws are only the tools used by cliques of politicians to further their own ambitious ends, in opposition to the interests of mankind. They are upheld in the sacred name of religion. We all have our own views about religion, and we mean to keep them without infringement, or being forced to adopt those of other men. We honour all days, and consider what is right to be done on one day is right to be done on another. Men should be left to the exercise of their own judgment in regard to the way they spend their time. If they wish pleasure, let them have it; if they wish social enjoyment and enlivening music, let them have it. This is freedom." At this meeting it was "*Resolved*, That the liberty to worship what we please, implies the liberty to worship nothing we please; and that those professing what are called infidel and atheistic sentiments, have a right to the same recognition and protection from the civil powers, as those professing Jewish, Christian, or any other doctrine; and that any attempt, direct or indirect, to exact a virtual confession of faith in the inspiration of the Old or New Testament writings as a qualification for a legal oath, or the keeping of some holy day enjoined, or supposed to be enjoined, by the Jewish or Christian Scriptures as the first or seventh day of the week, is alike defiant of natural right and constitutional law." Another resolution declares, that the attempt to enforce the observance of the first day of the week as a Sabbath, is "actuated by the same sectarian and proselyting spirit which has at the same time inspired the effort to enforce the reading of the Protestant Scriptures in our public schools." "This

effort to proselyte the youth of our public schools to Protestant Christianity," is looked upon "as no less flagrant a violation of natural right and constitutional law, than if, instead of King James's, the Douay or Roman Catholic version were required to be used; or instead of the Christian Bible the Mormon Bible, the Koran of Mahomet, or the Vedas and Shastas of the Hindoos." We make these quotations not for the purpose of exposing the shallowness and confusion of thought by which they are characterized, but simply to exhibit the *animus* of the opposition to our Sunday laws. For the same purpose we translate a few sentences from the *New Yorker Demokrat*, vom 30, mai d. j. Under the caption "The Day of the Lord," the editor of that representative journal says:

"As frogs in the swamp from time to time raise their heads, and fill the air with their melodious croaking, and then sink back into their slimy element, so the Sunday-saints raise their heads up and down out of the swamp of their church-creeds, and croak, 'Sanctify the Sabbath! Desecrate not the day of the Lord!' Such a frog-concert was held on Friday afternoon before the Commissioners of Police, to whom a delegation of frog-heads presented a memorandum, in which an earnest protest was made against the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday, and the faithful execution of the Sunday laws was demanded."

It is well for people to understand each other. It is well, on the one hand, that those Christians and Christian ministers, and other respectable men, who lend their influence to this anti-Sabbath movement, should know their associates, and understand the real spirit and design of the enterprise in which they coöperate. It is well, on the other hand, that the friends of the Sabbath, and of the laws of the land enacted for its due observance, and that magistrates and judges charged with the exposition and execution of those laws, should understand the origin and aim of the opposition which they have to encounter. We pass no judgment on individuals, but we are fully convinced that if the anti-Christian, irreligious, and foreign element were abstracted from this anti-Sabbath crusade, it would lose all its significance and power. It is but another outbreak of the

spirit of evil; and one may almost hear Lucifer, as in Longfellow's Golden Legend, crying out to these assailants,

> "Aim your lightnings
> At the oaken
> Massive, iron studded portals!
> Sack the house of God, and scatter
> Wide the ashes of the dead!"

Quite as distinctly, however, comes back the answer,

> "O we cannot!
> The apostles
> And the martyrs, wrapped in mantles,
> Stand as warders at the entrance,
> Stand as sentinels o'erhead!"

We do not want such a leader, or such associates. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, when the religious men of a community are on one side, and the irreligious, as a class, upon the other, the contest between them is a contest between light and darkness, between God and Satan, and, therefore, the stake at issue is the best interests of man. Good men, indeed, neither individually nor collectively, are infallible; and, therefore, we do not set up their judgment in any given case, as the ultimate standard of decision. But it is nevertheless true as a matter of history, that the intelligence and religion of a country go for what is true and good, ignorance and irreligion for what is false and evil. We know that there are cases in which the mariner cannot trust the needle, but must look for guidance to the unchanging star in the heavens; and there are cases in which even the mass of religious men swerve from the right course, and we have to look away from earth to heaven for direction. Nevertheless, the sailor who throws his compass overboard is sure to be shipwrecked; and the man, whether minister or magistrate, who sets himself against the religious convictions of the mass of good men, is sure to be ruined. This reference to the irreligious character of this movement against the Sunday laws is not made *ad invidiam.* It is intended as an appeal to a rational and well established principle of action. It is wise and right (except in extraordinary cases,) for public men to follow the enlightened religious senti-

ment of the community; it is unwise, disastrous, and wrong for them to go counter to that sentiment, or to take side with the irreligious and the vicious. All history is filled with illustrations and proofs of this truth. It is, therefore, a presumptive argument against this anti-Sabbath movement, that the religious sentiment of the country is against it, and the irreligious in its favour. No right-minded man can hesitate which side to take in such a controversy, unless his own convictions are singularly clear and strong, so that his allegiance to God forces him to array himself against God's people.

We propose briefly to examine the leading arguments of the anti-Sabbatarians, and see whether they are of such cogency as to constrain a conscientious man to take part with the anti-Christian and irreligious portion of the community against the great body of enlightened and religious men. It is plain that this is a very serious question. There is far more at stake than simply the laws for the due observance of the Lord's day. The principle on which those laws are assailed, would, as its advocates avow, exclude the Bible from our public schools, banish chaplains from all our legislative halls, and from the army and navy, from hospitals and almshouses, from our penitentiaries and state institutions of every kind. It would, as we shall see, do far more than this. It would forbid the exaction of an oath of office, or for confirmation of testimony. It would obliterate from our statute-books all laws for preserving the sanctity of marriage, for punishment of polygamy or adultery; and, in short, of all enactments which assume that we are a Christian people, bound by the revealed will of God. We should, therefore, approach this subject with a due impression of the magnitude of the interests at stake, and of the radical character of the revolution which it is now sought to introduce into our laws and customs.

The first argument urged, by many at least, in opposition to Sunday laws, is that the Bible is not the word of God; it is not a revelation of his truth and will, to which we owe faith and obedience. This is substantially the ground taken by the author of the work at the head of this article. On page 18, he says, "In this account of creation nature speaks one language, the Bible another; shall we put aside those unchangeable marks

of a creation long anterior to that recorded, in order to be guided by records written when, or by whom, no one knows. The account in the book of Genesis can only be considered an allegory calculated to please children and ignorant men." We happen to have heard one of the first scientific men of the age, the friend and peer of Agassiz, lecture on the Mosaic account of the creation, and saw him overawed by the stupendous exhibition of Divine wisdom therein contained. To his mind and to his auditors, as unfolded by a true philosopher, it was shown to be a summation of all the results to which modern science had arrived. We can imagine how such a man would regard the flippant ignorance displayed in the sentence just quoted. Speaking of the Bible, the author asks on page 176, "Can any believe that this book, ambiguous in its language, uncertain in its conjectures, is designed by the Almighty to be the rule of life for man?" On page 180, after stating what he calls certain philosophical truths, he adds, "They put an end to the popular delusion that the Scriptures are the rule of life, and establish in its place that sublime idea of the constant omnipresence of God, comforting us in our affliction, and guiding us according to his own purposes through all the intricate scenes of our existence." It is the special design of one of his chapters, and apparently of the whole work, to overthrow the idea of a "book religion," and to show that the doctrine of "the authority of the Scriptures," "is of incalculable evil to the morals and welfare of society." His substitute for the Scriptures is, "every man's own perceptions of truth and justice," which, in accordance with the language, but not with the doctrine, of Friends, he calls "the inner light." The only use we propose to make of Mr. Fisher's book, is to select the heads of the common objections against the Sabbath, and the laws enacted in regard to its observance. The first in the order of importance is the one above stated, viz., that the Bible is not authoritative; is not derived from God, and ought not to be regarded as the rule of our faith or practice. This objection is not peculiar to Mr. Fisher, nor to the very inconsiderable class to which he belongs. It is the objection either openly avowed or tacitly admitted by a very large portion of those most active in their opposition to the Sunday laws. These men are not atheists,

but deists. They admit the existence of a personal God, but deny that he has made a supernatural revelation recorded in the Christian Scriptures. They say that the only guide for the individual or for governments, is reason, the light of nature, as some express it; or, as Mr. Fisher would say, "a divine principle in the mind of man;" which he tells us is sufficient for "the governing principle of the individual man," and "for the governing principle of nations."

The first remark it occurs to us to make on this objection is, that it proves too much. If we must not make laws in obedience to the commands of God recorded in the Bible, because some men say the Bible is not true; neither can we make laws in obedience to the Divine principle or voice of God within us, because some men say there is no God. Mr. Fisher says to the Christian, "Your Scriptures are not divine as to their origin or authority. The assumption that they are a rule of life is the source of incalculable evils. Any laws founded on their commands are both unjust and injurious." The atheist says to Mr. Fisher, "Your doctrine of a God has been and is the greatest of all curses to the human race. It is the fountain-head of all superstition, and of the countless crimes perpetrated in the name of religion. It degrades man from his true position, converts him from a freeman into a slave; brings his inward life under the lash of a perverted conscience, and makes his soul a nest of scorpions." Let Mr. Fisher call an anti-Sabbath convention, and although the atheists may not outnumber the combined elements on the other side, we answer for it, they will be immensely superior in knowledge and power. Should our author fall into the hands of some of these "Free Germans," he would soon find himself crumpled into very small dimensions, and trodden under foot. If, then, he will not admit Christianity as the governing principle for the nation, he will have to submit to atheism, and then we shall soon have a strumpet for a goddess, and the guillotine for the chief source of public amusement. Mr. Fisher admits that we must have some "governing principle" not only for the "individual man," but for nations. He says the Scriptures must not be that principle, because they are not the word of God. We must, he says, substitute for them natural religion, "the inner

light," "the omnipresence of God," every man's "perceptions of truth and justice." But with the same right that he tells us to put out the sun, and follow the farthing candle of his "inner light," the atheist says to him, "Put out your smoking taper, it has ever led man into swamps and quicksands." If, therefore, we must give up our Christianity, he must give up his Theism.

Our second remark is, that this objection is unreasonable, not only because it is unfounded, but also because it is entertained only by an insignificant minority of the people. The objection that the Scriptures are not an authoritative rule of life is an unreasonable objection, because their Divine origin is a well authenticated fact. It is unreasonable to deny what by sufficient, and even superabundant evidence is proved to be true.

