THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW.

EDITED BY

CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

JANUARY, 1861.

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY
PETER WALKER, 821 CHESTNUT STREET.
AND SOLD BY
CROSBY, NICHOLS & CO., BOSTON; R. CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK;
WILLIAM S. & ALFRED MARTIEN, PHILADELPHIA;
AND TRÜBNER & CO. LONDON.

CONTENTS OF No. I.

JANUARY, 1861.

PAGE

ART. I.—The State of the Country 1

ART. II.—Antiquity of the Book of Genesis 37

ART. III.—The New Oxford School; or Broad Church Liberalism ... 59

ART. IV.—The Fulfilment of Prophecy 84

ART. V.—Liverpool Missionary Conference of 1860, or, Results of Missionary Experience 122

ART. VI.—The Alexandrine and Sinaitic Manuscripts 150

SHORT NOTICES 167

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1861.

No. I.

Article I.—*The State of the Country.*

There are periods in the history of every nation when its destiny for ages may be determined by the events of an hour. There are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule for political action is to be sought, not in considerations of state policy, but in the law of God. On such occasions the distinction between secular and religious journals is obliterated. When the question to be decided turns on moral principles, when reason, conscience, and religious sentiment are to be addressed, it is the privilege and duty of all who have access in any way to the public ear, to endeavour to allay unholy feeling, and to bring truth to bear on the minds of their fellow-citizens. If any other consideration be needed to justify the discussion, in these pages, of the disruption of this great confederacy, it may be found, not only in the portentous consequences of such disruption to the welfare and happiness of the country and to the general interests of the world, but also in its bearing on the church of Christ and the progress of his kingdom. Until within a few years there was no diversity of opinion on this subject. It was admitted that the value of the union of these states did not admit of calculation. As no man allowed himself to count the worth of

the family union, to estimate in dollars and cents the value of his father's blessing or his mother's love, so no one dreamt of estimating the value of the union of these states—a union cemented by a common lineage, a common language, a common religion, and a common history. We were born in the same family, rocked in the same cradle, struggled through the same difficulties. We were united in the council chamber and on the battle-field. The blood of Northern and of Southern patriots flowed in a common stream, and their ashes lie mingled in the same graves. These are not sentimentalities which men of sense can afford to despise. They are bonds of union which it argues moral degradation to disregard. Moreover, there is no denomination of Christians whose members are not found in every part of our common country. Almost every family at the South has kindred living at the North, and the families at the North have kindred at the South. The union of these states is a real union. It is not a mere association, such as binds together nations of different races, languages, and political institutions, as in the Austrian empire. Our outward union is the expression of inward unity. To this we owe our dignity and power among the nations of the earth. Had we been as the dissociated communities of Italy, we had been insignificant. It is because we are one that we are great, prosperous, and powerful. All this, until recently, was the common sentiment of the country; and the man who should advocate a dissolution of the Union, would have been associated, in the estimation of his countrymen, with Benedict Arnold. And such, we doubt not, will be the position assigned by the judgment of posterity to the authors of disunion, should that calamity befall us.

Besides the bonds of union above adverted to, this country is geographically one. The bounds of nations are not arbitrarily assigned; they are, in general, determined by fixed laws. A people indeed, as in the case of the Romans, may conquer other nations, and gather them all under one despotic head in despite of their essential diversities. But this is a temporary contravention of the laws of nature. It is the configuration of the earth's surface which determines the boundaries of nations. Greece was geographically one. So was Egypt: so is Italy, which is now at last struggling to attain its normal state.

Spain, France, Great Britain, Germany, are all one, not by the will of man, but by physical laws, which men can contravene only to their own detriment or destruction. The immutable law of God, as expressed in nature, makes the territory assigned to the Anglo-Saxon race on this continent one nation. The same mountain ranges run through the whole land. The great valley, beginning in Carolina and Tennessee, reaches to the borders of Canada. The broad Atlantic slope is one continuous plain. The immense basin of the Mississippi includes, as the bosom of a common mother, the states from the Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. The Ohio, the Missouri, and the Mississippi, are arteries which carry the same living flood through the vast region through which they flow. The country is thus physically one, and therefore its organic life is one. We cannot divide a tree without destroying its life. We cannot divide a river without producing an inundation. The union of this country, therefore, is determined by the homogeneity of its people, by its history, and by its physical character. It cannot be permanently dissevered. The mistaken counsels or passions of men may cause a temporary separation, but the laws of nature will ultimately assert their supremacy, and avenge, by terrible disasters, their temporary violation. Besides, there is the moral bond. We are bound together by covenants and oaths. It requires something more than annoyances, or collisions of opinion or interests, to free men in the sight of God or man from the obligation of an oath. These states are pledged to a "perpetual union." All federal and state officers are bound by oath to maintain that union, and the constitution on which it is founded. It is admitted that there may be circumstances which will justify a nation in violating a solemn treaty, or a people in casting off the obligation of an oath of allegiance; but no man, who has the fear of God before his eyes, will advocate such violation except in extreme cases.

Although these things are so, and although the conviction of their truth until recently rested as an axiom in the public mind, we are nevertheless at this moment on the brink of disunion. We are not of the number of those who think there is no danger in the present state of the country. We fully believe that several of the Southern states are bent on secession, and there is

great reason to fear that should a Southern confederacy be once formed, all the fifteen slave-holding states will ultimately combine. What has produced this great and lamentable change in the public mind? Why is disunion, so recently regarded as criminal and impossible, now looked upon as almost inevitable? What are the causes which have produced the present state of feeling? This question may be viewed in different aspects. It may be understood to mean, What are the political events of which the existing condition of the country is the natural sequence? or, it may mean, What are the grounds on which the cotton states desire a separation from the Union? These are different questions and must receive different answers. As to the former, it is a political question, and will be answered according to the political views of those by whom the answer is given. One party says, that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the effort to force the Lecompton constitution upon the people of Kansas, the refusal of Southern politicians to unite in the nomination of a Northern democrat for the presidency, are the causal antecedents of the present state of things. It matters not, they say, whether the Missouri Compromise Act was constitutionally obligatory as a law, it was binding as a compact. It had been voluntarily formed; it had been regarded as sacred for thirty years; to set it aside for the sake of a sectional advantage was regarded as a violation of honour and good faith. Much of the Territory of Kansas lies to the north of latitude 36° 30′. If the compromise was acted upon, Kansas must be a free state. To secure her admission as a slave state was regarded as a matter of great importance, not only to the South generally, but especially to Missouri. Therefore that compromise was abolished. Then whether Kansas should be a free or slave state, depended on the character of the settlers. This led to a rush from both sections of the country to pre-occupy the ground. This gave rise to fierce collisions. The settlers from the North proved the more numerous. To overcome this fact and to give the minority the ascendency, fraud and force were resorted to. Election returns were falsified, legislatures and conventions were packed with men illegally elected; attempts were made to force the pro-slavery constitution thus framed upon the people without their

consent. These facts rested not on rumour, nor upon newspaper reports, but upon judicial investigation and the testimony of democratic governors and federal officers. It was the conviction of the truth of these facts which called into existence the Republican party. That party is not an anti-slavery, much less an abolition party. It may suit politicians on either side so to represent it, but the mass of the people care little for politicians or for what they say. They make little account of platforms which are not read by one in a thousand. The people act from their own views. The facts above-mentioned offended the conscience of the people of the North, and the condemnation of those acts was the whole significancy of their vote, first for Fremont, and then for Lincoln. In this condemnation they have the concurrence of probably nine-tenths of all the intelligent people in the country; for it is one of the infelicities of the necessary existence of parties in a free government, that men are often obliged to sanction acts which they personally condemn. Notwithstanding, however, the general disapprobation of the measures referred to, such is the disposition at the North to concede everything to the South for the sake of peace and party predominance, there is little doubt that the election of Mr. Lincoln would have been defeated had it not been for the split in the Democratic party at Charleston. The nomination of a sectional candidate at the South and another at the North necessitated the defeat of the other candidates who had some claim to stand on a national basis. Such is the view of the political causes of the present alarming state of the country, taken by the great body of the people of the North. They refer it to the action of the dominant party during the last six years. Whether this is a correct view of the case, is not the question. It is enough that this is the view which has determined, and which interprets the action of the North. It is important that this should be understood, in order that the state of the public mind should not be misapprehended and misinterpreted.

The special supporters of the present administration, or the leaders of the dominant party, of course seek for other political causes of the present agitation of the country. They deny that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, or the action of the

government in the Kansas question, or even the division of the Charleston convention, is the cause of the difficulty. They throw the responsibility on the opposers of those measures. They say that if the policy of the administration had been acquiesced in, as a true regard for the interest of the country required, there would have been no interruption of the public peace.

It is not, however, the political aspect of the case that we propose to examine. It is more important to turn our attention to the question, What are the grounds on which the cotton-growing states advocate the dissolution of the Union?* or, What are the reasons why they desire to secede? These reasons are two, very different in their nature and in their effects. The one is the conviction that they would be more prosperous in a separate, independent confederacy. Their pecuniary interests, they think, would thereby be greatly promoted. The other reason is, the alleged aggressions of the North, which, it is said, not only justify secession, but render that measure necessary for the preservation of the rights and safety of the South. The former reason probably determines the action of the leaders in this movement, the latter sways the popular mind, and by the exasperation of feeling which it excites under the sense of injustice and apprehension of danger, furnishes the motive power.†

* We confine the question to the cotton-growing states, as in them only has any strong secession movement been developed. The vast majority of the people in the other slave states are opposed to disunion. They would prevent it if they could. It is only in the event of the cotton states withdrawing from the confederacy, that the other states may be constrained to join them.

† The *New York Herald's* special Virginia correspondent writes from Richmond on the 24th November, as follows:

"The best informed men in this section—among whom I class some of our wisest representatives in Congress—seem to entertain very slight hopes of any good result from a Southern Conference. There is one serious obstacle, which will probably nullify all efforts at conciliation, viz. The cotton states believe that secession, intrinsically, involves much more benefit to them than could result from a continuance in the Union. *Their prime, animating motive in pursuing this policy is to reopen the African slave trade*, and that they are aware they never can do within the Union. Secession is, after all, with them a matter of material interest. I do not mean to insinuate that the movement is solely actuated by that consideration, but there can be no doubt of its exerting a controlling influence on it. This you may rest assured of.

"I have no idea that the cotton states will now forego the advantage which

That the leaders of the secession movement are influenced by the conviction that secession would promote the prosperity of the cotton states, has been openly and frequently avowed. It is said they would not only be relieved from great national burdens and from commercial restrictions, but their resources would in every way be increased. They cast their eyes on Cuba. They see that that noble island is rendered secure by the jealousies of other nations. France will not permit its acquisition by Great Britain, and Great Britain will not consent to its passing under the dominion of France. Neither France nor England would be satisfied to see it in the hands of the United States. Thus secure from foreign aggression, its productiveness and its geographical position would render it, in a pecuniary point of view, one of the most prosperous portions of the globe, were it not for the enormous drain upon its resources made by the demands of Spain. As it is, it has few rivals in pecuniary prosperity. What is to hinder the cotton states, it is asked, from occupying a similar position? Cotton is held to be an absolute necessity to England, France, and the Northern states of this Union. All would be forced, by a regard to their own interests, to maintain the independence of the Southern confederacy. With unlimited free trade, the ships of other nations would crowd the Southern ports, bringing every article of luxury or use the South requires, and taking cotton in return. The wealth which now pours into the North would thus be transferred to the South. By opening the slave trade, labour could be obtained at a far cheaper rate than at present, and the production of cotton increased to meet the utmost demand. The Southern tier of states would thus become rich and prosperous beyond all competition. Such is the picture which the advocates of disunion have drawn. The first remark which such representations suggest is, that all these advantages

the election of Lincoln presents for the accomplishment of an object which to them is far dearer than the preservation of this Union. In the reopening of the African slave-trade they recognize one of the greatest sources of wealth and prosperity that any country could acquire. With such advantages, they feel that they could control the destinies of the world, and make Europe and the North bow in obedience to their will. There is much truth in the idea; but, whether there is or not, they entertain the conviction firmly, and argument will be unavailing in the effort to remove it."

are for a class, and that a very small class, of the inhabitants of those states. The benefits of disunion are to accrue to the holders of slaves. But they constitute a small minority of the white population of those states. Is it fair or reasonable that a revolution should be effected for the benefit of so small a minority of the people? Has not class-legislation been ever regarded as one of the greatest evils of the nations of Europe? Are not thousands of sufferers from such legislation constantly flocking to this country as to an asylum? And are we to introduce among ourselves this most odious and unjust feature of foreign policy? But admitting that disunion would not only be advantageous to slaveholders, but incidentally to the non-slaveholding majority, is this a reason for disunion which can present itself at the bar of conscience? Can a contract be rightfully broken for money? The people of Pennsylvania, and of many other Northern states, are fully convinced that a high protecting tariff would be greatly to their advantage; that under such protection, with their immense mineral resources, they would soon become to this continent what England has long been to Europe and the world. It has, however, never been suggested that this conviction would afford any justifiable ground for a dissolution of the Union. The prosperity of the New England states was utterly prostrated by the policy of the government in the times of the non-intercourse and embargo laws. In those times, secession, as a means of redress, was denounced as high treason. How then can any Southern state justify a disruption of the Union which was declared to be perpetual, on the ground that it would be profitable?

This bright vision, however, of the prosperity which is to follow disunion, is a work of the imagination. All the conditions of the problem are not, and perhaps cannot be, taken into view. The cotton-growing states are not an insular territory like Cuba. They are an integral part of a great continent. They are a member of an organized body. They cannot have a separate life of their own. A tourniquet applied to a limb may cause its distension for a time, but at the certain expense of its vitality. The carrying out of this Southern programme would place the cotton states in direct hostility with the other slave states. It would be their ruin, at least for years to come.

The value of their property in slaves must be depreciated many per cent. This would lead to their being crowded into those States where their labour could be profitably employed. This would soon be followed by over production; the price of cotton, the sole foundation of all these brilliant hopes, must decline, and the besom of desolation would sweep over the land. The hopes of security and protection from the conflicting jealousies of European powers; the anticipation that France and England, having abolished slavery in their own dominions, would unite to uphold it in the cotton-growing states of this confederacy, and rejoice in the humiliation and destruction of the North, are all built on the assumption that Satan governs the world. The natural anticipation is, that as those nations have submitted to the enormous sacrifice of emancipating their own slaves, they would use all their influence to abolish slavery elsewhere. It has long been the conviction of our most enlightened men, that it is nothing but the protection which the flag of the Union spreads over slavery in this country, that prevents England arraying all her power for its destruction. Separated from the North, a Southern confederacy of the cotton-growing states would be at the mercy of the anti-slavery feeling of the world. The dissolution of the Union, therefore, in all human probability, would be the death-blow to slavery. Hence men who think only of that subject, have been the earliest and warmest advocates of the dismemberment of the confederacy. We have no heart to dwell on this point. No one can predict the evils of disunion. The chimera of abounding wealth can prevent none but the infatuated from perceiving the overwhelming counterbalancing considerations. An entire loss of dignity and power by the cotton states consequent on secession from the Union, might suffice of itself to deter from such an experiment. Without a navy, without an army, without resources for either, such a confederacy could exist only by sufferance. It would be subject to all kinds of insults, annoyances, and injuries, for which impotent wrath would be the only redress. The disproportion between the two portions of the Union thus divided, would constantly increase. The South would grow in a slave population, and the North in a population of freemen. By the time

the Southern confederacy numbers four millions of white inhabitants, the North would have forty millions. What can be the consequence of such disproportion between conterminous political communities, when there is nothing to restrain injury and annoyance? This is a dismal prospect, from which we gladly turn our eyes. The evils to the cotton states themselves, from disunion, are so probable and so great, that the argument from interest is not that on which reliance is placed. It is a sense of injustice, of injury, of danger, and consequent feeling of animosity, that is appealed to by political leaders in order to make the people willing to secede.

Let us calmly, and in the fear of God, examine this other view of the case. What are the grievances of the South? That our Southern friends do feel aggrieved, that they believe that great injustice has been done them, that their rights have been encroached upon and their safety endangered, there can be no doubt. Nothing else can account for the state of feeling which now prevails at the South. It must also be acknowledged that the South has some just grounds of complaint, and that the existing animosity towards the North is neither unnatural nor unaccountable. At the same time it is perfectly apparent to every dispassionate mind, that these grievances are greatly exaggerated, and that this animosity arises in a large measure from misapprehension.

The first great grievance of the South is the spirit, language, and conduct of the abolitionists of the North. It is a grievance to be hated and denounced, to be held up as execrably wicked. It is a grievance to have slaveholding represented as the greatest of crimes; to have immediate emancipation insisted upon as an imperative duty. The grievance consists partly in the injustice of these judgments. Those thus condemned and denounced feel that they are injured. Resentment is the unavoidable consequence of unmerited condemnation. Mere moral disapprobation of the system of slavery would be no just ground of complaint. One of the ablest and most philosophical speeches delivered of late years on the floor of Congress, was pronounced by a representative from Alabama, in which he took the ground that the mere disapprobation of slavery was a sufficient reason why the South could not remain united with

the North. But this is evidently untenable. A man may have a moral disapprobation of the system of serfdom in Russia, of the church establishment in England, or of the law of primogeniture, or of an order of nobility, and yet live as a peaceful citizen of those countries. The disapprobation of slavery, always entertained and avowed by the Quakers, has never been regarded as a grievance by the South. It is only when such disapprobation is not only unjust, but when it is the source of hatred and abuse, that it rouses animosity. In the case before us the elements of injustice and violence are combined. Slaveholding is not a crime. A man by being the owner of slaves does not justly forfeit respect and confidence. He may be one of the best of men. It is therefore an act of injustice to condemn him as a criminal. And when this condemnation is connected with violent defamation, it becomes an intolerable grievance; that is, such a grievance as cannot ordinarily be submitted to without awakening the strongest resentment. It must be admitted that this is a grievance under which the South has laboured and is still labouring. The great mistake, however, of our Southren brethren, is that they charge this offence on the people of the North; whereas, the truth is, there is not one in a hundred of the people of the North who entertains these opinions and joins in these denunciations. We appeal in support of this statement to every accessible index of public opinion. Of the hundreds of religious newspapers published at the North, the number is very small that breathe the spirit of abolitionism. The proportion of the secular press controlled by that spirit is not greater. We do not know of one clergyman among the Roman Catholics, or the Episcopalians, or the Dutch Reformed, belonging to the class of abolitionists. Of the three thousand Old-school Presbyterian clergymen in the country, we do not believe there are twelve who deserve to be so designated. Of the Northern Baptists we have no knowledge of the prevalence of abolitionism to any great extent in their ranks. Among the Methodists there is perhaps more of that spirit, but counteracted by a strong conservative element. The clergy may be taken as a fair index of public sentiment on all moral and religious subjects, and their influence in determining that sentiment cannot be denied.

It is a great and lamentable mistake, therefore, on the part of the South, to suppose that the great body of the intelligent men at the North have any sympathy with those who are known among us as abolitionists; that is, with those who regard slaveholding as a crime, and immediate emancipation a duty; and who denounce all slaveholders as unworthy of Christian fellowship.

But it is said that the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency is unmistakable evidence of the prevalence of abolitionism, and of settled hostility to the South. It has been pronounced a declaration of war. The fact that abolitionists generally voted for Mr. Lincoln, is appealed to as one proof, at least, that the Republican is an abolition party. But does the fact that all the Southern disunionists voted for Mr. Breckinridge prove that all who favoured his election are disunionists, or that he himself belongs to that class? The reverse is notoriously true. Why, then, should the Republicans be denounced as abolitionists, because abolitionists voted the Republican ticket? No rational man can believe that Pennsylvania gave Mr. Lincoln sixty thousand majority as the representative of abolition principles. As before remarked, the Republican party consists of those who desired to enter their protest against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the attempts to force slavery upon Kansas, joined by thousands who wish for a protective tariff, and thousands more, who, from dislike of one candidate, and distrust of another, preferred to vote for Mr. Lincoln. The only question of principle, so far as relates to slavery, which distinguishes the mass of the people at the North from the extreme Southern party, is, whether slavery is a municipal or natural institution; whether a man's right to hold a slave as property rests on statute law, or upon the common law. If the latter, then a man has a right to carry his slaves into any state or territory into which he may lawfully carry his ox or his horse. He may bring them by hundreds and thousands into any state in the Union, and settle with them there. If the former, he can carry them no where beyond the legitimate authority of the law by which slavery exists. Which of these views is correct, this is not the place to discuss. All that we wish to say on the point is,

that this is the sum of the difference in principle between the North and the extreme South; and that, as a historical fact, the doctrine that slavery is a municipal institution, that no man has the same right to hold his slave in bondage in France and England, that he has there to keep possession of his books or clothes, was the doctrine of all parties in this country until within the last twenty or thirty years. If, therefore, holding this opinion is a just ground for separating from the North, it was a just ground for refusing to submit to the administration of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and every other President, unless our present chief magistrate be an exception. Holding this opinion as to the foundation of slavery, therefore, does not constitute the Republicans an abolition party, and does not afford a reason for disunion which can satisfy the judgment or conscience of any reasonable man.

There is another consideration which ought to satisfy the South that the North is not infected with abolitionism. There are three different views entertained as to the moral character of slavery. The one is that adopted by the abolitionists, viz. that slave-holding is a crime calling for the execration of the world, and excommunication from the church. The opposite extreme is that slavery is a normal institution, good in itself, and one which should be perpetuated and extended, and, therefore, that the slaves should be kept in such a state of ignorance and dependence as is necessary to render the indefinite duration of the institution possible, safe, and useful. The third view is that slavery, as a system of domestic despotism, belongs to the same category with political despotism. It is not morally wrong in itself, and, therefore, under all circumstances; it is not to be denounced as a crime, nor are slaveholders, as such, to be held up as worthy of condemnation, or excluded from the fellowship of the Christian church. At the same time, as slaves are men, they should be treated as such, as the children of a common Father, entitled by the gift of God to mental and moral culture, to have the light of heaven let in upon their souls, to the rights of property, and to the prerogatives of the conjugal and parental relations. To deny them these rights is as great a sin as though they were freemen. Most men,

when they condemn slavery, have certain slave laws in their minds; laws which forbid the slaves to be instructed, which declare they cannot contract marriage, or which authorize the forcible separation of husbands and wives, parents and children. But Southern Christians condemn these laws as heartily as we do. Indeed, no man can be a Christian who does not condemn them. It is only a few days since we heard a slave-holding minister say that his church would as certainly discipline a man for selling a husband away from his wife, as for drunkenness. It is a wicked misrepresentation when men at the North hold up Southern Christians as approving of such laws, and it is an equally wicked misrepresentation when men at the South denounce men at the North as abolitionists, because they condemn those same laws. This view of slavery, we verily believe, is held by nine-tenths of the intelligent Christian people of this country, north and south, east and west. At the late meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church at Rochester, there were present over three hundred delegates from every state in the Union, except Oregon and one or two of the New England states. A more harmonious body never assembled in this land. It was a fair representation of the whole country. Yet on the subject of slavery there was no difference of opinion or feeling manifested from beginning to end. There was not one Southern minister in that body who might not have settled at the North, nor one Northern minister who might not labour acceptably at the South. Presbyterians do not differ so much from other Christians, as to invalidate the argument from their unanimity in proof of the prevailing sentiment of the country. It is, therefore, a judgment unsupported by facts that the people of the North are abolitionists in the sense in which that word is constantly used. There is no material difference of opinion on the subject of slavery among the intelligent Christian people of this country. There are extremists North and South, but the mass of the people are of one mind. The state of opinion, therefore, at the North on this subject, affords no reasonable or justifiable ground for the disruption of the Union.

Another grievance justly complained of, is the interference of Northern abolitionists with the slaves of the

South. This is done by the attempted distribution of abolition publications through the Southern states, and by emissaries who endeavour to create dissatisfaction among the slaves. This is not only offensive, but in the highest degree dangerous. It puts in peril the lives of men, women, and children—of wives and daughters. This is beyond measure exasperating. The slaveholders feel as men living over a powder magazine into which people outside insist upon throwing burning coals. We admit that such tampering with the slaves is a great crime, and that it is a grievance which would justify almost any available means of redress. We doubt not that it is to the exasperation arising from this cause that the animosity and excitement now pervading the Southern mind are principally due. We admit the fact; we admit that it is a crime and an offence; we admit that it calls for redress. But is disunion the rightful or effectual remedy? Is it right to break with the whole North because of the conduct of a small band of fanatics over which the people have no control, and for which they are not responsible? Of the eighteen millions of Northern white men, there is probably not one thousand who have any agency in these attempts to excite the Southern slaves, or who approve of it. Would it be fair for the North to hold the South responsible for the deeds of violence reported in almost every paper, of which innocent Northern citizens in Southern states are the victims? It is unjust therefore to visit on the North the sins of a small class of men among them, when those offences are heartily condemned, and when they would be prevented, were prevention possible.

This, however, is not the only injustice in the case. It is not only unjust to hold the North responsible for the dissatisfaction excited among the slaves at the South, but it is a great injustice to attribute that dissatisfaction to the efforts of Northern abolitionists as its sole or principal cause. For one communication that reaches the minds of the slaves tending to promote disturbance, coming from Northern fanatics, a hundred, probably a thousand, come from Southern men and from their political allies at the North. The circulation of abolition publications is prohibited by law, and sedulously guarded against; abolition emissaries, if such there be, act at the

imminent peril of their lives. So far as the minds of the slaves are concerned, little can possibly be effected by those agencies. Whereas Southern papers, and those of the same political party from the North, circulate freely through the South. Those papers teem with extracts from the extreme anti-slavery publications. They labour to convince those who read them, that the North with its eighteen millions of people is of one mind that slaveholding is a great crime. They constantly endeavour to prove that the Republican party is pledged to abolish slavery, to interfere with the peculiar institutions of the South. Who read those papers? The coloured people read them. Their contents spread from mouth to mouth—exaggerated and distorted. You might as well fire cannon from one end of the country to the other, and complain of the slaves hearing them, as to allow such papers to circulate and expect their contents to remain unknown. We verily believe that it would be less dangerous to the South to allow unrestricted circulation to the *Independent* than to the *New York Herald* or the *Journal of Commerce*. If disunion is to come, if the South is to experience the horrors of servile insurrections, it will be referable more to the inflammatory and defamatory character of such publications, than to any other proximate cause. Besides the evil done by such publications, exciting public speeches are made in almost every town and village. In these speeches Northern men are denounced as enemies. They are spoken of with hatred and contempt. These orators labour to convince the people that property in slaves is in danger; that the North is sending emissaries through the land to promote emancipation; that the success of the Republicans would be the triumph of abolitionism; and, if not resisted, the death-blow to slavery. Who hear those speeches? The slaves hear them and believe them, though nobody else may. Southern planters also do not hesitate to discuss all these questions around their dinner tables, while their slaves are standing at their elbows. We have heard and seen this with our own ears and eyes. Southern men say they are living in a powder magazine, and resent the show of combustibles a thousand miles off, and yet daily disport themselves with fireworks. It is a miracle of mercy that an

explosion has not long since occurred. While, therefore, we admit that the attempts of Northern fanatics to produce dissatisfaction in the slaves is a crime, yet we deny that this offence can be justly chargeable on the people of the North, the vast majority of whom condemn it, and would gladly prevent it if they had the power; and we maintain that so far as dissatisfaction or disposition to servile insurrection exists, it is attributable far more to Southern papers, speeches, and table-talk, and to Northern anti-Republican papers having free circulation at the South, than to all the efforts of fanatical abolitionists.

A third prominent grievance of which the South complains, is that the provision of the Constitution requiring the restoration of fugitive slaves, has been, and is, openly disregarded and set at nought. The Constitution is a compact. If, say our Southern brethren, that compact is violated by one party, it ceases to be binding on the other. On this ground they assert that they are at perfect liberty to secede from the Union. This is the argument which is presented in every possible form, in newspaper editorials, in legislative debates, in gubernatorial messages. It is rung through the South, and echoes through the North. Yet a moment's consideration will show that the complaint is utterly unfounded. It is admitted that Southern masters have a constitutional right to the restoration of their fugitive slaves. On whom does the obligation to restore such slaves rest? Upon the Federal Government, or upon the state authorities? Upon the Federal Government, according to the solemn decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, our highest judicial authority. Assuming that the obligation rested upon the states, Pennsylvania passed certain laws to regulate the manner in which the duty should be performed. The Supreme Court pronounced those laws unconstitutional, on the ground that it belonged to the Federal Government to carry into effect that provision of the Constitution. Has the General Government refused to perform that duty? It is the party on whom the obligation rests. Has it failed to discharge that obligation? Not at all. Stringent laws for carrying into effect that part of the constitutional compact have been passed by both houses of Congress, and approved by the President. The whole judicial and executive power of the Government is pledged

to their execution. In not one instance have the judicial or executive officers charged with this duty failed to perform it. So far from it, the judicial officers have notoriously erred on the other side. They have sent free men to the South as slaves, who have been returned on their hands. They have shocked public justice in their zeal to carry out the law. The United States troops have been called out to secure its execution. Slaves have been returned to their masters, in some instances, at an expense of twenty, thirty, or forty thousand dollars to the Government. Educated men, professors in our colleges, have been condemned to imprisonment for attempting to interfere with the execution of the fugitive slave law. At this moment, if any Southern man can point out a slave living in Massachusetts or Vermont, he will be restored, though it should cost a hundred thousand dollars, or even a civil war. The Federal Government, the party bound, has never failed to discharge to the utmost its constitutional obligations in this matter. It is not true, therefore, that the national compact has been broken. The North, as represented in the Federal Government, the only organ through which it can constitutionally act in the premises, has not only been faithful in this matter, but it has carried its fidelity to the verge of servility. Contrast the zeal of the General Government in carrying out the provision of the Constitution in reference to fugitive slaves, with its conduct in regard to the provision which requires that the citizens of one state shall have in all other states the same privileges as the citizens of those states themselves. This provision of the Constitution, so far as concerns coloured persons, is a dead letter in some of the Southern states. It has been formally nullified by law. A gentleman of the highest social and professional standing was sent to Charleston, peacefully and respectfully to bring the validity of that law before the United States courts. He was not allowed to do so. He was ordered and forced to leave the city. No judicial officer of the General Government has been commissioned to carry out that provision of the Constitution. United States troops have not been ordered out to secure its faithful observance. It has not been executed, and it cannot be executed. The attempt to enforce its observance would inevitably split the Union, and therefore the North

quietly submit. It may be said that persons of African descent are not citizens in view of the Constitution, and therefore have no right to be recognized as such in the Southern ports. This is the point which Massachusetts wished to have judicially decided, and was forbidden to make the attempt. It never has been judicially decided by a court of competent jurisdiction. Besides, this was not the ground on which the law forbidding free negroes to enter the state of South Carolina was enacted. Whether citizens or not, they were to be excluded. We do not say there may not be an overruling necessity for that law. It may be that the North would be unreasonable and unjust to insist on the full execution of the Constitution in this matter. Our only object is to show that while a constitutional provision painful to the North is carried out by all the resources of the Federal Government, a like provision distasteful to the South is allowed to remain a dead letter.