The Christian Scriptures, the Old and New Testaments, have been subjected to the scrutiny of men for thousands of years. They have been exposed to all kinds of assault. The greatest and the worst of men have united to overthrow their authority. Philosophy, science, and history, have been marshalled against them; yet at this day the conviction of their Divine authority, is more deeply rooted in the minds of men than at any former period. At this moment a larger portion of the enlightened and virtuous of the human race believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, than ever before bowed to their authority. They are luminous with Divine knowledge; knowledge of the past and of the future, of the visible and of the invisible, of God and of man; knowledge such as God only could reveal. They are resplendent with holiness. They are instinct with power over the heart, the reason, and the conscience. They meet our necessities, explain the mystery of our origin, of our nature, and of our destiny. We believe in them for the same reason that we believe in the sun, or in the moral law, or that the Madonna of Raphael is a miracle of beauty. We believe in the Bible for the same reason that Mr. Fisher believes in God. And if he would know how his denial of its authority affects us, he has only to ask himself how the denial of the being of God affects him. Such denial would not, in the least degree, weaken his own convictions. He would only feel indignant that a truth so evident, which addresses itself with such con-

trolling power to his higher nature, should be called in question on grounds which to him must appear trivial. He would regard the demand that he should not make his Theism a rule of life, an outrage on his humanity. He could not fail to answer that it was impossible for him not to regulate his conduct, whether as a citizen or magistrate, by his "own perceptions of truth and justice;" that to throw away his sense of moral obligation and responsibility to God, would be to brutalize himself. The assertion of the atheist that truth and justice are bugbears to frighten "children and ignorant men;" that moral distinctions are merely subjective; that there is no sin and no virtue; that might makes right; that the actual is the only possible; that all who succeed, whether robber or murderer, ought to succeed, would doubtless appear to him very absurd and very shocking. Well, Mr. Fisher, if you cannot give up God, we cannot give up Christ, who is God in his clearest manifestation. If the will of God, as revealed in your own soul, takes such hold of your conscience, that you cannot disregard the demands of truth and justice, we must tell you that the will of God, as revealed in his word, takes such hold of our inward nature, that we cannot disregard its authority. Nay, as God is greater than man, if your own "perceptions of truth and justice" have such authority and power over you, you may believe that what God declares to be truth and justice, has a proportionately greater power over us. If you must follow your farthing candle, we must follow the blazing sun, let owls and bats do what they may. If, then, you would regard the demand of the atheist, that you should give up your sense of truth and justice, as the rule of individual and national life as unreasonable, you must permit Christians to regard as still more unreasonable, your demand that they should give up the more distinct revelation of the Divine will in his word, as the rule of their conduct, whether as individuals or as a nation.

The unreasonableness of this demand is the more glaring, because it is made by a very small minority of the community. It is conceded, for the present, at least as between us and Mr. Fisher, that nations as well as individuals must have some rule or principle to regulate their conduct. Christians say, that

principle should be the will of God as revealed in the Bible. Deists, such as our author, say, it should be the will of God as revealed in the soul; or, in other words, the inward sense of truth and justice. The atheist says, as there is no God, there is no right or wrong; there are only force and happiness. Therefore the only rule of action for the individual is power and a regard to his own happiness; and for the nation, the greatest happiness for the greatest number. If murdering all the Indians would promote the happiness of the nation, then let them be murdered. If poisoning the wells in Canada would promote the enjoyment of Americans, let the wells be poisoned. If taking the wealth of the rich and giving it to the poor would make the people happy, let the rich be despoiled. Leaving out of view the truth or falsehood of these different theories, and assuming for the moment, that questions of duty and of allegiance to God can be settled by the ballot-box, it is certainly preposterous for the atheists, who in this country number only a few thousands, to say to the deists, who probably amount to some millions, You must give up your principle and adopt ours; there is no such thing as truth and justice, and therefore you shall not act in a national capacity on the assumption that there is. Mr. Fisher could not stand this. With what face then can a million or two of deists say to twenty millions of Christians, You must give up your principle and follow ours. Let it be remembered we are speaking on the concession of Mr. Fisher, that there must be some principle to regulate a nation's acts. If this be so, then as the vast majority of the people of this country profess to be Christians, it follows that the Bible, which they believe to be the word of God, must be the rule of their conduct; and it must, even on the low principle of relative numbers, be unreasonable that the few should control the many.

There is still another remark to be made on this objection. To argue that Sunday laws should be abolished, because the Bible is not a rule of life, is altogether irrelevant. It matters not, as to this point, whether the Bible is the word of God or not. It is enough that the people believe it to be his word. It is perfectly competent to Mr. Fisher or any body else, to endeavour to convince them that they are labouring under a

delusion, and should emancipate themselves from an illegitimate authority. But it is preposterous to require them to abolish laws which the Bible enjoins, so long as their faith in the Bible is unchanged. Mr. Fisher must act according to his "inner light," so long as he believes it to be Divine. Our telling him that it is an *ignis fatuus*, may be a reason for his re-examining the matter, but it is no reason why he should alter his conduct before he alters his opinion. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land. Any man has the right to endeavour to persuade the people to alter its provisions; but so long as it is in force, it must be obeyed. If a Christian goes to a Mohammedan country, it would be very absurd for him to call for the abrogation of a particular law enjoined in the Koran, on the ground that Mohammed was an impostor, and his book a tissue of absurdities. So long as the people regard Mohammed as a prophet, and the Koran a revelation, it is most unreasonable to require them to disregard their authority. So in a Christian country it is absurd to require that the people should act as if the Bible was not the word of God. It is one thing to try and change their conviction of its Divine authority, but another thing to persuade those who believe it to be Divine, to disregard its injunctions.

The second great objection urged in the book before us, and often elsewhere, is, that admitting the Bible to be the word of God, and the fourth commandment of the Decalogue to be yet in force, the Bible itself does not require such an observance of the Sabbath as our Sunday laws assume. On this objection little need be said. We may repeat the remark just made. The real question is, not what the Bible as interpreted by the objectors means, but how do the mass of Christian people in this country understand it. Mr. Fisher says that the Sabbath, even as enjoined in the Old Testament, was a day of recreation. The people were commanded to rest from their ordinary labours, and to amuse themselves. The mass of Christians say that the Sabbath was a day separated from worldly avocations, and set apart for the service of God; a day to be devoted to learning his will, and worshipping in his presence. It matters not, so far as the question about our Sunday laws is concerned, which of these views of the design of the day is cor-

rect. If the law-making power is in the hands of Christians, and the responsibility for the laws enacted rests on them, they must act according to their convictions. If that power and responsibility rest on Mr. Fisher and those who agree with him, they must act according to their views. So long, therefore, as Christians believe that the Sabbath as instituted by God was to be a day of rest from ordinary labour, and of devotion to religious duty, anything inconsistent with that design they are bound, within the limits of their legitimate authority, to prohibit.

In another point of view, however, the question as to the design of the institution of the Sabbath is a matter of vital importance. Its hold on the religious feelings will of course be destroyed, if it could be shown that it was intended by God himself, to be a day of recreation. It is impossible, in an article like this, that we should enter on all these disputed points. Mr. Fisher denies the Divine origin and authority of the Bible. Must we write a new book on the evidences of revealed religion? So he denies that the Jewish Sabbath had a religious design; he denies that the institution, such as it was, was designed to be perpetual, that the early Christian church recognized the Divine authority of the institution, &c. These are points which have been discussed and settled to the satisfaction of the church, generations before Mr. Fisher or ourselves were born. It would require more space than his work occupies, and more time than its composition cost him, for us to go over the ground which has already been so often traversed. This cannot be expected, and is altogether unnecessary, as works in abundance can be had discussing all these subjects. Our object in this review is simply to point out the inconclusiveness of the arguments presented in this work, and so often repeated elsewhere, in favour of the abrogation of our Sunday laws. We might therefore properly content ourselves with the remark, that so long as the Christian people of this Christian country believe that the Sabbath as instituted by God, was a day, not for amusement, but for religious service, the Sunday laws cannot be dispensed with, without a violation of the public conscience. That Christians are right in their view of this subject might indeed be easily demonstrated to the satisfaction

of all who believe the Scriptures. The avowed and often repeated purpose of its original institution was to keep in mind the creation of the world. If the world was created, then there is a personal God, to whom, as to the author of their being, all rational creatures owe allegiance and worship. If the world was not created, then there is no God; and men are left to choose between Atheism and Pantheism—a distinction without a difference. So far, therefore, from the Sabbath being designed primarily as a day of relaxation from the ordinary labours of life, this was a very subordinate object of its institution. It was designed to be a periodical and often recurring arrest of the course of worldly life; to make men aware that there is a God to whom they are responsible, and on whom they are dependent, from whom come all their mercies, and to whom they must answer for all their sins. It was designed to prevent men sinking into the material and present, by keeping God in remembrance, and letting in upon the darkness of this outward and fleeting state the light of the spiritual and eternal world. The Sabbath was, therefore, the corner-stone of religion. Its neglect was sure to lead to forgetfulness of the true God, and then to idolatry, and the dominion of all evil. True religion, that is, what even a deist would call true religion, the knowledge and worship of the true God, has never, since the apostasy of man, been preserved where the Sabbath was unknown, or its religious character denied or neglected. It is to reduce the Old Testament from the sublimity of a revelation of God, and of the mode by which he is to be worshipped, and of the means by which the knowledge of Him is to be preserved and promoted, to make its most characteristic institution a mere day for worldly amusement. If the Old Testament be viewed as simply a collection of historical records and human compositions, having no higher reference than the temporal affairs of the Jews, then the Sabbath, in keeping with such view, may be regarded as a day of recreation. But if the Bible be a religious book, if its design be to reveal God, his works and will, and to prepare man for a higher state of being, then the Sabbath is a religious institution, having for its object to wean man from the seen and temporal, and prepare him for the unseen and eternal. It is therefore called a holy day; that is, a day set apart to

the service of God, just as the temple and its appurtenances, the priests and the people were holy as consecrated to God. The command to sanctify or hallow the Sabbath is a command to devote it to a religious use. The word to *sanctify* always means, in such connections, to separate from a common to a sacred use. In Lev. xxiii. 3, it is said, "Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, a holy convocation: ye shall do no work therein; it is the Sabbath of the Lord (or, the Sabbath to Jehovah, i. e., devoted to his service) in all your dwellings." It was the day on which the people were to be convoked for holy purposes. The sacrifices in the temple were multiplied—the people resorted thither to worship, they rejoiced, as the Psalmist said, in the courts of the Lord. He preferred to be a door-keeper in the house of God, rather than to dwell in the tents of wickedness. He was glad when they said to him, "Let us go unto the house of the Lord." The book of Psalms is a collection of devotional exercises for the worship of God, specially on the Sabbath. That day was, therefore, a day set apart for religious services, according to the command, "Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I am Jehovah." Lev. xix. 30. And the prophet said, "The people of the land shall worship at the door of this gate before the Lord in the Sabbaths." Ezek. xlvi. 3. Isaiah said, "From one Sabbath to another shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." lxvi. 23. In chapter lviii. 13, he says, the blessing of God shall rest on those who shall abstain from doing their pleasure, or seeking mere amusement on God's holy day; and shall call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, (or the day holy to the Lord,) honourable; and shall honour him, not doing their own pleasure, nor speaking their own words. The Jews ever understood the Sabbath to be a day consecrated to religious worship. Philo, as quoted by Eusebius, says, Moses commanded the people "on the seventh day to assemble together, and to listen to the recital of the law." Josephus says, (*Contra Apion.* Lib. i. § 22,) the Jews were accustomed on every seventh day not only to abstain from the ordinary affairs of life, "but spread out their hands in their holy places, and pray till the evening." We have, however, higher authority than this. It

is said in Acts xv. 21, "Moses of old times [literally *from ancient generations*,] hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day." Such was the usage of the Jews in the time of Christ, as we learn from many passages in the New Testament. Mark vi. 2, "When the Sabbath was come, he [Christ] began to teach in the synagogue." Luke iv. 16, "He came to Nazareth—and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up to read;" xiii. 10, "He was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath." The apostles everywhere went into the synagogues on the Sabbath to preach; see Acts xiii. 14, xvii. 2. In this latter passage it is said, "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures;" and xviii. 4, Paul "reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." It is plain, therefore, that the Hebrew Sabbath was not a day for worldly amusement, but a day set apart for religious duties. The people, indeed, were commanded to rejoice on that day. And well they might, for it was the constant memorial of the being and goodness of God, not only as their Creator and benefactor, but as their deliverer from bondage. There is nothing ascetic or gloomy in the religion of the Bible. Men are commanded to rejoice always, to praise God with a cheerful voice. There is no doubt that the Pharisees perverted this sacred day, and burdened its observance with many uncommanded austerities; and there is no doubt that some Christians have erred in the same direction. But this is not to be laid to the charge of the Bible; and it is not the tendency of our age. All that God requires is, that the day should be set apart from worldly avocations, and consecrated to religion. The more cheerfully it is observed, the more, that is, of joyful gratitude for the blessings which it commemorates attends its celebration, the better.