It is, however, said that "the personal liberty laws" passed by some of the Northern states are a virtual nullification of the fugitive slave law, and therefore a breach of compact. If a breach of compact, they are, as it is asserted, a full justification of the disruption of the Union. We admit that the obligation to restore fugitive slaves is a constitutional and moral obligation, and consequently that any law designed to prevent such restoration is unconstitutional and criminal. So far as the laws in question have that design, they are worthy of all condemnation; and so far as they are the expression of impotent hostility, they are unbecoming the dignity of a sovereign state. If the people of any state cannot conscientiously submit to the constitution, there are only two courses open to them: they should either endeavour, in a peaceable and orderly way, to have the Constitution altered, or they should move out of the country. They have no right to live under a Constitution and enjoy its benefits and yet refuse to submit to its stipulations. This is a matter as to which the conscience of many people is at fault. They think that if they disapprove, on conscientious grounds, of the restoration of fugitive slaves, they are bound to resist such restoration. This is a great mistake. Their duty, in that case, is to try to have the Constitution altered, but until it is altered, they are bound to allow it unre-

stricted operation, or to renounce all allegiance to it. We regard, therefore, all opposition to the restoration of fugitive slaves, whether by legislatures, or by individuals, or by mobs, as morally a crime, deserving legal penalties and the condemnation of all good men. If, therefore, any state has passed laws to prevent the full and efficient operation of that provision of the Constitution, we hold that they are bound by their allegiance to God as well as to the country at once to repeal them. Let them endeavour to free themselves from an obligation which wounds their conscience, in some just and honourable way. There is a very prevalent mistake as to the responsibility of individuals for the constitution and laws under which we live. We are bound to use all our influence to make the constitution and laws what they ought to be. But if, without our agency, or in despite of our efforts, constitutional provisions are adopted or laws enacted, which our conscience does not approve, it is not our fault. We are not at liberty to resist them. Submission to their operation implies no approbation. We are not bound to coöperate in giving them effect. We may quietly refuse, and submit to the legal penalty. It is thus the Quakers act with regard to church rates in England, and to the militia laws in this country. They do not muster for military training as the law requires, but they pay the prescribed penalty. Thousands of the people of France disapprove of the act of Louis Napoleon in assuming imperial power, but it would be a crime to resist his authority. Our country may enter on an unrighteous war, but that would not justify any state legislature or any individual in resisting the national army. The moral responsibility of such laws rests upon those who pass them, not on those who have no agency either in their enactment or their execution.

We heartily join, therefore, in the condemnation of all resistance to the restoration of fugitive slaves. All laws designed to interfere with the full and efficient operation of the constitutional compact on this subject are immoral. But the question now before us is, Whether the personal liberty laws, as they are called, free Southern men from their allegiance to the country and from the obligation of their oaths? This is the question which every Southern man has to answer in the sight of God.

It is not to be answered under the impulse of passion, or the dictates of interest. He is not freed from his obligation to the Union because he is alienated in feeling from the North, nor because he thinks his interests would be promoted by secession. The only question is, whether these personal liberty laws are such a violation of the national compact as to destroy its binding force, and to justify disunion? We answer, No, for the following reasons: 1. Because, as already said, the Federal Government is the party bound, and therefore so long as that government is faithful to the contract there is no violation of the compact. 2. Because the liberty laws, so far as we can learn, are not *ex professo* a nullification of the fugitive slave law. They are not directed against the agents legally appointed to execute that law. The law emanates from the General Government. It is designed to carry into execution a federal prerogative and duty. It is confided to federal officers. A law to forbid the collection of duties at a port of entry by federal officers would be an act of nullification. But a law to forbid state officers to make the collection, or state warehouses to be used for storing the goods, would not be nullification. So in like manner, a law to forbid federal officers to arrest fugitive slaves would be nullification. But a law forbidding state officers making the arrest, and prohibiting the use of state prisons for their detention, is not a nullification of the law of Congress. The duty is from its nature a distasteful one, and any declaration that it must be performed by federal officers thereto appointed, and not by state officials, who cannot legally be required to perform it, is not a breach of contract. If the United States troops in Boston harbour should desert, Massachusetts is not bound to arrest them, and a law prohibiting the state officers from being called upon to perform that service, would not be a nullification of the law against desertion. It is a United States law, and must be executed by United States officers. 3. A third argument on this subject is, that the liberty laws are designed professedly to protect free negroes. There is danger of their being unjustly carried into slavery. It has been done, and we know that a young woman from Texas, although liberated by her owner and father, was considered so much in danger in New York that she was sent to Canada for

protection. If a negro in Virginia, held as a slave, claims to be a free man, the law gives him certain facilities for having the validity of his claim judicially decided. If a negro living in Massachusetts is seized as a slave, Massachusetts desires to give him the same means of proving that he is free. The provisions of the Massachusetts law are said to be identical with those of the corresponding Virginia law. This is not nullification. 4. But suppose these laws to be directly in conflict with the fugitive slave laws; suppose a state should expressly prohibit the restoration of a fugitive slave arrested within her borders, would that justify secession? Would that exonerate any slave-holding state from its allegiance to the Union? Certainly not, because secession is not the proper remedy for this injustice. The first step would be to have such state law declared, by the Supreme Court of the United States, to be unconstitutional. That would make it a dead letter. In no part of the Union could it be executed in the face of such a decision. But should it be persisted in, the next step would be for the United States to enforce obedience to its own law. Any state resisting under such circumstances would be in rebellion, and must be reduced to submission to the law, just as Washington suppressed the Whiskey insurrection. This is the operation of our system. Nullification of the fugitive slave law, therefore, even if formally enacted in any state, would be no justification of secession. It is not a breach of contract, so long as the Federal Government, the party bound, is faithful to its duty. These liberty laws, objectionable as they may be, are not the real cause of the difficulty. The border states which suffer from the loss of slaves, are not in favour of secession. The complaint of breach of contract comes from states which suffer little or nothing from this source. We do not see, on a careful consideration of the matter, how any conscientious man can justify disunion on the ground that the North has proved unfaithful to the national compact. The great majority of the people of the North are in favour of the faithful execution of the law, and the Federal Government, their constitutional organ, has never failed to discharge its duty in the premises.

Another ground of complaint is that the South has lost its equality in the Union; or that they are denied equal rights.

This complaint has the more force on the popular mind from its vagueness, and from its appealing to a sense of justice. A denial of equal rights to any part of the confederacy would be indeed a just ground of complaint. This grievance is presented in different lights by our southern brethren. It sometimes means one thing and sometimes another. It often has special reference to the territories. These are the common property of the country. The North, South, East, and West, have an equal right to their possession and occupancy. Hence it is inferred that if immigrants from the North are allowed to take every species of their property into the territories, immigrants from the South have the right to take everything which the laws of the South declare to be property. To deny this is to deny equal right in the territories. To this it is answered, 1. That there is no restriction peculiar to the slave holding states. The people from those states may take into the territories everything that the people from the North are allowed to take. They are placed on terms of perfect equality in this respect. 2. That the restriction with regard to slaves, which bears equally upon all, whether citizens or foreigners, whether from the North or from the South, is not founded on any assumed superior claim of the North to the common heritage of the country, but simply on the principle that slavery is a municipal institution, and therefore can exist only where there is some law to create and to enforce it. Carolina cannot justly claim that her slave laws should have authority in France, or England, or in the Northern States, or anywhere else beyond her own territory. Whether this reasoning be correct or not, yet since the doctrine that slavery is a municipal institution was the common faith of the country when the Constitution was adopted, and when the Southern states entered the Union, as it was held by all our presidents and statesmen until the time of Mr. Calhoun, with few, if any exceptions, it cannot now be justly regarded as a grievance. 3. It may be further answered to this complaint, that all difficulty on this score was avoided by the Missouri Compromise, and might be removed by a restoration of that agreement. It is at best a theoretical difficulty, as the South has neither freemen nor slaves to spare for the territories. Their slaves are too valuable where they are, to

send them into regions where their labour could be turned to little or no account.

At other times, by equality of the states is meant an equal control in the administration of the government. In the past history of the country the South has been dominant. Although in a minority as to population, it has shaped the whole policy of the country. A compact minority in almost all governments holds the balance of power. The Germans, although not more than one-third of the people, secured the control of the state of Pennsylvania through a great part of its history. And so the South, by throwing her weight into one party or the other, has hitherto secured the ascendency. A protecting tariff, a national bank, internal improvements, were the policy of the country so long as the South was in their favour; when she turned against them they were abandoned. This state of things is passing away. By the inevitable progress of events, the sceptre is changing hands. The more rapid increase of the free states in number and in population, is more and more reducing the relative importance and power of the South. This result has been long foreseen. Southern statesmen have predicted that the time must come when the South could no longer control the policy of the country. Not to command, however, is in their estimation to submit. Not to be masters, in the logic of the extremists, is to be slaves. And hence the frequent and fervid declamations addressed to the people, against the tyranny of the North, and the inevitable servitude of the South, should it remain in the Union. The thing complained of is not the irresponsible power of a majority. The founders of our government were fully convinced that no despotism could be more intolerable than a pure democracy, where the majority had unrestricted power. Our national legislature is restricted within very narrow limits by the Constitution. It has not the political omnipotence of the Parliament of Great Britain, which can change the dynasty, abolish the peerage, or the church establishment, and model at pleasure the institutions of the country. Our Congress has no such power. Its authority is limited by a written Constitution. It is held in check by the distribution of power, and by the legislative authority being vested in two houses—the one composed of the representatives of the states

without regard to their relative size or importance. In every way, therefore, that human wisdom could devise, the minority is protected from the tyranny of the majority. Nor is the equality claimed by the disunionists, the equal rights of the states one with another; for this is now enjoyed and secured to the fullest extent. The thing claimed is this, viz. that the slave interest should have equal political control with all the other interests of the country combined. This is what is meant by equality. Less than this is declared to be inconsistent with their safety and honour. This is the idea which, by the teaching of Mr. Calhoun, has taken thorough possession of the minds of a certain class of Southern politicians. The correctness of this representation is proved beyond question, by the nature of the means proposed to correct the inequality complained of, or dreaded. These remedies are all directed to the natural, peaceful, and normal operation of the Constitution. They require that the Constitution should be changed in order to secure the equality demanded. Thus it has been proposed that the number of slaveholding states shall always be equal to that of the free states; that every new free state admitted into the Union should be counterbalanced by a new slave state. Thus the equality of the representatives of the slave interest in the Senate—which has controlling power in the government—with the representatives of the free states, would be preserved. Another proposal is, that there should be two Presidents—one chosen by the North, and the other by the South, and that their concurrence should be necessary to the validity of any Presidential action. Still another proposition is, that the Constitution should be so altered as to make a majority of the whole of the slaveholding states, and a majority of the free states, necessary to the election of a President; and further, that no law should take effect unless sanctioned by a majority of representatives from both sections of the country. These are so many devices to make one equal to three. They amount to an avowal on the part of their advocates, that slaveholders cannot live in any political community which they do not control. The propositions above referred to all assume that the slave interest must be dominant; that nothing shall be done without its consent; no officer, whether civil or military, judicial or executive, shall

be appointed; no law enacted, no measure adopted, without its approbation, and consequently for its benefit. This supposes that the interest of the slaveholders is antagonistic to all others, and is so important that it may rightfully be dominant, or at least co-ordinate and limiting. It assumes that three hundred and fifty thousand shall equal twenty millions. As this is a physical and moral impossibility under our present Constitution, it is proposed to alter it, or failing that, to dissolve the Union. This is the light in which the claim to equality, as interpreted and urged by the disunionists, presents itself to the people of the North. It is an unrighteous and unreasonable demand. It is demanding far more than the Constitution, which we have all sworn to support, ever contemplated. Equality of all classes in the eye of the law, equality of the states as to rights and privileges, equal protection, equal liberty, equal facilities of advancement, equal access to all places of honour and power—in short, constitutional equality in its fullest extent, is what all are willing to concede. But that one particular interest, one special class of the community, should have equal weight and influence with all the others combined—that three hundred thousand should equal twenty millions—is, at least under our present Constitution, an impossibility. And if this is the ultimatum of the extreme South, disunion is inevitable. Our present system gives every security and advantage to the slaveholding class, which can be reasonably demanded. The Constitution permits the representation of slave property, while no other species of property is allowed a representation in the national legislature. Florida, with its forty-seven thousand of white inhabitants, and its twenty-three millions of property, has as much influence in the Senate of the United States, as New York, with its three millions of inhabitants, and one thousand millions of property. Is not this enough? There are only twenty-five thousand slaveholders in South Carolina, and yet they have really as much control of the Government as the two million five hundred thousand people in Pennsylvania. Of the eighteen Presidential elections which have been held since the adoption of the Constitution, twelve resulted in the choice of slaveholders, and six in the choice of non-slaveholders. Of three hundred and seven principal appointments under the Con-

stitution, two hundred and four have been held by slaveholders. Surely, the complaint of want of equality on the part of the slaveholders, is of all others the most unfounded.

We have thus endeavoured calmly and fairly to estimate the grievances alleged by our Southern brethren. We have endeavoured to show that the people of the North are not responsible for the defamatory language of the abolitionists; nor for any attempts to create dissatisfaction among the slaves. We have endeavoured to prove that the constitutional compact with regard to the restoration of fugitive slaves has not been violated; because the Federal Government, the only constitutional organ for the performance of that duty, has never refused or failed to perform it to the extent of its ability; and because, even if any state attempted to nullify the fugitive slave law, the Constitution provides redress, first in the judicial, and then in the military power of the government. And, finally, we endeavoured to show that the complaint of the want of equality has no rational foundation.

It is however assumed that any state has the right to secede from the Union, whenever it sees fit. It matters not, therefore, whether these grievances are real or imaginary, if the cotton states believe that their interests will be promoted by secession, they have the right to secede. This is the ground taken by the leaders of the secession movement. They desire a dismemberment of the Union; they wish that the cotton states alone, or in connection with the other slaveholding states, should be constituted into an independent nation. Complaints of injustice or inequality, predictions of aggressions, are only the means employed to arouse the public mind, and to make the people willing to sever the tie which binds them to the other states. Is, then, secession one of the reserved rights of the states? Is any state at liberty to withdraw from the Union whenever she sees fit? The question does not concern the right of revolution. Revolution and secession are very different things. The one is the overthrow of a government, on the ground of the abuse of its powers, by those who are legally and *de facto* subject to its authority. It is admitted to be illegal. It is an act of violence, as much as homicide, and is, like homicide, to be justified only by necessity. The other is claimed to be a peace-

ful, orderly process, a mere dissolution of a partnership, which is binding only during the consent of parties. The leaders of the secession movement regard the Union as a mere partnership; a treaty between sovereign states, which may be dissolved by any one of the parties, by giving due notice. That this is a false view of the case is evident:

1. From the very idea of a nation. It is a body politic, independent of all others, and indissolubly one. That is, indissoluble at the mere option of its constituent parts. As the Abbeville District cannot secede at pleasure from the state of South Carolina, so neither can South Carolina secede at pleasure from the United States, provided the United States constitute a nation. That these states do constitute one nation, as distinguished from a number of nations, bound together by treaty, is proved from the fact that they in their collective capacity have all the attributes, and exercise all the prerogatives of a nation. They have national unity. They have one name, one flag, one President, one legislature, one Supreme Court, one navy and army. The authority, legislative, judicial, and executive, of the general government, extends to every part of the land, and is everywhere, within its sphere, supreme. That the states are independent and sovereign, within constitutional limits, in the management of their internal affairs, is no more inconsistent with the unity of the nation, than the like independence of the municipal corporations in England is inconsistent with the national unity of Great Britain. Our Constitution, says Mr. Madison, is neither a consolidated government nor a confederated government, but a mixture of both. "It was not formed," he continues, "by the government of the component states, as the Federal Government, for which it was substituted. Nor was it formed by a majority of the people of the United States as a single community, in the manner of a consolidated government. It was formed by the states; that is, by the people in each of the states acting in their highest sovereign capacity, and formed consequently by the same authority which formed the state constitutions. Being thus derived from the same source as the constitutions of the states, it has, within each state, the same authority as the constitution of the state; and is as much a constitution, in the strict sense

of the term, within its prescribed sphere, as the constitutions of the states are within their respective spheres; but with this essential and obvious difference, that being a compact among the states in their highest sovereign capacity, and constituting the people thereof one people for certain purposes, it cannot be altered or annulled at the will of the states individually, as the constitution of a state may be at its individual will." (Letter of Mr. Madison, quoted by Amos Kendall, Esq., in the *Washington Star.*) The United States, therefore, under the Constitution, are one people; they are one nation, in virtue of a common Constitution within its sphere, in the face of all other nations, just as any state is one, in virtue of its constitution. But if a nation, there is no possibility of its dismemberment, except by rebellion or revolution, unless by common consent. The very idea of a nation is, that it is one, independent, organized political community, whose separate parts are not severally independent of each other, but constitute an organic whole. The word *right* has both a legal and a moral sense. No constituent member of a nation can ever have the legal right to secede or rebel. It may have a moral right, in case of absolute necessity. But having no legal right, it exercises its moral right of rebellion, subject to the legal and moral right of the government against which it rebels, to resist or to concede, as it may see fit.

2. A second argument against the right of secession is found in the very words and avowed design of the compact. The contracting parties stipulate that the Union shall be "perpetual." A perpetual lease is one that cannot be annulled at pleasure. A perpetual grant is one which cannot at will be recalled. A perpetual union is one which cannot be dissolved except on the consent of all the parties to that union. Secession is a breach of faith. It is morally a crime, as much as the secession of a regiment from the battle field would be. If the country were at war and one state should withdraw her contingent, on the ground that her officers were not put in supreme command, or that their rations were not to their taste, she would retire draggling her standard in the mire of ineffaceable disgrace. It seems almost too plain for argument, that if the several states, or the people thereof in their sovereign capacity,

have pledged themselves to a perpetual union, and ratified their plighted faith by an oath, no one state can secede without incurring the twofold criminality of breach of faith and violation of an oath.

3. A third argument against the right of secession is drawn from the historical fact, that the right was at first desired by some of the states and formally rejected. New York wished to adopt the Constitution on condition that she might be permitted to withdraw should she see fit. Madison wrote to Hamilton that such a conditional ratification of the Constitution was worse than a rejection. New York, therefore, concluded to come in on the same terms with the other states, with the express understanding that there was to be no secession. These facts have been recently presented in all the papers and need not be enlarged upon. It is plain, therefore, from the history of the adoption of the Constitution, that the right of secession was denied. It was on this understanding that South Carolina and all the other states entered the Union. For one or more of them now to withdraw, must therefore be either justifiable rebellion or a breach of faith.

4. This may be said to be *res adjudicata.* All parties are committed against the doctrine of secession. When the New England states, under the pressure of the embargo laws and of the evils to them of the war of 1812, sent delegates to the Hartford Convention to consult about the means of redress, the measure was condemned with one voice by the dominant party as tending to secession. The *Richmond Enquirer*, then in the height of its influence, the recognized exponent of the principles of the Jeffersonian party at the South, elaborately proved that no state or number of states had the right to separate from the Union unless by the consent of the other states. In 1814 that journal held the following language: "No man, no association of one state or set of states, has a right to withdraw from the Union of its own account. The same power which knit us together can unknit us. The same formality which formed the links of the Union is necessary to dissolve it. The majority of the states which formed the Union must consent to the withdrawal of any one branch of it. Until that consent has been obtained, any attempt to dissolve the Union or distract

the efficiency of its constitutional law, is *treason—treason to all intents and purposes.*" What was true then is true now. And treason by the law of God and man is one of the greatest of crimes.

5. The manifold absurdities, abnormities, and evils which flow from the doctrine of secession, afford a sufficient proof of its unsoundness. These have of late been abundantly presented in the public prints. The United States gave fifteen millions of dollars for Louisiana, for the express purpose of securing command of the Mississippi river. According to the doctrine of secession Louisiana may secede, and the whole advantage of the purchase be lost. Ten millions were paid for Texas, thousands of lives and millions of dollars were expended in the Mexican war for her security, and the acquisition of California. Five millions were paid for Florida, one hundred and twenty millions have been offered for Cuba. It is absurd to suppose that our government can be founded on the theory of secession, and yet the people be willing to spend such enormous sums for territory to which they would acquire no title. If the right exists, it belongs to all the states and at all times. The country may be engaged in a perilous war, and one-half the states may legally secede and leave the remainder to bear the consequences. Suppose Louisiana or Texas had seceded in the rear of our army during the Mexican war, and cut off our resources. Would that have been a legal procedure? Or if the whole people should join in making the Pacific railroad, may Missouri and California at its termini secede, and keep it all to themselves. Such are some of the consequences of this theory. It is refuted by the *argumentum ad absurdum.* Secession, as Mr. Madison says, is revolution, and revolution is rebellion, and rebellion is at least illegal. Whether in any case morally right, depends on circumstances. If not justified by intolerable oppression and injustice, it is one of the greatest of crimes. That the Southern states are not oppressed, is plain from their own declaration. They boast of their prosperity and power. They claim to be the richest portion of the Union. They contrast their $200,000,000 of exports with the $100,000,000 exported from the North. Georgia has doubled her taxable property in the last ten years. The same general prosperity prevails throughout the South.

Of oppression, therefore, there can be no pretence. As to injustice, the only things complained of are the difficulty thrown in the way of the restoration of fugitive slaves, and the territorial question. These grounds of complaint have been considered. The North has not broken faith with the South as to fugitive slaves. The Federal Government, which alone has the right to restore them, has never refused to do so. The difficulty is not in any breach of faith. It is in the nature of the service. Men at the North are willing to let the General Government do the work, but they do not choose to be made slave-catchers themselves. The present fugitive slave law could not be executed efficiently at the South, except by federal officers. We should like to see Senator Chesnut or the Hon. Mr. Rhett called to join in the pursuit of a fugitive slave. They would do what men here do. They would say, The work must be done, but let those whose business it is see to it. Neither oppression nor injustice can be pleaded in justification of disunion. Disunion was determined upon for other reasons; these complaints are used to inflame the public mind. We do not doubt that many excellent men, many sincere Christians at the South, have been brought to believe that secession is legally and morally right. But it is no new thing in the history of the world that great crimes have been thought right. There never was an *auto da fe* which was not sanctioned by the ministers of religion. The greatest crimes have been perpetrated by those who thought they were doing God service. The fact, therefore, that good men approve of secession, that they pray over disunion, that they rise from their knees and resolve to commit the parricidal act, does not prove it to be right. It only proves how perverted the human mind may become under the influence of passion and the force of popular feeling.

This is the light in which we think this subject ought to be viewed. Is disunion morally right? Does it not involve a breach of faith, and a violation of the oaths by which that faith was confirmed? We believe, under existing circumstances, that it does, and therefore it is as dreadful a blow to the church as it is to the state. If a crime at all, it is one the heinousness of which can only be imperfectly estimated from its probable effects; but these are sad enough. It blots our name from among the

nations of the earth. The United States of North America will no longer exist. All the recollections which cluster around those words, all the bright hopes attached to them for the future, must be sunk for ever. The glorious flag which has so long floated in the advance of civilization and liberty, must be furled. We lose our position as one of the foremost nations of the earth—the nation of the future—the great Protestant power, to stand up for civil and religious freedom. All despots will rejoice, and all the friends of liberty mourn over our fall. We write thus in the apprehension that the whole South should secede. If the movement were to be confined to South Carolina, it would be simply absurd. The attempt to make a nation of a state, with a white population less than half that of Philadelphia, without anything to distinguish them for wealth, intelligence, moral power, or culture, from the other states of the Union, would be madness.* But the loss of a single plank may

* In speaking thus, we are only repeating the sentiments of a leading Carolinian. In 1851, the Hon. W. W. Boyce addressed the following protest against secession, to the people of South Carolina: "South Carolina cannot become a nation. God makes nations, not man. You cannot extemporize a nation out of South Carolina. It is simply impossible; we have not the resources. We could exist by tolerance, and what that tolerance would be, when we consider the present hostile spirit of the age to the institution of slavery, of which we would be looked upon as the peculiar exponent, all may readily imagine. I trust we may never have to look upon the painful and humiliating spectacle.

"From the weakness of our national government, a feeling of insecurity would arise, and capital would take the alarm and leave us. But it may be said, Let capital go. To this I reply that capital is the life-blood of a modern community, and in losing it, you lose the vitality of the state.

"Secession, separate nationality, with all its burdens, is no remedy. It is no redress for the past; it is no security for the future. It is only a magnificent sacrifice of the present, without in any wise gaining in the future. We are told, however, that it is resistance, and we must not submit to the late action of Congress. Now, I would like to know which one of these measures we resist by secession. It is not the prohibition of slave marts in the District of Columbia. It is not the purchase of the Texas territory. It is certainly not the admission of California. Which aggression, then, do we resist by secession? These are all the recent aggressions which we resist now by secession. Secession, gallant as may be the spirit which prompts it, is only a new form of submission.

"For the various reasons I have stated, I object, in as strong terms as I can, to the secession of South Carolina. Such is the intensity of my conviction upon the subject, that, if secession should take place—of which I have no

cause the noblest ship to founder. The secession of South Carolina may draw after it that of Georgia and the other cotton states. This is possible; although how those states can contemplate with complacency the position they must occupy in a confederacy by themselves, is more than we can tell. They can exist only by sufferance. Any great naval power, as France or England, could at any moment, by interrupting their commerce, reduce them to the greatest distress. They would attract to themselves all the slaves of the country, and then how could they exist in the midst of an anti-slavery world? It is only in the event of Virginia, with her venerable name, her political power, her commanding influence, joining in the secession, and drawing with her all the other slaveholding states, that the full measure of the evils of disunion would come upon us. Then, it is difficult to see how the irritation arising from conterminous independent states, the one slaveholding and the other free, should fail to produce collision, and collision lead to civil war and servile insurrection. It is the possibility, or probability, of such horrors following this secession movement, that makes us view the matter as so worthy of condemnation. As to the mere prosperity of the North, we see no reason why it may not do as well without political union with the South, as Canada does without a like union with the United States. The extent and resources of the country above Mason and Dixon's line, are far greater than those of almost any modern empire. The time may probably soon come when Canada and the Northern states would be peaceably united in one great confederacy, and the free portion of the country would have a career before it scarcely less glorious than ever. All this supposes disunion to be peaceable. As we fear this is impossible, we look upon disunion as only another name for destruction. A Southern paper says: "The first fugitive that escapes after dissolution, will be equivalent to a declaration of war." One of the most distinguished advocates of secession tells the people of South Carolina not to deceive themselves with the expectation that disunion does not mean war. It seems to be

idea, for I cannot believe in the existence of such a stupendous madness—I shall consider the institution of slavery as doomed, and that the Great God in our blindness has made us the instrument of its destruction."

the general impression, North and South, that rushing a state out of the Union, without preliminary action on the part of the other states, the sudden and violent disruption of the ties which bind together the complicated system of our national and state governments, is hardly possible, especially in the present state of public feeling, without hostile collision. And the first conflict will be like a spark in a magazine of powder. The responsibility, therefore, assumed by those who are urging on secession, which all parties have united in denouncing as treason, is indeed fearful. No part of the Union is free from guilt in this matter. The North has its sins to answer for. But if the views presented in the foregoing pages are correct, the blood and misery which may attend the dissolution of the confederacy must lie mainly at the door of those who for selfish ends labour to effect it, who wish for disunion as a means of prosperity. What is to be the effect of this state of things on the church and the interests of religion? How are those churches to be held together, whose members are nearly equally divided between the North and South? The papers already announce the introduction of a resolution into the Synod of South Carolina, for the dissolution of its connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. If we are to be plunged into the horrors of civil war and servile insurrections, no tongue can tell how the cause of the Redeemer must suffer throughout our whole land. It seems impossible that Christian men can blind their eyes to these probable consequences of disunion. The eloquent appeal of Dr. Dabney, of Virginia, made through the columns of the *North Carolina Presbyterian*, to the Christians of the South, can hardly fail to produce a salutary impression. And should the President, as is generally anticipated, earnestly recommend in his message to Congress, a convention of the states, that disunion, if it must come, may at least be peaceably effected, the public sentiment of the country would demand that his counsels should be heeded. Under those circumstances, if Christians at the South do not protest against immediate action, we shall conclude that God has given us up.

But is disunion inevitable? It is of course impossible by any concessions or compromise, to arrest the course of those who

desire disunion for its own sake; who believe that the Southern states will be more secure and prosperous in an independent confederacy than under the present Constitution, no matter how faithfully it may be administered. But we believe that this class is very small. It consists of the Garrisonians of the North and the professed disunionists at the South. The former desire the dissolution of the Union, because they are persuaded, as are thousands, North and South, that such dissolution would be the doom of slavery. The others desire it for their own ends. The mass of the people would gladly preserve the sacred edifice, cemented with the blood of our fathers, if we could only be reconciled and live together peaceably. The two great difficulties which stand in the way of this harmonious union, are the fugitive slave law, and the territories. As to the former, the constitutional claim of the South is undoubted, but the difficulties in the way of carrying into effect that provision of the Constitution are almost insuperable. These difficulties do not arise from state laws, or from the supineness of the General Government, but from the laws of human nature. The compromise which has been proposed on this point is, that the North should pay the full value of every fugitive slave. This we are persuaded the North would gladly do. How it should be done, may be a question difficult to answer. The ends to be accomplished are that the payment should be prompt and without contention. Neither of these ends could be secured if the payment is to be sought from the separate states or counties. It must be made by the General Government, and may be reimbursed from that portion of the price of the public lands already deposited with the states; or, as the public lands are common property, their proceeds may be distributed among the states, and the amount necessary to pay for fugitive slaves deducted from the portion due to the North. Any objections to this scheme are trifling compared with the importance of the object to be attained. As to the territories, let the Missouri Compromise be restored, the abrogation of which is the immediate source of all our present troubles. The adoption of these measures, both of which have been repeatedly proposed, would meet the views, as we cannot but believe, of the great body of moderate and good men in every part of the country.

Art. II.—*Antiquity of the Book of Genesis.*

In considering the Pentateuch in a literary and historical point of view, the most obvious remark to be made is, that its first book is anonymous, while in the other four the writer is carefully and repeatedly named. And this fact is the more worthy of notice, inasmuch as that first book is first not only in order, but also in respect to time.