The third objection to our Sunday Laws is, that admitting the Divine origin of the Old Testament, and conceding that the observance of one day in seven as a holy Sabbath to God is therein enjoined, it was a purely Jewish institution, and is not binding upon Christians.

It is on all hands admitted that the Mosaic laws include two

elements, the one designed especially for the Jews, the other designed for all men. Some of the laws of Moses bound the Jews as Jews, and therefore only Jews; others bound them as men, and therefore all men. The abrogation of the Old Testament economy, with all that was ceremonial, typical, and national, left what was moral and universal untouched. The commands, Thou shalt have no other gods before me; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not covet, are not swept away because the law of Moses is abolished. The only question is, what part of the Mosaic institutions was temporary and national, and what part is permanent and universal? In some cases, as in those just cited, the answer to this question is easy. In others it is more or less difficult. And it is to be admitted that very great evils have arisen from transferring temporary rules and principles from the national economy of the Old Testament, to the catholic economy of the New. Christianity has thus, in different forms, been corrupted by a Judaizing spirit. Whether the Sabbath belongs to the class of temporary Jewish institutions, or was designed to be permanent and universal, is therefore the question. We must here, however, repeat the remark already twice made. It is not so much the truth in this matter, as the faith of the general body of Christians we are to inquire after. Even if Mr. Fisher were right in his confident assertion that the Sabbath was a purely Jewish ordinance, still if the Christians of this country are of a contrary conviction, it is unreasonable to expect them to violate their sense of duty because some men think them mistaken. That the Christian world does consider the Sabbatical law of perpetual obligation is obvious from two notorious facts. The whole Christian world observe that law. All classes of Christians (with exceptions too inconsiderable to be taken into account) do observe every seventh day, as a day for religious worship. This is done, indeed, by different churches and persons with different degrees of strictness. But the same may be said with regard to everything else which belongs to Christians as such. It is undeniably true that the whole Christian world, whether Greek, Latin, or Protestant, comprising ninety-nine hundredths of all who bear the Christian name, do observe one day in seven for Divine worship, and have done so

from the beginning. This has not been done by accident, or from motives of convenience or expediency. That precisely one day in seven, and not one in six, eight, or ten, has been thus universally observed, is proof positive of its being regarded as a Divine institution. If in any case the rule, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, can be applied with certainty, it is to this. But there is another proof of this point. The Decalogue is incorporated into the liturgical or catechetical formulas of all the great divisions of the Christian church. The Greeks, the Latins, and all Protestants, who have a liturgy, repeat the ten commandments from Sabbath to Sabbath. In their worship the minister says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" and the people answer, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law;" and at the end of the repetition of the Decalogue, they say, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and write these thy laws in our hearts, we beseech thee." Here then is the testimony, uttered in the ears of God, and before all men, of the whole Christian world to their faith in the continued obligation of the fourth commandment. This being so, what Mr. Fisher or those who agree with him, have to say to the contrary, is of very little account. If Christians are to be allowed to act according to their faith, they must be allowed to keep the Sabbath, which with one voice they pray God to incline their hearts to do. And if, as even Mr. Fisher admits, there must be a principle to determine national as well as individual conduct, then Christian states must obey the law which Christian men believe binds them with the authority of God.

But it is important to inquire into the grounds on which Christians proceed in separating the permanent from the temporary in the Jewish institutions. If we observe the Sabbath, why do we not observe other festivals and rites enjoined in the Old Testament? There are three principles or criteria of discrimination. First: when any command was given before the time of Moses, and not addressed to the chosen people as such, but to all mankind, then it is certain that such command forms no part of the peculiar institutions of the Jews. Whether it was intended to be of permanent as well as universal obligation, is to be otherwise determined. The offering of sacrifices was

anterior to the Mosaic period, and was no doubt a Divine institution designed for all men; but being typical, it ceased to be obligatory when the great antitypical Sacrifice had been presented on the cross. Second: when the reason assigned for any command is permanent and universal, then the command itself is permanently and universally obligatory. The ground of the commands, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet, is nothing in the relation of one Jew to another, but the permanent relations of men. Those commands, therefore, do not bind Jews as Jews, but men as men. The command to worship God and not to worship idols, was not founded on any peculiar relation which the Hebrews bore to God, but on the relation which all rational creatures bear to their Creator. Therefore those laws can never be abrogated. Thirdly: when any command in the Old Testament is recognized by Christ and his apostles as obligatory on their disciples, it becomes a part of the law which binds all Christians. Thus the original law of marriage was adopted by our Lord, and is permanently obligatory upon all who recognize his authority.

It is the application of these criteria which has convinced the Christian world that the command to consecrate every seventh day to the worship of God and the duties of religion, is of permanent and universal obligation. From the beginning of the world, long before the time of Moses, and therefore for all mankind, God sanctified the seventh day, that is, separated it from an ordinary to a sacred use. This is the plain meaning of the sacred text. "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work." Gen. ii. 3. This occurs in the account of the creation. It asserts the fact that God blessed or sanctified the seventh day from the beginning. To make this passage mean that the fact that God rested on the seventh day was the reason why, thousands of years afterwards, it was set apart as a day of rest, is to do obvious violence to the text. The language used in Exod. xx. 11, plainly teaches that the Sabbath was instituted from the beginning. "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." The reason assigned for blessing the day was a

reason which existed from the creation. This view of these passages is confirmed by the consideration that the necessity for the Sabbath was a common necessity. Whether considered as a day of rest from labour, or as a day set apart for the worship of God, it was as important before, as after the time of Moses. Besides this, we have the clearest evidence, in the history of the deluge, that time was then divided into periods of seven days. For this, no satisfactory reason can be given other than the original institution of the Sabbath. Seven is not an equal part either of the period of one revolution of the moon around the earth, or of the earth round the sun. There is nothing in nature to indicate this division of time, or to account for its early introduction. This, too, accounts for the wide prevalence of septenary observances, and for the sacredness so widely attached to the number seven. To account for these facts from the worship of the seven planets, is not only arbitrary, but unsatisfactory. There is no evidence that the knowledge of the seven planets existed at that early period, much less that the worship of them prevailed before the deluge. The hypothesis of the institution of the Sabbath at the beginning, which is demanded by the simple meaning of the sacred text, and confirmed by the considerations just stated, is consistent with all the facts of the case. It is indeed objected that we find no mention of the institution in the subsequent chapters of the book of Genesis. This, however, is not surprising, considering the brevity and the object of that sketch of the early history of the world. There is no mention of the Sabbath in Joshua, Judges, First or Second Samuel, although so solemnly enjoined by Moses. No special instance of the practice of circumcision is recorded as having occurred from the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan to the time of Christ. The mere silence of the brief scriptural narratives therefore proves nothing. Neither is the fact that the Sabbath is said to have been commemorative of the deliverance of the people from Egypt, and a sign of the covenant between them and Jehovah, inconsistent with its institution in paradise. It was designed to answer many purposes; to keep in mind the creation of the world; to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt; and to typify the rest which remains for the people of God.

An institution originally of Divine appointment, which the nations had neglected, and therefore sunk into idolatry, was, as Nehemiah says, ix. 14, "made known" by the hand of Moses; and being thus reinstituted and enforced by additional considerations, became a distinguishing mark between the Jews and the other nations of the earth. Although thus communicated anew to the people, it would appear from Exod. xvi. 23, that it was not unknown to the chosen people. Other nations had neglected it, but the knowledge of such a day, although they have been remiss in its observance, lingered among the Hebrews. This appears from the fact that Moses, in giving directions in regard to gathering the manna, before any new command on the subject, enjoined on the people to collect a double quantity on the sixth day, for "the seventh, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none."

Of all classes of Protestant Christians, those who stand at the greatest remove from Brownists or Puritans, to whom Mr. Fisher refers the doctrine of the perpetuity of the law of the Sabbath, are the High-church, or Anglican, party in England, and the Lutheran element of the united church of Prussia. The celebrated Dr. Hook, vicar of Leeds, a representative of the former, in his Church Dictionary, labours at length to show that "one day in seven was in the beginning dedicated to the service of the Almighty." He says that Gen. ii. 3, proves that one day in seven was sanctified, or "set apart for a religious purpose." He teaches that this rule was given to Adam, and was "binding not on a chosen few, but upon all his descendants." As a representative of the latter class, we refer to Huebner, Professor in Wittenberg. In his edition of Büchner's Exegetisch-homiletisches Lexicon, he maintains, that the Sabbath was instituted in paradise, and says the observance of such a day "is plainly no local or temporary command, but an original necessity of the spiritual nature of man; he must suppress all aspiration after the heavenly and invisible, and sink into the earthly, and even the brutal, without the Sabbath." These are men of our day, not of the age in which witches were hung, and Quakers persecuted. It will not do, therefore, to attribute to any such age or spirit, the doctrine of the primitive institution and permanent obligation of this holy day.

The second criterion leads to the same conclusion. The reason for the Sabbath is permanent, and therefore the institution is permanent. That reason as given in Genesis, in the Decalogue, and most frequently through the Bible, is nothing in the peculiar or national relation of the Hebrews to God, but the relation which men as rational creatures bear to their Creator. On the same ground, therefore, that the other precepts of the Decalogue, founded on the permanent relations of men, either to God or to each other, are of necessity regarded as binding all men in all times, the Sabbath which is placed on a similar foundation, must be considered as permanently and universally obligatory. Men are bound to worship God. They are bound to do this socially as well as privately. This worship is a necessity of their spiritual nature. It is essential to the healthful development of their powers, to the formation of character, to their well-being in this world, and their salvation in the next. Without the stated public worship of God, men lose the knowledge of his existence, and all sense of obligation. Enlightened piety gives place to superstition, fanaticism, or irreligion. Men become debased and society utterly demoralized. The institution of the Sabbath was designed to preserve the knowledge of God, and the power of religion among men.* It is God's means to that end, and wherever it has been unknown or neglected, idolatry or false religion has always prevailed. The ground on which the Sabbath rests being, therefore, an abiding necessity of our nature, common to all men, the institution itself cannot be regarded as a temporary Jewish ordinance.

The third criterion by which to determine whether any institution of the Old Testament was intended to be permanent, is the manner in which it is treated in the New Testament. If it is there represented as belonging to the old economy, it is no longer in force, but, if it is recognized as still binding, it becomes a permanent law of the Christian church. On this principle all the precepts of the Old Testament founded in the

* Mr. Fisher quotes, and afterwards refers to, with evident approbation, the suggestion that the Sabbath was instituted to relieve the sore feet of the Jews during their toilsome journey through the wilderness. So low as that may men get in this nineteenth century!

essential and necessary relations of man to God, or on the permanent relations of society, are in the New Testament either expressly enjoined, or clearly recognized as of permanent obligation. Thus, while the Mosaic law itself, with all its peculiar enactments and penalties, all its rites and its ceremonies, its temple-service and ritual, is declared to be abolished; the prohibition of the worship of false gods, and of all forms of idolatry, is reiterated; all precepts relating to the relative duties of men as fellow-creatures, as husbands and wives, as parents and children, as magistrates and citizens, are recognized as still in force. Now with regard to the Sabbath, we find, in the first place, not the slightest intimation that it was regarded as a temporary institution. The various festivals of the Jews, *their* Sabbaths, their new moons, their great days of convocation and atonement, are declared to have passed away, as shadows of good things which had already come. But the original command anterior to the law of Moses, to separate one day in the week from worldly avocations, and to set it apart to the worship of God, is never in any way set aside. In like manner the Jewish law of marriage, with its death penalty, its permission of polygamy and arbitrary divorce, is abrogated. But the original law of marriage is re-enacted and declared to be of perpetual obligation. The abrogation, therefore, of the Jewish Sabbath, with its death penalty, its peculiar services and regulations, leaves the original law of the Sabbath untouched.

In the second place, besides this negative argument, we have abundant evidence that the original law was regarded as permanently obligatory. Our Lord on various occasions, by word and act, taught that the view of the Sabbath entertained by the Jews of his day was erroneous, but he never taught that the Sabbath itself was to be set aside. He taught that it was right to do good, to supply the cravings of hunger, and the like, on the Sabbath; but he never taught that it was right to make the day one of labour or recreation. His doctrine was that the "Sabbath was made for man, (not for the Jews) and not man for the Sabbath." It was designed to promote the physical and spiritual interests of men, and was not to be observed in any way which would sacrifice the end to the

means. With regard to sacrifices, it was not merely the spirit and manner in which they were offered, but the sacrifices themselves which were set aside or condemned; whereas it was not the Sabbath itself, but the mode of its observance that our Lord objected to. He sanctioned the religious observance of the day by attending the synagogue services; just as he sanctioned marriage by his attendance on the wedding at Cana. Christ and his apostles also on various occasions gave their sanction to the Decalogue as a permanent rule of duty. They quote it as a whole, and command that it should be obeyed. That was the law which could not be broken. The decisive fact, however, is, that the whole Christian church, under the guidance of Christ and his apostles, have from the beginning acted on the assumption that the original law requiring one day in seven to be consecrated to God is permanently and universally binding. All Christians, as before remarked, have incorporated the Decalogue, including the fourth commandment, into their standards of faith and practice. The law of the Sabbath, therefore, is written as by the finger of God on the heart and conscience of the Christian world.

The change of the day is merely circumstantial. Any day may be the seventh, according to the mode of ordering the succession. There was a reason why the seventh in the Jewish mode of numbering the days, should be observed by them, because the creation was the thing to be specially commemorated. There is a reason why the first day of the week should be the sacred day of Christians, because the new creation, the work of restoring a ruined world, is the thing we are most interested in bearing in mind. This change of the day was not made arbitrarily, or by human authority. It was made by inspired men, as is proved by the designation of the first day of the week, in the New Testament itself, as the Lord's day, and by the observance of that day by the apostles and early Christians. This circumstantial change in no way interferes with the original command. All the permanent and salutary designs of the institution are answered by the observance of the first, as well as by the observance of the seventh day of the week. It is still one day in seven; and this is the substance of the original law.

The fourth, and by far the most effective objection, so far as the popular mind is concerned, against the Sunday laws, is, that they are, as the "Free Germans" express it, a violation of the constitutional rights and religious liberty of the people. It is assumed that the separation between the church and state which prevails universally in this country, and the provision, found in most of our State Constitutions, that no man shall be molested for his religious principles, and no religious profession shall be required as a qualification for office, forbid the enactment of such laws. Those who do not believe in the Sabbath, or even in Christianity, Jews, and infidels of every grade, say they have precisely the same rights under the Constitution as any Protestant Christian. If a man chooses to labour or to dance on the Lord's day, no one has the right to interfere with him. And if any set of men choose to run their cars, or steamboats on that day, it is declared to be an act of injustice for the government to prevent it.

In reference to this plausible objection we would say, 1. That this is a Christian and Protestant country. 2. That the people have not only the right, but are bound in conscience, to act on the principles of Protestant Christianity, not only in their capacity of individuals, but as a government, in all cases in which such Christianity affords a rule for individual or governmental action. 3. That in so acting, no violence is offered to any man's constitutional rights or natural liberty.

These are not new principles for this Journal to maintain. They have been repeatedly asserted in their application to the introduction of religious teaching into our public schools. They are developed in a masterly manner, (as we may be permitted to say,) in a communication to the pages of this number of our Review. With the principles contained in the article referred to, we heartily concur, although we may differ from our able contributor, as to the extent to which our national and state governments have in point of fact denuded themselves of their rights as Christian organizations. We propose to explain and vindicate, as briefly as possible, each of the principles just stated.

First: This is a Protestant and Christian country. This does not mean merely that the great majority of the people are

Protestant Christians. This is indeed a most important, as it is an undeniable fact. Take out of the country all who profess Protestant Christianity, and you take out of it its heart, soul, life, and essence. Still this is not a question of numbers. Turkey is a Mohammedan country, although the Christians may outnumber the Moslems. Nor does the proposition above stated mean simply that the controlling legislative and executive power in this country is in the hands of Protestant Christians. Ireland is a Celtic Roman Catholic country in spite of the domination of Saxon and Protestant England. But it means that the organic life of the country is that form of social, political, and religious life, which is peculiar to Protestant Christianity. As every tree or plant, every race of animals, so every nation has its own organic life. If you plant an acorn it develops into an oak; and as it grows it assimilates or eliminates all that comes within the sphere of its activity. So if you take a number of Chinese as a nucleus of a nation, as they multiply and form themselves into a self-governing community, not only their physical organization, but their whole individual, social, religious, municipal, and political life, is of necessity, or by a Divine law, conformed to that peculiar type. Of course the same would be true of any number of English or Frenchmen. The greater the distinction of races, the more marked the difference in the manifestations of the organic life of different communities. An African or Asiatic nation differs more from an European one, than one European nation from another. Every nation, however, has its peculiar character and usages, the product and manifestation of its organic life. This country is no exception to this law. It was originally constituted by Protestant Christians. They were not only the first settlers, but they constituted almost the only element of our population for the first hundred years of our history, which was the forming period of our national existence. These progenitors of our country being Protestant Christians, not only each for himself worshipped God, and his Son Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world, and acknowledged the Scriptures to be the rule of his faith and practice; but he introduced his religion into his family. He associated with others for the public service of God. The people abstained

from all ordinary business on the Lord's day, and devoted it to religion. They built churches, erected schools, taught the children to read and obey the Bible as the word of God. They formed themselves as Christians into municipal and state organizations. They acknowledged God in their legislative assemblies; they prescribed oaths in his name; they closed their courts, their places of business, their legislatures, and all places under public control on the Lord's day. They declared the common law of England, of which Christianity is the basis, to be the law of the land. In this way we grew to be a Protestant Christian nation, by the same general law that an acorn becomes an oak. When emigrants who were neither Protestants nor Christians come to the country, they were either perfectly assimilated and absorbed, as the rivulets which flow into the Mississippi are lost in its mighty waters; or, from want of congeniality, they mingle with us, but are not completely of us; as a branch of one kind of tree may be engrafted upon a tree of a different kind, without altering the nature of the sustaining stem. Sometimes the difference is so great as to forbid even this partial assimilation; and these uncongenial elements become warts and excrescenses on the body politic. This is the case with the Indians, the Mormons, and the Chinese in California. It is with our religions as it is with our ethnical development. The great majority of the settlers in this country were from Great Britain. They brought with them the English language, English literature, laws, ideas, feelings, and domestic and social usages. They grew up, therefore, essentially an English people, and they so remain to this day. The accession to our population from other sources, does not change our ethnical character. Our language, laws, and institutions are as much English as they were a hundred years ago. Germans, French, Irish, Norwegians, and Danes, in the course of a generation or two, are merged indistinguishably into the mass of the English speaking and English feeling population. Not less palpable is the Protestant Christian character of our nation. It is what it is because it is the development of a germ of Protestant Christianity. This is an outstanding historical fact. It cannot be changed by denying it, by pooh-poohing it, or by cursing it. There stands an oak, because an acorn was

planted. And we stand a Protestant Christian nation, because God planted Protestant Christians as the national germ on this western continent. The sense, therefore, in which we understand this to be a Protestant Christian country is, that its organic life, that which gives it being and character, and determines its acts and destiny, is Protestant Christianity. By Protestant Christianity is meant that form of religion which acknowledges Jesus Christ, as God manifest in the flesh, to be the absolute, sovereign and only Saviour of men, and which takes the Bible, as his word, to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and protests against all human authority in matters of religion.

The second proposition stated above, is, that the people of this country have the right, and are in conscience bound to act on the principles of Protestant Christianity, not only in their capacity as individuals, but as a government, in all cases in which Christianity affords a rule for individual or governmental action.

This seems almost a self-evident truth. Christianity is a law of life; a law of Divine authority; it binds the conscience, it must therefore be obeyed by those who profess to be Christians. They must obey it as men, as heads of families, as magistrates, as citizens, as legislators and executive officers. They cannot deliberately violate any of its injunctions without doing violence to their own conscience, and forfeiting their allegiance to God. If they believe that Christianity forbids war, they cannot, as a government, declare war, or permit it to be prosecuted by those under their control. A nation of Quakers could not maintain a navy, or organize an army. By so doing, they would forfeit their character as Quakers, and all the benefits and blessings therewith connected. If a set of men believe in God and the moral law, it is self-evident that they must obey that law, not only as individuals, but in all the associations into which they may enter. If they form themselves into a manufacturing, or banking, or railroad company, they cannot, in that capacity, do what they believe the moral law forbids. If they cannot deceive or defraud as individuals, neither can they do it as a society. If they are bound to keep the Sabbath in their families, they are bound to keep it in their

workshops and banking-houses. It would help them very little at the bar of conscience, or at the bar of God, to say that a railroad company was organized for secular purposes, and had nothing to do with questions of morals; that those are matters to be left to every man's own conscience and to God. The man who was at once a prince and a bishop, could not get drunk as a prince, and be sober as a bishop. The principle here asserted is so clear that men who occupy the low platform presented in Mr. Fisher's book cannot deny it. Even he admits, as we have seen, that there must be a principle not only for the control of individual, but also governmental action. He and many others say, "the inner light," or every man's sense of truth and justice, is such a principle. This is giving up the whole controversy, for it admits that men must act in matters of government in obedience to what they believe to be the will of God; and therefore as the people of this country believe the Bible to be a revelation of the will of God, they must, in their governmental capacity act in obedience to the Bible. If the Bible forbids polygamy, they cannot sanction it. If the Bible prohibits arbitrary divorce, they cannot allow a man to put away his wife whenever he pleases. If the Scriptures enjoin the religious observance of one day in seven, they cannot, as a government, profane that day and be guiltless.