To the value of Scripture it no way imports who the original writer was. The authority of inspiration is of equal weight without the sanction of a human name. Can it be determined who penned the book of Job, or of Judges, or of Chronicles, or some of the most beautiful and affecting of the Psalms? and are those parts of Scripture of inferior weight because of that unsettled question? Is a psalm less the dictate of inspiration if not penned by David? It is not the human authorship which confers the authority of inspiration; but, on the contrary, it is inspiration which gives his weight to any of the prophets, no matter what his name. The word of God bears its own stamp, and stands in no need of a voucher in any name of human renown. There is that in it and about it whereby it is as truly distinguished from a work of the human mind, as a natural rose is distinguishable from an artificial one, or a natural landscape from one arrayed according to the laws of art. As the silent declaration of Deity rises from nature, so does it from revelation, self-sustained and sustaining its defenders, while borrowing nothing from them. Whether we know, or do not know, the name and genealogy of God's human instrument in the case, is, in respect to scriptural authority, a matter of very little moment. Where the name of the writer has been recorded, and we know about him, in other connections, it is certainly gratifying to feel that we have a sort of personal acquaintance with one so favoured of God; and yet it is undoubtedly not without a valuable design that the names of several Scripture writers have been withheld.

The book of Genesis came down from antiquity to the Hebrew nation with their laws, and through the hands of the

lawgiver, and was, therefore, very naturally, by them classed under the same head; but that traditional classification is not entitled to forbid its full weight to the obvious fact that the book is anonymous. Yet, anonymous as it is, no other portion of Scripture bears the mark of Divine inspiration more legibly impressed upon it than the book of Genesis. The aroma of the early time is about it—the time when men of simple but princely manners and elevated piety held oral communion with God; and the passage with which it opens is not only obviously revelation, but also the sublimest in human language. The man of science, who honestly studies its first chapter, the Christian, whe reads its narrative of the fall of man and the words of promise to the seed of Abraham, and considers its relation to the whole plan of redemption, stands in no need of a human voucher for its Divine origin. The question of its authorship is merely one of literary history; but, under that head, a question of no comman interest.

Moses is a writer very careful about affixing his name to what he writes. The other books of the Pentateuch consist of a great number of subdivisions or topics, and to almost every several one of them is the name of Moses attached, and to all that contain revelations, together with the authority of God, as "The Lord spake unto Moses," or, "Moses wrote this law," or some equivalent form of expression. And certainly if it was to him that God revealed the order of creation, or of primal mankind, there was the best of reasons for introducing that revelation with his usual sanction. Hence, we remark with the greater cogency, that in not one of the headings of the parts of Genesis, nor anywhere in their contents, does the name of Moses appear.

That the book was transmitted through the hands of Moses is a matter that admits of no dispute; but what he did for it must be determined otherwise than by mere tradition, however ancient that may be. Unsupported tradition is not competent to establish original authorship in a case of this kind. Because, in the first place, the book of Genesis treats of matters which had all taken place ages before Moses was born; its latest subjects were to him antiquity; and, secondly, the account which it gives of many events is circumstantial and personally

characteristic, descending even to details of conversations and descriptions of personal attitudes and incidents, which none could be cognizant of but the parties concerned. The very latest event mentioned in Genesis had occurred, at the shortest estimate, more than half a century before Moses was born; and the rest of its human history covers a period extending to more than two thousand years of a prior antiquity; the earlier parts of it standing in relation to Moses, chronologically, as the times of Homer and Hesiod and Thales stand to ours. It is clear that he could not have been the original author of such a history by any natural means. The book could have come to his hands in only one of four ways. Either the whole was revealed to him supernaturally; or its materials came down to him on the stream of tradition; or they were kept in detached records —written monuments of one kind or another, from which he composed the work; or, finally, the whole is an historical series, preserved in the usual historical way, and existing in its original historical integrity.

In the first place, the book of Genesis presents none of the features of a vision. Its simple directness, and plain daylight outlines, are such that, if it is a vision, it has no parallel in the rest of Scripture. In all the declared visions of the prophets there is certainly nothing like it.

Neither is it according to the analogy of Scripture to assume a retrospective revelation of human events. God has not, in subsequent time, suffered ages of important progress in the history of redemption to pass by unrecorded, and to be all forgotten, and then recalled them in a vision to some individual, thereby substituting the testimony of one person for that of whole generations. Other steps in the unfolding of the plan of redemption were recorded in their proper time, and preserved in true historical manner. If Genesis must be made an exception, we need to have some good reason therefor.

Nowhere else, in Scripture, do we find a gratuitous interposition of revelation. The work which man is competent to do for himself, is never taken out of his hands. But to keep a record of remarkable events, occurring under one's eyes, is both natural for man to wish, and, when the art of writing is known, easy to effect.

The Divine discipline has never been such as to render human industry unnecessary, but always to educe it—to move man to record his own history rather than to suffer his mind to lie dormant and forget all that God had done for him, and then to bring it up again, at the end of centuries, when it had still to be recorded, in the way that it might have been at first. That is not the kind of discipline which we have learned to expect at the hand of God; and for a case, which is claimed to be of that kind, as being unparalleled, we need some most cogent reason.

It is certainly very improbable that holy men, favoured with special revelation of the Divine will, should treat it with such neglect and forgetfulness;—that Noah, Abraham, Jacob, for instance, should keep no account of those wonderful revelations made to them, and which they understood were to affect deeply the well-being of future generations, and should coolly consign them to such utter oblivion, that, at the end of many ages, they had all to be revealed again, together with the very existence of the men to whom they were made.

Again, Moses was a man scrupulously careful to render God the glory of all communications received from him, and could not have neglected, through a whole book, to make the slightest recognition of a revelation so great and unparalleled; especially as that recognition would have been deemed a necessary voucher for the truth of the book. He would not have left to be assigned, in any degree, to the instrumentality of man, what he had received directly from God.

And, finally, the assumption that Genesis is a retrospective revelation, is entirely gratuitous. It is without the slightest foundation in any recorded fact. Scripture nowhere asserts, or implies, or gives the least countenance to it.

Such was the length of life among the patriarchs, that tradition had but few hands to pass through between Adam and Moses; but that, in the first place, is not like the certainty which God establishes his word upon. He has taught us to make a very broad distinction between the written word and oral tradition. And, secondly, the book presents not the slightest appearance of oral tradition, while it contains passages of a kind which oral tradition has never elsewhere been known to

retain—passages of recondite science, physical and ethnological, given in popular style, yet with perfect precision and order, as well as a number of long genealogical lists, some of them not belonging to the descendants of Jacob; and it contains a systematic chronology, not all arranged in relation to one era, but in each genealogy in relation to itself. In a matter of this kind, we are not concerned with what the human memory might possibly effect, or what some particular men of retentive memories can do. That belongs to mental science, or rather to the head of curiosities of mental phenomena. We have here to do with the law of oral tradition, among an unlettered people—not what a man might do, or can do; but what men, under those circumstances, are actually found to do. Now, Genesis contains materials, such as no production positively known to have taken its rise among an unlettered people, and its shape from oral tradition, is found to contain; and throughout, in all ascertainable matters—in geography, in ethnology, in history, in geology, in astronomy, and whatsoever it touches—it wears the stamp of the accuracy of writing. But might not tradition, as truly as writing, be supernaturally defended from error? True, it might; and we should promptly admit it, if God had given any instruction to that end; or, if the Saviour had not left a very strong testimony against tradition, as contradistinguished from the written word. And, thirdly, this is also a totally gratuitous assumption, founded upon another equally gratuitous assumption, namely, that none could be its first writer but Moses.

The halfway position that the book may have been composed from oral traditions, supplied and corrected by revelation, is liable to similar objections, and, like the preceding, is a pure assumption, without a particle of authority human or divine.

On the other hand, while the book of Genesis is nowhere in Scripture mentioned as either a vision or tradition, it is repeatedly quoted as Scripture, that is, holy writ. Thus, it is quoted in Romans, fourth chapter and third verse, Galatians, third chapter and eighth verse, and fourth chapter and thirtieth verse, and, in the twenty-second verse of that same chapter, it is referred to expressly as that which was written. We would not be understood to attach more to this fact than it fully

amounts to, namely, that it discountenances any supposition that Genesis was produced in a way different from that common to other books of the sacred canon. And this is to be taken together with that other fact, that no passage quoted from it in Scripture is ever referred to Moses, although his name is frequently mentioned in connection with quotations from other books of the Pentateuch, and he is expressly said to have spoken all the *precepts* of the law. Heb. ix. 19.

In the gospel according to Luke xxiv. 27, we find it said of the Saviour, that "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the the Scriptures the things concerning himself;" and hence might infer a final settlement of this question. Because, if there are things concerning the Messiah in Genesis, as we hold there are, it must be comprehended under the name of Moses, from whom, together with all the prophets, he began his exposition. But in order to that conclusion, we must show that the words "Moses, the prophets, and the Scriptures," are designations of authorship, and not mere classification of the sacred books. Upon attempting, however, to make this point good, from parallel passages, and passages of direct reference or quotation, we find everything going to determine the opposite. In the 44th verse of the same chapter of Luke, "the law of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms," is obviously a classification of the books of Old Testament scripture. So in Matt. v. 17; vii. 12, and xxii. 40, and Luke xvi. 16, "the law and the prophets" are used as general terms comprehending all Scripture. In these last mentioned instances it is clear that the words "law and the prophets" correspond respectively to Moses and the prophets in the first. The name of Moses, as the writer of the law, is used in a sense synonymous with law, according to a custom equally prevalent in our own language. And then either or both of them are used as terms whereby to designate a class of sacred books in which the law was the principal part. That group of books contained also history, poetry, and much else besides law, but the law was its great feature, and furnished a convenient designation of the whole, which every Hebrew rightly understood when so used. It was not, however, always confined to the Pentateuch. Jesus himself sometimes called the whole body of

Old Testament scripture the law, (John x. 34; xv. 25,) sometimes the two heads, the law and the prophets, were used as comprehensive of the whole, and sometimes three classes were made, the law, or Moses, or the law of Moses, being the name given to the first, the prophets designating the second, and the Psalms the third. It is clear that these names, so far from determining authorship, do just the very opposite, by grouping together under the same head books of acknowledgedly different authors, and of dates separate by hundreds of years. Thus, as Job, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon were classed with the Psalms, although certainly not Psalms, and Kings with the Prophets, although really historical, so Genesis was classed with the law of Moses, although not belonging to the law.

Genesis being thus arranged under the general head of the law by the Jews, the Saviour, by adopting, confirmed that classification; but did not, thereby, affirm anything else than that the classification was a proper one; just as much, and no more, as he affirmed of the other heads by adopting them.

So far then, we have the best authority for the historical connection of the book. It was correctly classed with the oldest books of the Old Testament.

But further, Scripture in several places makes a broad distinction between the materials of Genesis and the law, and in some of those places as distinctly assigns the book to a prior antiquity.

This position is remarkably illustrated in the ninth chapter of Nehemiah, where the people are said to have spent part of the day reading in the word of the law of the Lord, after which, in the course of their worship, they were addressed by the chief Levites. That address begins with a summary of what they had been reading, and presents an outline, first of the history contained in Genesis, continued down through the bondage in Egypt, and the exode, and then mentions particularly the giving of the law by the hand of Moses; thus recognizing the whole series of ancient writings as "the book of the law," and yet fully and carefully distinguishing the earlier history from the law properly so called. And this distinction we find uniformly observed in Scripture, wherever anything but mere classification is meant. In the seventh chapter of Hebrews, the period of

the promises to the patriarchs is very elaborately distinguished from that of the law. The apostle actually contrasts the one with the other; and in Galatians, third chapter and nineteenth verse, assigns the law to its proper place, as not only different from the preceding dispensation, but as only an addition thereto for a temporary purpose. The importance of that early history, as prior to the law, is set forth in many passages of subsequent Scripture, (*e. g.* Psalm cv., Acts vii., Neh. ix., Heb. vii., Gal. iii.,) which uniformly assumes its priority.

There was good reason for the classification of Genesis with the law, inasmuch as they had come down together from before the settlement of Israel in Canaan, and unitedly contained the preliminary history and national constitution of that people. In these very important respects, Genesis and the books of the law formed a group by themselves.

Such being the case, it is the more worthy of remark, that Scripture invariably observes a scrupulous discrimination touching their contents, purport, and authorship.

The law is discriminately said to have been given by Moses, and he is declared to have spoken every precept thereof; but a quotation made from Genesis is quoted simply as Scripture—that is, as the written word of God. And in one such passage, Gal. iii. 8, the form of expression implies that what is quoted was written in the time of Abraham. The written word is there said to have preached the gospel to Abraham.

Moreover, Genesis is never quoted, nor is any passage of it referred to as "the law," or as "the law of Moses," nor as the law, with any epithet; nor is it ever in any way alluded to as of contemporaneous origin with the law. This amounts to great cogency when we remember that Genesis is quoted many times, and the law, in one way and another, more than three hundred times, in Scripture; and yet never, in any instance, are the two confounded. Obviously this did not occur, in the case of books grouped together from such antiquity, without a careful intention.

Thus, in later Scripture, Genesis is repeatedly referred to as the written, and yet never assigned to Moses as the writer. Now, we hold that this discrimination is correct, and that it

will be borne out by a fair consideration of the book itself and its ascertainable conditions.

In the first place, the book bears the unmistakable marks of a composition originally written. For instance, one part of it is headed, "This is the *book* of the generations of Adam." Gen. v. 1. Another, "These are the generations of Shem," and so on. Then the structure of some of its parts is that dependent upon the composition of them in writing. The great argument,, and in fact, the sole reason for leaving these particulars out of view, or shrinking from granting to them their proper importance, is the improved assumption that, in those days, writing was unknown.

Such was an utterly unjustifiable presumption at any period. Because the mere existence of an ancient book, bearing the features of written composition and the archaic character of the time to which it pertains, logically throws the presumption on the other side, which must hold its position unless displaced by some more cogent argument. Such an argument, as far as we know, never has been adduced, and the investigations of the last thirty years have now put it out of the question.

It is no longer a disputable point whether writing was practised before Moses or not; it is one of those things which to doubt is to betray a culpable ignorance; but we have also to add, that in the time of Moses the system of writing was already ancient, and that too, in the highest perfection it ever possessed among the Egyptians, with whom he was educated.

By the Egyptians various methods of writing were employed from very ancient date; but the most common, and really the basis of the whole, was, in its system, precisely the same as that employed by the Hebrews and Phœnicians. The Egyptian phonetic writing was only an elaborate multiplication of signs upon the same system which was common to them and the neighbouring nations of Asia.

Now, that system of writing, in all the completeness that ever belonged to it, is found, at this hour, upon monuments, which must have been inscribed long before Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees. Moreover, upon those same monuments we find pictures of books; and repeatedly occur the bound papyrus roll and the scribe's writing apparatus, as graphic signs—

evincing a preëxisting familiarity with the art. Under the fourth dynasty of Egyptian kings, at least two hundred years before the call of Abraham, such evidences of the antiquity of writing are both numerous and unmistakable.

A similar witness has recently arisen to testify to the antiquity of the same art in Assyria. Among the multitude of written monuments collected from the ruins of Babylon and Nineveh, some have come down from the very time of Abraham, and others, in the opinion of the most learned Assyrian archæologists, are probably older than that by more than two hundred years. And nothing has yet been discovered which intimates that research has entered upon the period when writing was invented.

Not only the art of writing, but also that of literary composition, had attained a high degree of excellence in the time of Moses. The works of that author bear no marks of incipiency, but rather of perfection in the art. More particularly, Hebrew style had already the completeness of its finish. The style of Moses does not stand to Hebrew as that of Lucilius to Latin, or that of Chaucer to English, but presents the features of its maturity. Hebrew, in his hands, has all the air of familiarity with literature, as if it had been long accustomed to artistic shape in letters. Although the Israelites were then only beginning to assume their place as a nation, their leaders and forefathers had been well informed, refined, and wealthy men, from time immemorial; and their language was not a narrow, peculiar dialect of their own, but belonged to the whole stock of which they were sprung. Nor was it confined even to the descendants of Shem. In dialects but slightly differing from one another, it was the language at once of the Canaanites and of the empire founded by Nimrod on the Tigris and Euphrates. From Nineveh to Sidon and to the borders of Egypt, it was spoken with little variation. Indeed, what are commonly called the Semitic languages, should rather, if regard is had to the people by whom they were first extensively used, be called Hamitic. Hebrew was not the sole possession of the family of Abraham. It was the language of Canaan, when Abraham migrated there, and was spoken at that very time both in Sidon and in Babylon. The use of the Hebrew language or of

a kindred dialect is no indubitable evidence of Semitic origin, unless associated with some more discriminate marks. These two branches of a common stock, Hebrew in the east, and Egyptian in the west, were the principal languages of the then civilized world.

Accordingly, the most ancient Babylonian inscriptions vary but little from the language of the book of Genesis. They are autographs of a date earlier than half of its contents.

Within these few months, announcement has been made of a discovery, which, if verified, must carry the history, not only of writing, but also of literature in Assyria, fully up to the date of the earliest Egyptian monuments. We refer to the Arabic translations of ancient Babylonian books, recently examined by Ghwolson, of St. Petersburg. Upon those books themselves we are not yet in condition to found an argument; but the reputation of the eminent scholar who makes the announcement, is such as to leave no room to question either his own entire belief in the reality of his discovery, or the honesty and laboriousness of the investigations by which it was reached. And the very fact, which is not now stated for the first time, that, in the days of the Abbassides, there were ancient Babylonian books still extant, is one not to be left out in this connection.

It is also to the point to add, that the Chaldees, among whom Abraham's father dwelt, are, by the earliest information we obtain of them, presented as an eminently learned people, while the ruins of their buildings, recently exhumed, give evidence of a literary taste, and zeal for the perpetuation of their records, hardly inferior to that of Egypt.

Now, Terah's family was just of the kind to value most highly such an art, being neither degraded by the pressure of poverty, nor enfeebled by the frivolities of luxury. They were pious, sensible men, of a regal style of thinking and acting, as well as of nomadic simplicity of manners—just such men as were most likely to have the best education that was going. And they most probably followed the manners and customs of their ancestry.

Writing has from ancient time been the favourite art of the sons of Shem. We do not mean to say that every tribe of

them, in every age, has possessed skill therein; but the great divisions of the people have from time immemorial cherished it as an ethnic feature. Most remarkably have they been the people of the book. A book has, in all recorded ages, been their rallying point—their national centre. Even in the present day, sunk as they are, crushed under the weight of ages of degeneracy, scattered refugees over the face of the world, wherever you find a little neighbourhood of the sons of Israel, you find readers—readers of the ancient language of Canaan. And even among the savages of Africa, the wandering or trading Arab has carried his national art of the pen. Consequently, we deem it exceedingly improbable, that, living in the midst of those who used writing, the Semitic patriarchs should have remained ignorant of it.

Here we are met by another class of those who seem bent upon diminishing the authority of Scripture by one way, if not by another, who inform us, with as much assurance as if they had been there and seen the thing done, that true, there were writings—documents call them—in the earlier time; but that they do not exist any longer; for Moses composed his book out of them, and then left the originals to perish. If such is the fact, we ask to have it well proved. For it is a singular one in Scripture, and not according to the analogy of revelation in this respect. It must be borne in mind that we have not here to deal with mere lists of names which might be copied from some secular register; but also with passages of holy writ upon which the stamp of inspiration is most clearly impressed, and with which the lists are connected as integral parts of the series. We cannot admit that the substance of Genesis ever was anything but inspired. For wisdom, and knowledge, and holiness, and justice, belong to the grain of its texture; and the whole bearing of its narrative is prophetic and from sin to salvation. Consequently we reject the hypothesis that Moses composed the book out of secular documents.

That it should have been composed out of inspired documents is not according to the analogy of Scripture history. The books of Chronicles, which are altogether peculiar, may be an exception to this remark. They appear to be an epitome of the national records made by an infallible hand. But when Ezra

edited the sacred books accumulated in his time, he did not presume to pick and choose among them, and to say what should be preserved and what not. Much less did he make a book of his own out of their materials. So when the books of the New Testament were arranged together they were reverently preserved in their respective forms, which had been given them under the dictate of inspiration. No hand dared to remodel them, or to leave out what might be deemed unnecessary repetition in one book of what had already been contained in another.

Now, if Moses could be shown to have done with previous books what later hands did not with later Scripture, we should be at a loss to account for it, and consequently are not prepared to admit that he did so, unless the fact is well proved. But it is not proved, it is only conjectured. Under the conditions, the conjecture is inadmissible.

It might be said that the inspiration which guided the hand of Moses would give authority to his selections and alterations. So was Ezra inspired, but he did not presume to alter what God had revealed to others.

Moreover, it is inconsistent with analogy to assume that God first revealed a series of writings, and then subsequently ordained another person to modify or amend them, or to select some of them and reject others.

Considered in itself, this document theory is to the last degree improbable.

And, finally, there is not a vestige of proof to sustain it in either the shape of the component parts of the book, or in the way in which they are quoted in subsequent Scripture. No ancient authority of any kind has been adduced as asserting it, or as referring to Genesis in such a way as to imply it. The internal evidences which are claimed, such as the use of the words Jehovah and Elohim, are all perfectly consistent with the integrity of the respective parts in their original form.

The book must be taken for what it appears and professes to be, unless it can be shown to be something else. It appears and professes to be a series of histories. All attempts to prove it a vision, or a tradition, or anything else than it professes to

be, turn out to be hopelessly lame. Consequently we hold that it is history.

Now, when we come to look into the book of Genesis, and consider its substance and structure, we find that view completely sustained. It is not a single composition, but a collection of smaller books, as the whole Bible itself is. Its structure, in fact, is just that of the Bible, on a smaller scale. The different parts of which it consists, have, in all cases but one, their respective titles, after the usual Hebrew manner, and all of them their proper unity and completeness, arising from an obvious purpose to that end. The oneness of historical effect, in their chronological arrangement, is similar to that of the whole Bible, and independent of any intention in the persons who wrote its parts.

The shape of these parts and their respective symmetry forbid the hypothesis that the book is a reconstruction out of previously existing documents. Each part is complete in itself, having its own proper beginning, subject and appropriate close, as well defined, and after the same manner as the later books of Hebrew Scripture. You may call them books, or sections, or parts, or what you will; we have their own authority for calling them books: one of the very earliest of them, Gen. v. 1, calls itself the Book of the Generations of Adam; in the word *sepher* employing a term which cannot be mistaken for anything short of writing; and by their very titles and shape they declare themselves to be of independent construction. Take any one of them and publish it apart, and it will tell its own story from beginning to end, and be found to stand in as independent a literary position as the book of Joshua or of Ruth. Each one of them bears every appearance of being now all that it ever was.

Genesis has no appearance of being a reconstruction from the materials of more ancient documents. It is the collection, in chronological order, of the ancient books themselves, without further trace of editorial work than that of modernizing the diction and prefixing the conjunction, in some cases, by way of linking the consecutive books together. The division into chapters, and even the older Hebrew division into sections, is one obviously made at later time by persons who paid no attention

to the original structure. Both these divisions, at different periods of the history of the book, have covered up and disguised its real proportions by designating it with new marks upon a different principle: as sometimes we find works of ancient architectural art overlaid with plaster, and marked with the features of another order by some later hands. We must break away the plaster and search beneath it for the moldings which reveal the original design. In like manner, by neglecting the division into chapters, and studying that of the original books, we shall obtain a much clearer idea of the nature and effect of the whole series.

Another evidence that we have the ancient inspired books, and not a reconstruction by any later hand, is that, in some cases they are found to overlap each other, the introduction of one book running briefly over the ground already traversed by its predecessor; as if originally standing by itself, it recognized the propriety of preparing the ground for its own position, which would not have been the case had it been composed consecutively with the preceding, as part of one work.

In all, this canon of early Scripture consists of eleven books. The first extends from the beginning of the first chapter to the third verse of the second chapter, and contains the account of creation until earth was prepared for the habitation of man, and the work crowned by the formation of man in the image of God. This first of existing books surpasses all that have been since composed, in grandeur of manner and of conception. It opens without a title, without a preface, in majestic simplicity, by a sentence which declares the birth of the universe. Its subject is of the order in which God made the heavens and the earth, and majestically as it opens, so it closes with the day on which God rested from all his works of creation. No other passage of Scripture bears more deeply the mark of having been not only inspired, but dictated by the Creator himself. It is a revelation, not adapted to the Hebrew alone, but to the whole human race, instructing them in the position to which they have been assigned in the order of the universe. They are created as the ministers of God upon this globe during the "period of its rest from the mighty revolutions of creation." Having in all ages sustained the flight of devotion, this part of

Scripture has also, in later time, served a most valuable purpose in science, by resisting tendencies to error, and constraining effort into the proper direction, where large results of truth reward the toils of investigation. And in this latter field we are convinced that its value is still far from being fully apprehended.

The opening of the second book is marked by a separate title, and treats again of the creation of man, but enters more particularly into the manner of it. For the subject is here of primal man, his original state of holiness, how he fell from it, the wretched consequences of that fall upon himself and his children, until the birth of Seth, in whose descent should come the Saviour. It extends from the fourth verse of the second chapter to the end of the fourth chapter. This history, complete in itself, is also of equal interest to all mankind, setting forth, as it does, the origin of that evil which is in the world, and the remedy for it, in calling upon the name of the Lord.

The third book is the genealogy of Seth, starting once more from the creation of man, and briefly recapitulating its principal facts. It records the degeneracy of men among the descendants of that pious patriarch, with the honourable exceptions of Enoch and Noah, and comes down to the five hundredth year of Noah's life on the verge of the flood. And there, as an antediluvian genealogy, it properly comes to a close. Of the fourth book, which extends from the ninth verse of the sixth chapter to the end of the ninth chapter, the single subject is the history of the deluge, and it closes with a few brief statements touching the subsequent life of Noah, and the date of his death.

In the fifth, which includes from the beginning of the tenth chapter to the ninth verse of the eleventh, we have the most valuable ethnological record in existence—positively the key of general history. It treats of the distribution of the family of Noah, with the original cause of their dispersion. Like all the rest, it has every element of a complete work. Nor should we overlook the internal evidences of its antiquity: first, that it makes mention of Sodom and Gomorrha in such a manner as to show that when it was written those cities were still in existence, and occupying a distinguished position in the civil geo-

graphy of Canaan; secondly, that, in its account of national settlements, it contains no name known to have arisen at a subsequent period; and thirdly, that although belonging to a series of records chiefly concerned with the descendants of Shem, it gives as much space to the settlements of Ham as to all the rest of mankind together. Evidently its writer was deeply impressed with the existing superiority of that race, as in the present day a similar treatise would give most room to the Japhetic. When that book was composed, the sons of Ham were still the masters of the world. God's judgments had not yet fallen upon them, and Sodom and Gomorrha, Admah and Zeboim were still in the unchecked career of worldly prosperity and vice.

From this point it was no longer consistent with the purpose of revelation to carry forward the history of the whole race. Accordingly, the stream of narrative is confined to the descendants of Shem through Arphaxad. And the sixth book, from the tenth verse of the eleventh chapter to the twenty-sixth verse of the same, presents the genealogical series from Shem to Abram, with whom it closes. It is merely a genealogical list, kept undoubtedly by the hereditary care of the ancestors of Abram. The seventh book is the life of that patriarch, and the most beautiful example of ancient story. Its object being throughout to set forth the call and faith of Abram, and the blessing which rested upon him and was promised to his seed, it properly comes to a close, at the eleventh verse of the twenty-fifth chapter, with the death of Abraham and the transfer of the blessing, according to promise, to his son Isaac. The eighth is a brief account of the family of Ishmael. And the ninth contains a fuller and more circumstantial history of Abraham's son according to the promise. Isaac's quiet and comparatively stationary life, however, occupies less space than do the adventures and animosities of his two sons. And the book closes, at the end of the thirty-fifth chapter, with his death, and the final reconciliation of his sons over his grave. The tenth, consisting of the thirty-sixth chapter, contains the genealogy of the descendants of Esau, and lists of their princes. It is composed of six different lists, is longer and more circumstantial than any other in this portion of Scripture, and bears

marks of having been enlarged at some subsequent time. Nothing is more natural than that such additional facts should have been appended, inasmuch as, of all their kindred, the Edomites were the most intimately connected with Israel, and these facts of their early history could not be inserted in a more proper place. And the eleventh book is the history of Jacob, from the time when he came to the patriarchal succession, together with the adventures of his children, until his death in Egypt, and princely funeral in Canaan, and closes with a brief account of the circumstances in which he left his family, until the death of Joseph. Here the early records come to an end. A long interval of silence succeeded. The sojourn among foreigners, and ultimately the hard bondage to which they were subjected, long crushed the Hebrew taste for letters, and in their degradation the Divine vision was withheld, until Moses was providentially prepared and miraculously called to effect their deliverance.

To account for such an array of complete productions, the hypothesis of oral tradition will not suffice. And there can be no call for it, until some fact is discovered which shall go to ascertain when writing was invented, or, at least, go far enough back to present it in some stage of incipiency.

It is equally unnecessary, for the same reason, to have recourse to the hypothesis of a retrospective revelation to Moses. The book has every appearance of being genuine history, preserved in the usual historical manner, and nothing in the conditions of the case can be shown to be inconsistent with that appearance which it bears. In structure, it is indisputably a series of parts, each complete in itself, and bearing every mark of an independent work; and there is nothing in the book itself, nor in other Scripture, which in any degree conflicts with the declaration which that structure makes.

The substantial facts of most of those early books must have been first put on record by contemporaries. The only one, which is not a simple account of facts observable by men, is the first; and we can see no reason why the revelation of it must be supposed to have been delayed until the time of Moses, when it was of as much value, and as comprehensible to the first man, as to him, and pertains not to the interest of the Hebrews

alone, but of the whole human race. Adam, or Seth, or Enoch, were much more likely to be the first recipients of that revelation. And it will hardly be claimed, that, coming from them, it would be less worthy of confidence.

As to authorship, seeing we have only probabilities to rely upon, the strongest claim would seem to belong to those eminent servants of God who lived nearest to the facts recorded. It is reasonable to think that the best qualified to record a revelation, and the circumstances connected therewith, must be the highly honoured individual to whom it was made.

In most of those ancient books, private conversations and other circumstances are given, which, by natural means, none but the persons to whom they occurred could possibly relate for the first time. There can be no doubt that Adam himself is the authority for the conversation held with God, in the primitive state of human holiness, and in connection with the fall. And who could possibly relate what took place in the ark, but some of the patriarchs who crossed the flood in it? We may remark similarly of Jacob's dream on the way to Padan-Aram, of Abraham's offering up Isaac, and of many other passages.

We can see no reason for denying the existence of a written revelation until the Hebrew exode from Egypt, except that of claiming the credit thereof for a well-known name. With all due reverence for the penman of the Divine law, we think it sufficient that the honour redound to God. If a prophecy was uttered by Enoch, or the truth preached by Noah, it was already as abundantly vouched for as if sanctioned by Moses. Of all men, none were so likely to seek a permanent form for the manifestations of the Divine presence and will, as the very men to whom they were made, both from the impulses of human nature, and because they, as the most eminently pious men of their respective times, would attach the highest value to every word of God. All things considered, the probabilities are certainly in favour of the position that those early books of Scripture were first penned by the patriarchs to whom they respectively pertain. This, however, we claim only as a probability. Others may think differently of it, without affecting in any degree the antiquity of the books.

Whoever were the penmen of it, the book of Genesis was composed after the manner of all the rest of Scripture, by successive addition of book to book, as it was revealed, and soon after its facts occurred. In other words, before the time of Moses, this collection of eleven books was already the volume of Holy Writ. It was the Bible of the Hebrews in Egypt, by which, in that long and hard bondage, the religion of their fathers, and belief in the promises of God were kept alive among them, as now in their dispersion over the world, the same people are held together and withheld from losing themselves in any other population, by the book of their completed canon.

That primal epoch of the church was separated from its successor by a long period of degeneracy; and a longer period intervened between the close of the revelations pertaining to the Mosaic epoch, and those which opened the Christian. In both these intervening periods the written word kept the spirit of the church alive. During the first dispensation the church existed only in the families of the faithful. And the whole series of revelation pertaining to it is addressed to that state of society. In the second, the people constituting the church had become a nation, and needed a code of national law and a land to dwell in. Accordingly the second series of revealed books consists chiefly of national laws, national instruction, and national history. Moses was the highly honoured instrument in writing out that law, which was to constitute the church into a separate nation: certainly the loftiest position that statesman ever occupied. In the third period, the church is prepared to be more than a nation. It is now the kingdom of heaven, and the books addressed to it are of a correspondingly higher spirituality and catholicity. In all three, the character of the sacred books is adapted to that of the dispensation. Thus a comprehensive view of the whole series of Scripture, as connected with the history of the church, goes to corroborate the more minute considerations of archaic criticism.

As the Bible of the Mosaic church closed its canon four hundred years before Christ, so the patriarchal series ended, at least, one hundred and fifty years before Moses was called in the desert of Horeb. The three different classes of books consti-

tuting our sacred canon, are remarkably separated from each other by these two intervening periods of silence. And as towards the close of the second, critics and copyists were raised up to collect, examine, and arrange, for the more careful preservation, the books then accumulated, so Moses, or some other pious and learned man, had discharged a similar office for the earlier canon, as the first dispensation drew towards its close. And when that early Scripture passed through the hands of Moses, as it certainly did, such was the reverence with which he regarded it, that, though he may have modernized its diction,* and adjusted its arrangement, he did not presume to make a new book out of its materials, but transmitted it just as he found it, leaving each book in its original form, as Ezra, at a later time, edited the fuller collection, and as we now edit the whole series when complete.

In what we call the book of Genesis, then, we have the Bible of the patriarchal church—the Bible of the church before Moses, containing literary productions from the earliest ages of our race, and the only historical authorities of the first two thousand years. It contains the patriarchal creed in that shape which was best adapted to the instruction of patriarchal times. Even before its narrative has got beyond the first sons of Adam, it has exhibited these fundamental doctrines: That God created the heavens and the earth; that God made man in his own image, in righteousness and true holiness; that man, though able to remain holy, was free to sin; that he did sin, and thereby involved himself and all his posterity in condemnation and misery; that human suffering is the consequence of sin; that God had provided a way of salvation through the blood of sacrifice, and that whosoever worshipped him thereby would be accepted, but that to any other attempt to approach him he would have no respect.

Succeeding revelations made progressively fuller exposition of the way of redemption, uncovering the subordinate features

* Occasionally we find ancient names followed by the explanation in the more recent name, as if the editor had not felt free to modernize the whole so far as to leave out the old and substitute the new, but preferred to retain the old, appending the new by way of explanation. Thus "Bela, (the same is Zoar.)" "Kiriath arba, (the same is Hebron,)" &c.

of that great mystery as the minds of men were prepared for it; but even for the family which first sinned, its essential outlines were distinctly drawn. Revelation has, from the beginning, been in every age a code of complete religious instruction in what God required of his people at that time, always adapted to the particular shape of the existing dispensation, and each preceding portion the most admirable preparation for that which was to follow, while possessing its own permanent value as a part of the whole.

Scripture is not only a revelation of God's will touching sinners, it is also a contemporaneous history of the various steps in the unfolding of the plan of redemption from the earliest day that man needed redemption, until in the fulness of time it was completed. To the first narrative left by Adam was added that of some other holy man, then that of another, and another, until that dispensation drew to an end. Then followed another and broader dispensation under the instruction of another series of inspired books, similarly adapted to it. And, finally, the Christian dispensation completed the order with a similar collection of sacred books, similarly adapted to its spirit and place, when it is found that the library, thus accumulated in the course of thousands of years, has been designed by the Holy Spirit, who inspired it, in the shape of one complete and symmetrical book. Thus it is that God effects the unity of his works. When man would make a plant assume a particular shape of his choice, he imprisons its growth within some hard material casing; when God would do so, he wills it, and the plant, obedient to the mandate, springs spontaneously into the shape designed, but with a native grace and finish which it transcends the art of man to confer.

The growth of Scripture has been of the same nature all along from the first Adam until the completed revelation of the Second. From the first sin of man until the manifestation of Him who came to do away with all sin, the accumulation of Scripture was commensurate with the unfolding of the plan of redemption, and its unity and purpose were due, not to a design of man, but to the decrees of God.

Art. III.—*The New Oxford School; or Broad Church Liberalism.*

Recent Inquiries in Theology, by eminent English Churchmen: being "Essays and Reviews," reprinted from the second London edition. Edited with an Introduction, by Rev. Frederic H. Hedge, D. D. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860.

The Order of Nature considered in reference to the Claims of Revelation. A Third Series of Essays. By the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., F. R. A. S., F. G. S. Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans & Roberts. 1859.

Various types of doctrine have, in successive periods, had place or ascendency in the Anglican church. When it disowned allegiance to Rome, and erected itself into an independent national organization, its faith was substantially that of the Reformed churches on the continent. Joined with them in a common reformation from Papal heresies and abominations, it was essentially one with them in that great system of faith which was the life of this Reformation. This is sufficiently conspicuous in the Thirty-nine Articles, and in the testimonies of her great divines, and her noble army of confessors and martyrs, who at this time adorned her annals. On the ecclesiological side, however, the English church retained more of the ritual and hierarchical element than her continental sisters. The reigning monarch was made her temporal head. Her liturgical services also retained certain expressions which savoured of an *opus operatum* efficacy in the sacraments. The consequence has been that this church has usually had two adverse parties struggling for the ascendency within her pale—the Evangelical, who interpret the liturgy according to the articles; and the Ritualistic, who construe the articles according to the liturgy. Under and between these classes, all varieties and grades of doctrine and practice have had place in that great communion. Neither tendency has been at any time wholly extinct, although the predominance has oscillated from one side to the other.

After that early predominance of the Augustinian system of

doctrine, with its correspondent spirituality and holiness of life, which attended and followed the primitive organization of the Reformed Anglican church, the ritualistic element began to develop itself in overpowering strength. In the person of Laud it found its Pontifex Maximus. He inaugurated a superstitious ritualism to shelter and hallow voluptuousness and licentiousness of life, along with a remorseless and bloody persecution of the non-conformists, the followers of the faith and practice of the Reformers, who framed the articles and liturgy of the church. The ejection of these holy men from her pale was the consequence. Here was, to a great extent, the seed of those dissenting bodies of Christians which surround and harass, but cannot be won to it.

This state of things, however, could not last long. With the gradual advance of toleration, came increased freedom in religious thinking, and its publication. The licentious living which had become allied with the punctilious observance of certain Christian rites, superstitiously prostituted to its protection, conspired with other causes to produce a bountiful crop of infidelity and deism. Indeed, deism became the genteel creed, as clearly appears from the famous passage in Butler's advertisement to his "Analogy," in which he says: "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted, by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is, now at length, discovered to be fictitious. Accordingly, they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained, but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were, by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."

Antagonistic to this fashionable deism, arose that great school of apologetic divines and thinkers who gave tone to English divinity during most of the last, and the early part of the present century, and of whom Butler and Paley are representative examples; the former, of those who elaborately argued the intrinsic reasonableness, or freedom from unreasonableness, of Christianity, whatever might be the evidence of its truth; the latter, of those who elaborated the miraculous and other

evidence of Christianity, whatever be its reasonableness. But, subject to such exceptions and qualifications as every such general observation requires, it is to be observed that this school was not only apologetic, but moralizing, and, to a certain extent, rationalizing. We mean to say, that the preaching and other religious teaching of this period centred largely upon the moralities and proprieties of life—the ethical relations of man with man, and for this world; and that, so far as it ascended to the sphere of religious duty, it enjoined this rather in the way of dry and frigid inculcation of duties, than of presenting the evangelical springs, supports, and grounds for its performance. The sermons of Butler, Blair, (for this spirit was not confined to the English church,) Paley, and innumerable others, read more like ethical instructions with a Christian aspect, than Christianity proper, as a supernatural method of saving the soul—the gospel of Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation. This characteristic, which peers out even in the very titles of their sermons, involved, in its own way, a rationalizing element. They sought to prove the reasonableness of Christianity, not so much in the eye of cultivated and philosophic reason, as in the view of the common sense and conscience of men. They were prone, therefore, to expatiate, not so much on those supernatural mysteries, gifts, and requirements of revelation, which are clear only to faith and spiritually illuminated reason, as upon those moral or religious duties which are their own evidence to the average conscience of society. They expatiated, often with deep philosophy, and oftener still with elegant rhetoric, on the great excellence and utility of these virtues to individuals, to society, for this world, if not for the next. And they magnified Christianity as giving to these virtues the support of distinct and emphatic Divine requirement, of greater or less Divine helps to their performance, and, above all, of the sanction of eternal rewards and punishments. This style of thinking culminated in Paley. With him the grand discovery made to us by revelation was the certainty of a future state of eternal rewards and punishments, while the only sure attestation of revelation is miracles, which he marshalled in support of the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures with matchless skill

and power.* This view, moreover, tallied with his partly utilitarian and partly Epicurean theory of the nature of virtue, which he defines to be "the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, *for the sake of everlasting happiness.*" He illustrates the nature of obligation by saying, "I am obliged to keep my word, because I am urged to do so by a violent motive, (namely, the expectation of being after this life rewarded if I do, or punished if I do not,) resulting from the command of another (namely, of God.)" In attributing a rationalizing tendency to this school, we mean it in a negative and qualified sense. We do not mean that they impeached the inspiration or authority of Scripture, or that they explained away the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation; but that they emphasized the humanly moral virtues, while supernatural regeneration, gratuitous justification by faith in the vicarious merits of Christ, living to God through Christ living in us, were more or less overlooked or attenuated. We cannot help thinking, as we read Paley, that his conception of Christian holiness is the sum of those virtues which make up his ideal of a genuine English gentleman; while the chasm between the spirit of his writings and those of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, of Leighton and Jeremy Taylor, or of Cecil and John Newton, is immense. The exaggerated caricature of Coleridge, in regard to this type of preaching, is not without meaning—that it valued Christianity chiefly as an "aid extraordinary of the police."

In the earlier half of the last century, however, the great

* The following conclusion of the fourth chapter of Paley's Moral Philosophy has been lauded, says Coleridge, by Dr. Parr, "as the finest prose passage in English literature:"

"Had Jesus Christ delivered no other declaration than the following—'The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life: and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation;'—he had pronounced a passage of inestimable importance, and well worthy of that splendid apparatus of prophecy and miracles by which it was introduced and attested; a message, in which the wisest of mankind would rejoice to find an answer to their doubts and rest to their inquiries. It is idle to say that a future state had been discovered already: it had been discovered as the Copernican system was: it was one guess among many He alone discovers who *proves;* and no man can prove this point but the Teacher, who testifies by miracles that his doctrine comes from God."

awakening connected with the labours of Whitefield and the Wesleys, not only raised up a powerful organization without the church, which interdicted their labours, but infused a new current of spiritual life into the Establishment itself. It reared up a body of evangelical preachers and Christians, who have maintained their position, with varying numbers and influence, until now. They have not only held up the gospel-standard themselves. They have exercised an influence on their adversaries, and done much to raise their preaching above the dulness, inanity and stagnation of mere frigid moral essays or exhortations. While these two classes, with various intermediate shades of opinion, thus held possession of the Establishment, reciprocally acting upon each other—the evangelicals, from their greater catholicity largely known as Low Church, and the others, from their exaltation of the outward church organization and hierarchical exclusiveness known as the High Church, the Oxford Tracts appeared. On their character it is needless to dwell. They are so recent, so memorable for the principles they maintain and the effects they have produced, as to be familiar to all. It is enough to say, that they undertook with signal earnestness and ingenuity to twist the whole framework of the Anglican church, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, into accord with the few shreds of Popery still left in the liturgy. It was simply an attempt to romanize the Establishment. In regard to the authority of tradition, the infallibility of the church, the apostolic succession and authority of the ministry, the *opus operatum* efficacy of the sacraments, the confessional, priestly absolution, the most trivial, superstitious rites and fantastic mummeries, these tracts were a laboured effort to restore the Papal doctrines and practices which had been cast off at the Reformation. The fruits of this movement have been extensive in the revival of Popish practices in the English Establishment, and the secession of a large body of its ministers and members to Rome. The comparative novelty of the principles avowed, together with the extent and continuance of the welcome they received, prove that their propagators were but representative organs to articulate and develop the latent and struggling views which had already taken, or were ready to take, root in the minds of large numbers.

More recently, the counter extreme has appeared in the party which appropriates to itself the title of "Broad Church," some of whose productions we have placed at the head of this article. In the radical character of its principles, the zeal, ability, scholarship, and culture of its organs and expounders, it is quite a match for the Tractarian party. Whether they represent an equally prevalent style of thinking in the establishment, remains to be seen. We trust and pray not. And we are sure, that as we proceed authentically to expose their peculiar tenets, our readers will sympathize with us.

These principles are sufficiently declared in the volumes above-mentioned; the first of which presents the views of this school on various subjects, and from various authors, while the second treats a single topic in a more elaborate and exhaustive manner than was possible in the single article on the same subject by the same author, in the first of these volumes, occupying only one-sixth the space. The author of these is the celebrated Baden Powell, of the University of Oxford, who has died within the year, and has often addressed the public with ability on this and related topics—the immutability of the Order of Nature, and the consequent impossibility of miracles. The "Essays and Reviews" collected in the first of these volumes are as follows: 1. "The Education of the World." By Frederick Temple, D. D., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen; Head Master of Rugby School; Chaplain to the Earl of Denbigh. 2. "Bunsen's Biblical Researches." By Rowland Williams, D. D., Vice Principal and Professor of Hebrew, St. David's College, Lampeter; Vicar of Broad Chalke, Wilts. 3. "On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity." By Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., &c.; Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. 4. "Séances Historiques de Genève. The National Church." By Henry Bristow Wilson, B. D., Vicar of Great Staughton, Hunts." 5. "On the Mosaic Cosmogony." By C. W. Goodwin, M. A. 6. "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688—1750." By Mark Pattison, B. D. 7. "On the Interpretation of Scripture." By Benjamin Jowett, M. A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford. Thus it will be seen that two are Professors in Oxford University, one in St. David's

College, Wales, while another is the successor of Arnold at Rugby. Baden Powell has been long distinguished alike in physical science and theological discussion. These Essays have been republished in this country under the editorial supervision of Dr. Hedge, one of our most distinguished Unitarian divines, who contributes a commendatory introduction. He describes the theological spirit of the Broad Church, articulated in these volumes, as "listening, if here and there it may catch some accents of the Eternal Voice amid the confused dialects of Scripture, yet not confounding the former with the latter; expecting to find in criticism, guided by a true philosophy, the key to revelation; in revelation, the sanction and condign expression of philosophic truth." Language could not more clearly or positively deny the authority and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures, or set up human philosophy as the ultimate standard and test of truth by which the Bible itself is to be tried. And we are constrained to say that this is a mild representation of the sceptical tone of these writers—all which, without further prelude, we will proceed to demonstrate from these books. And first, let us note their deliverances in regard to that branch of theology which is theology in the strictest sense —their views of the being, nature, attributes, word, and works of God. Says Dr. Williams,

"The profoundest analysis of our world leaves the law of thought as its ultimate basis and bond of coherence. This thought is consubstantial with the being of the Eternal I AM. Being, becoming, animating, or substance thinking and conscious life are expressions of a Triad which may be represented as will, wisdom, and love; as light, radiance, and warmth; as fountain, stream, and united flow; as mind, thought, and conscicusness; as person, word, and life; as Father, Son, and Spirit. In virtue of such identity of Thought with Being, the primitive Trinity represented neither three originant principles nor three transient phases, but three eternal inherencies in one Divine Mind. The unity of God as the Eternal Father, is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity; but the Divine Consciousness or Wisdom, becoming personal in the Son of Man is the express image of the Father; and Jesus actually, but also mankind ideally, is the Son of God. If all

this has a Sabellian or almost a Braminical sound, its impugners are bound," &c.* It would not be easy to find blanker Hegelianism. It simply maintains the "identity of Thought with Being," as at once the "profoundest analysis of our world," and of the evolution of the Absolute into consciousness and personality, in the person of Jesus, in man, in nature. It is, so far as we can see, undefecated Monism or Pantheism. In like manner, Dr. Temple says: "Man cannot be considered as an individual. He is, in reality, only man by virtue of his being a member of the human race. . . . If, then, the whole in this case, as in so many others, is prior to the parts, we may conclude that we are to look for that progress which is essential to a spiritual being subject to the lapse of time, not only in the individual, but also quite as much in the race taken as a whole. . . . This power whereby the present ever gathers into itself the results of the past, transforms the human race into a colossal man, whose life reaches from the creation to the day of judgment. The successive generations of men are days in this man's life." P. 3.

This is not mere rhetoric, nor mere medieval Realism, which, indeed, by logical necessity terminates in the doctrine of one substance pervading all classes and individuals, which are its modes or manifestations; but, taken in connection with other deliverances by these writers, it must be regarded as that type of Realism, which is born of and presupposes the modern Monistic or Pantheistic hypothesis.

To the same effect Professor Powell tells of "the structure of the infinite universe, in which we can infer no final design or purpose whatever; which is *perpetual* in its adjustments, offering no evidence of *beginning nor end*—only of continual orderly changes. . . . When the astronomer, the physiologist, the geologist, or the naturalist, notes down a series of observed facts or measured data, he is not an *author* expressing his own ideas—he is a mere *amanuensis* taking down the dictations of nature; his observation book is the record of the thoughts of *another mind;* he has but set down literally what he himself does not understand, or very imperfectly. . . . That which it

* *Recent Inquiries*, pp. 98, 99. When we give a page without specifying the volume, our reference will be to this book.

requires thought and reason to understand, must be itself thought and reason. That which mind alone can investigate and express, must be itself mind. And if the highest conception attained is itself but partial, then the mind or reason studied is greater than the mind or reason of the student." *Order of Nature*, pp. 237—240. What does all this intimate, if not the perpetuity and eternity of nature, and its identity with the Absolute Mind or Reason? So, in his Essay on the Study of the Evidences, he says, "the simple but grand truth of the law of conservation, and the stability of the heavenly motions, now well understood by all cosmical philosophers, is but the type of the universal self-sustaining and self-evolving powers which pervade all nature." *Essays*, p. 151. He asserts "the impossibility even of *any two material atoms* subsisting together without a determinate relation; of any action of the one on the other, whether of equilibrium or of motion, without reference to a physical cause; of any modifications whatsoever in the existing conditions of material agents, unless through the invariable operation of a series of *eternally impressed consequences, following in some necessary chain of orderly connection*, however imperfectly known to us." This self-evolution and self-sustentation of nature, this impossibility of aught but "eternally impressed consequences," following in a necessary chain, virtually makes Nature and Fate supreme. They are either superior to or identical with God. Which of these is meant will be indicated by the scope of the quotations which precede and follow. At all events, if any room is still left for a personal God, who is sovereign in Nature and Providence, it will soon disappear before the quotations which follow. He insists that all philosophy, physical and metaphysical, "is generalization, and therefore implies universal order; and thus in these sublime conclusions, or in any inferences we make from them, that principle must hold an equally prominent place. If we indulge in any speculations on the Divine perfections, we must admit an element of immutable order as one of the chief. The firm conception of the immutability of order is the first rudiment in all scientific foundation for cosmo-theology. . . . . The difficulty which presents itself to many minds, how to reconcile the idea of *unalterable law* with *volition*, (which seems to imply some-

thing changeable,) can only be answered by appealing to those immutable laws as the sole evidence and exponent we have of supreme volition; a volition of immutable mind, an empire of fixed intelligence." *Order of Nature*, pp. 245—247. All this is ostensibly directed to prove the *a priori* impossibility of miracles. But if good for this purpose, it is good for a great deal more. It will prove all supernatural divine interposition impossible;* and not only this, but all supremacy of any sort on the part of God over nature, such as is implied in creation and providence, is thus ruled out. All which, as we shall soon see, the author too well understands. He adopts Hume's theory of cause and effect, which resolves them into mere uniformity of antecedence and sequence, (*ib.* p. 140,) and describes it as "involving the rejection of the idea of efficient power, as among the last lingering remains of the old mysticism." *Ib.* p. 228. He further says: "From what has been before observed, it is readily seen how little satisfactory the simple and positive view of causation must be to the imaginative and mysticising tendency of the human mind, which is ever seeking some conception of efficient power, instead of a necessary connection in reason and generalization *only*.

"It is to this tendency that we may trace the lingering disposition to dwell on the old antithesis of 'first cause' and 'second causes.'" *Ib.* pp. 233, 234.

We just pause to ask how it is that the human mind is ever "seeking some conception of efficient power," unless it be preconformed to this idea; and if so, then is it either not preconformed, even in its normal workings, to spend itself on delusions and unrealities, or does not the idea of efficient causation represent an eternal and necessary truth—the occurrence of events and changes being once granted? Does not his theory exhibit the human mind as a fallacious and unreliable organ of knowledge? Does not night as well as the sunrising always precede day? Why, then, do mankind univer-

* "From the very conditions of the case, it is evident that the *supernatural* can never be a matter of *science* or *knowledge*." *Order of Nature*, p. 232. The italics are the author's. "The supernatural is the offspring of ignorance, and the parent of superstition and idolatry; the natural is the assurance of science, and the preliminary to all rational views of Theism." *Id.* p. 248.

sally and intuitively pronounce the former, not the latter to be the cause of day, unless efficiency is of the very essence of causality, in the primary and universal intuitions of the human mind? Of course, if there is no first cause, as distinguished from second causes, or no cause efficient to produce what before was not, creation becomes an impossibility. God, man and nature are either identified, or, what is very much the same, we are turned over to an atheistic hylozoism, with Matter for our only God.

In perfect symphony with all this, he tells us (*ib.* p. 222) "the radical fallacy lies in the assumed idea of *sudden formation* out of nothing," and (*ib.* p. 229) denies "the alleged sudden supernatural origination of new species of organized beings in remote geological epochs." In still more portentous terms, the conception of creation is pronounced a contradiction. He says:

"Even without referring to that metaphysical *conception*—or, more properly, metaphysical *contradiction*—to imagine anything which can be strictly called a *beginning*, or first formation, or endowment of matter with new attributes, or in whatever form of expression we may choose to convey such an idea, —*is altogether beyond the domain of science*, as it is an idea beyond the province of human intelligence." *Ib.* p. 251. "Both the idea of self-existence and that of creation out of nothing are equally and hopelessly beyond the possible grasp of the human faculties. How, then, can we pretend to reason, or infer anything respecting them?" *Ib.* p. 255.

How is it possible more fully and explicitly to deny the possibility of any Supreme Creator, Upholder and Disposer of all things? It is to no purpose that he afterwards tells us on page 257,

"The idea of creation is wholly one of *revelation*, accepted by *faith;* and if guided by Christianity, the assertion of it will rest in the *general* expression, and will never degenerate into an admixture with the obsolete cosmogonies of olden dispensations."

No doubt creation must be here used as a very "general expression"—so general, indeed, that the true and proper idea of creation evaporates into thin air. Revelation and faith can compass mysteries; but contradictions are beyond their reach.

Such, we have seen, the very idea of creation is pronounced to be. Moreover, the fundamental principle of this author and his confederates, everywhere affirmed, is, that science controls our interpretation of revelation, but can never be overruled by it. Besides, if in the above passages the author means any real creation out of nothing, he subverts his whole doctrine with regard to the impossibility of Divine interpositions interrupting the order of nature. If creation out of nothing is possible, much more are miracles, which simply control, modify, or destroy what is so created. This would annihilate the pet theory of this writer and his Broad Church friends, viz. the impossibility of miracles, and of attesting any Divine revelation by such evidence. He tells us elsewhere (p. 249) that these views of naturalism are not "meant as a negation of higher truths; but only that they are of another order." But observe, whatever "higher truths" may be ascertained from other sources, they must be such as do not contradict the principles claimed to be ascertained from physical philosophy, which have been already brought to view. This is implied, or expressly asserted, in all the reasonings of this school, and preëminently in their exegesis of Scripture. Says Powell, of revelation, (*ib.* p. 278,) "*it can involve nothing which can come into contact or collision with the truths of physical science, or inductive uniformity; though* wholly *extraneous* to the world of positive knowledge, *it can imply nothing at variance with any part of it*, and this can involve us in *no difficulties on physical grounds.*" The italics are the author's. If we turn, however, from the volume on the "Order of Nature," to the tract on the "Evidences of Christianity," which forms one of the "Essays and Reviews," we shall find all this indubitably affirmed, along with assertions of the development theory and spontaneous generation, which he puts forth in both treatises in furtherance of the same cause. In this article he says, "the first dissociation of the physical from the spiritual was rendered necessary by the palpable contradictions disclosed by astronomical discovery with the letter of Scripture. Another still wider and more material step has been effected by the discoveries of geology. More recently, the antiquity of the human race and the development

of species, and the rejection of the idea of 'creation,' have caused new advances in the same direction." P. 145. Again:

"It has been the unanswered and unanswerable argument of another reasoner, that new species *must* have originated *either* out of their inorganic elements, or out of previously organized forms; *either* development or spontaneous generation *must be* true; while a work has now appeared, by a naturalist of the most acknowledged authority, which now substantiates on undeniable grounds the very principle so long denounced by the first naturalists—*the origination of new species by natural causes;* a work which must soon bring about an entire revolution of opinion in favour of the grand principle of the self-evolving powers of nature." Pp. 156, 157. Mr. Jowett not obscurely intimates the same thing, in passages which we may yet have occasion to cite. Pp. 384, 463. Thus, while the idea of creation is rejected, we have substituted in its place development, spontaneous generation, the origination of new species by natural causes, the "self-evolving powers of nature"!

It can hardly be necessary to exhibit with further explicitness and detail of proof the doctrine of this party in regard to the Trinity. As we have already seen, the Triad of Dr. Williams is, "being, becoming, animating," or "substance, thinking and conscious life." These writers do not give us any very definite formula on the subject. Their theistic hypothesis renders it superfluous. They, however, display their animus in occasional flings, such as the following from Prof. Jowett:

"How can the Nicene or Athanasian creed be a suitable instrument for the interpretation of Scripture?" P. 389. "The decision of the Council of Nicæa has been described by an eminent English prelate as 'the greatest misfortune that ever befell the Christian world.' That is, perhaps, true; yet a different decision would have been a greater misfortune." P. 465. The personality of the Holy Spirit is brought into question (pp. 394—6) where, referring to John xiv. 26, xvi. 15, Mr. Jowett says, "What is spoken in a figure is construed with the severity of a logical statement, while passages of an opposite tenor are overlooked or set aside."

The Christology of this school is in keeping with its radical character. Dr. Williams tells us the "ideal of the Divine

Thought was fulfilled in the Son of Man." P. 79. What this means may be learned from the Hegelian views already cited from him. He tells us, "The kingdom of God is no more Romish sacerdotalism than Jewish royalty; but the realization of the Divine Will in our thoughts and lives. This expression of spirit in deed and form, is generically akin to creation, and illustrates the incarnation; for, though the true substance of the Deity took body in the Son of Man, they who know the Divine Substance to be Spirit will conceive of such an embodiment of the Eternal Mind very differently from those who abstract all Divine attributes,—such as consciousness, forethought and love, and then imagine a material *residuum*, on which they confer the holiest name. The Divine attributes are consubstantial with the Divine Essence. He who abides in love abides in God, and God in him. Thus the Incarnation becomes with our author (Bunsen) as purely spiritual as it was with St. Paul. The son of David by birth is the Son of God by the Spirit of holiness. What is flesh is born of the flesh; what is Spirit is born of the Spirit." Pp. 91, 92.

Notwithstanding the somewhat transcendental mysticism and obscurity of this language, we think it very evident that he has misstated and caricatured the true doctrine of the Incarnation, in order to set it aside, as amounting to a mere "material residuum without Divine attributes;" while he sets up in its place an Incarnation consisting in the realization of the Divine Will in our hearts and lives. In other words, God is incarnate in all who have his Spirit, or who abide in him by abiding in love. The Son of David was preëminently or representatively "the Son of God by the Spirit of holiness." But whoever is born of the Spirit is spirit—that is, divinity in the same essential sense. For holiness and love are Divine attributes; and these are declared "consubstantial with the Divine essence." Whoever has them, has then the Divine essence—God incarnated in him. It is only this Hegelian key that gives us any clue to the exegesis of the foregoing passage. The same writer scouts the meritorious and vicarious character of Christ's death and sufferings in the following terms: "Salvation from evil through sharing the Saviour's Spirit was shifted into a notion of purchase from God through the price of his bodily pangs. The

deep drama of heart and mind became externalized into a commercial transfer, and this effected by a form of ritual." P. 97. Again, "why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer?" P. 90. If all efficacy is thus denied to Christ's death, and the very idea of sacrifice discarded, his life is pronounced by Jowett "the centre of Christian teaching," (p. 475,) while Dr. Temple says, "This (Christ's) life we emphatically call the Gospel." P. 29. Prof. Powell thus naïvely disposes of our Saviour's resurrection: "Not in its physical letter, but its doctrinal spirit; not as a physiological phenomenon, but as the corner-stone of Christian faith and hope, the type of spiritual life here, and the assurance of eternal life hereafter." *Order of Nature*, pp. 458, 459. It is well to magnify the spiritual significance of Christ's resurrection. But this cannot be done, unless in inverse proportion, by underrating the "physical phenomenon" which was so far implicated, and, in a high sense, identical with it, that it is signalized as of the highest moment in the representations of Scripture, the symbols of the church, and the experience of the believer.