No one denies that men are bound to recognize the authority of the moral law in their governmental acts, that for a nation to authorize or to permit, within its jurisdiction, theft, rapine, or murder, is as atrocious as for an individual man to be guilty of these crimes. No one would dare to rise in a legislative body, and propose that such offences should be sanctioned or overlooked. No one, therefore, can reasonably deny that Christians are bound to recognize the authority of Christianity in their governmental acts. They must do it. It may be said that these cases are not parallel, because the precepts of the moral law are obeyed by governments, not as moral duties, but out of regard to the public good. This is not true. It is impossible that men with a moral nature, should not act under a sense of moral obligation. All public men are loud in their declarations that they favour or oppose certain measures because they are right or wrong, just or unjust. But even if it

were possible for men to deny their moral nature, and to act always and only from selfish motives of expediency, this would not alter the case. It is expedient to obey God. If he has enjoined the observance of the Sabbath, all who recognize his authority, will feel that it is expedient, best for the interests of society, that the day should be observed. What, however, we now desire to insist upon, is the absolute impossibility of Christians ignoring their Christianity in their governmental acts. They can no more do it than they can ignore their reason or their moral nature.

But suppose they could do it, what would be the consequence? What would be the effect of carrying out the principle that religion has nothing to do with human governments, that it has no right to control their acts? Or, to state the question in a different form, what would be the consequence of adopting the principle that human governments have nothing to do with religion, and need not concern themselves whether their enactments violate the principles of Christianity or not? The first consequence of adopting this principle would be that all the Christians of the country would be disfranchised. Suppose our governments, municipal, state, and national, were to act as though there were no such thing as Christianity, or as if it had no right to determine their action. Then, as in Mohammedan or Pagan countries, all public business would go on on Sundays as on other days; all courts would continue in session, all public offices would be open; all town-councils, state legislatures, and both houses of Congress would sit without interruption on the Lord's day. It is plain, therefore, that no Christian could be a lawyer or judge, nor an office-holder of any kind, nor a member of town-council, or of a state legislature, or of Congress. The whole legislative, executive and judicial power in city, state, and nation, would be thrown into the hands of Jews, infidels, and atheists. We should have a test act of a novel character. Not religion, but irreligion would be demanded as a necessary qualification for every post of trust or power. This is the kind of liberty and equality which our "Free Germans" and Fisherites would establish in the land. This is inevitable. He that will not bow to God, must bow to Satan. There is no help for it. If we banish

religion as a controlling power, we thereby establish atheism. If we extinguish light, we introduce darkness. And for a man to profess that his object is simply to banish the light, and not at all to bring in darkness, will deceive nobody who has sense enough to understand the meaning of words.

A second consequence of divorcing Christianity from government, no less inevitable than the one just mentioned, would be that all laws which have their foundation in the Christian religion must be abrogated. Take, for illustration, the laws relating to marriage. The doctrine that marriage is a contract for life between one man and one woman, is peculiarly a Christian doctrine. It is not a Jewish, a Mohammedan, or Pagan doctrine. It cannot be said to have its foundation in natural religion, nor in the nature of man, nor in expediency. It is, indeed, the original law given before the introduction of Christianity. It is, no doubt, consonant to the higher nature of man, and necessary to the best interests of society. But these are not the foundations on which it rests. It is founded on the authority of Christ. It is received and obeyed because he has enacted it. It is the doctrine of the Christian church; and is observed and held sacred only by those who recognize Christ's authority. In other words, it is peculiar to Christian lands, and is purely a Christian institution. If, then, the government has nothing to do with religion; if Christians in their governmental capacity are not to be controlled by Christianity, then they have no right to enforce the Christian law of marriage. Any man who may choose to have more than one wife, or to put away one, and take another, may plead his natural right, and put in the plea, that government has no religion, and cannot enact laws to favour any one religious doctrine to the disadvantage of another. To this plea no answer can be made, according to the doctrine against which we are contending. If one man's religion justifies polygamy, and another condemns it, the government, according to that doctrine, has no right to interfere. If it cannot enforce the Christian law concerning the Sabbath, it cannot enforce the Christian law concerning marriage. The advocates of "free-love," have, therefore, the anti-Sabbatarians on their side, so far as the principle is concerned.

A third consequence of the theory in question would be that

government can make no law to punish vice. We have before remarked that if deists may drive Christians to the wall, and insist that the Bible shall not be taken as a rule of life to control the action of the government, the atheists may turn their own weapons against the deists, and say that the government must not recognize the authority of natural religion, or of the moral law. It must not exact an oath, because an oath implies not only the existence, but the providential government of God, and a future state of retribution. Thus this great safeguard of life, reputation, and property, must be swept away. What right has a government divorced from religion to exact an oath, which is an act of worship, as a condition of holding office, or receiving testimony? This principle, however, would carry us much further; not only must oaths be abolished, but the moral law must be set aside. If it is unconstitutional to act in obedience to the Bible, it is unconstitutional to act in obedience to the moral law. If one man has a right to say, I am an infidel, and you cannot require me to regard the Sabbath; another may say, I am an atheist, and you have no right to make me obey the decalogue. You say that the interests of society require that the moral law should be obeyed; I say, replies the atheist, that what you call the moral law is a bugbear, set up by priests to answer their own ends. So far from promoting the interests of society, it is the prolific source of all the evils under which society has groaned for ages. Necessity is the plea of tyrants. The church in the darkest ages never ceased to say she burned heretics for the good of society. No man, or set of men, has the right to set up their "inner light," or sense of "truth and justice," as a rule of life for others. This is only carrying out to its legitimate conclusions the principle on which the Sunday laws are now so vigorously assailed. So far, therefore, from admitting that Christianity must be divorced from the government, we maintain that such divorce is impossible. If Christianity is a rule of life, it must go with us into our families, into our schools, our prisons and hospitals; into our workshops and banking houses, into railroad and canal companies, into our municipal councils, and state and national legislatures. We maintain that if this principle be denied, all Christians must be disfran-

chised; infidelity or atheism must be a condition of office and power; not only our Sunday laws must be given up, but all religion must be banished from our public institutions of every kind. No man can enter the navy or army but on the condition that he renounces all claim to the public worship of God. We must send forth our ships and troops without chaplains, and let our fellow-citizens live and die as heathen. In short, the demand that the government shall not be administered on Christian principles, is a demand that it shall be administered on atheistic principles. The absolute negation of religion is atheism.

The third proposition laid down above, is, that there is no violation of any man's constitutional rights, or of his civil and religious liberty involved, in making the Bible the rule of individual and governmental action in this country.

Our readers will not overlook the limitation attached to our second proposition. We said that Christians have the right, and are bound in conscience to act on the principles of Protestant Christianity in administering the affairs of government, so far as Christianity affords a rule of governmental action. Christianity enjoins on us certain truths to be believed, and certain laws to be obeyed, as men. It does not prescribe any particular form of civil government, nor any definite principles of political economy. It does not invest civil government with authority over the faith of its subjects, nor over the performance of their religious duties. It simply requires that Christians, in all their relations and associations, should have reference to the law of God as revealed in his word, as their rule of action. Carrying out this principle is perfectly consistent with the widest liberty consistent with the existence of human society.

If a number of Christians should associate to carry on any mercantile or manufacturing business, requiring the outlay of large capital, and the employment of many assistants and subordinates, they would, of course, conduct their business on Christian principles. That is, they would feel bound not only to be just, and faithful in all their transactions, but they would suspend all their operations on the Lord's day, afford their employees the opportunity to attend public worship, provide

for the education of minors and dependents, and act towards them in all respects as Christ would require at their hands. If a man not a Christian, whether Jew or deist, or an utter sceptic, should propose to join their company, they might receive him into partnership on terms of perfect equality; give him a full share in the profits of the business, and equal right in its management. If this new partner should become infected with the modern ideas of liberty, and say to his associates, I have as much right to control the business of the company as you have, the property is as much mine as yours, you have no right to bring your religion into a business concern. I insist upon it, that our operations shall not be suspended on the first day of the week, that no part of the property shall be used for religious purposes; let the parents of the children whom we employ, see to their religious training. I maintain that we must conduct our business without regard to the Bible, or anything which it enjoins. His associates would doubtless say to him, Then we must dissolve partnership. You knew we were Christians when you joined us. You knew that we could neither work ourselves on the Sabbath, nor allow our mills to run, or our workshops to be open. If you choose to work on that day, that is your own concern. But you have no right to require that our property shall be employed on the Lord's day; that our clerks, porters, or mechanics, should labour for your accommodation. You have no right to demand that a man must be willing to disregard the Sabbath as the condition of being taken into our employ. God moreover holds us responsible, not only for the physical comfort, but for the proper Christian education of the children dependent upon us. If you cannot remain with us, unless we conduct our business on infidel principles, you must transfer your capital and talents elsewhere. On the same ground that you require that we should disregard our Christianity, another man may come in and require you to disregard the moral law.

The same answer the Christians of this country give all classes of men, who demand that Christianity should be divorced from our governments, municipal, state, and national. This country was settled by Protestant Christians. They possessed the land. They established its institutions. They formed

themselves into towns, states, and nation. From the nature of the case, regarding the Bible as the word of God binding the conscience of every man with Divine authority, they were governed by it in all their organizations, whether for business or civil polity. Others have since come into the country by thousands; some Papists, some Jews, some infidels, some atheists. All were welcomed; all are admitted to equal rights and privileges. All are allowed to acquire property, to vote in all elections, made eligible to all offices, and invested with an equal influence in all public concerns. All are allowed to worship as they please, or not at all if they please. No man is molested for his religion or for his want of religion. No man is required to profess any particular form of faith, or to join any religious association. Is not this liberty enough? It seems not. Our "Free Germans" and other anti-Sabbatarians insist upon it, that we must turn infidels, give up our God, our Saviour, and our Bibles, so far as all public or governmental action is concerned. They require that the joint stock into which they have been received as partners, and in which they constitute even numerically a very small minority, should be conducted according to their principles and not according to ours. They demand, not merely that they may be allowed to disregard the Sabbath, but that the public business must go on on that day; that all public servants must be employed; all public property, highways, and railroads, should be used. They say we must not pray in our legislative bodies, or have chaplains in our hospitals, prisons, navy, or army; that we must not introduce the Bible into our public schools, or do anything in a public capacity which implies that we are Protestant Christians. Those men do not know what Protestant Christians are. It is their characteristic, as they humbly hope and believe, to respect the rights of other men, and stand up for their own. And, therefore, they say to all—infidels and atheists—to all who demand that the Bible shall not be the rule of action for us as individuals, and as a government, You ask what it is impossible can be granted. We must obey God. We must carry our religion into our families, our workshops, our banking-houses, our municipal and other governments; and if you cannot live with Christians, you must go elsewhere.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Ancient Church: its History, Doctrine, Worship, and Constitution, traced for the first Three Hundred Years. By W. D. Killen, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859, pp. 656. 8vo.