We shall give attention to what further of these essays relative to soterology requires attention, after noticing their anthropology. Meanwhile we will bring to view their principles relative to the authority and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. These must have been in some measure foreshadowed to our readers in what has already been set before them. It has been already shown that they deny the reality, and even possibility, of miracles, and their utility as attestations of Divine revelation. Of course, the miracles of Scripture, together with the constant appeals made to them by Christ and the sacred writers, as attestations of their message, must be explained away. They were either myths, or hallucinations, or exaggerations, or otherwise erroneous representations; and, so far as true, are explicable by some law of nature, either known already, or yet to be discovered. But any hypothesis which explains away the reality or the utility of the miracles of Scripture, equally discredits those portions of the Bible which assert them—this at least, if nothing more. We have no time, nor is it necessary

here to evince the extent and emphasis of the scriptural teachings on this subject.*

We proceed, then, to show their doctrine concerning the inspiration and authority of the sacred oracles. Says Dr. Williams:

"If such a Spirit did not dwell in the church, the Bible would not be inspired; for the Bible is, before all things, the written voice of the congregation. Bold as such a theory of inspiration may sound, it was the earliest creed of the church, and it is the only one to which the facts of Scripture answer. The sacred writers were men of like passions with ourselves, and we are promised illumination from the Spirit which dwelt in them. Hence, when we find our Prayer-book constructed on the idea of the church being an inspired society, instead of objecting that every one of us is fallible, we should define inspiration consistently with the facts of Scripture and of human nature. These would neither exclude the idea of fallibility among Israelites of old, nor teach us to quench the Spirit in true hearts for ever. But if any one prefers thinking the sacred writers passionless machines, and calling Luther and Milton 'uninspired,' let him coöperate in researches by which his theory, if true, will be triumphantly confirmed." Pp. 87, 88.

According to this, the inspiration which guided the writers of Scripture, was the same in kind, and in the absence of infallibility and Divine authority, with that illumination which actuates all Christians of every age. In a like tone, Prof. Jowett tells us, "there is a view of inspiration which regards the apostles and evangelists as equally inspired in their writings and in their lives, and in both receiving the guidance of the Spirit of truth in a manner not different in kind, but only in degree, from ordinary Christians. . . . . Nor for any of the higher supernatural views of inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels or Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings that the evangelists or apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them, different from that of preaching or teaching, which they daily exercised; nor do they

* Those who are desirous to inquire more fully into this matter, will find a clear and succinct collation of the teachings of Scripture in reference to the convictive force of miracles, in the first article of our July number for 1860.

anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity." Pp. 379, 380.

Such principles are put forth in all forms of implication, assertion, and elaborate argument, throughout the several articles of this volume. The article on the Mosaic "Cosmogony," by Mr. Goodwin, is, of course, devoted to proving that the account of creation, in Genesis, is false, and that all attempts to reconcile it with the discoveries of geological science are inconsistent with each other, with the sacred record, and with scientific fact: hence that it subverts the inspiration and Divine authority of the Bible. The main drift of the article on the "Education of the World," by Dr. Temple, Dr. Arnold's successor at Rugby, is to show that humanity, collective and individual, has three successive stages in its education: 1. by formal precept; 2. by example; 3. by the development and exercise of self-reliant reason. Analogous to this, he tells us, has been the Divine method of educating the race: 1. in the minute precepts of the Jewish ritual; 2. in the example of Jesus Christ; 3. in the subsequent development and reign of reason as the source of doctrine and guide of life. To say nothing on the question whether precept or example first make their power felt in the training of individuals; of the assertions that the "Pharisaic teaching contained elements of a more spiritual religion than the original Mosaic system," (p. 11); that "the Hebrews may be said to have disciplined the human conscience; Rome, the human will; Greece, the reason and taste; Asia, the spiritual imagination," (p. 22);—or of other analogous statements, which rank heathen or natural agencies as coördinate and concurrent with Christianity in the advancement of our race—it is enough that this article, ingenious, scholarly, and beautiful as it is, has for its main object the exaltation of reason to an authority paramount to that of revelation. As our quotations have already shown, the articles of Drs. Williams, Powell, and Jowett, are, *ex professo*, devoted to this object. The same view is patent enough in the remaining two, as will sufficiently appear in the citations which have been, or will be made. Thus, Mr. Pattison says,

"The word of God is contained in Scripture, whence it does not follow that it is co-extensive with it. . . Under the terms

of the sixth Article, one may accept literally or allegorically, or as parable or poetry or legend, the story of a serpent-tempter, of an ass speaking with a man's voice, of an arresting of the earth's motion, of a reversal of its motion, of waters standing in a solid heap, of witches and a variety of apparitions. So, under the terms of the sixth Article, every one is free in judgment as to the primeval institution of the Sabbath, the universality of the Deluge, the confusion of tongues, the corporeal taking up of Elijah into heaven, the nature of angels, the reality of demoniacal possession, the personality of Satan, and the miraculous particulars of many events. So the dates and authorship of the several books are not determined by any authority, nor their relative value and importance."

"Many evils have flowed to the people of England, otherwise free enough, from an extreme and too exclusive Scripturalism. . . . A Protestant tradition seems to have prevailed, unsanctioned by any of our formularies, that the words of Scripture are imbued by a supernatural property. . . . But those who are able to do so ought to lead the less educated to distinguish between the dark patches of human passion and error, which form a partial crust upon it, and the bright centre of spiritual truth within." Pp. 198, 199.

While this needs no comment, Professor Jowett uses the following language: "We can no longer speak of three independent witnesses of the gospel narrative. Hence there follow some other consequences. (1.) There is no longer the same necessity as heretofore to reconcile inconsistent narratives; the harmony of the Gospels only means the parellelism of similar words," &c. P. 408. "It will be hard to demonstrate from the Scriptures any complex system of doctrine and practice." P. 404. To the same effect, says Dr. Wilson, p. 181, "Our Lord's discourses have almost all of them a direct moral bearing. This character of his words is certainly more obvious in the three first gospels than in the fourth; and the remarkable unison of these gospels when they recite the Lord's words, notwithstanding their discrepancies in some matters of fact, compels us to think that they embody more exact traditions of what he actually said than the fourth does."

"Calvinists and Arminians—those who maintain and those

who deny the final restoration of man—may equally find texts which seem to favour their respective tenets." P. 471.

Says Dr. Williams: "Thus considerations, religious and moral, no less than scientific and critical, have, where discussion was free, widened the idea of revelations for the old world, and deepened it for ourselves; not removing the footsteps of the Eternal from Palestine, but tracing them on other shores, and not making the saints of old, orphans, but ourselves partakers of their sonship. Conscience would not lose by exchanging that repressive idea of revelation, which is put over against it as an adversary, for one to which the echo of its best instincts should be a witness. The moral constituents of our nature, so often contrasted with revelation, should rather be considered parts of its instrumentality." P. 58. The same author, in all consistency, refuses to "confine revelation to the first half-century of the Christian era," and affirms, "at least, affinities of our faith existing in men's mind anterior to Christianity." P. 92. Of course, revelation and Christianity are only the voice or echo of natural conscience. Professor Powell utters the same principle more articulately. "The philosophy of the age does not discredit the inspirations of prophets and apostles, though it may sometimes believe it in poets, legislators, philosophers and others gifted with high genius." Pp. 157, 158. If this is not rank infidelity, where can it be found? He tells us of the "perversions which make the cursing Psalms evangelically inspired." P. 71. "As imperfect men have been used as the agents for teaching mankind, is it not to be expected that their teachings should be partial, and to some extent erroneous?" *Goodwin*, p. 275. Says Professor Jowett: "No one can form any notion, from what we see around us, of the power which Christianity might have, if it were at one with the conscience of man, and not at variance with his intellectual convictions." P. 414.

"Why he (Bunsen) should add to his moral and metaphysical basis of prophecy a notion of foresight by vision of particulars, or a kind of *clairvoyance*, though he admits it to be a natural gift, consistent with fallibility, is not so easy to explain. One would wish he might have intended only the power of seeing the ideal in the actual, or of tracing the Divine government

in the movements of men. He seems to mean more than presentiment or sagacity; and this element in his system requires proof." P. 79. This, with other like passages, of course makes an end of all real prophecy. Of course the same destructive process is employed to overthrow the Messianic prophecies. Accordingly, Dr. Williams tells us of arguments for applying Isa. lii. and liii. to Jeremiah. "A little reflection will show how the historical representation in Isa. liii. is of some suffering prophet or remnant, yet the truth and patience, the grief and triumph, have their highest fulfilment in Him who said, 'Father, not my will, but thine.' But we must not distort the prophets to prove the Divine Word incarnate, and then, from the incarnation, reason back to the sense of prophecy." Pp. 82, 83.

"Loudly as justice and humanity exclaim against such traditional distortion of prophecy as makes their own sacred writings a ground of cruel prejudice against the Hebrew people, and the fidelity of this remarkable race to the oracles of their fathers a handle for social obloquy, the cause of Christianity would be the greatest gainer, if we laid aside weapons the use of which brings shame. Israel would be acknowledged as in some sense still a Messiah." Pp. 82, 83.

It is difficult to imagine a more thoroughly destructive rationalism, than is evinced in the foregoing passages which might be multiplied to any extent from these writers. If the system is to be accepted, the Bible is no more the word of God than the Koran or the "Critique of Pure Reason." Its authority as an objective standard of faith, and the infallible word of God, is absolutely annulled.

The anthropology of this school has already gleamed out through its theology, Christology, and doctrine of inspiration. We have already seen that, as to the origin of our race, they regard the account in Genesis as a myth, "half ideal, half traditional notices of the beginnings of our race," (p. 64); they teach the origination of the race by development, not by creation; that its antiquity vastly exceeds the Scriptural representation; that it "may one day be known, that mankind spread, not from one, but from many centres, over the globe," and hence descended from several distinct pairs. This, of course,

subverts the scriptural doctrine of the Fall, Original Sin, and Redemption. The idea of a "curse inherited by infants" is scouted. That view of the fall of Adam, which makes it represent "ideally the circumscription of our spirits in limits of flesh and time, and practically the selfish nature with which we fall from the likeness of God, which should be fulfilled in man," is referred to with seeming approbation. P. 98. In regard to the state of the heathen, their future destiny is to be inferred, we are taught, rather "from reflections suggested by our own moral instincts than from the express declarations of Scripture writers, who had no such knowledge as is given to ourselves of the amplitude of the world which is the scene of the Divine manifestations." It is abundantly insisted by these writers, that, whatever the Scriptures may say, the Christless heathen shall be saved. Pp. 173—177.

The soterology of this school has already been so distinctly and fully stated or implied, under other topics, that it scarcely requires to be further signalized. There can be no doctrine of salvation if there be no fall, apostasy or ruin to be saved from. We have already seen that propitiation and justification are scouted. It is the office of the Gospel, they tell us, to "do more perfectly that which the heathen religions were doing imperfectly." P. 189. It is constantly asserted, as has appeared in some of our citations already made, that morality is the great moment of our Saviour's teachings and requirements, and that it is so set forth by him as wholly to overshadow doctrine and faith. It can hardly be necessary to multiply quotations like the following. "Our Lord's discourses have almost all of them a direct moral bearing. . . . . These words of our Lord, taken in conjunction with the Epistle of St. James, and with the first, or genuine Epistle of St. Peter, leave no reasonable doubt of the general character of his teachings having been what, for want of a better word, we must perhaps call 'moral.'" P. 181. "Moreover, to our great comfort, there have been preserved to us words of our Lord Jesus himself, declaring that the conditions of men in another world will be determined by their moral characters in this, and not by their hereditary or traditional creeds—i. e., in accordance with the whole system, by any creed or faith in Christianity." Pp. 176, 177. "The Cal-

vinist, in fact, ignores almost the whole of the sacred volume, for the sake of a few verses." P. 403. "If our philosopher had persuaded us of the moral nature of justification, he would not shrink from adding that regeneration is a correspondent giving of insight, or an awakening of forces in the soul. By resurrection he would mean a spiritual quickening. Salvation would be our deliverance, not from the life-giving God, but from evil and darkness, which are his finite opposites (*ὁ ἀντικείμενος.*) Propitiation would be the recovery of that peace which cannot be, while sin divides us from the Searcher of hearts. The eternal is what belongs to God, as spirit; therefore the negation of things finite and unspiritual, whether world, or letter, or rite of blood." P. 91. It is easy to see that this language resolves regeneration, justification, and the resurrection into a mere moral quickening. Not merely so: it seems to identify the finite with evil and darkness, as opposites of God; to imply that there is no wrath and curse of God from which we need salvation; but that salvation consists in deliverance from God's "finite opposites," i. e., we judge, in re-absorption into the Divine substance. The finite is apparently represented as "unspiritual," and the opposite of the eternal. Eternal salvation of men then, is—what? What else can it be than the resumption of man into that absolute and eternal One of whom he is, on this theory, an emanation? And what is this but pantheistic philosophy, theology and soterology? The writer last quoted proceeds to say, "The hateful fires of the vale of Hinnom (Gehenna) are hardly in the strict letter imitated by him who has pronounced them cursed, but may serve as images of distracted remorse." This intimates what is elsewhere more explicitly given out—that future punishment is either a chimera or purgatorial, terminating in universal restoration. Says Dr. Wilson, "The wise heathens could anticipate a reunion with the great and good of all ages. . . . The Roman church has imagined a *limbus infantium.* We must rather entertain a hope that there shall be found, after the great adjudication, receptacles suitable for those who shall be infants, not as to years of terrestrial life, but as to spiritual development; nurseries, as it were, and seed-grounds, where the undeveloped may grow up under new conditions, the stunted may become strong,

and the perverted be restored. And when the Christian church, in all its branches, shall have fulfilled its sublunary office, and its Founder shall have surrendered his kingdom to the Great Father, all, both small and great, shall find a refuge in the bosom of the Universal Parent, to repose, or to be quickened into a higher life, in the ages to come, according to his will." Pp. 231, 232.

We close this branch of our subject with a single quotation from Prof. Jowett, in which he sets forth his view of what missionaries ought to teach the heathen. In the following terms he indicates his opposition to giving them the Bible, while he would offer them in its place what he calls the "essence of religion;" i. e., of course, the wretched system of negations and inanities which we have educed from the works under review, and which differ in no appreciable degree from sheer infidelity: "It is not the Book of Scripture which we should seek to give them, to be reverenced like the Vedás or the Koran, and consecrated in its words and letters; but the truth of the Book—the mind of Christ and his apostles, in which all lesser details and differences should be lost and absorbed. We want to awaken in them the sense that God is their Father, and they his children; that is of more importance than any theory about the inspiration of the Scripture. But, to teach in this spirit, the missionary should himself be able to separate the accidents from the essence of religion; he should be conscious that the power of the gospel resides, not in the particulars of theology, but in the Christian life." P. 473.

It is safe to say, that as such a religion is not worth propagating among the heathen, so it never did and never can awaken zeal enough among its adherents, to induce any large and enduring self-sacrifice for the sake of thus propagating it. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." "The essence of religion" we are commissioned to teach, "not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Our commission is to "preach the word." "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you:* and lo, I

am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

It only remains that we briefly exhibit the ecclesiology of this school, which is not obscurely implied in its assumed title of Broad Church. And, 1. as a logical sequence from what has already been shown, they reject from the foundation of the church, every doctrinal basis, all fundamental articles of Christian truth. "A national church must be concerned with the ethical development of its members; and the wrong of supposing it otherwise, is participated in by those of the clericalty who consider the church of Christ to be founded, as a society, on the possession of an abstractedly true and supernaturally communicated speculation concerning God, rather than upon the manifestation of a Divine life in man." P. 219. Hence, 2. formularies ought to "embody only an ethical result." P. 223. 3. Subscription to articles of faith pertains to "a subject which a promise is incapable of reaching." P. 212. Hence churches are multitudinist and national. "The acknowledgment of churches as political and national institutions is the basis of a sound government of them." P. 477. The nationality of churches is lawful and scriptural, because, first, the qualifications for membership are ethical; and secondly, "if any called a brother were a notoriously immoral person, . . . the rest were enjoined, no, not to eat with him; but he was not to be refused the name of a brother or Christian, (1 Cor. v. 11.)" P. 185. 4. Hence, while the church ought to be national, it need not be Christian. "A national church need not, historically speaking, be Christian; nor, if it be Christian, need it be tied down to particular forms which have been prevalent at certain times in Christendom. That which is essential to a national church, is that it should undertake to assist the spiritual progress of the nation and of the individuals of which it is composed, in their several states and stages." Pp. 194, 195. Hence, 5. the broadest latitudinarianism is to be allowed. "The freedom of opinion which belongs to the English citizen should be conceded to the English churchman; and the freedom which is already practically enjoyed by members of the congregation, cannot without injustice be denied to its ministers." P. 202.

But enough. We have aimed to show what this scheme is, rather than to offer a formal refutation of it, which is unnecessary for our readers, and would unduly prolong this article. We think, if we have not proved the Broad Church principles tantamount to the grossest liberalism, and to substantial infidelity, then no proof can establish any matter of fact. This scheme seems to us a reproduction of the polite Deism of the last century, sublimated by an infusion of the later pantheistic, transcendental theology of the continent, and decked or disguised by some scriptural references and technical Christian terms and phrases. Religion, Christianity, must perish, so far as such principles prevail. All Christendom will look with intense anxiety to the reception which this system meets in the English church and nation. Should it meet the welcome given to the Tractarian principles, the effects will be deplorable. The fruits which will grow from such a root must be the apples of Sodom and the clusters of Gomorrha. They will blast the land with the "abomination of desolation." We earnestly hope for a vigorous and decisive reaction against these principles; that the English church will resound with protests against these invaders of her precincts; and that the Spirit of the Lord will raise up a standard against them which will prevent such sentiments from going beyond the closets of speculatists to penetrate and poison the heart of the people. The Tractarian system awakened a distorted and morbid faith; it induced a revived but perverted religious zeal. This undermines all Christianity; all true faith; and gives us nothing in its place. It destroys, but does not build up—it leaves us only dead negations and hopeless vacuity. We will close with a quotation or two from admirers of these writers and their principles, which go to confirm the truth of our interpretations, and of our estimate of the extreme liberalism and destructiveness of their opinions. The following language of the *Christian Examiner*, (Unitarian,) in regard to these writers is incontestable: "In general they advance views like those which have for half a century been maintained in our own journal, while on some important points they far exceed in 'destructiveness' any opinions that are identified with Unitarianism."

Says the *Monthly Religious Magazine*, as quoted by the

publishers on the fly-leaf, a journal of apparently similar spirit, after a warm laudation of these writers: "Their doctrine is, that the race is a collective man, to outgrow, in time, the regulative discipline of childhood, and be moved by the Spirit within, and not subject to authority without; that the Bible is not a book of plenary inspiration, or Christianity a universal religion, specially authenticated in Palestine; but that God inspires men ever and everywhere; that there is only one kind of inspiration, and all good men have it, as well as prophets and apostles; and that the doctrines of the church, such as the Trinity and the Fall of man, are to be held in the light of a 'philosophical rendering.'"

ART. IV.—*The Fulfilment of Prophecy.*

THE predictions uttered by the prophets were real disclosures of future events, and must therefore of necessity always be accomplished. Luke xxiv. 44. The denial of this rests upon a radical misconception of the nature of prophecy. If it were of merely human origin, no fulfilment in any proper sense could be expected. Even if there should be a fortuitous correspondence with the future, this would not be the necessary completing of the word which was spoken. Prophecy, however, came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 2 Pet. i. 21. It proceeded from Him to whom the future, equally with the past and the present, is naked and opened, and whose word cannot return unto him void. Isa. lv. 11. This removes it entirely out of the region of vague anticipations, the forebodings of hope or fear, shrewd conjectures, calculations from existing causes, fictions by which actual history was clothed in a prophetic dress, or frauds giving that out as prediction which was written after the event. It is evident, too, that there is no antecedent necessity limiting the range of a prophet's vision. It need not be confined to what has been called his own politi-

cal horizon, to events of the proximate future, of which there were indications already discernible. The omniscient Spirit can with equal ease reveal the remotest future, and describe what was to occur in far distant ages, with the same precision and accuracy as what was close at hand. The only restriction upon the extent or the definiteness of prophetic revelations is that which arises from the will of God in general or in each individual case.

As the prophet is not omniscient, and discerns the future not by any inherent faculty, but only as it is made known to him, he cannot disclose everything that shall take place hereafter, nor even all that relates to the events of which he actually speaks; but simply what is divinely revealed and as it is revealed to him. And inasmuch as these revelations form part of a Divine plan having for its end the training of the people, their nature and extent must of course be conditioned by this design. It is not, therefore, to be expected that prophecy will furnish such a record of the future as history does of the past. Their respective aims are quite different. It is not the knowledge of the future, as such, which prophecy seeks to communicate. In fact, there would be manifest objections to such a disclosure of the future as would interfere with the freedom of the actors in the events predicted, and as might lead the enemies of the truth to combine to defeat the prediction, or give them occasion to say that its fulfilment was brought about by the designed agency of its friends. It uses the future, and that not of one, but of all periods, for the instruction of the present. It hence contemplates the future from its own particular point of view, and with a definite design, by which it is guided both in its choice of materials and its mode of presenting them.

Prophecy may be compared to the view of a landscape taken from some prominent position, whence its principal features can be discerned. The objects seen, the relation in which they appear to stand to each other, their respective prominence and magnitude, will be greatly influenced by the point of view selected. Sketches taken from different points of the same landscape will differ widely from each other; and all will differ from the topographical survey, which may serve to represent history, and in which things are not contemplated from a dis-

tance, but the comparative size, distance and direction of every object carefully noted, by passing over the ground with the chain and the compass. The sketches are as true a representation of the country as the survey, and they answer better than it could do their own particular end. Such is, however, the difference in their plan and construction, that they are anything but precise counterparts, and neither could be constructed by the sole aid of the other. Nay, even he who has them both may be obliged to study long and carefully before he can discover in all its details that exact correspondence which does in fact obtain between them. The identity of the prominent features would perhaps be readily made out. But a very prolonged examination might be necessary in the subordinate details, before he could discover the precise object in the survey which answered to each particular in the sketch; and it would not be surprising, if in certain cases this could not be satisfactorily determined, and the identification should be doubtful or impossible.

It is thus with prophecy and its fulfilment in history. They cover the same territory and exhibit the same objects. There can be no discrepancy between them; but there may be, and there is, a very wide difference in the mode of their representation. Prophecy surveys its objects from its own definite point of view. History sets each in its proper position in respect of time and of attendant circumstances. It casts no reflection, therefore, either upon the accuracy or the value of a prophecy, to say that it is not possible by its sole aid to construct the future in which it shall find fulfilment. It may, nevertheless, give a very correct and intelligible picture of the subject which it represents, and may have an end which is answered irrespective of the recognition, upon the map of history, of the precise events predicted. And even with this map spread out before the students of prophecy, there may be great diversity of judgment in regard to the identification of some of the objects foretold; others, perhaps, it may be quite impossible to identify satisfactorily in the present state of our knowledge. But this cannot render doubtful the recognition of those leading objects in which its fulfilment is readily perceived, nor can it disprove the exactness of the correspondence even in those details which

are most difficult to recognize, for this is a difficulty which the nature of the case leads us to anticipate, and which fuller information might enable us to solve.

This divergence of the prophetic from the historical mode of representation is regarded by Hengstenberg, Fairbairn and others, as a sequcnce from the revelation by vision. But this view is open to several objections. 1. The vision does not necessarily involve a departure from the forms of history, or forbid the exhibition of the objects revealed in their historical order and relations. The communications made to Abraham in vision, (Gen. xv. 13—16,) and that to Daniel, (xi. xii.,) contain events and dates, just as they might be supposed to be recorded after the occurrence. The reason given is, therefore, inadequate. 2. It is likewise unfounded. It rests upon a theory which, to say the least, is insecure—that the prophets received all their revelations in the state of ecstatic vision, and while their ordinary consciousness was suspended. The same departure from historical forms characterizes those prophecies in which there is no appearance of a vision, as those in which there is. 3. It is unnecessary. There is a better mode of accounting for the phenomenon in question. The mode of prophetic representation may be *illustrated*, as has been seen, from the sense of sight; but this is only an illustration, not the actual rationale of the process. The true key, as has been shown already in the general, and as will be exhibited hereafter in detail, is to be found in the peculiar design of prophecy leading to the contemplation of the future from its own particular point of view. 4. It is superficial. Even if the prophets received no revelations except in vision, and the peculiarities found in prophecy were necessarily involved in that mode of communication, the important question would still remain unanswered—Why was that mode of revelation selected which led to this peculiar form of representation? The answer to this question will show that instead of being a defect, a disadvantage necessarily attendant upon prophetic disclosures, as this theory tacitly assumes, it is a striking feature of their adaptation to their end. It was impressed upon them because they would thus more effectually subserve the purpose of the people's instruction.

The prophetic differs from the historical mode of representation chiefly in two respects. The first concerns the time, and the second the form of the events predicted. There is in prophecy very commonly a neglect of the relations of time. It was not for the most part necessary, in order to the lesson to be drawn from future events, that anything should be known as to the time of their occurrence, their precise duration, or the intervals which were to separate them. Such knowledge might minister to a vain curiosity; but instead of furthering the ends of prophetic instruction, might tend rather to contravene them. It was accordingly withheld. "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." Time is not an element to be regarded in the consideration of his plans. What he will bring to pass in distant ages reveals his present purposes and the existing features of his government as really as though it were just at hand. But while the time is thus unessential to the lesson to be conveyed, the revelation of it might defeat the design of the lesson itself. That which is remote, or which will be long in maturing, loses its effect in spite of its truth and importance. Thus a future judgment of God, however distant, is in its proper nature a warning to transgressors; and yet the knowledge that it was still far off, and especially the revelation of the precise manner of its occurrence, might convert it for the present into a temptation to carnal security. Prophecy, therefore, eliminates this disturbing element. It presents the objects themselves without regard to qualities so unessential and variable as distance and duration. They can thus be contemplated more in their true character and with a greater likelihood of their producing their proper effect. No false statement is ever made in regard to the time of an event predicted; there is no error in the prophecy, nothing which needs correction. The time is simply not revealed. As the Saviour said to his inquiring disciples, Acts i. 7, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." It is necessary for him who would trace the fulfilment of prophecy upon the pages of history to bear this in mind, lest he involve himself in the error at the start, of imposing restrictions upon it which are foreign to its nature.

In certain cases, indeed, where any important end was to be answered by it, the time was definitely revealed. Thus to Abraham, Gen. xv. 13, the four hundred years of the oppression of his seed; to Isaiah vii. 8, the sixty-five years within which Ephraim was to cease being a people; xvi. 14, the three years to the humbling of Moab, qualified as the years of a hireling, to denote the exactness of their measurement; xxi. 16, the one year to the reduction of Kedar; xxiii. 17, the seventy years of Tyre's depression; to Jeremiah xxix. 10, the seventy years of the captivity in Babylon; to Habakkuk i. 5, its occurrence in the lifetime of his hearers; to Daniel ix. 24—26, the seventy weeks to Messiah's coming. In other cases, where the precise time was not important and was not made known, it was nevertheless desirable to give some idea of relative duration. This may perhaps be the case with the three hundred and ninety and the forty days representative of the guilt or punishment of Israel and Judah, Ezek. iv. 5, 6; with the seven years that Israel shall be burning the weapons, and the seven months that they shall be burying the dead of the host of Gog, Ezek. xxxix. 9, 12; and in the book of Revelation, the three years and a half of the humiliation of the church, the three days and a half of the triumph of antichrist, and the thousand years of the reign of the saints. These are sufficient to show that prophetic disclosures of time, whether with absolute or relative exactness, are not impossible. The Divine purpose and foreknowledge embrace the times of all events as well as the events themselves. Eccl. iii. 1. And there is nothing in the nature of prophecy to prevent this from being made known, whenever the aims of the revelation may require it.

Generally speaking, however, as has been observed already, the relations of time are disregarded. This may be done in four different ways, which may be respectively denominated the logical, the complex, the apotelesmatic, and the generic. 1. The logical method is when events are grouped agreeably to their affinities or their relation of cause and effect, irrespective of their chronological position. Thus a denunciation of the penalty may follow immediately upon a charge of sin, because these are indissolubly linked together, whatever interval of time may separate them. And any event in the progress of God's plan

of grace may be set in connection with the ultimate result to which it looks, and of which it is a necessary or important antecedent. The curse upon Canaan, Gen. ix. 25, did not enter upon its accomplishment until ages after it had been uttered. The promise to the patriarchs, Gen. xxvi. 4, was that they should have a numerous posterity, possess the land of their sojournings, and all nations should be blessed in them. The salvation of the world is here joined with the multiplication of their descendants and their settlement in Canaan, and there is no intimation that the events may not be simultaneous or immediately successive. The last two events were important steps in the Divine plan of preparation for the first; they were links in the chain of causes by which it was to be brought about. It is true that many other links were necessary to complete the chain. Thousands of years must elapse after Joshua has given the tribes their inheritance, before the ultimate issue is accomplished. But the necessary connection still holds good, and the word of the prediction puts those things together which in the purpose of God are so joined. So too Habakkuk, in the midst of a prediction of the fall of Babylon, introduced the statement, ii. 14, that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. This is not because the world was to be converted on the instant of Babylon's overthrow, but because the destruction of that great oppressing power was one of the necessary antecedents to the perfect triumph and the universality of the kingdom of God. This hostile heathen empire was an obstacle that must first be removed out of the way before the destined end could come. The intervening ages, however great to human view, are a mere point of time to the eternal God, and cannot break that sure connection which the Most High has established.