SINCE a portion of this number was in type we have received this noble volume, which we welcome both as an additional and interesting proof of intellectual activity in our mother-church, and as a further bond of union with ourselves, by tending to promote the knowledge and the love of our common principles and institutions. We are glad to learn from the prefatory notice, that the prompt appearance of the work is owing to the liberal encouragement received from a New York publisher, an office-bearer in our own communion. This edition, although published in New York, is from the famous press of Ballantyne in Edinburgh, and will, no doubt, attract many by its sumptuous and almost immaculate typography. In keeping with this external dress is the simple and transparent style, sometimes rising into chastened but impressive eloquence. We are also justified, even by a cursory inspection, in giving the work credit for the more substantial qualities of solid learning, iron industry, and sound Presbyterian principle. The author appears equally familiar with the ancient and the modern literature of the subject. While he draws directly from original authorities and sources, there are few recent works, either English or German, which have any bearing on his theme, that are not quoted or referred to in the margin. Even where the facts are perfectly familiar, it is really refreshing to encounter them, expressed in native English, and in good old Presbyterian phraseology. But over and above these merits which will no doubt give the work, though somewhat costly, an extensive circulation, it contains original and novel views, especially in reference to the genesis of Prelacy, and the genuineness of the writings of Ignatius, upon which it would neither be respectful to the author, nor expedient for ourselves to pass a hasty, unpremeditated judgment.

The Greek Testament: with a critically revised text: a Digest of various readings: marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage: prolegomena: and a critical and exegetical Commentary. For the use of Theological Students and Ministers. By Henry Alford, M. A., Vicar of Wymeswold, Leicestershire, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. [Now D.D., and Dean of Canterbury.] London. Vols. I.—IV. 1849–1859. 8vo.

The Greek Testament with English Notes. By the Rev. Edward Burton, D. D., some time Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity. Fourth edition. Oxford, 1852. 8vo.

The Greek Testament with Notes Grammatical and Exegetical. By William Webster, M. A., Assistant Master in King's College School, late Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge; and William Francis Wilkinson, M. A., Vicar of St. Werburgh's, Derby, late Theological Tutor of Cheltenham College. Vol. I. containing the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. London, 1855. 8vo.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the Original Greek: with Notes. By Chr. Wordsworth, D. D., Canon of Westminster. Parts I.—III. 1856–1859. London. Small folio.

It is greatly to the credit of the Church and Universities of England, that they have maintained the study of the original New Testament as an indispensable prerequisite, not only to ordination, but to graduation. Hence the large space occupied by this one subject in the College lectures and examinations, both at Cambridge and Oxford. Hence, too, the multitude of books upon this part of Scripture, originating at the University, but often carried on amidst the pressure of parochial duty, and completed after the attainment of cathedral dignities. The four works named above are probably but samples of a whole class published within the last ten years. The authors are all Anglican clergymen, and have been Fellows at Oxford or Cambridge; one a Regius Professor of Divinity, and two now holding high positions in the ancient chapters of Canterbury and Westminster. When we add that Dr. Trench, another labourer in the same field, although not in the same form, is at the head of one of these establishments, as Dr. Alford is at that of the other, we have said enough to show how zealously this part of biblical learning is cultivated in the highest places of the English church, at least since Lord Palmerston began to fill them with incumbents really distinguished for professional accomplishments, as well as personal character. The earlier works of this class, (such as Bloomfield's, Valpy's, Trollope's, and a host of others) had a peculiar English type of scholarship and exposition, derived from the usage of the great schools, and the universities, and much more grammatical than theological, or even historical. This was partly owing to the want of thorough theological training in the Church of England, which has made

the classical attainments of its members far less useful, than they might be in the exposition of the Scriptures. Within a few years this prescriptive usage has been greatly modified by German influence, which, in some cases, has extended even to the inspiration of the books. In others, it has generated an obscure and mystical doctrine, neither orthodox nor infidel, and not very easily defined or apprehended. One peculiar English fashion, still adhered to in the works before us, is the constant publication of the Greek text in an elegant and costly style, to which the notes are mere appendages, frequently (as in the case of Burton's) bearing but a small proportion to the text. The editors never seem to dream of the student's being already in possession of the Greek text, and requiring only something to assist him in the study of it. Thus a young clergyman, or candidate for orders, who desired to avail himself of all these recent helps, would be under the necessity of purchasing four sumptuous editions of the text, at a price which in America amounts to a prohibition. This showy style of publication, without any regard to cheapness, or the circumstances of the class of readers most immediately interested, seems to indicate that in England learning is still rather a luxury than a necessary of life. The evil in the present case is aggravated by the fact, that all the valuable matter in these volumes might be readily reduced to one. Under this description we do not include Alford's ostentatious *apparatus criticus*, which occupies a space entirely disproportioned to its value, and is not regarded as authoritative out of England. Both these expensive features are retained in the American edition, which is thereby put beyond the reach of most American students. This is the less to be regretted as the work is far more showy than substantial, deriving its chief value from a hasty deglutition, rather than digestion, of the latest German books, and often giving signs of what in England is expressively called "cramming." The author's judgment is, at best, by no means his most shining gift, and is never more at fault than when he is most positive; as, for instance, in his scornful treatment of all harmonizing methods not exactly in accordance with his own foregone conclusion, which is itself nowhere clearly or distinctly stated. By far the best part of this work is to be found in the Introductions, where a great amount of useful information is laboriously compiled, and conveniently arranged. In other respects, we think it less deserving of republication than the other works which we have here associated with it, and especially than Canon Wordsworth's, which displays far more original ability and varied learning, with a

higher or, at least, a clearer doctrine as to inspiration, and the harmony of Scripture. The other two works are of less pretension, and less real merit, although full of valuable matter, and impressed with the peculiar stamp of English scholarship and mental culture. We sincerely wish that what is really important in these four works, and some others of the same class, could, with the authors' leave, be put within the reach of the American student at a reasonable price, without the needless repetition of the text, and the vain show of critical elaboration.

The Greek Testament Roots, in a selection of texts, giving the power of reading the whole Greek Testament without difficulty. With Grammatical Notes, and a Parsing, Lexicon, associating the Greek Primitives with English Derivatives. By G. K. Gillespie, A. M. London, 1858. 12mo.

This is another fruit of the attention paid to the Greek Testament in England as a necessary part of education. It is not a labour-saving substitute for regular grammatical study, which it presupposes and endeavours to assist, by a novel and ingenious plan sufficiently indicated in the title. In addition to the matter thus described there are two long notes, one giving a new explanation of the apocalyptic number (666,) and the other vindicating the new word *telegram*, as no less regular and legitimate in its formation than the classical and well known terms *parallelogram* and *monogram*.

The Revival of the French Emperorship anticipated from the Necessity of Prophecy. By G. S. Faber, B. D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury. Fifth edition. London, 1859.

This is a republication of a prophecy uttered by the venerable author nearly forty years ago, as the result of his apocalyptic studies. Without referring to the exegetical and polemical details, with which the tract is chiefly filled, we may gratify some readers who have not yet seen it, by transcribing the prophecy itself, originally published in 1818. "On these solid grounds, I deem the future destiny of the *Individual*, who now wears out his hours on a sea-girt rock in the midst of the Atlantic, quite beneath the particular regard of the Prophetic Muse. Whenever the FRENCH EMPERORSHIP is revived, it is less than of the least consequence, whether it be revived by Napoleon himself, or by the son of Napoleon, or by any other military adventurer. THE NAKED FACT OF ITS REVIVAL is, I fear, but too plainly foretold by the Voice of Inspiration; but THE TIME WHEN, and THE PERSON BY WHOM, are alike uncertain." (P. 67.) The italics and capitals are the author's own.

The Principles of English Punctuation, preceded by brief explanations of the Parts of Speech. By George Smallfield. New edition. London, 1852.

This is, in one respect, the best of several recent treatises on punctuation, namely, as the shortest. It is still unknown to multitudes of readers and some writers in this country, that the English punctuation is a uniform and settled system. The proof of this is furnished by the perfect similarity of all the great reviews and other periodicals of England, and indeed of all the better class of publications, except where an unpractised author undertakes to do the work himself, a circumstance immediately detected by a more experienced eye. It is a curious fact, though easily accounted for, that while the uneducated point too little, the tendency of scholars is to point too much, and especially to multiply the comma. This, with the profuse use of the dash, a punctuation which belongs to the newspapers rather than to books, should be carefully avoided by all writers for the press. The remedy for such faults is not the invention of new rules, however plausible, but close adherence to the best contemporary usage, which is so far uniform that most books can be read without observing at the moment whether there are any stops at all.

The Typology of Scripture; Viewed in connection with the entire scheme of the Divine Dispensations. By Patrick Fairbairn, D.D., Professor of Divinity, Free Church College, Glasgow. In two volumes. From the third Edinburgh Edition. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, No. 606 Chestnut Street. 1859. Pp. 399, pp. 451.

There is no material difference between this edition of the Typology and the second. It is already a standard work, with which our readers are well acquainted. It need only be commended to theological students and our younger ministers, as a very valuable work on a most important branch of scriptural interpretation.

The Knowledge of God subjectively considered. Being the second part of Theology considered as a science of positive truth, both inductive and deductive. By Robert J. Breckinridge, D. D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Danville, Kentucky. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Louisville: A. Davidson. 1859. Pp. 697.

Few books from the American press produced so deep an impression on the public mind, as the first volume of this work. Whatever diversity of opinion existed as to its merits in some aspects, it was felt and acknowledged to be a work of extraordinary power, and a noble exposition and vindication of divine truth. It was regarded, indeed, very extensively as rather a series of eloquent discourses or orations on theology, than a

system of theology itself. It is probable the same judgment may be passed on this volume. But should this be true, although it may impair the value of the work as a book for teaching theology, it will probably extend the sphere of its usefulness, by bringing it to bear on a larger class of men than students of theology.

Annals of the American Pulpit; or, Commemorative notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of various denominations, from the early settlement of the country to the close of the year 1855. With Historical Introductions. By William B. Sprague, D.D. Vol. VI. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1860. Pp. 858.

Dr. Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit is probably a work which no other man in our country could have so successfully executed. Not only the excessive labour required, but the catholic spirit and amiable temper, as well as varied mental excellencies necessary for its accomplishment, place such a work beyond the ability of any ordinary man. He has certainly the satisfaction of having executed a most difficult and delicate task, to the general satisfaction of the multitude of readers, whose personal and family feelings, as well as their taste and judgment were to be consulted. These six massive volumes will not only remain a monument of his tact and industry, but a storehouse of interesting and important information to coming generations.

An Exposition of the Apocalypse. By David N. Lord. New and revised edition. New York: Franklin Knight, 348 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 542.

Clearness, force, and confidence are the leading characteristics of all Mr. Lord's writings. He is, therefore, a man formed for a leader, especially through dark and intricate paths. He has chosen such a career for himself, and he is certainly doing a great work. Whether it will stay done, is another question. We suspect that the paths which he is cutting through tangled woods will, in another generation, be overgrown and obliterated, as so many other paths through the same region have already been.

The Great Exemplar: or, The Life of our ever blessed Saviour Jesus Christ. By Jeremy Taylor, D.D., Bishop of Down and Connor. In two volumes. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 489, pp. 388.