It is also quite usual with the prophets to present events in classes according to their respective characters, instead of being governed by the accidental order of time. Thus Joel in his prophecy throws together all the evils to be experienced by the chosen people under the symbol of the ravages of locusts; then the blessings they were to experience; and finally, the judgments upon their foes. The logical order here pursued is not to be mistaken for the chronological. They were not first to

suffer all the evils that were ever to come upon them before a single blessing was enjoyed; nor were all their blessings to be received before any portion of the deserved punishment was meted to their foes. These are intermingled in various proportions throughout the entire course of history, but they are here arranged according to their respective affinities, for the sake of more distinct presentation. Isaiah, also, in the foresight of Sennacherib's invasion, chap. x. 11, promises the fall of that oppressor, and the coming and kingdom of Messiah; and in the foresight of the Babylonish captivity, chap. xl. 66, blends the deliverance by Cyrus with the salvation by Christ. In like manner Jeremiah, chap. xxxiii., connects the coming of the Messiah with the return from Babylon; and Zechariah, ix. 8, 9, connects it with the protection from Greek invasion. And in fact, as a general rule, the Messiah is included in every prophetic picture of the coming good. This is not because Christ was to appear immediately upon the occurrence of the inferior blessings with which he is thus associated, but because in every representation of the good things in reserve, he claimed a prominent place. The prophets may not have known, and the people probably did not know, the length of the intervening periods; they may indeed not have suspected the existence of any interval whatever. It may, for example, have been imagined, until Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks prevented such misapprehension, that Christ would come immediately upon the termination of the exile. This inference might have been drawn from the prophecies; but that it would be so, is nowhere stated. They did not reveal the time of his first coming, any more than the prophecies of the New Testament do that of his second. And it may have been designed for wise reasons, that the Jewish church, like the Christian, should be kept in constant expectation of the appearing of the Lord.

2. In foretelling events which occupy long periods in their performance, and which advance by successive stages to complete accomplishment, the prophets sometimes adopt the complex method of representation. Instead of confining attention to some one epoch, and describing the event as it then appears, they present a more comprehensive view by condensing the whole into a single picture. The characteristic features which

it assumes in different periods, belong still to one common subject, and are properly included in its complete delineation. Thus, the fall of a great empire is commonly not accomplished in a moment, but by a long succession of reverses and a gradual wasting away of its strength. The heavy blow which initiates this process of decline, may be separated by centuries from the complete ruin by which it is concluded. The prophets, however, give to the whole its proper unity and connection by exhibiting it in a single scene. Thus Isaiah, xiii. 17—22, links the capture of Babylon by the Medes with its final and utter desolation. True, it continued to be a great and flourishing city long after the time of Cyrus. But its decline then began; and the eye of the prophet was enabled to look forward from its beginning to its termination, and to foresee what lay so far beyond the reach of human calculation that it required ages for its development. So too, God's work of judgment is one. It is one continued exercise of his punitive justice which inflicts deserved punishment upon his enemies in the course of this world's history and at its final consummation. The prophets often bring this connection into view by linking Divine judgments upon particular nations with the final judgment upon the whole world. Thus Isaiah, chap. xiii., in depicting the fall of Babylon, connects with it, verses 6—13, the day of the Lord in which the sun and stars shall be darkened, the world shall be punished for its evil, and the earth removed out of its place. This did not occur when Babylon was overthrown. But its fall is here set in its place in the grand drama of judgment, whose closing scene shall involve convulsions of nature such as are there described, and inflictions of wrath upon the entire world of transgressors. In the same way, and for the same reason, our Lord, in Matt. xxiv., links the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world. Zechariah, ix. 9, 10, speaks in the same breath of the King of Jerusalem riding upon an ass, and exercising a dominion from sea to sea, because the work of Christ, embracing both his humiliation and his exaltation, is viewed in its totality. So Joel, ii. 28—32, connects the effusion of the Spirit upon all flesh with which the new dispensation opened, with the turning of the sun into darkness and the moon into blood, with which it is to close. Both charac-

teristically belong to the Messianic period, which is here presented in its unity. This same method is sometimes poetically employed in descriptions of the past, as in David's retrospect of God's goodness in his own previous history, Psalm xviii., in which he blends together all the deliverances of his past life; and in his review of God's mercies shown to Israel, Psalm lxviii., which are contemplated in the aggregate: different expressions are suggested by individual acts of grace in different periods, but these are regarded not by themselves so much, as component parts of one continued course of gracious dealing.

3. In dealing with the same class of objects as that already referred to—viz., those which require long periods for their mature development, the prophets sometimes employ another method. Instead of blending the separate phases of its progress in a single scene, they describe one to the exclusion of the rest. And as the best adapted to their purpose, they select the last—that in which the object spoken of reaches its consummation, and appears in its completed form. Its true nature is in this most fully unfolded, and most distinctly seen. This may be called the apotelesmatic method. It is such a method as a naturalist might employ in describing a plant or an animal: he would speak of it, not as it was in the earlier stages of its growth, but after it had reached its maturity. And a political philosopher who desired to convey a distinct idea of the constitution of a state or empire, would speak of it, not as it was when imperfectly organized and only partially formed, but when it had attained to its most complete condition. It is thus that the prophets most frequently speak of the kingdom of Christ. Without delaying upon the feebleness of its inception, the slow degrees by which it was to win its way, or the centuries which would elapse before it had done its work, they hasten upon the first mention of it to describe its triumph and glory. And this is the exhibition best suited to give correct ideas of its character. It is not by its period of struggle, its times of oppression from without and corruption within, that it is to be judged, but by what it shall be when all opposition has been vanquished, and it is allowed, without restraint or foreign commixture, to put on its own proper form and adequately reveal its true nature. Hence, the prophets no sooner speak of Mes-

siah's coming, than they describe the period of universal peace and holiness which he shall inaugurate, the glory of his dominion, and the submission of all nations beneath his sway. In Isa. xi., the coming forth of the rod out of the stem of Jesse is followed by the wolf dwelling with the lamb, and the leopard lying down with the kid. In Dan. ii. 44, the mention of the setting up of the kingdom of heaven is connected with the breaking to pieces of all opposing kingdoms.

4. The last method is that of generic prophecies. These are predictive not of individual events, but of a series of events, in each of which they have a separate fulfilment. They are commonly such as reveal a particular principle in the Divine administration, which secures a fixed result from given antecedents. As often consequently as the prescribed conditions exist, so often the predicted consequence will follow. Our Lord announced this rule in the case of his own predictions, Matt. xxiv. 28, Luke xvii. 37, when interrogated by his disciples as to their accomplishment, "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together." The threatening, Deut. iv. 25, etc., of punishment at the hands of the heathen in case of transgression, and the accompanying promise of returning mercy in case of repentance, were fulfilled again and again throughout Israel's entire history; the book of Judges is from beginning to end a record of their repeated accomplishment in the period to which they relate. The voice crying in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," Isa. xl. 3, was fulfilled in various instruments who by calling the people to forsake their sins, prepared the way for God's gracious visits, before John the Baptist preached repentance as the forerunner of his personal appearing. The outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh promised by Joel ii. 28, belongs not only to the day of Pentecost but to every age of the Christian church. As prophecies of this description contemplate a succession of events, which, though they are alike exemplifications of the same general law, may differ widely in every other feature, it is manifest that they cannot be accurately adapted to all the circumstances of every one. Three courses were here possible; and they have been severally adopted in different cases. The prophetic description might in the first place be made to coincide precisely

with one of the events, that, for example, which was most important in itself, or in which the common idea of the whole was to be most fully realized, without any note being taken of the divergence, in less essential points, of others which were of less consequence, or in which the idea found a less complete embodiment. Or, secondly, it might be partially accommodated to them all, or to several of them, instead of exactly representing any one by borrowing individual traits from different events and blending them together. Or, finally, the prophecy may be restricted to what is common to them all, every allusion to points in which they differ being excluded, or at least the description couched in such terms as by the varying extent of their signification are capable of being applied alike to all. Thus the prediction, Deut. xviii. 18, is generic, and contemplates the entire prophetic order culminating in Christ. The expressions employed are applicable to all, but find their highest application in him. Again, the prediction, 2 Sam. vii. 12—16, of the perpetual royalty of the seed of David, is, of course, generic, and embraces all his descendants who sat upon the theocratic throne, including the last and the greatest who now holds the kingdom. Some of its expressions are conformed to one, others to another of the subjects to which it was intended to apply. "He shall build a house for my name," is spoken of Solomon's material structure and of Christ's spiritual temple. The threatened chastisement in case of iniquity belongs to Solomon and his merely human successors. The stablishing of the throne for ever took place in the person of Christ. "I will be his father and he shall be my son," was, in a limited sense, true of Solomon and the mortal race of kings descended from him; in its strict and proper sense it belongs exclusively to Christ. Heb. i. 5. Isaiah employs in his later prophecies the title "the servant of the Lord" in a double application at once to the chosen people and to the great Redeemer who was to arise from amongst them. They had the common commission, though fulfilled by them in very unequal measure, to perpetuate and spread the true religion; and in the execution of this task both would be exposed to injurious treatment and severe suffering, issuing in a glorious reward. That Israel has a part in these predictions, is shown by his very name being given to the

servant of the Lord, xlix. 3, and by the unfaithfulness with which he is charged, which could only apply to him: xlii. 19. And yet the part of the Messiah so outweighed that of Israel in intrinsic moment, and the appellation, "servant of the Lord," belongs to the Messiah in so much higher a sense, that the terms of the prediction are throughout conformed to his fulfilment of it, and that even in things so exclusively true of him as his vicarious atonement. Ch. liii. The fulfilment by Israel falls within the territory covered by the prediction, and, so far as it goes, corresponds with the inspired description. But the work of the Messiah is precisely coincident with it, accomplishing it in every particular.

The double or multiple sense of prophecy, as far as that has any foundation in fact, finds its explanation in what has just been stated. This does not denote a mystical or hidden sense of the words used, or that they are employed in any other than their ordinary and proper import. But the expressions of certain prophecies were so framed under the guidance of the Spirit, whether with or without the knowledge of the original writer and readers, as to apply with more or less exactness to distinct subjects. The same fact or principle which is represented in the one, appears likewise in the other, but in greater perfection; and the prophecy is so drawn as to cover both, in its more limited and lower sense answering to one, in its larger and higher sense to the other. This may be done not only where both events lie in the future, but where one is already past. Thus the Messianic Psalms have a partial application to experiences in the life of David or Solomon, or, as Ps. viii., to man in general; but the terms employed would be extravagant, if nothing more was intended by them. There is no other adequate explanation of them but their additional reference to Christ.

It may be remarked here, that while some prophecies are manifestly and in their primary intent generic, having in the strict and proper sense repeated fulfilments, there is a generic element more or less involved in all prophecies. Even when the original reference is exclusively to individual facts, these nevertheless represent general laws in God's providence or plan of grace. The facts may not occur again in that precise form,

but the laws are permanent, and will have other exemplifications. And these, though not comprehended within the direct and immediate scope of the prophecy, are demanded by its spirit. This is the explanation of the fact that later prophets, in adopting the language of their predecessors, not infrequently make a new application of it. This is mostly more than an arbitrary accommodation of familiar words to a different subject. The new application is really involved in the old, being only a fresh exhibition of the same essential principle. When Jeremiah (xlviii. 43, 44) repeats in application to Moab what Isaiah had said of the whole earth, (xxiv. 17, 18,) or repeats of himself (xi. 19) what Isaiah had said of Messiah, (liii. 7,) or when Nahum (i. 15) employs that language of Nineveh's overthrow which Isaiah (lii. 7) had used of a different subject, it is each time only another instance of the working of the same general law. And when the book of Revelation resumes the ancient prophecies respecting Babylon in its denunciations of Antichrist, the apostle would thereby intimate that the fundamental idea of those prophecies is still in force, and that the same reasons grounded on the attributes and purposes of God which accomplished the fall of the chief foe of the Old Testament church, certify a like destiny to its New Testament counterpart.

It has now been seen in what various ways prophecy may neglect the element of time, and how it may depart from the chronological arrangement of the facts predicted, for the sake of substituting other modes of grouping them better adapted to its purpose. It may in like manner and for similar reasons, present future objects under another than their strictly historical form. The design of this, as of the preceding peculiarity of prophecy, is twofold—viz. the partial obscuring of the events revealed, and the greater distinctness and force of the lessons conveyed. It was not the will of God to make the future known with exactness beforehand, or to enable men precisely to anticipate the disclosures of history. Too great distinctness might, as has been before observed, have frustrated or interfered with the very end for which the future was revealed at all. It was his purpose rather to awaken general expectations, and furnish such a description of events as might readily be recognized after, not before, they actually occurred. It was his purpose

likewise to instruct the people by these revelations in his plans of grace and of providential administration. But this did not make it necessary to reveal the precise mode in which future events would take place, or the exact shape which they would assume, any more than it required a disclosure of the time of their occurrence. It might, and it did in fact, really contribute to render these lessons more intelligible and impressive to their original hearers, that they were dressed in familiar and striking forms, which nevertheless truly represented the essential ideas and principles involved, in place of employing the unknown and more prosaic form to be assumed when they should come to pass in actual history.

This departure from historical forms was grounded in no antecedent necessity. No limitation can of course be put upon the foreknowledge of God, and there was nothing in the nature of prophecy, or in the mode of its communication, to prevent the disclosure of any of the details of future history which the Most High chose to impart. Indeed, the practicability is set beyond question, by the fact that this was actually done with as much frequency and to as great an extent as was deemed needful or desirable. The subjugation and dispersion of the Jews, the overthrow and desolation of Babylon, Tyre, and other ancient states, the Babylonish captivity and the restoration by Cyrus, whose very name was predicted more than a century before his birth, Isa. xliv. 28, as that of Josiah, had previously been, and for a much longer time beforehand, 1 Kings xiii. 2, the succession of the four great empires, with such details as Israel was particularly concerned to know, the birth of Christ of a virgin at Bethlehem, his entry into Jerusalem on an ass, his sufferings and rejection by the covenant people, are instances of prophecies in which the future is to a greater or less extent literally and precisely described.

When, however, prophecy departs from the historical form, one of two methods may be adopted; the identity of the object predicted may be retained with a mere diversity of form, or another similar object may by a figure be substituted for it.

1. The former is the case when an object of the future is spoken of, not as it shall actually be at the time of the fulfilment, but as it is at the time of the prediction. Those who

were acquainted with the thing only under its existing form and name, would gain a readier and more accurate idea of what was intended, if it were spoken of as they knew it, than if a novel nomenclature were adopted, or it were exhibited in a strange dress, however exactly these might correspond with the actual future. Thus objects common to the two dispensations, as a general rule, are called by their Old Testament names, and wear their Old Testament forms, even though the period contemplated by the prophecy is that of the new dispensation. The time had not yet come to reveal the changes which would be brought about at that eventful epoch. Thus, the people of God are constantly called Israel, their habitation Canaan, and the seat of God's worship, or his dwelling-place, Jerusalem, Zion, or the temple. To indicate the conversion of the heathen to the true religion, they are represented as engaging in the ritual worship, erecting altars in their land, Isa. xix. 19, offering incense and pure oblations in every place, Mal. i. 11, keeping the feast of tabernacles, Zech. xiv. 16, paying annual or even monthly and weekly visits to Jerusalem, Isa. lxvi. 23, and enrolled amongst the Levitical priesthood, Isa. lxvi. 21, although at the time to which these predictions refer, this particular mode of worship would be abolished. The outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh is described in forms peculiar to prophetic inspiration, Joel ii. 28, though that spiritual influence was in fact to manifest itself in the way of sanctification, rather than of immediate supernatural revelation. Names of nations hostile to the kingdom of God, are used to designate those in whom this hostility is perpetuated, though at the period spoken of, these nations no longer exist in their individuality; e. g., Egypt and Edom, Joel iii. 19; the Assyrians, Micah v. 5, 6; the Philistines, Moab, and Ammon, Isa. xi. 14. The unity of the people of God under the Messiah, is represented by the healing of the breach between Judah and Israel, although this particular form of division and schism had ceased before his appearing. Isa. xi. 13; Jer. iii. 18. Messiah is said to sit upon the throne of David, although the theocratic kingdom has in his hands entirely changed its form. Isa. ix. 7. It is carrying this same principle into the realm of figure when Messiah is called David, Ezek. xxxiv. 23, Hos. iii. 5, and his forerunner is

called Elijah, Mal. iv. 5, by which is meant not their personal reappearance, but their revival, so to speak, in the persons of others. This usage of prophecy is the more intelligible to us, as it has been perpetuated to a considerable extent in the current religious language of the day. Though the forms of the ancient dispensation have long since passed away, Israel, Zion, and Canaan, are as familiar to the most unlettered believer, in their application to the present and the future, as their modern equivalents.

It is to be observed here that no false or inaccurate statements are made by the prophets in the cases now under consideration; there is not even the figurative substitution of one object for another to which it bears an analogy, but simply there is no disclosure made of the changes to be effected in the administration of the plan of grace. The two dispensations were not to be confused. Everything was not to be made known then which is revealed now; just as everything is not made known now that is to be revealed hereafter. The communications respecting the future state in which the present dispensation is to be swallowed up, are few and scanty. Glimpses are given, which impart some vague idea of the eternal world, but there is no such clear and connected account of it as would enable us to image to ourselves precisely what it is. And the language employed about it is borrowed from objects in the present world. What new and unimagined forms are hidden beneath these expressions, none can tell. In like manner, while the old economy lasted, God did not see fit to lower its sacredness by untimely anticipations of the important changes to be made upon the introduction of the new economy. Limits were therefore set to the prophetic revelations, which they were rarely suffered to overstep. Glimpses were granted of the most distant future, not merely of the beginning, but of the end of the present dispensation, of the awful convulsions accompanying the final judgment, and of the new heavens and the new earth which are to succeed it. Still these were only glimpses. No complete view was afforded them of the precise state of things when these events were to occur. From these momentary glimpses they invariably return to the representation of the future under forms then existing. Isaiah connects

with the new heavens and the new earth, chap. lxv. 17, etc., building houses and inhabiting them, planting vineyards and eating their fruit, and, lxvi. 22, etc., the observance of new moons and sabbaths. Joel iii. 17, etc., and Zechariah xiv. 16, speak of what is to occur after the final overthrow of the enemies of God, in terms borrowed from the old theocracy and the Levitical service.

The questions relating to what has been called the literalistic controversy, find here their true solution. Those who style themselves literalists, maintain that the predictions respecting Israel, Jerusalem, and Canaan, in the days of the Messiah and the establishment of his kingdom in Zion, are to have a national and local fulfilment. The great body of sound interpreters, on the other hand, affirm that all which is demanded by these prophecies will be met, if these Old Testament terms be understood in a New Testament sense, and the local and national restrictions temporarily imposed upon the dispensation of grace be removed. This subject cannot now be discussed at length. It is sufficient at present to call attention to the principle underlying the whole matter, which is much more comprehensive than the particular cases in dispute. It must also be insisted upon, that the prophecies are in this respect to be interpreted consistently, and upon some settled method—not arbitrarily, and at the caprice of the expositor. There is no propriety in demanding strict literality as the only possible sense when it chances to suit a preconceived theory, and quietly departing from it when it does not. And yet this is what all literalistic interpreters do, and are in fact compelled to do, if they are not prepared to defend the most incredible and extravagant opinions.

2. The other way in which prophecy may depart from the historical form of the objects predicted, is by the employment of figures in place of the real things intended. These answer the double purpose, which, as has been abundantly seen already, attaches to all the departures from the historical mode of representation. They tend both to concealment and to illustration. There is a vagueness and ambiguity attendant upon their use, which allows a general notion of the future, but forbids any exact anticipation of its actual events in their proper forms and

minute details. At the same time there is a vividness and force imparted to the prophetic lessons, which is quite independent of the shape which will belong to these events when they come to be converted into history. The truths respecting God's providential designs, or his plans of grace, which are to be conveyed, are fully contained in the figures employed, these being divinely selected representations of the facts themselves. They can be understood, therefore, and appreciated, as well before the facts occur as after; by him who has no clear conception of what the facts shall be when verified in history, as by him who knows every particular of the fulfilment.

The figurative form may consist in figures of speech or in symbols. Both are quite frequent. When Isaiah predicts, ii. 2, "The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains and shall be exalted above the hills;" or xxxv. i. "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them: and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose;" or xxix. 17, "Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest," the words strictly taken denote physical changes, but, without doubt, moral changes of an analogous nature are the real things intended.

Symbolical prophecies are those in which one class of objects is used as representatives of another; in which, accordingly, there is not merely the illustration of one thing by another, but an actual substitution. The symbol may be (*a*) presented to the senses, as in Zech. vi. 11, the high priest Joshua, crowned with silver and gold brought from Babylon, symbolizes Messiah as both priest and king, to whom all in distant lands should lend their aid. All the symbolical actions of the prophets are instances of the same kind. Or, (*b*) it may be exhibited in vision or in a dream, as the temple and its worship, Ezek. xl., etc. Symbolical of the future state of the theocracy, the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, Dan. ii., and the four beasts, ch. vii., signifying the four great empires of the ancient world, the ram and the he-goat, ch. viii., representing the Medo-Persian and Greek empires, and the man upon the red horse among the myrtle trees, Zech. i., denoting the angel of the Lord as the guardian of Israel. Or, (*c*) it may be simply described and

thus partake of the nature of allegory, as the locusts, Joel i. 2, representing the foes of the covenant people; the marriage of Hosea to an unfaithful wife, Hosea i. iii, representing God's relation to transgressing Israel; the eagles and the cedar of Lebanon, Ezek. xvii., representing the monarchs of Babylon and Egypt and the royal family of Judah; the adulterous sisters, ch. xxiii., representing Judah and Israel.

The difficulties connected with the interpretation of the symbolical prophecies are confessedly great. But this does not justify, on the one hand, the entire neglect with which they have sometimes been treated, as though the difficulties were insurmountable, and the time and labour bestowed upon them were simply thrown away. For these, too, are part of the revelation of God, and are profitable for instruction. Nor does it, on the other hand, justify the capricious treatment which they have so often received from those who have professed to expound them, and who have attributed to them significations at random, without any intelligible reason or consistent method. Anything can thus be made of them that the interpreter pleases. They thus become mere riddles, at which every one is at liberty to guess, but which no one can be sure of having solved. If there is to be any certainty in the interpretation, it must be conducted upon consistent and well established principles; it must be based not upon random guess work, but upon a careful investigation of their meaning, and a faithful use of all the aids by which this may be ascertained. These aids are of three sorts, viz.

1. The prominent qualities or associations of the symbol itself afford an indication of the thing signified. Things are chosen to represent others as symbols, which bear a resemblance to them in some marked respect, or which are commonly connected with them, and consequently are fit emblems of them, or naturally suggest them. It is true that symbols may be purely arbitrary and conventional. In this sense the letters of the alphabet may be said to be symbols of the sounds which they respectively represent. But there is no resemblance between the sign and the thing signified, and no natural association which links them together; it is purely conventional. It does not appear that there are any symbols of this sort in the

Scriptures, and especially in the writings of the prophets, with which we are at present concerned. All which are there found are naturally suggestive, by reason of some likeness to the thing signified, or an established connection with it; many of them are so appropriate and striking that they at once explain themselves. Thus, locusts devastating a land, Joel i., are a natural emblem of foreign invaders; filthy garments, Zech. iii. 4, of sin; reaping a harvest, Joel iii. 13, of cutting down those who are ripened for destruction or for ingathering; eating a book, Ezek. iii. 1, of inwardly receiving its contents; a stream flowing from the temple, xlvii. 1, and healing the Dead Sea, of saving influences, reaching the most hopeless; crowns, Zech. vi. 11, commonly worn by monarchs, are a fit symbol of royalty; fat kine and full ears of corn, of years of plenty; and lean kine and thin ears, of years of famine, Gen. xli. 26, 27, with which they are respectively associated.

2. The resemblances and associations which obtain amongst different objects are so various and multiplied, however, that there would be great uncertainty in the interpretation of symbols, if these were the only guides to their meaning. This may be remedied in some measure by having recourse to the second of the aids referred to, viz. established usage. Symbols must have a uniform signification, if they are to be an intelligible medium of communicating ideas. If the same symbol may have a different sense every time that it is employed, it ceases to be a vehicle of thought, for it will be impossible to tell which signification is to be attached to it in any given case. It is, indeed, conceivable that symbols, which bear an equally decided resemblance to distinct objects, might upon occasion be employed to represent more than one, its particular signification being each time determined by the connection in which it stands; just as words may have different senses, and yet all ambiguity be removed from them by the mode of their employment. The brazen serpent of Moses, Num. xxi. 8, if explained according to the hypothesis of some eminent interpreters, will afford an illustration. This serpent, to which Israel was to look for healing, cannot, it is argued, represent the destroyer of the race, as in Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2, a meaning derived from association with the tempter of Eve. Its sense is accordingly

gathered from the symbolism of Egypt, where it was used to denote healing, as it was also in the worship of Æsculapius among the Greeks and Romans. The most formidable objection to this ingenious hypothesis is its departure from the established meaning of the symbol. And upon this ground it is more natural to conclude, either that the serpent-form is not in this case symbolical, or else that it retains its constant signification, and the serpent exhibited to view, transfixed and harmless, indicates a victory over the destroyer. Although a diversity of meaning is perhaps possible in the symbols, therefore, it is not to be assumed without necessity, nor beyond the limits of that necessity. The strong presumption, in the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, is that each symbol has its own fixed and invariable sense. Consequently the usage of a symbol once ascertained must, in most cases, if not in all, be held to determine its meaning wherever it occurs.

A number of the symbols of prophecy are borrowed from the Levitical institutions. These had the advantage of being familiar, sacred, and significant of the very truths with which prophecy was mainly conversant. They are uniformly used in the signification belonging to them in their original connection; and if any modifications of the essential idea were to be expressed, this is done by varying the form of the symbol. Thus the cherubim, chap. i., and temple, chap. lx., of Ezekiel, and the candlestick of Zechariah, chap. iv. When the symbols are drawn from other sources, they are still, if possible, to be illustrated by parallel scriptural usage. In the absence of this, welcome light may sometimes be cast upon their meaning by the symbolical use of the same object among other ancient nations, especially those with which Israel was brought into contact. It is not improbable that the prophets may have adopted symbols from the Babylonians, as Moses did from the Egyptians. And it is no more prejudicial to their inspiration to employ the language of symbols, which they found in vogue among the heathen, than the use of the Greek language, also borrowed from a heathen people, is to the inspiration of the apostles. It is simply the medium of communicating ideas which is adopted in either case, not the ideas themselves.

3. In addition to the aids already mentioned, another, which

leaves nothing to be desired where it is actually afforded. is the authoritative explanation of the symbols furnished by inspiration. This is sometimes directly given by the prophet himself, who, after having stated the symbol. adds the interpretation; as Daniel, of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, chap. ii.; and Ezekiel. of the two eagles and the cedar, chap. xvii.; or receives it from the Lord, as Jeremiah, of the visions of the almond-tree and seething-pot, etc., and the baskets of figs, chap. xxiv. 5; or from an angel, as Zechariah, or Daniel, of the visions of the four beasts and of the ram and the he-goat; the explanation itself being sometimes enigmatical or designedly obscure, e. g. Zech. iv. 14. Or the needed commentary may be afforded in some later book of Scripture, and especially in the New Testament, by our Lord or the apostles. Thus all doubt is precluded as to the meaning of the "Son of Man" in Daniel's vision. chap. vii. 13, by our Lord's constant application of the expression to himself, and especially by his citation of this very passage before Caiaphas, Matt. xxvi. 64; and so the meaning of the little horn of Daniel's fourth beast, chap. vii., is settled by Paul's commentary upon it, 2 Thess. ii. 3, etc. Or the explanation may be indirectly given, by mingling literal language with the description of the symbol. The thing signified is so blended in the prophet's conception with the sign, which is in its real meaning identical with it, that language appropriate only to the former is frequently applied to the latter, thus affording a clue to what is actually intended. This mingling of the literal and the symbolical is sometimes even carried to the extent of introducing literal objects along with the symbolical, or in the place of them, although this is chiefly confined to incorporeal beings, who, while retaining their identity, assume corporeal forms; e. g. the Angel of the Lord, and Satan. Zech. iii. 1. The general scope of a prophecy, and the connection in which a symbol stands, may also indirectly afford a key, by suggesting the true interpretation of that which would have been obscure had it stood alone.

It is further necessary to the just interpretation of symbols, to observe, that all the subordinate details contained in the description of them need not have a separate significance in the thing represented. The use of one object as the symbol of

another, implies certain prominent features of resemblance. But the similarity is of course limited by the nature of the case, and it is neither necessary nor possible that it should extend to every minor feature, and that the two objects should be in all respects precise counterparts. There will always be particulars, therefore, which belong to a full account of the symbol, but which stand in no direct relation to the thing signified, and consequently possess no distinct significance. These may be introduced into the description, and they have their force in the more graphic portraiture of the symbol as a whole, but are entitled to no separate part in the interpretation. The rule for distinguishing what is separately significant from what is not, is sufficiently simple in theory, whatever difficulty or embarrassment may attend its application in actual practice. It is that the sense of the entire symbol must first be ascertained. Whatever, then, really belongs to the likeness of the objects, is to be held to be significant. Whatever does not do this, or can only by forced and unnatural interpretations be brought into harmony with the main intent of the whole, belongs merely to the filling up of the symbol, but not to its significant portions.

Mr. David N. Lord, who has written more largely and earnestly upon the subject of the figures and symbols of prophecy than any other person in this country, has done a valuable service by calling increased attention to the importance of the subject, the necessity of fixed rules and principles of interpretation, in order to exclude caprice, and to substitute certainty for wild conjecture, and the duty of gathering these principles from the Scriptures themselves. The laws of symbols, as deduced by him from scriptural usage, are the six following,* viz. 1. The symbol and that which it represents, resemble each other in the station they fill, the relations they sustain, and the agencies they exert in their respective spheres; that is, agents represent agents, not acts or effects; acts represent acts, not agents; effects stand for effects, and conditions for conditions. 2. The representative and that which it represents, are of different species, kinds, or ranks, in all cases where the symbol is of such a nature or is used in such a relation that it can pro-

* "The Coming and Reign of Christ," by D. N. Lord, p. 41, etc.

perly symbolize something different from itself. 3. Where the agents or events to be represented are of a nature, or are to appear in conditions, that no symbol of a different order can properly represent them, they appear in the visions as their own symbol. 4. When the symbol and that which it represents differ from each other, the correspondence between them extends to their chief parts, and the general elements or parts of the symbol denote corresponding parts in that which is symbolized. 5. A single agent, in many instances, symbolizes a combination and a succession of agents. Times, also, such as days, months, and years, represent combinations of days, and successions of months and years. 6. The names of symbols are their literal and proper names.

It is not our purpose here to enter upon the detailed examination or discussion of these rules. In the main they are undoubtedly correct, and yet in certain minor respects we conceive them to need, if not modification and correction, at least explanation. Thus for instance we should wish it to be understood, under the first rule, that the agents symbolized by agents need not be actual persons, but may be also personifications; as when the omniscience of the angel of the Lord is represented by couriers coming from all parts of the earth to render up their report, Zech. i. 8—11, and war, famine, and death by the horsemen in the second, third, and fourth seals, Rev. vi. 4—8. And under the second and third rules, we would be disposed to claim that the sacred writer, and not the interpreter, is to be the judge whether a particular object can properly be represented by a symbol of a different nature from itself or not. These rules, however, and those propounded by the same author with regard to figurative language, supposing them to be admitted and accepted, do not have the sweeping consequences which he attributes to them, as though they settled at once and for ever all controverted questions upon prophetic subjects. His mistake consists in supposing that all questions of interpretation can be determined by mechanical rules with mathematical exactness, and that all exercise of discretion and judgment on the part of the interpreter may thus be entirely superseded, and that no need can exist of qualifying the results by the analogy of faith, the scope of the

context, or the light of parallel passages, and that nothing need be left to be determined by the actual fulfilment.

A most important question here arises—How can those prophecies which adhere to the historical form of future events be distinguished from those in which it is departed from? Both extremes of error have here led to the most serious results. The Jews, by a literal interpretation of what is figurative, deny the Messiahship of Jesus, because he failed to satisfy their carnal expectations of a temporal kingdom and a political deliverance. Modern unbelievers, by a figurative interpretation of what is literal, fritter away the evidence of Divine foreknowledge, and convert everything into vague anticipations. In Mr. Lord's opinion this is a very simple matter, and may be readily determined in every case by the application of his rules of figurative language. But neither these nor any other rules enable any one, from the bare inspection of the terms of individual prophecies, irrespective of other aids, and especially of the fulfilment, to determine what was literal and what figurative in the predictions which have been already accomplished, such as those respecting the Messiah or the nations of antiquity. They cannot, consequently, be accepted as a safe and adequate solution in the case of those which are yet unaccomplished.

The following suggestions embrace all that we conceive essential upon this subject.

1. In prophecies which have been already accomplished, the surest criterion is to be found in the fulfilment. This is the authoritative explanation by God, in his providence, of what he intended in his word. Thus, that Christ should rise from the dead before he saw corruption, Ps. xvi. 10; that his garments should be parted, and lots cast upon his vesture, Ps. xxii. 18; that vinegar should be given him in his thirst, Ps. lxix. 21; that thirty pieces of silver should be paid for his betrayal, Zech. xi. 12; that he should enter Jerusalem upon an ass, Zech. ix. 9, are shown by the event to have been literally intended. The drying up of the river of Egypt, Isa. xix. 5, exalting the valleys and making low the mountains and hills, Isa. xl. 4, the coming of Elijah, Mal. iv. 5, are shown to have been figurative. In the application of this criterion, however,

care should be taken to ascertain whether the prophecy is entirely fulfilled. For, if there be a residuum still awaiting accomplishment, that which is only figuratively true of past fulfilments, may be destined to come to pass literally hereafter. Thus the darkening of the heavenly bodies, Isa. xiii. 10, is figurative, if the prophecy is not intended to reach beyond the fall of Babylon; but if it have relation likewise to the end of the world, it may be literally meant.

2. The comparison of other prophecies in the Old or the New Testament, relating to the same subject, affords a valuable criterion. The figures of one passage may be shown to be such by the literal statements, or by the figures of another with which they would be incompatible if literally understood. Thus the conversion of the heathen is represented in some passages by their building altars and offering sacrifices in their own land, Isa. xix. 19, 21, and that in all parts of the earth, Mal. i. 11; in others, by their going up to Jerusalem to worship, Isa. ii. 3, Zech. xiv. 16. Joel iii. 18, says that a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord and shall water the valley of Shittim. Ezekiel xlvii. 1, etc., makes it a river running into the Dead Sea. According to Zech. xiv. 8, only half the waters flow into the Dead Sea, and the other half into the Mediterranean. These accounts are inconsistent if an actual stream is described, but quite harmonious if it is a symbol. In Ezek. xxxviii. 2, Gog is the prince of the land of Magog; in Rev. xx. 8, Gog and Magog are both nations. The heathen are sometimes spoken of as destined to be destroyed in the days of Messiah by immediate Divine judgments, Joel iii. 11, etc., sometimes as subjugated by Israel, Isa. xi. 14; sometimes as yielding not a coerced, but a voluntary service, Ps. lxxii. 11, Isa. xlix. 22; and sometimes as leagued with Israel on terms of equality, Isa. xix. 24, 25. Ammon was to be blotted from existence, Ezek. xxv. 7, 10, and yet to be an object of future mercy, Jer. xlix. 6. It is in one place declared that noxious animals shall be extirpated, Ezek. xxxiv. 25, and in another that they shall change their nature, Isa. xi. 6. These various statements are in mutual conflict, if literally understood, but perfectly consistent as figures. Care must be taken in the application of this rule also, not to be misled by apparent dis-

crepancies which are not really such. There is no conflict, for instance, between the predictions of Messiah in his humiliation, and in his glory; both may in succession be literally fulfilled.

3. It is the doctrine of the New Testament that the restrictions of the old economy, with its peculiar theocratic and ceremonial institutions, are now abolished. The ceremonial services were weak and beggarly elements, Gal. iv. 9, suited only to the childhood of the church, a system of restraint imposed during its minority but now removed, a yoke of bondage which it is inconsistent with Christian freedom to reimpose, Acts xv. 10, a shadow of good things which has given place to the gospel substance, Heb. x. 1. Henceforth the people of God are his temple, and it is no longer requisite to worship in Jerusalem. John iv. 21. The wall which separated Jews and Gentiles is thrown down, Eph. ii. 14, etc. Christ's unchangeable priesthood leaves no room for priests on earth, nor his perfect atonement for other sacrifices. The apostle expressly declares, Heb. x. 2, that as soon as a complete expiation for sin is accomplished, sacrifices must cease to be offered. Consequently if any prediction speaks of these obsolete forms in connection with Messianic times, it must be understood, not according to its letter but according to its spirit. In all that is said of the temple and the ritual and pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and the entire circle of objects associated with these legal services, those things must have been regarded by the spirit of inspiration which now occupy their place and have the same essential meaning.

4. The figurative character of a prophecy is often stated or suggested: as when Daniel appends an explanation to his symbolical visions, ch. vii. 8. Ezekiel xxxvii. 11, declares the resurrection of the dry bones to mean the restoration of Israel. Joel employs expressions, ii. 4, 5, 20, implying that the locusts which he describes were hostile armies. Zechariah says, x. 11, he shall pass through the sea affliction, (not *with* affliction, as in the English version,) showing that he did not mean a literal sea, but affliction represented under that figure. The wine-cup of which the nations were to drink, is explained, Jer. xxv. 15, to be God's fury.

5. Where the terms of a prediction stand in evident relation to the past history of the chosen people, or to typical events and institutions, there is reason to suspect that these may be figuratively employed. It is a common thing with the prophets to represent the past as repeated in the future: not because it is to occur again in precisely the same form, but because the same Divine attributes or the same principles of the Divine administration which were therein exhibited, shall be again displayed with equal power and clearness. Thus they foretell a second miracle of dividing the Red Sea, Isa. xi. 15; a fresh leading through the wilderness, Ezek. xx. 34—38; bringing water from the rock, Isa. xlviii. 21; the pillar of cloud and fire, Isa. iv. 5; raining fire and brimstone as once on Sodom, Ezek. xxxviii. 22; the renewal of the harmless estate of Paradise, Isa. xi. 6—8; lxv. 25. These represent deliverances, trials, blessings, and judgments, of like character and equally conspicuous, but not necessarily of the same form which is here described.

6. If the literal explanation would involve physical impossibility, or a manifest incongruity, this is a clear index of the figurative character of a prediction. Thus Ezekiel shows that he did not intend a literal temple by assigning to it such measures, that Mount Moriah would not be large enough to afford it a site, xlii. 16; the apostle John does the same in regard to the new Jerusalem, by declaring that its height should be twelve thousand furlongs, equal to its length and its breadth, Rev. xxi. 16; Joel shows the locusts to be figurative, by making the same swarm perish in two different seas, ch. ii. 20; and in the prophecy respecting Gog, the extravagance of the time devoted to burning their weapons and burying their dead, is designed to give an intimation of its figurative character. Ezek. xxxix. 12.

7. The general character of a prophet may afford some hints as to the way in which a particular passage occurring in his writings is to be understood. The more largely he deals in figures, the greater the probability of their employment in any given case. So the general character of a prophecy, whether literal or figurative, may throw light upon the proper mode of understanding its individual portions.

8. In prophecies yet unfulfilled, it must often be left to the developments of Providence to distinguish what is literal from what is figurative. How could it have been known in advance of fulfilment, that the prophetic appellations, Josiah, 1 Kings xiii. 2, and Cyrus, Isa. xlv. 1, 4, were to be real names, and Immanuel, Isa. vii. 14, was not? or that the predicted coming of Elijah, Mal. iv. 5, was not to be the personal reappearance of the prophet? As it is only by the event that the line can be unerringly drawn in the case of prophecies already accomplished, it seems plain that we must wait for the fulfilment, before we can attain positive certainty in the case of others also.

9. The line between figurative and literal prophecies is not to be too sharply drawn, as though these formed quite distinct classes. The same prophecy may be intended and fulfilled in both senses; e. g. Isa. xxxv. 5, opening the eyes of the blind and unstopping the ears of the deaf, was fulfilled literally in the miracles of Christ, and figuratively in the blessings of the gospel dispensation. Haggai ii. 7—9, predicts that the silver and the gold of the heathen should be brought to adorn God's house, which is verified both in the material and the spiritual temple. Messiah's coming to Jerusalem riding upon an ass, Zech. ix. 9, was fulfilled, not only in his public entry into the city in that manner, but in his possession of the character which that act symbolized. The convulsions of material nature, so frequently described by the prophets in connection with the fall of particular empires, had a figurative fulfilment then, and await a literal accomplishment at the end of the world. These different modes of fulfilment are so far from inconsistency or mutual interference, that the literal sometimes serves to identify the subject of the other. Thus, that John came preaching in the wilderness of Judea, Matt. iii. 1, was an external sign of the fact that he was the voice spoken of by Isaiah, as crying in the spiritual wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." That the bones of Christ were not broken upon the cross, John xix. 36, was a literal mark of similitude, identifying him as the true paschal Lamb.

Prophecy has thus its own modes of representing the future, growing out of, and adapted to, its special ends. The task of the prophet was not to write history beforehand, but, while

giving some foreshadowing of God's great designs, to draw from them instruction for his own and every succeeding age. Accordingly, the study of a prophecy is quite a distinct thing from the study of its fulfilment. The student of the prophecy is occupied with its terms, with the meaning of its words and expressions, with the picture of the future precisely as it is there presented. It has thus its value and importance as a part of the revelation of God, quite irrespective of the question how or when it has been or will be fulfilled. The study of its fulfilment raises the inquiry, how it has been, or may be expected to be, realized in actual events. This will require the elimination of its peculiarities in respect to time and form already exhibited, and the reduction of all to the style of history. It may be likened to the conversion of a picture into a map of the future.

Two directions are important in the study of the fulfilment of prophecy. It should, in the first place, be preceded by a thorough and careful study of the prophecy itself. If it were proposed to identify the objects in a picture of an extensive landscape, with their proper equivalents in the landscape itself, the first step would be to scrutinize the picture, discover its plan and the point from which it was taken, and to become acquainted with the objects as there represented: then an examination of the landscape would, it might be hoped, show where they were to be found. So in this case it must first be ascertained, by the direct study of the prophecy, what it is precisely that has been predicted, and then, by an inspection of the pages of history, what events will answer to these given requisitions. This order has not infrequently been inverted, and has led to the most extravagant results. Where the attempt is to adapt the prophecy to some previously selected passage in history, instead of gathering from the prophecy what it is that is to be sought in the history, nothing can be expected but preposterous interpretations. Some of the old Dutch interpreters found in the Old Testament prophecies all the events of the Thirty Years' war. Some in more recent times have discovered predictions of the taking of Sebastopol. And no matter what may have been the theory which any expositor has entertained of the book of Revelation, he has, in

his own judgment at least, succeeded in making it conform to the facts to which he has thought proper to apply it.

A second direction equally obvious and essential is, that the student should proceed from the plain to the obscure, from the fulfilled to the unfulfilled. In the case of the picture and the landscape, before supposed, there might probably be certain leading objects which could be identified at once. These would afford fixed points as the basis of further investigation. By the aid thus furnished, others could be made out, and so progress might be made from point to point until the whole was satisfactorily determined. The opposite course of hastily concluding upon some obscure and doubtful points first, and settling all the rest upon this basis could only lead to confusion and error. So if a person had several pictures of different landscapes, and he had access only to some of the scenes represented and not to others, the proper method would be to begin with the former class, and the skill obtained by comparing these with the scenes from which they were taken, would prepare him better to image to himself the scenes portrayed in the rest. When engaged upon prophecies which are clear, or where the fulfilment is before his eyes, the student is in less danger of error, and may correct his results by the Divine exposition afforded by the event. Having tested his methods thus, and adjusted them into conformity with these more evident cases, he may adventure prudently and cautiously into that which is more difficult, or whose fulfilment lies yet in the future. This is the only way to attain reliable and trustworthy results. To begin with the enigmas of prophecy without the previous preparation indispensable for their solution, or even feeling the need of it, is only to give way to profitless conjecture, and may end in the adoption of the wildest vagaries.

The study of the fulfilment of prophecy has many important uses. Among these the most noteworthy are its practical and its apologetic use. The practical use of this study lies in the light which it sheds upon duty and the incentives and encouragements which it supplies to its faithful performance. It is by tracing the connection between the disclosures of God's word and the unfoldings of his providence, that we come to

understand in their true nature the events which are taking place around us, to refer them to their true position in the Divine plan, and to comprehend the lessons which they read to us, as well as the tasks to which they summon us. It is thus that the Jews should have been taught to recognize in Jesus the Messiah; thus the early disciples, when they saw Jerusalem compassed with armies, were warned to save themselves by flight; and we should be stimulated to labour zealously and hopefully for the universal spread of the gospel, by observing how that has been fulfilled and is fulfilling which was predicted in regard to it.

The apologetic use of this study belongs to it as a branch of the evidences of revealed religion. There is no clearer proof of Divinity than that afforded by infallible foreknowledge of the distant and contingent future. The prophets predicting events beyond the reach of human calculation or conjecture, are thereby demonstrated to have been the immediate messengers of God, and all their communications bear in consequence the impress of heavenly authority. The force of this argument is not destroyed by the peculiar difficulties of the subject, arising from the obscurity of many of the prophecies, some of which were dark even to the prophets themselves, Dan. viii. 26, 27, xii. 8, 9, or the peculiarities of the mode of depicting events which has been seen to characterize prophecy in general. There are enough that are plain and have been unambiguously fulfilled; so many, in fact, that the strength of the argument could not be increased by the addition of more. The alleged obscurity is also often greatly exaggerated; or, very frequently, where it existed originally it is removed by the event, and then the argument is the stronger for its having been dark and hard to be understood before.

To the question, whether all the prophecies of Scripture have been or are to be fulfilled, a negative answer has been returned by two very different classes of interpreters, and on essentially different grounds. Many believers in the inspiration of the prophets have contended that certain prophecies contain implied conditions upon which their fulfilment or non-fulfilment, according to the tenor of their announcement, is suspended. The Socinians held it to be inconsistent with the liberty of free

agents that their acts should be foreknown or certainly determined beforehand: all predictions relating to the free acts of men must, consequently, upon this theory, be contingent or conditional. The schoolmen distinguish three sorts of prophecies—*prophetia prædestinationis*, *prophetia præscientiæ*, and *prophetia comminationis*. The prophecy of predestination is when the event depends wholly upon God's will, without any respect to the will of man, as the prophecy of the incarnation of Christ; the prophecy of prescience is of such things as depend upon the liberty of man's will; and the prophecy of commination denotes God's denunciations of heavy judgments against a people. The first and second rest upon the Divine decree and foreknowledge, and they always take effect; the third is a simple declaration of what is deserved, and, in the existing state of things, is to be expected, but which need not follow if the antecedent conditions are altered. Stillingfleet* remarks upon this point, "Comminations of judgments to come do not in themselves speak the absolute futurity of the event, but do only declare what the persons to whom they are made are to expect, and what shall certainly come to pass, unless God by his mercy interpose between the threatening and the event. So that comminations do speak only the *debitum poenæ* and the necessary obligation to punishment; but therein God doth not bind himself up as he doth in absolute promises; the reason is, because comminations confer no right to any, which absolute promises do; and therefore God is not bound to necessary performance of what he threatens. . . . . Predictions concerning temporal blessings do not always absolutely speak the certainty of the event, but what God is ready to do, if they to whom they are made continue faithful to him." Fairbairn† likewise maintains that predictions of coming good or evil are always conditional, never absolute; for the assumption implied in their being absolute, that the spiritual state of the subjects of it would undergo no change, nullifies the very design of the delivery of the prophecy, which is the production of a spiritual effect.

The decisive objection to this view, on whatever footing it

* Origines Sacræ, book ii. chap. 6.

† Fairbairn on Prophecy, part i. chap. 4.

is placed, or by whatever grounds it is defended, is that the inspired criterion for distinguishing true from false prophets, is the accomplishment of their predictions, Deut. xviii. 22. This test would be practically rendered nugatory if predictions of specific events, expressed in absolute terms and with no intimation of any condition, might fail of fulfilment, and yet be true prophecies. And that Jeremiah xviii. 7—10, had no intention of nullifying this test, appears from his appeal to it in his contest with Hananiah, Jer. xxviii. 9. The righteous dispensations of God towards men are indeed conditioned by their character and conduct, so that a change in them is followed by a change in his dealings with them, which the Scriptures, employing the language of men and speaking according to the outward appearance, often describe as a change in the Divine mind. But God's eternal purpose never changes. His foresight of the future is not conditional, but absolute, and he may, if he pleases, reveal it absolutely. When a specific good is unconditionally promised, therefore, it is because it is certain to the Divine mind that his mercy will not be taken away from the object of his favour. When a specific evil is similarly threatened, it is with the certainty that they who are thus doomed are incorrigible and will not repent. Even where this is the case, as in Isa. vi. 9, etc., the prophecy is not useless, as Fairbairn objects. It still serves two important purposes. It is a witness on God's behalf and against the obdurate offenders, that judgment did not come upon them without just cause, or without antecedent warning; and it may be the means of leading individuals to repentance and salvation, though the unbelieving mass persist in going on to ruin. There may be no claim upon God, *ab extra*, to fulfil his threatenings, but the reasons of his acts are in himself, and his inviolable truth and justice stand in the way of his revoking them. Whenever the moral effect of a prophecy required that it should be conditional, it is made so in express terms. Or, the same end may be answered by leaving it indefinite, announcing some general principle of the Divine administration, without specifying when or how it shall go into effect, or at least, leaving the time undetermined. But whatever is absolutely declared by the prophet, is to be absolutely understood. The most plausible exception is that derived from the

case of Jonah. Nineveh continued to stand, notwithstanding his having been sent of God with the declaration, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." But, as Hengstenberg has well said, we have only this general statement respecting Jonah's preaching there, not the preaching itself. No doubt this was such as to indicate that the only hope of escape lay in a timely repentance. It was at least, so understood by the Ninevites, and they acted accordingly. Jonah's displeasure at the sparing of the city cannot be urged in proof of the unconditional character of his prophecy; for there is reason to believe that this did not arise from the fear of his being discredited as a prophet, but rather from his distress at seeing the mercy of God transferred from obdurate Israel to their penitent foes. Jer. xxvi. 18, 19, to which Caspari* appeals in proof of the conditional character of Micah's prophecy, iii. 12, is still less to the point. It simply repeats the opinion of certain elders, without vouching for its correctness. The prediction in question relates to an event whose time was not defined by the prophet, although intimated, iv. 10, and it was fulfilled to the letter.

On the other hand, unbelievers in the inspiration of the prophets allege that several of their predictions failed of accomplishment, thereby showing that they had no certain knowledge of the future. Thus De Wette:† "Jer. xxii. 18, etc. xxxvi. 30, appear not to have been fulfilled, comp. 2 Kings xxiv. 6; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6. The following are not fulfilled: Amos vii. 11; Hosea ix. 3, xi. 5; Isa. xxii., xxix., xvi. 14; xxiii.; Jer. xliii. 8, etc., xlix. 7, etc.; Ezek. xxxv., xxix., xxxviii., etc.; not accurately fulfilled, Isa. vii. 17, etc., viii. 4, xiv. 23, xvii. 1—3, xxxiv. 9, etc." But even if we were not able to prove that these particular prophecies have been accomplished, this would not affect the argument of inspiration from

* Caspari on Micah, p. 160.

† Einleitung in die A. T. § 204. In the translation of this work by Theodore Parker, the translator has mistaken his author's meaning, when he makes him say, 'The definite predictions of Ezekiel xii. xxiv. 25, 26, xxxiii. 21, 22, seem not to have been fulfilled.' De Wette merely alleges these as instances of the prediction of specific events, without denying their fulfilment, this being too plain to be questioned.

the remainder, many of which have been most signally and undeniably fulfilled. This is sufficient, likewise, to show that we should be slow to admit the non-fulfilment of any prophecy uttered by those who are so clearly attested as the messengers of God. Nothing but the plainest and most undeniable evidence can justify such an admission. But so far from this being afforded, an examination of the passages adduced by De Wette, will show that his denial rests in every case upon a false interpretation of the passages themselves, a want of historical knowledge, or the groundless assumption that the prophecies contemplate only the immediate future. Amos vii. 11, 'Jeroboam shall die by the sword,' is not the language of Amos, but words which Amaziah slanderously puts into his mouth, to make him odious to the king. The real words of Amos were, vii. 9, 'I will rise against the *house* of Jeroboam with the sword,' which came to pass, 2 Kings xv. 10. Ezekiel's prophecy respecting Gog, chaps. xxxviii. xxxix., relates to events still future. Isaiah, ch. xxxiv., blends the final judgment with the judgment upon Edom. Isa. vii. 17, the invasion of Judah by the king of Assyria; Isa. xiv. 23, the utter desolation of Babylon; and Jer. xlix. 7, etc.; Ezek. ch. xxxv., that of Edom, have been fulfilled to the letter, and the length of time which intervened between the predictions and their accomplishment, only enhances the evidence of prophetic foresight. According to 2 Kings xv. 29, xvi. 9, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria (not the city, but the kingdom) were taken away before the king of Assyria within the time predicted, Isa. viii. 4. That Damascus was in consequence temporarily desolated, Isa. xvii. 1—3, is as credible as the desolation of Samaria and Jerusalem in their respective captivities. In regard to Isa. xvi. 14, the overthrow of Moab within three years, Isa. xxiii., the humiliation of Tyre fo seventy years, and its subsequent revival, and Jer. xliii. 8, etc., Ezek. xxix., Nebuchadnezzar's subjugation of Egypt, the sole difficulty arises from the deficiency of historical records. We know nothing of Moab's history except from the incidental references occasionally made to it in the Old Testament. But it was, in all probability, devastated by the Assyrian armies, which so often invaded Palestine. It is

well known that Tyre was besieged by Nebuchadnezzar for thirteen years, and there is good reason to believe successfully, although the fact of its capture does not happen to be mentioned in express terms. It cannot, at any rate, be disproved; neither can his conquest of Egypt, which is, moreover, asserted by Josephus, *Antiquities*, x. 9, 7, who quotes Megasthenes and Berosus to the same effect, *Antiquities* x. 11, 1. These positive statements are certainly sufficient to outweigh the silence of Herodotus and Diodorus. The indignities threatened to the dead body of Jehoiakim, Jer. xxii. 18, etc., xxxvi. 30, are not discredited by 2 Kings xxiv. 6, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, for there is no conflict between these passages and the prophecy. Nor is there any reason to question Josephus's explicit testimony to its fulfilment, *Antiq.* x. 6, 3, notwithstanding its rejection by De Wette. The difficulty in Isa. xxii. 29, is not so much to discover a fulfilment, as to decide between different events which have a claim to be so regarded. The invasion of Sennacherib seems to have been more immediately regarded in both cases. Elam and Kir, chap. xxii. 6, denote troops from those nations in the Assyrian army; and the sudden and miraculous defeat, xxix. 5, etc., is that of the host of the Assyrians. But with this is blended the foresight, in chap. xxix., of other trials and deliverances; and perhaps, in chap. xxii., of the later sieges by Esar-haddon and Nebuchadnezzar. Hos. ix. 3, "Ephraim shall return to Egypt," and xi. 5, "he shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king," are mutually contradictory, if regard be had merely to the letter and the form of expression. In thus affirming and denying the same proposition, the prophet must, if he is to be absolved from the charge of inconsistency, have intended it in different senses. Two explanations are possible, either of which is satisfactory. He may mean, Ephraim shall return to an Egypt, i. e., he shall be reduced again to a servitude like that which he formerly experienced in that land—not in the literal Egypt, however, but in Assyria. Or he may mean some of the people shall return to Egypt, fugitives from Assyrian invasion; the mass, however, shall be carried not to Egypt, but to Assyria. Upon either of these hypotheses, the language of the prediction accords with the event. And these explanations will still hold

good, though xi. 5 be translated with De Wette, interrogatively, Shall he not return into the land of Egypt? There is no note of interrogation in the Hebrew, however, so that the declarative form, adopted in the common English version, is to be preferred.

ART. V.—*Conference on Missions held in* 1860 *at Liverpool.* Including the Papers read, the Deliberations, and the Conclusions reached, with a comprehensive Index, showing the various matters brought under Review. Edited by the Secretaries to the Conference. Tenth thousand, revised. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1860.

IN bringing this interesting and important volume to the notice of our readers, we are influenced by the momentous character of the questions it discusses, and the valuable light it sheds upon them. No interest of the church, or department of Christian labour, towers above missions to the heathen. When, at the beginning of this century, the mind of Protestant Christendom awoke from its lethargy on this subject, and commenced its labours of foreign evangelization, the field was new and untried, at least in modern experience. While the great principles which underlie and shape the missionary work are laid down in Scripture, yet those details of practical development and organization, which are conditioned by the difference between present circumstances and those of the apostolic church, and which can only be determined by actual experience, remained to be evolved by the future working of missions. Great questions have thus been emerging in regard to various matters connected with the conduct of missions, which have tasked the wisdom of missionaries, and of missionary boards and managers, while some of them have agitated the mind of the church at large. In this exigency, it has been felt to be desirable to collect the lights of experience from those who have personal knowledge of the operations and effects, the difficulties and perplexities, that have shown themselves in the practical working of modern missions. The most obvious

method of applying this resource for facilitating the solution of the problems in question, was by deliberative conventions of missionaries, and of the conductors and intelligent friends of missions, in all parts of the world. Of the obstacles which for a time prevented the gathering of such convocations, and of the meetings for this purpose which have been successively held within the past few years, we shall soon make brief mention. This volume is a complete and accurate account of the last and greatest of these conventions, for which those previously held formed at once the demand and the preparation. It contains over four hundred large octavo pages, in clear and ample type, and although exceedingly cheap, is, in all respects, neatly got up. It gives the entire proceedings, papers, debates, speeches, results, of this conference, at its formal sessions, its soirees, and public meetings, together with an appendix of valuable documents, a most copious and accurate index, and marginal headings of topics on the sides of the pages. We have seldom met with any report or record of the doings and sayings of any deliberative assembly so complete and satisfactory. The editors, who were the four secretaries of the meeting, together with their assistant stenographers, deserve all praise for the manner in which they have executed their work. And the work is worthy of the labour bestowed upon it. It presents the many-sided experience, the profound reasonings, and the deliberate judgments of this great catholic missionary convention, on the vexed questions which have most baffled the conductors of Protestant missions. It contains several papers on these questions of consummate excellence; also, a number of addresses before public meetings, which are among the finest recent specimens of Christian eloquence. The members of the Conference numbered one hundred and twenty-six. They embraced missionaries, both retired and still in service, from all quarters of heathendom, together with the active and controlling officers of the chief missionary societies of Britain, besides other leading friends of missions, lay and clerical. Among these were included prominent representatives of all the great evangelical bodies, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Moravian, Independent. Leading parts in the proceedings of the Conference were assigned to members of these respective denominations.

Not the least interesting and able constituent portion of the assembly were the officers of the British army who had been stationed in missionary fields, more especially in India. We can scarcely wonder that the Queen's armies in India are victorious over insurgent foes that vastly outnumber them, when they are commanded by the Havelocks, Campbells, Alexanders, and other Christian officers like those whose noble Christian and missionary addresses are reported in this volume. One of these, Major General Alexander, presided at the regular sittings of the Conference. The Earl of Shaftesbury, however, presided at the general public meeting held at its close. No class of members contributed more to the objects of the meeting, or exhibited greater piety, wisdom, earnestness, and eloquence, than these army officers. One of the charms of the volume lies in the large variety of writers, speakers, and orators to which it introduces us. In short, our inspection of the book fully bears out the statement of the *Glasgow Examiner*, that "there is no such collection of opinions on mission-work extant." It justifies the following language of the *Edinburgh Witness:* "At the missionary meetings of individual churches or societies, the experience has been often detailed that falls within their own limited and sectional operations. For the first time the Conference brought into play what we may call the catholic experience of missions. The results of long years of observation in all fields and by all classes and denominations of missionaries were thrown into a common stock, and the materials furnished, out of which there may be drawn, if not a new theory of missions, new and wiser methods of mission operations. We know not a more valuable contribution towards the formation of a science of missions than the volume that records these meetings. It has not only added largely to the experience that has been accumulating for half a century—it has concentrated it."

Having thus presented to our readers the general features of this volume, we propose to bring before them a brief conspectus of the missionary conventions which preceded and culminated in this, and of the results at which this arrived—availing ourselves of the statements and language of this volume, with or without quotation marks, as convenience may dictate. From

a paper in the appendix by the Rev. Joseph Mullens, one of the Secretaries of the Conference, we learn the following facts in regard to previous conferences on missions.

During the last few years several important conferences have been held respecting the best modes of furthering the great work of Christian missions in heathen lands. The growing union of all branches of the Church of Christ in England and America, on several occasions led to suggestions respecting a gathering of the chief managers of missions, lay and clerical, that they might combine their sympathies and their efforts, more openly and more completely, in extending the Saviour's kingdom. For a considerable time, however, the carrying out of such a plan was hindered by the fear, expressed in many quarters, lest some Utopian scheme should be broached for confounding combined action with unity of association; and substituting, for the affectionate co-operation of independent churches and societies, the action of some single Missionary Society, to be formed by the union of the whole. At length meetings of the kind were successfully commenced; and common discussions on missionary principles and plans of labour were permitted to take place.