There is a difference between "The Life of Christ" and "The Life of our ever blessed Saviour Jesus Christ." This difference in title is indicative of a difference in spirit and design. It is refreshing to turn from the historical, critical,

polemic, or sceptical discussions of the evangelical records, to the devout exposition of their incidents and doctrines; from the dry, matter of fact method of many modern writers on the subject, to the affluent style, the rich and varied imagery, and religious fervour of Jeremy Taylor, the Chrysostom of the English church. This is a book for the cultivated and refined, as well as for the devout. It is an altar of incense to the Lord and Saviour of all Christians.

Memoir of the Rev. James MacGregor, D. D., Missionary of the General Associate Synod of Scotland to Pictou, Nova Scotia; with Notices of the Colonization of the lower provinces of British America, and of the social and religious condition of the early settlers. By his grandson, the Rev. George Patterson, pastor of the Presbyterian congregation at Greenhill, Pictou, Nova Scotia. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, No. 111 South Tenth street, below Chestnut street. 1859. Pp. 533.

Dr. MacGregor was one of the pioneers in the establishment of Presbyterianism in Nova Scotia; a man of apostolic labours and sufferings, and amiable Christian character. The history of his life is the history of an important branch of the church on the American continent during the incipient stages of its career. The work, therefore, has an interest and importance beyond that which attach to the memory of any one man. Mr. Patterson, the grandson of the subject of this memoir, has devoted much labour to the preparation of the work, which is in every way worthy of its subject.

Christ and His Church in the Book of Psalms. By Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, author of the Memoir of the Rev. R. M. McCheyne, etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1860. Pp. 457.

It is an old remark that some men find Christ everywhere in the Old Testament, and some men find him nowhere. The former err in the right direction. Our Lord himself said, Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me. Modern criticism to a great extent proceeds on the assumption that the future was as dark to the prophets of old as to others of their generation, and therefore it admits only of infrequent and indefinite aspirations after a coming deliverer. Such works as this of Mr. Bonar are, therefore, specially seasonable, and important not only to the devout Christian, but to the critical student.

The Immortality of the Soul, and the future condition of the Wicked carefully considered. By Robert W. Landis. New York: Published by Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry street. Pp. 518.

This work is designed as a refutation of the doctrine of the "Annihilationists." It discusses the question in its philosophical, as well as in its scriptural aspect. It, therefore, begins

with the question of materialism, and quotes largely from the statements and argument of the advocates of that system. The writer evinces a range of reading much beyond the ordinary standard, and his work should be cordially welcomed as a defence of important truths.

Expository Thoughts on the Gospels. For Family and Private Use. With the text complete, and many Explanatory Notes. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B. A., Christ Church, Oxford, Rector of Helmingham, Suffolk, author of "Living or Dead," "Wheat or Chaff," "Startling Questions," "Rich or Poor," "Priest, Puritan, and Preacher," etc. St. Luke, Vol. I. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 390.

This volume is a continuation of a work, two volumes of which are already in the hands of our readers. The work is designed to meet the wants of heads of families, and of Bible readers, and visitors of the sick, as well as students who have not access to more extended expositions of the Bible.

The History of the Religious movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism, considered in its different denominational forms, and its relations to British and American Protestantism. By Abel Stevens, LL.D. Vol. II. from the death of Whitefield to the death of Wesley. New York: Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry street. London: Alexander Reylin, 28 Paternoster Row. 1859. Pp. 520.

This, with the volume already published, forms a complete work. The subsequent volumes are to be issued as a distinct publication, for readers who may wish only the "Life and Times of Wesley." Methodism is so important a manifestation of the religious life both of England and America, and its history is so rich in incidents interesting in a psychological, as well as in a religious aspect, that an entirely trustworthy history on the subject, written by a Methodist, is of great value to every student whether of psychology or of religion. As such, this elegantly printed, and scholarly work of Dr. Stevens can be confidently recommended.

The Essentials of Philosophy; wherein its constituent principles are traced throughout the various departments of Science; with Analytical Strictures on the views of some of our leading Philosophers. By Rev. George Jamieson, M. A., one of the ministers of the Parish of Old Machar, Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. Aberdeen: L. & J. Smith. 1859. Pp. 260.

This is a work of which no judgment can be expressed in a short notice. It deals with the profoundest problems of human thought. The author is evidently a man not only of powerful mind, but familiar with the whole range of modern philosophical speculation. He argues with and against Sir William

Hamilton as equal with equal; and shows the confidence which is so often an incident of consciousness of strength. He believes that he has in good measure met "the great want of our time, an exposition of the true philosophy of existence—an interpretation of ontology, on principles of universal application, throughout all the departments of natural law." Whether this is so or not we are not prepared to say, but we have no doubt that the work is entitled to, and will command the serious attention of those addicted to such investigations.

Ishmael; or a Natural History of Islamism, and its relation to Christianity. By the Rev. Dr. J. Muehleisen Arnold, formerly Church Missionary in Asia and Africa, and late Chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital, London. London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place. 1859. Pp. 524. The proceeds of this work will be devoted to establishing a society for propagating the gospel among the Mohammedans.

This work consists of two parts, the history of the rise and progress of Mohammedanism, and a contrast between that fanatical system and Christianity. It is a timely work, written by a man who has had special opportunities to become acquainted with the spirit and working of the religion which he describes.

Our Christian Classics: Readings from the best Divines. With Notices Biographical and Critical. By James Hamilton, D. D., author of "Life in Earnest," "Mount of Olives," "Royal Preacher," etc., etc. In four volumes. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1859.

Dr. Hamilton's design in this work is to give those who have not access to the great "masters in our Israel," or not leisure to consult their massive folios, some knowledge of their spirit and sentiments. The biographical and historical notices constitute more than a third of the entire work, and are among its most interesting portions. The specimens are given in chronological order, beginning with the Anglo-Saxon period. Our readers are too familiar with the attractions of Dr. Hamilton's mode of writing, to need any special commendation of any new production of his pen.

Magdala and Bethany. By the Rev. S. C. Malan, M. A., Rector of Broadwindsor, Dorset, England. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 201.

The author of this small volume is the eldest son of the celebrated Doctor Malan, of Geneva, Switzerland. He married an English lady, and was appointed Professor of Oriental Languages in the Bishop's College, Calcutta. He subsequently spent much time with the Arabs, and became familiar with their language. It is said that he speaks twenty-six distinct

languages, and reads with ease one hundred and twenty-two languages and dialects. This volume is a graphic description of some of the scenes connected with our Saviour's earthly life.

A Treatise on Theism, and on the Modern Sceptical Theories. By Francis Wharton, author of "A Treatise on American Criminal Law;" "A Treatise on the American Law of Homicide;" "A Treatise on Medical Jurisprudence;" "State Trials of the United States," etc.; and Professor in Kenyon College, Ohio. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Trübner & Co., London. 1859. Pp. 395.

The author first presents a demonstration of the being of God, and then discusses the various modern anti-theistic theories, such as Positivism, Fatalism, Pantheism, Development. The argument is presented with all the precision of a legal treatise, and conducted with singular clearness and force. It is an unusual and most gratifying spectacle, when a young lawyer devotes his leisure and talents to the vindication of those great truths which lie at the foundation of all religion, and of the social and political well-being of man.

Memoirs of the Life of James Wilson, Esq., F. R. S. E., M. W. S. of Woodville. By James Hamilton, D. D., F. L. S., author of "Life in Earnest," "Mount of Olives," etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 399.

This volume designs to delineate a Christian gentleman, and to show "how honourably and usefully an accomplished mind may fill up a life of leisure." The subject of this memoir is sure to shed the light of his example on thousands who never heard his name while living, since he has found such a delineator as Dr. Hamilton.

Bible History, in connection with the general History of the World. With Notices of Scripture localities, and sketches of social and Religious Life. By the Rev. William G. Blaikie, A. M., author of "David, King of Israel." London: T. Nelson & Sons, Paternoster Row. Edinburgh: and New York. 1859. Pp. 470.

The outline of Bible history is given in this work under distinct heads, with illustrations derived from modern researches and travels, and with descriptions of the more important cities and countries mentioned in the sacred narrative. There is continuous reference to the contemporaneous events in profane history, and a condensed history of the Jews during the interval between the close of the Old Testament canon, and the gospel era. The same plan is pursued in reference to the evangelical and apostolic period. The book is compactly printed, and contains much valuable knowledge.

The History and Habits of Animals: With special reference to the Animals of the North American continent, and those mentioned in the Scriptures. By Peter Walker. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut street. Pp. 320.

The intention of the author in preparing this volume was to give an outline of zoology, and lay a foundation for the more systematic study of the subject. It is prepared with intelligence and skill, elegantly printed, and adorned with numerous illustrations. Everywhere, when occasion serves, the author is careful to refer to the Scriptures, and to elucidate what is said in the sacred volume by what is learned from other sources of the nature and habits of the animals therein mentioned. The work is creditable to the writer, and in a high degree entertaining and instructive.

Paul the Preacher; or, A popular and practical Exposition of his Discourses and Speeches, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. By John Eadie, D. D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature to the United Presbyterian Church. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 453.

This volume is more than the title promises. It is not merely an exposition of the discourses of Paul as recorded in the Acts, but it is a description of the places in which these discourses were delivered, and such an exhibition of the attendant circumstances, that a reader becomes, as it were, a hearer, whether at Athens, Corinth, or Rome. This is the best of Dr. Eadie's books which we have seen. His commentaries are apt to be cumbered with too much learning, and to run out into homilies. But in this work we have the fruits of his learning without the roots and stems which produced them. Everything is to the point. We regard it as a very readable, as well as valuable book.

Letters of John Calvin. Compiled from the Original Manuscripts, and Edited with Historical Notes. By Dr. Jules Bonnet. Vol. I. and II. Pp. 483, pp. 454. Translated from the Latin and French Languages. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut street.

In the preface to these volumes, Dr. Bonnet gives us much valuable information in relation to Calvin's letters; the disposition made of them after his death, the various collections hitherto published, and an account of his own labours in the preparation of the present work. About six hundred letters of the great Reformer have been gathered together, which will make four volumes of the size of those already published. Two volumes were translated and printed in Edinburgh, when the

progress of the work was arrested. A gentleman in New York interposed, and had the copyright transferred to our Board of Publication, under whose auspices these volumes are issued from the press. Letters bear to biography the relation that a photograph bears to a painted portrait. The latter is the work of the artist, and varies according to his style and skill, the former, although somewhat rude, is the man himself. No biography of Luther reveals the man as he is self-revealed in his letters. It is not only, however, as a revelation of the author that such a collection, and especially this collection, is of interest and value. It is contemporaneous history. Events are narrated as they rose by those who were either actors or spectators. We need say nothing to commend such volumes from such a source to the religious public.

A Familiar Compend of Geology. For the School and Family. By A. M. Hillside. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1859. Pp. 150.

It is difficult to make compends at once intelligible and attractive. They are apt to be like skeletons. The authoress of this little volume, for it is the production of a mother of a family, has, we think, overcome this difficulty. The subject cannot be taught without a good scientific terminology, for the subjects treated of have no other than scientific designations. This terminology itself is a thing to be learned, and a knowledge of it is becoming more and more important to persons of general education. This work has stood the test of experiment. It has been successfully used in communicating the elements of Geology to young students; and as far as we are capable of judging, it is well adapted to this purpose.

Lectures for the People. By the Rev. Hugh Stowell Brown, of Liverpool. First series, with a Biographical Introduction by Dr. Shelton Mackenzie. [Authorized edition.] Philadelphia: Published by G. G. Evans, No. 439 Chestnut Street. 1859. Pp. 414.

Mr. Brown is the pastor of a Baptist church in Liverpool. He began life as an engineer on a railroad. Determining to study for the ministry, he passed three years at King's College, Douglas, the capital of the Isle of Man, intending to take orders in the established church. His views of baptism undergoing a change, he became a Baptist minister. He is a man in prime of life, and a popular preacher. These lectures were delivered to audiences composed principally of mechanics and artisans. They are clear, pithy, homely, and to the point. They are not sermons in the ordinary sense of the term, but discourses on practical subjects, mostly on proverbial sayings, such as "Penny wise and pound foolish." "Take care of num-

ber one." "Cleanliness is next to godliness." "Waste not, want not," &c. Some of these lectures have had an immense circulation in the form of tracts. From two to three thousand working men are said to attend his Sunday afternoon lectures. He is, therefore, doing a great work. This volume has a mezzotint engraving of the author, which must be a likeness.

Revival Sketches and Manual. In two parts. By Rev. Heman Humphrey, D.D., Pittsfield, Mass. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau Street, New York. Pp. 476.

The venerable Dr. Humphrey, who has had so wide and protracted experience in the office of the ministry, and amidst revivals of religion, has given in this volume, first, a history of revivals; secondly, a collection of addresses such as he had himself delivered during such visitations; and, thirdly, pastoral conversations, as held with different classes of inquirers. From this account of the book, the reader will at once see that it is one which the young pastor must welcome as a guide in the discharge of some of his trying duties.

Theopneustia. THE BIBLE: its Divine Origin and Inspiration, Deduced from Internal Evidence, and the Testimonies of Nature, History, and Science. By L. Gaussen, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Oratoire, Geneva. New and revised edition, with Analysis and Topical Index. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard, 39 West Fourth Street. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1859. Pp. 365.

An improved edition of a well known and popular work.

Sermons by the Rev. John Caird, M. A., Minister of the Park church, Glasgow. Author of "Religion in Common Life," a sermon preached before the Queen. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1858. Pp. 398.

Queen Victoria has the honour of having conferred celebrity on Mr. Caird. Sovereigns may confer titles of nobility, but they can only direct attention to the claimant to literary distinction. It is well for Mr. Caird that the royal favour has served in his case to reveal merits which might otherwise have passed, at least for a time, unknown to the general public.

Historical Sketches of Hymns. Their Writers, and their influence. By Joseph Belcher, D. D., author of "William Carey: A Biography;" "George Whitefield: a Biography;" "Religious Denominations of the United States," &c. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1859. Pp. 415.

Our literature is very far from being well furnished with works on Hymnology, in itself one of the most interesting departments of literary history. This work of Dr. Belcher

gives in the first sixty-nine pages, a brief historical sketch of the use of hymns in public worship; then notices of writers of hymns, many of which notices are only a few lines in length, occupying about two hundred and twenty pages; and, thirdly, illustrations of the usefulness of hymns, which is a collection of anecdotes.

Deutschcs Gcsangbuch. Eine Auswahl geistlicher Lieder aus allen Zeiten der Christlichen Kirche. Von Philipp Schaff, Doctor und Professor der Theologie. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. Shäfer & Koradi. Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben. 1859. Pp. 663.

Dr. Schaff has in this work given us five hundred choice German hymns, arranged under ten general divisions. To the several hymns is prefixed a heading giving its history, its author, date, mode of publication, translations, &c. To readers of German it will prove an acceptable present.

History of the Old Covenant. From the German of J. H. Kurtz, D. D., Professor of Theology at Dorpat. Vol. I. Translated, Annotated, and Prefaced by a condensed abstract of Kurtz's "Bible and Astronomy." By the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, Ph. D., author of "History of the Jewish Nation;" Translator of "Chalybaus' Historical Development of Speculative Philosophy," etc., etc. Vol. II. Translated by James Martin, B. A., Nottingham. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. Dublin: John Robertson. 1859. Pp. 380, pp. 426.

We noticed the second volume of this valuable work in our last number. It may be of service to some of our readers to be informed that the standard works composing the "Foreign Theological Library," published by T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, are on sale at Smith and English's, and Lindsay and Blakiston's, Philadelphia.

Twelve Lectures on the great events of Unfulfilled Prophecy, which still await their accomplishment, and are approaching their fulfilment. By Rev. Isaac P. Labaugh, Rector of Calvary church, Brooklyn, New York. Published for the Author. 1859. Pp. 288.

Mr. Labaugh belongs to the class of writers who believe that the design of prophecy is to make men prophets. These lectures are his predictions, and will prove interesting to those who can be persuaded to adopt his principles.

Scenes in the Indian Country. By the author of "Scenes in Chusan," "Learn to Say No," and "How to Die Happy." Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut street. Pp. 283.

The writer of this book spent a year as a missionary among the Indians, whose habits and country are herein described. The work, therefore, has the interest and value belonging to the testimony of an eye-witness.

The Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. A Practical Exposition of Matt. xvi. 13–28, xvii., xviii.; Mark viii. 27–38, ix.; Luke ix. 18–50. By the Rev. William Wilson, Minister of St. Paul's Free Church, Dundee. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. Dublin: John Robertson. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1859. Pp. 453.

This is neither an exegetical nor a prophetical book, but a doctrinal and practical exposition of several important passages of Scripture relating to the nature and functions of the church of God.

Memoir of John Griscom, LL.D., late Professor of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy; with an account of the New York High School; Society for the Prevention of Pauperism; the House of Refuge; and other Institutions. Compiled from an Autobiography, and other sources. By John H. Griscom, M. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 427.

Dr. Griscom, a member of the Society of Friends, devoted his long and useful life to science, and to benevolent institutions, of several of which he was the principal author or founder. He was a man widely known and revered for his various excellencies far beyond the limits of the religious association of which he was a distinguished ornament.

The Works of Philip Lindsley, D. D., late President of the University of Nashville. Vol. I. Educational Discourses. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Nashville: W. T. Berry & Co. 1859. Pp. 588.

Dr. Lindsley's name is associated with the cause of education from one end of the country to the other. First Tutor, then Professor, then Vice-President of the College of New Jersey, of which Institution he was elected President, afterwards for many years President of the University of Tennessee, his whole life was devoted to the work of training youth in the higher departments of knowledge. He was a man of fine bearing, of popular address, of diversified attainments, and of great energy and zeal. His numerous pupils, both east and west, cherish his memory with affectionate respect, and will welcome the publication of his discourses as a memorial of an honoured instructer and friend.

Political Economy: Designed as a Text-Book for Colleges. By John Bascom, A. M., Professor in Williams College. Andover: Published by W. F. Draper. 1859. Pp. 366.

We can only speak of the externals of this book. It goes over the whole ground in a logical order; the matter is perspicuously arranged under distinct chapters and sections; it is

a compendious exhibition of the principles of the science, without prolonged disquisitions on particular points, and it is printed in the style for which the Andover press has long been deservedly celebrated.

The Crucifixion of Christ. By Daniel H. Hill, Superintendent of the North Carolina Military Institute, and late Brevet Major in the United States Army. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, No. 606 Chestnut street. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1859. Pp. 345.

This is an elaborate collation of the several narratives of the Evangelists, with a view not only to their elucidation but confirmation. Major Hill treats the sacred historians as witnesses in a court of justice, and endeavours to show how the testimony of one supplements and confirms that of the others. We have already had occasion to welcome the author of this volume as a valuable co-labourer in the defence and propagation of sound doctrine and Christian piety. We cheerfully commend this new production of his pen to the religious and reading public.

A Pastor's Selection of Hymns and Tunes, for worship in the church and family. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1859. Pp. 191.

This volume is the production of a gentleman of cultivated mind, versed in the science, and skilled in the art of music, and beyond all others, we presume, familiar with hymnology. It comes, therefore, with the highest recommendation such a book can have.

Theodore Parker's Experience as a Minister, with some account of his early life, and education for the ministry; contained in a letter from him to the members of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Society of Boston. Boston: Rufus Leighton, Jr. 1859. Pp. 182.

Theodore Parker is a man of brilliant gifts and of noble traits. But he leans to his own understanding. He is his own Lord, Master, and Saviour. He has undertaken to do for himself what God alone can do for him. He is, therefore, a warning, and not a guide.

A Little Thing Great; or, the Dance and the Dancing School. Tested in a few plain sermons by John T. Brooke, D.D., Rector of Christ Church, Springfield, Ohio, formerly Rector of Christ Church, Cincinnati, Ohio. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1859. Pp. 116.

Professing Christians moving in the more refined classes of society, whose children associate more or less freely with worldly and fashionable people, are often at a loss to know whether to allow them to join their companions in dancing, or to restrain them from all participation in that amusement. They are

strongly tempted to the side of indulgence. The thing is so common; the young are apt to be so urgent in their solicitations to be allowed to do as others do; the refusing of invitations to dancing parties, when other social reunions are attended without scruple, is so awkward; the argument "there is no harm in dancing" is so plausible, that many parents yield to the wishes of their children in this matter without a due consideration of the consequence. To all such persons we recommend this book of Dr. Brooke. It is addressed to Christians. It takes for granted that those to whom it speaks desire to live a godly life, and to bring up their children in the fear of the Lord. It is a faithful, forcible, scriptural argument; without exaggeration or extravagance. It does not make things indifferent to be sinful. But it brings home to the conscience the conviction that men cannot serve two masters; that they cannot merge themselves in the world, and yet live above the world. The question is not whether there is any sin in dancing, but whether in the present state of society, a Christian can join in such amusements without throwing his influence on the side of the world, and running the risk of being engulphed by it.

Letters on Psalmody: A Review of the Leading Arguments, for the exclusive use of the Book of Psalms. By William Annan. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, 606 Chestnut Street. 1859. Pp. 216.

Jesus Only! By J. Oswald Jackson. Philadelphia; William S. & Alfred Martien, 606 Chestnut Street. 1859. Pp. 72.

A Physician's Counsels to his Professional Brethren. By a Practising Physician. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821 Chestnut Street. Pp. 103.

Anna, the Leech Vender. A Narrative of Filial Love. By O. Glaubrecht. From the German. By Mrs. Clarke. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street. Pp. 142.

May I Believe? or, the Warrant of Faith. By Alfred Hamilton, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board. Pp. 138.

The Child a Hundred Years Old. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board. Pp. 120.

Infidelity against Itself. By Rev. B. B. Hotchin. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board. Pp. 100.

Profits of Godliness. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board. Pp. 114.

Stories about Africa, a Farewell Address to Sunday-school Scholars. By Rev. Robert Moffat. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board. Pp. 72.

John F. Oberlin, Pastor of the Ban de la Roche. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board. Pp. 72.

The Protestant Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia: being a condensed translation of Herzog's Real Encyclopedia. By Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D. Part IX. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston.

We have repeatedly called attention to this work, which continues to appear regularly in numbers of one hundred and twenty-eight double column pages, at fifty cents a number. Nowhere can the same amount of valuable information be obtained for the same price.

CORRECTION.—In the remarks on the Revision of the Book of Discipline in our last number, copied from one of the weekly newspapers, the paragraphs beginning on the 12th line of page 602, and ending with the first word of the 30th line, have been separated from their proper place—which is near the end of Dr. Humphrey's speech, on page 601.

END OF VOL. XXXI.