The first conference of the kind actually inaugurated was the Union Missionary Convention, which met in New York on May 4th, 1854, and was occasioned by the visit to America of the Rev. Dr. Duff. Stirred up by his fervent appeals, and anxious to take advantage of the presence and experience of one in whose labours all branches of the church felt a deep and sympathizing interest, various brethren in Philadelphia and New York joined in inviting the officers and supporters of all missionary societies to hold such an assembly; "to illustrate the practical unity of the church; to excite an increased interest in her holy work; and to combine and judiciously direct her efforts, for the salvation of the millions of our race perishing for lack of knowledge." All idea of merging existing agencies in some Utopian centralized missionary organization was repudiated; and the hope was expressed that, while each branch of the Christian church endeavoured to render more efficient its own share in the great cause, such an assembly of men, aiming at one common object, might collect and

concentrate scattered fragments of foreign experience; might inquire into the best method of raising funds: might discuss the relative advantages of the several modes adopted in evangelizing the heathen; and arrange for a freer interchange of information among existing missionary societies. On the day appointed a hundred and fifty members of the Convention met in the lecture-room of Dr. Alexander's church in New York; including eleven missionaries and eighteen officers of various Missionary Societies and Boards. They sat, however, for only a day and a half, and the range of topics discussed was necessarily limited. But the harmony, the practical union of affection, the earnest desire to maintain a cordial co-operation in the Saviour's work, manifested on every side, were most delightful; and in this respect the success of the Convention was complete.

Besides the consideration of general Scripture principles, on which the work of missions is based, three practical questions were taken up by the Convention, of which two related to foreign work, and one to the raising of missionaries at home. On each of these a distinct opinion was pronounced.

(*a*) On the subject of concentrating or scattering labourers in a foreign field, the Convention resolved: that while approving the plan of diffusing the gospel by means of judicious itinerancies, it was equally proper and desirable to seize on commanding stations, especially in countries possessing ancient systems of error; and to concentrate a powerful agency there, which, by harmonious coöperation in different departments of missionary labour, may both largely influence the heathen, and perpetuate the gospel in pure churches to succeeding generations.

(*b*) On the expediency of different Boards planting stations on the same ground: the Convention expressed their thankfulness that Societies have interfered so little with each other—decided, and resolved, that, considering the vast domain of heathenism yet untaught, it was very desirable that an efficient preoccupancy of any portion of the field by one evangelical Society, should be respected by others, and left in their sole possession.

(*c*) On the important question of multiplying and preparing

qualified labourers; the Convention considered that much depended on a deeper missionary spirit in pastors of churches; leading them to constant efforts, in their pulpits, bible-classes, and Sabbath-schools, to impress parents, teachers, and the young, with the duty and glory of personal dedication to the work of the Lord. On these topics the conclusions reached are similar to those adopted by the recent Conference at Liverpool.*

The next Conference on missions was gathered in London, in the autumn of the same year; and sat for two days, October 12th and 13th, 1854. Like that at New York, it was limited in the range of its discussions; and dwelt rather more on general principles. Members of all the principal Societies were present; but many of the Secretaries were unable to attend.

The Conference was deficient, therefore, to a large extent in practical elements: but the kindly feeling and harmony prevailing among the members of the different churches present, evinced an earnest desire heartily to coöperate in the great work of preaching the gospel to the heathen. Three long and able papers were read to the Conference; of which the second only dealt with the plans of missionary life; having discussed the increase of native agents and the extension of itinerating operations. No resolutions were adopted on this or other questions: the object being to make the expression of opinion free and unrestrained. This first gathering in England of brethren deeply interested and engaged in missionary work tended greatly to prepare the way for the more practical assembly which has recently taken place.†

To these gatherings among the home friends of missions succeeded several more private Conferences on the actual fields of labour: all of a much more complete, searching, and practical character. The earliest took place among the American Missions in India and Syria. At the close of 1854, the Rev. Dr. Anderson, Foreign Secretary of the American Board, and the

* "Proceedings of the Union Missionary Convention held in New York, May 4th and 5th, 1854." New York: Taylor & Hogg. 1854.

† "The Missionary Conference in London: Evangelical Christendom." December 1854.

Rev. A. C. Thompson proceeded to India as a deputation from the Board, and spent the following year in visiting the entire range of their missions in those countries. In each case they examined the stations occupied by the Board in all their detail; and gathering the missionaries together for consultation, went over with them all the questions involved in every plan existing in operation in their peculiar circle of missions.

The American Board has three great spheres of missionary operations in India; in the Deccan, North Ceylon, and Madura; with two smaller missions in Madras and Arcot; and has two chief centres of missions in Western Turkey, at Beirut and Constantinople. In all these missions, this, or a similar range of searching topics was discussed in full by the missionaries and the deputation; the views of the brethren were interchanged, and the results of their experience on heathen ground were freely detailed. The deductions of this experience appear in the form of Papers drawn up by the missionaries (similar to the Minutes of the recent Conference,) and of Letters, commenting upon them, by the Deputation. They are contained in a volume of 600 pages, printed privately for the use of the Board and its friends; and it is not too much to say that no previous volume of equal size, published during the era of our modern missions, contains so much valuable information on all the details of missionary experience on several most important fields of labour, as that volume of missionary papers. It might be published with great advantage to the friends of all Missionary Societies; and deserves the careful study of all missionaries, and the managers of all missionary agencies, especially in the countries and provinces in Asia.*

About the same period, E. B. Underhill, Esq., the able and accomplished Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society, visited all the missions of that Society in India and Ceylon, as a deputation from the London Committee, and acting on a plan similar to that of the American deputation, gathered the missionaries of the Society in four separate Conferences, for a similar examination of every element in their local plans. A

* "Reports and Letters connected with Special Meetings of the India and Syria Missions of the American Board in 1855." Printed for the use of the Prudential Committee. Boston.

range of topics was discussed similar to that of the American brethren; and the result, as in their case, was embodied in reports by the missionaries and letters by the deputation. They are also equally valuable.* To the missionary in India no works will give a more complete insight into the worth and working of all sorts of plans, than the nine sets of Papers and Letters contained in these volumes of the two Societies.

Three other Conferences, of a more general character, also on Indian ground, accompanied, or have since followed, the meetings of the American and Baptist missionaries. They had to consider not merely general principles, but the minute details of each circle of missions. The General Conferences which followed, including missionaries from many Societies, were confined to the principal plans of labour adopted by Indian missionaries, but illustrated them by experience, drawn from a wide surface and contributed by the most able men, who had been engaged in carrying those plans into effect.

The Bengal Missionary Conference met in Calcutta in September, 1855; it consisted of nearly fifty missionaries; sat four consecutive days; held eight sessions, with meetings for devotion; enjoyed the most delightful harmony in its meetings; and its members were greatly cheered by their mutual counsels. The topics discussed were as follows:

The progress made by missions in Bengal:

The peculiar difficulties encountered in them:

Preaching the gospel in the native tongue:

English missionary education:

Influence of the Indigo and Zemindary systems on the progress of the gospel in rural districts:

Vernacular Christian literature:

Vernacular schools: and

Native female education.

Each subject was introduced by a brief paper; the discussions were conversational, pointed, and searching; and the opinions of the brethren were embodied in the form of resolutions, which were submitted to them and approved. The papers, brief notes

* "Minutes and Reports of Conferences of the Baptist Missionaries in Bengal; the North-west Provinces; Behar; and Ceylon, in 1855—56." Printed for the use of the Committee and the Missionaries.

of the discussions, and the resolutions passed, were also published in a thin volume, of great value to missionaries and the officers of their Societies.*

A second General Conference was held by the missionaries of the North-west Provinces, at Benares, in January 1857, three months before the mutiny. Thirty missionaries were present belonging to seven churches and societies, and, as in Calcutta, were greatly encouraged and instructed by the relation of their common experience. The plan followed, and the topics discussed were very similar to those adopted in the Bengal Conference; and the opinions of the members were embodied in the form of Resolutions. These resolutions, and a few brief notes from a private pen, are all the account now remaining of this instructive Conference; the whole of the MSS. and printed proofs having been destroyed when the Allahabad Mission Press was burnt in by the mutineers in the following June.†

The last Conference held in India, a gathering of the South India missionaries, took place at Ootacamund, in the Nilgherry Hills, in April, 1858. It differed from the previous general conferences, in the wide range of topics brought forward, and in the length of time devoted to their examination. Thirty-two missionaries met on the occasion; and having retired from the heat of the plains, were able to spend a quiet fortnight in the cool air of the hills, in a full and satisfactory examination of all the plans adopted in their different fields of labour. The results are published in a large volume, and are of very great value to all who would know the character and progress of Christian missions in the Madras Presidency.‡

The volume opens with a series of twenty-seven narrative papers, descriptive of the growth of the chief missions of the Presidency, in the several provinces speaking four great languages. These narratives contain a great deal of valuable

* "Proceedings of a General Conference of Bengal Protestant Missionaries, held in Calcutta, Sept. 1855." London: Dalton, Cockspur Street. Price 4*s*.

† "Outline of the Benares Missionary Conference." *Calcutta Christian Observer*, March 1857.

‡ "Proceedings of the South India Missionary Conference, held at Ootacamund, April, 1858." London: Missionary Societies.

information, from which a general view of that growth may be easily derived. They are followed by papers read on no less than twenty-one subjects connected with missionary life and plans. The papers are thirty in number, written by men most competent to produce them, and are followed by resolutions, in which the common views of the Conference are embodied. The subjects include not only the prime topics of native agency, missionary education, vernacular preaching, village congregations, and the like, but more special topics, as industrial institutions, caste, public morals, and the government, government education, and others. A number of statistical tables close the work—recent, and of the best authority. The book is a great storehouse of information on all that concerns the missions of South India, and deserves most careful study.

The records of these various missionary gatherings, both general and special, embody, to a far greater extent than any works previously written, the tested experience of missions in various localities, as to the worth of existing plans; and they are calculated to confer great service on all who wish to learn from that experience the most efficient methods of carrying out the great commission to preach the gospel, which underlies them all. A work might yet be written, which shall gather up, in relation to the whole, the principles, facts, and teachings thus presented respecting the various sections of our widespread Indian missions: a work which shall seize on general features of locality, work, and results; discriminate between them and local peculiarities; and fairly deduce the results taught by the entire field to the missionaries and managers of all Protestant Societies. The Rev. Joseph Mullens states that he has, for some time, planned the preparation of such a volume, but want of opportunity has compelled him for the present to lay it aside.

From these brief notices, the reader will at once see how far the recent Conference on Missions, held in Liverpool, has differed from its predecessors. Embracing in its details the experience of missionaries and Societies in all parts of the world, it has examined a wider range of field than the Conferences in India, though it has not, like them, descended to a great variety of minute details. Dealing less with general

principles, and going more deeply into plans, its discussions were of far greater value than those of its predecessors in London and New York.

It was arranged by the promoters of the scheme, that four days should be spent in discussing the various plans of missionary labour at home and abroad; that two sittings should be held each day, morning and afternoon, of about three hours and a half each; that they should be preceded by a morning prayer-meeting, and followed by a missionary soirée at night; and that while the official deliberations should be confined to the members of the Conference, all friends should be invited to attend the devotional services. The plan was carried out with great success; the general attendance at the opening and closing services increased day by day; a happy variety was observed in the addresses delivered, and the fields of labour described; a most delightful spirit of Christian union, devotion, and prayer prevailed; and the presence of the Lord, in whose name the work was done, was largely realized.

The more general services were brought to a conclusion by a public meeting held in the Philharmonic Hall. It proved to be the noblest meeting ever held in Liverpool, in connection with Christian missions.

The first session of the Conference was occupied with the subject of "European Missionaries Abroad," embracing various subordinate topics, first presented in a very brief but able paper of ten minutes, by the Rev. Joseph Mullens, London Missionary Society, Calcutta, followed by a series of terse and luminous addresses by members of the Conference—the whole concluding with a formal minute on "Missionaries and their plans," unanimously adopted by the Conference. A simple enumeration of the topics handled, will show the importance of this session. This is all that we can present, as we must dwell chiefly on matters which still more urgently press themselves on the mind of the church. They were the following:

"Necessity for a missionary at once mixing intimately with the natives, and obtaining a thorough mastery of their language.

The use of the common Colloquial, as compared with the so-called Sacred Languages.

Vernacular Preaching. Itinerancies.
Visiting from house to house.
Local Pastoral Work.
Medical Missionaries.
Translation of the Bible and Christian Books.
Causes of Missionary *Success.*
Causes of *Failure.*
Should Missionary Effort be concentrated in limited localities, or diffused over a large surface?
Reflex influence of a greater degree of vital religion among our European Soldiery and Countrymen abroad."

The following was the programme of the points discussed at the second meeting, which was opened with an interesting paper, by the Rev. T. B. Whiting, of the Church Missionary Society, "On the best means of exciting and maintaining a missionary spirit."

"How best to stir up, direct, and work, the Missionary Feeling at Home.
A Missionary Intelligencer. Missionary Periodicals.
Correspondence of Missionaries with University Prayer-Unions, and Missionary Associations in their Native Towns.
Deputations.
Juvenile Associations, and Missionary Effort on the part of the Young.
A Professorship of Missionary History at the Universities."

In the course of the discussions at this session, the principal novel suggestions made were, 1. "That the missionary work might be greatly advanced amongst the higher and more intelligent of the middle-classes by the publication of a first-class *Quarterly Review of Missions*, devoted to the discussion of all those subjects which had brought this Conference together; and in which men of ability, experience, and piety, might advocate their views in regard to the home and foreign operations of missionary societies. Christian missions in all ages; the condition and relations of ancient and modern churches; missionary biographies in connection with the work; special features of particular missionary fields; heathen systems of religion and philosophy; books of travel, and the like—so far as these cross

the path, or affect the proceedings of the missionary—might be discussed with great advantage to the committees of the various societies, to missionary students, and to the missionaries themselves. Such a Review would afford the means of discussing critically, comprehensively, and philosophically, all the secondary influences which affect and determine the religious faith of men, and would be read by a numerous class of persons well disposed to the mission cause, who would be more interested in that cause, if they had its principles and proceedings brought before them in a higher form than is done in the monthly publications and occasional meetings of the year."

The second suggestion related to the importance of making provision for the more efficient instruction of students academic, and especially theological, in regard to the nature and claims of the missionary service. In furtherance of this object four plans were mentioned. 1. The erection of a distinct Professorship of Missions in theological schools. 2. Due instruction in the premises by the chairs already established in these institutions and in colleges. 3. The establishment of a special lectureship in these institutions, on the subject of missions. 4. Making provision for an annual course of lectures on some topic connected with missions, in some great centre of population or education, analogous to the Bampton Lectures on the Christian Evidences. The last of these plans met the sanction of the Conference, which, before its adjournment, initiated measures, formed an organization, and obtained some generous subscriptions towards founding such a lectureship upon the basis of £300 per annum.

In regard to the proposed Quarterly, while Protestant Christiandom might afford a sufficient field and support for it, if it were established under favourable auspices, yet we think those conversant with the practical difficulties of such an undertaking, will endorse the wisdom of the final minute of the Conference thereupon: "that it would be exceedingly desirable to secure the establishment of a periodical of a higher class, that shall treat of Christian missions at large; so that while the friends of missions naturally support the periodicals of their own societies, they may, through such a general periodical, also secure regular and full information respecting the numerous missions

of their brethren. Till its establishment, however, they suggest that attempts should be made to employ in the cause of missions the service of existing periodicals."

In regard to the provision to be made for missionary instruction in theological schools, the following minute of the body is at once sufficiently emphatic and definite: "They further consider that the subject of Christian missions, in all their bearings, their history, difficulties, successes, and obligations, should be brought systematically before theological students, as a part of their college course; that they may thus be trained in the practical conviction that missionary work is the regular work of the church of Christ; acquire information respecting its position; and themselves go forth to share its toils."

The third session was devoted to the various questions connected with missionary education. It was introduced by three able papers, and closed with the unanimous adoption of the following minute on missionary education:

"The Conference believe that educational plans legitimately fall within the province of Christian missions; as affording means both for consolidating native churches, and promulgating the gospel among the heathen.

They consider that on this subject more than on any other, attention should be paid to the great rule:—That, preserving their single aim of spreading the gospel, all missionary agencies should be most carefully adapted to the numerous varieties of places, people, and spheres of missionary labour; and that experience should be followed as the most valuable guide.

In all countries, as a general rule, Vernacular Schools, carried on in the language of the country, are the most natural and most important, both for the children of converts and for those of the heathen. The Conference believe that such schools should be increased in number, and be made as efficient as possible in the character of their teaching.

In some countries and localities where the natives earnestly desire to obtain a knowledge of the English language, English Mission Schools have been established on good grounds, have turned that desire to good account, and have been blest with a variety of valuable results. Their value has been proved partly in the conversion of souls; and chiefly in the extensive diffu-

sion of a knowledge of the gospel, in spheres of usefulness which other plans of labour have not reached. Efforts, however, in this direction, the Conference think should not be carried too far.

In some countries, especially in India, where caste is so powerful, Orphan and Boarding-Schools, in which young people have been brought up, separated from heathen influences, have been found greatly useful in the conversion of their scholars, and in securing well-instructed native agents for the service of the mission.

Considering the position of women in the heathen world, the Conference think that great attention to Female Education is not only desirable, but necessary in every mission; and that all opportunities for extending it and increasing its usefulness should be eagerly embraced, and thankfully employed.

They consider that, as the sphere of education widens, where teachers are demanded, and can be obtained, Training Institutions for teachers should be established and efficiently maintained.

They regard with much satisfaction the progress already made in raising up in various missions a Vernacular Literature suitable both to Christian and heathen; and they think it a work of the greatest importance, that such a literature should be still greatly extended; especially in countries where the press is extensively employed by the heathen to circulate wrong views of religion and morality.

For most valuable help in this important matter, this Conference recognize with pleasure the generous support given to all Missionaries and Missionary Societies by the Bible and Tract Societies of England and America."

The following is the programme of subjects suggested for discussion at the fourth session:

"How the missionary feeling at home should be so stirred up as largely to increase the present income of Missionary Societies.

Paper of ten minutes, by Rev. James Lewis, of Leith.

The great expense of Religious Societies, from the necessity of constant begging, and the general neglect of St. Paul's advice (1 Cor. xvi. 2,) to lay by periodically.

Private hospitality, and private carriage for Deputations.
How to avoid collectors' per-centage."

The paper of Mr. Lewis is one of marked ability. Besides the usual points of such a discussion, he argues with great force the importance of sending to the heathen other agents and representatives of British and American Christianity, in addition to mere preachers and teachers. He maintains that this method, by rendering the missions more successful and effective upon the heathen, would tend powerfully to augment missionary zeal and liberality at home. He discourses on the subject, in the vivid and luminous sentences which follow, in a style which must command attention, whatever may be the ultimate judgment of the church.

"Do we seek to rebuild these fallen institutions (monasteries) of a mediæval age? Certainly not. But we would translate the variety of their mission action into the methods of our own times. It is not necessary, in availing ourselves of their experience, to adopt their principle of community life. In harmony with our own habits of thought, the strictly-teaching missionary might still go forth as the accredited agent of the church or the Missionary Society, whilst the Christian capitalist, planter, or factory proprietor, left to the bent of his own mind, could choose and organize his field of operation; yet so co-operate with the missionary teacher as that each should have the benefit of the services of the other, and the heathen the benefit of both. Why should not the arts, and agriculture, and mechanic skill of our British Protestants, be called to pay tribute to missions, through their own characteristic channels, in rearing the foreign factory, cultivating the tea, indigo, rice, sugar, and cotton; and, by prosperous industrial settlements, exemplify to barbarous or half-civilized nations the arts of Christian social life?

"If a capitalist who has ten thousand at his command, and business skill to use it to advantage in a foreign field, be desirous of dedicating his skill and his capital to the gospel, why should he be compelled to turn himself into a preacher, and his capital into a fund for the support of preachers, before he can lay himself and his gifts on the altar? Let him go forth, and be encouraged to go forth, to the mission-work as he

is; and gathering the heathen around his African or Indian settlement, he will prove more than a pioneer of the teaching missionary's work. He will be a choice fellow-worker, embodying to the eye the results of the word spoken to the ear, and more surely than by words, training to those moral habits, without which Christianity amongst a rude or half-civilized people can have no permanence.

"To establish missions of this more comprehensive nature in Africa, and widen thereby the circle of British sympathy in the mission enterprise, is the great work opening before our intrepid missionary traveller, Dr. Livingstone. Why should it be his alone? Other fields are ripe for the same operations. A large class of our practical working minds are becoming wearied with the oft-repeated tale of missionary preaching tours, bazaar-conversations, tract-distributions, and school-examinations—all necessary and invaluable means of sowing the good seed. But why these alone or exclusively? It is asked that other methods be incorporated with our missions, and other results presented than the reported pious lives of their converts. Let them be seen doing as we ourselves do—living in industrial, domestic, well-ordered communities; their new religion subjecting them to law and order, disciplining them to self-support, and binding them together in the spread of their own faith, to work with their own hands, to give to them that need; and fresh strength would be brought to the mission cause, and convictions of its great work flashed upon many still doubting minds. It is from the higher measure in which the Polynesian missions have exhibited these results, that they have always commanded the liberal support and the warm sympathy of the British Christian mind.

"The limitation of mission agency, and its consequent limitation of action, has necessitated the dependence of the modern mission—its inability to rise to self-support. Dr. Livingstone has asked the question, 'Why the former mission stations, the early mission monasteries, were self-supporting, rich, and flourishing, as pioneers of civilization and agriculture, from which we even now reap benefits; and modern mission stations are mere pauper establishments, without that permanence or ability to be self-supporting, which they possessed?' We need

not go far to seek an answer to this question. Missions, from which has been eliminated every capacity but that which could preach or teach could not possibly be self-supporting. An action more varied, an organization more complex, is demanded to reach this state. To attain it they must embrace in their conception, and ally to themselves all consecrated ability.

"And, because wanting in the element of self-support, or in the organization from which it would grow, missions have failed to lay hold of the British Christian *mercantile* mind. The British thought is self-support, and help only to men to help themselves. If missions be permanently wrought in antagonism to this thought, our great mercantile community may contribute to missions; but its contribution will be as the dole that is extracted from the reluctant. It will be a contribution that will leave untouched the mass and magnitude of its wealth. Continued dependence is repugnant to the British mercantile mind. It suspects an enterprise that is wrought for long years in reliance on foreign aid and continual foreign drafts. It ceases to have faith in it. If we would draw from the mercantile community according to the vastness of its resources, we must ask it to give in character, and work our missions in the line of its dominant idea. They must proceed on the principle that has made our nation the colonizer and merchant of the world. There must be inwrought into them the power of developing into self-support, of advancing on the strength of their organization from enterprise to enterprise, until, like the colonies of our empire, they engirdle the earth. In a sense more literal than has yet been conceived, the merchandize of Tyre must become holiness to the Lord—the tea, the sugar, the indigo, the cotton, which are the materials of our traffic, must become the products of our foreign missions, the fruits of their Christian industry and their support."

Passing by the fifth session for the moment, as we propose to consider it in connection with the seventh, we barely observe that the sixth was occupied with the consideration of the question, "How may we best obtain and qualify candidates of the right stamp for mission work?" The preliminary paper, by the Rev. Thomas Green, of the Church Missionary Society's College, Islington, is, like most of this class of documents, of high merit.

As, however, the plans sanctioned by the Conference are not new, we will not dwell upon them. We hasten to the deliberations and issues of the fifth session on "Native Agency," and of the seventh on "Native Churches." These subjects are closely allied. They were the paramount subjects before the Conference, and the primary cause of its assembling. They present the chief problems which now call for solution in the present stage of missionary development. Here, therefore, the proceedings of the Conference culminate in interest and value. The ultimate success of missions depends upon rearing up a competent native ministry, who shall be placed over self-supporting native churches. Till this result is accomplished, no heathen people can be said to be truly christianized. The prevailing judgment expressed by the members of the Conference in their papers and speeches, was to the effect, that this paramount object has been too much overlooked by our missionaries, and that native preachers and churches have been too long and too exclusively kept in a state of pupilage. We will, however, let the Conference speak for itself in this matter, and lay before our readers the formal deliverances in which their discussions regarding it terminated.

Minute on Native Agents.

"The members of this Conference recognize as of vital importance, in every healthy plan of Christian missions, the work of raising and employing, on the field itself, various classes of well-qualified native agents. The European or American missionary, who, in obedience to Christ's command, bears the gospel to some heathen country, is a stranger and a foreigner there: his work is temporary; his position is exceptional; and when Christianity becomes localized, his peculiar functions and duties come to an end. Christianity must be embodied in a living form in native churches; and the outward services it demands must be performed by native pastors and native missionaries of all grades. Apart from this circumstance, missionaries are few; the work is large; foreign climates are often unfavourable to their health; it is difficult to acquire foreign languages and manners; the expense, moreover, of the voyages and maintenance of missionaries is heavy. In all

these things native converts have the advantage; they are at home; the language they have learned in childhood; the climate is their own; the cost of maintaining them is comparatively small. These considerations show the maintenance of a native agency to be essential to the successful establishment of Christianity in a foreign land, and urge upon every missionary the duty of securing in his work as many well-qualified agents as, on careful inquiry, he is able to find.

"They consider that, while among the converts zealous lay-agents may be found, who, though supporting themselves, are willing systematically to fulfil the common Christian duty of urging, both on the heathen and Christian population around them, the faith which they have themselves received, it is still required that some of the converts shall devote all their time and all their powers to the service of the Lord; and, in various spheres of duty, as pastors, evangelists, readers and teachers, endeavour heartily to promote his cause. In all such men, personal piety, zeal for the work, and fitness to teach, they reckon essential to the right discharge of their important spiritual duties.

"The demands of numerous localities, states of society, and spheres of usefulness, differing greatly from each other, at once exhibit the necessity of securing a suitable variety in the native agents who are to occupy them. Some will be required to labour among a simple, rural population; others, among the people of great cities; some, among uncivilized tribes; others, among scholars, with minds perverted by false philosophy; some, among isolated communities, where a great deal is left to their own judgment; while others labour immediately under a missionary's eye.

"They consider it a rule of the first importance, that each native labourer should be placed, as far as practicable, in the sphere for which his various gifts render him suitable; and they believe that, in the present dearth of agents in the vast sphere open to their efforts, the services of all may be well employed, from the ablest to the most humble labourer. While young men, trained from their childhood amid Christian privileges, have proved most useful in leading a community to higher stages of Christian experience; older men, also, converted from

heathenism in riper years, have been found to bring their sober character and their knowledge of idol-systems to bear with great efficiency upon their still heathen neighbours.

"The Conference consider it, therefore, the solemn duty of all missionaries to endeavour to secure for the church of Christ the services of as many such agents as possible. They should watch well the call of God's Spirit, remembering that, in the exercise of his prerogative, he has taken his servants from all ranks, and has especially employed the lowly, making the weak things of the world to confound the wise. They should seek out all agents that may appear to possess the right qualities of head and heart; and make it a matter of constant prayer that they may be chosen and called forth by the Lord of the harvest, whose fields they are required to reap.

"The system of training adopted to render such agents, under God's blessing, competent and well-furnished teachers, should have direct and due regard to their intended spheres of labour. With the greater number, an education, through the medium of their own tongue, will be found sufficient; with others, English may be added to a certain extent; and with a few, an extensive knowledge of the English language and literature will be found a means of storing their minds with large knowledge, and furnishing them for those higher labours to which men of distinguished ability, in great heathen cities, are constantly called. In some cases, where native missionaries are pioneers of civilization as well as of the gospel, industrial pursuits have been found not only valuable but necessary.

"The Conference, however, believe that in all cases the more directly theological portion of their education should be given in the native language; that in their own tongue they may become perfectly familiar with all the expressions, texts, technical terms and phrases, which are required in every hour of an active preacher's life; lessons on preaching, specimens of sermons, arguments, and discussions, should be all given in the native tongue; and it would be well if, in their private reading, these native students used only their vernacular Bible.

"With this teaching of principles, should at the same time be associated direct practice in mission work; exercises in preaching and the like, should be undertaken under the missionary's

own eye; that the capacities of all may be thoroughly understood before they are appointed to positions of heavy responsibility. These studies also may most usefully be continued after native agents have been so placed; that as their experience increases, their knowledge also may grow, and they may be stirred up to seek higher attainments and greater ability for usefulness so long as they live.

"The Conference would dread that any course of training should be so conducted as to injure their power to do good. A missionary should so guide, and teach, and train his converts, as not to injure their national character. While he should seek to improve that character in every way, to raise its tone, and to christianize all its elements; when native customs are harmless, and are likely to continue among the community of his countrymen, the native teacher should seek to maintain them; he should, in his food, dress, manners, and style, continue to resemble his fellows; and show, that while he is a Christian indeed, differing from them in the possession of a purifying and ennobling faith, he is still one of themselves. By so doing, he will rather add to his influence with the heathen; on the opposite plan he may wreck it altogether.

"When the right men have been thus trained, and been duly qualified, the Conference consider that, in the various positions in which they may be placed, as pastors, evangelists, teachers, or readers, of whatever grade, they should be placed under such responsibility as they are able to bear; should not be too closely tied down; but should enjoy that amount of freedom in action, which will both test their principles and stimulate their zeal; in this way the agents of the native church may in due time grow out of pupilage, and be enabled to work perfectly alone.

"On the important question of native salaries, the Conference consider that no rules can be drawn from the artificial position occupied by the missionary himself. They think that it may most appropriately be settled in every case, by a careful consideration of the average incomes of natives moving in that rank to which the native agent belongs; and to evangelists, supported by Missionary Societies, they would apply the same rule as that of the foreign missionary; of securing an income that will supply real wants, give him ordinary comfort, and keep

him free from all anxiety. Where a native pastor has been appointed over a Christian congregation, they think that his support should come from them. It is neither natural nor just that his support should be derived from a foreign Society in a distant country; but where a church is poor or weak in numbers, a society may well continue to supplement such salary as the church can give, by an annual grant, until it is able in due course to bear all the burden alone.

"They believe that, in the extension of the gospel among the heathen, the power of female Christian influence should be employed as far as practicable; and that, where the state of society allows, and circumstances are favourable, Christian females should endeavour, not only as school teachers, but as visitors in heathen families, to lead them to an acquaintance with gospel truth and an acceptance of its claims.

"The Conference rejoice that the native agents, in whose welfare they feel so deep an interest, and for whose increase they so ardently long, have already, under the blessing of God, been made the instruments of great good. They rejoice and give thanks to God, that in many countries, in many spheres of missionary labour, converts, raised up from among the heathen, have been found faithful pastors, eloquent preachers, self-denying evangelists, and that in some cases they have joyfully laid down their lives for Christ's cause. They reckon this fact as one of the most gratifying proofs of the success of the gospel in modern days. They trust that this agency will be largely extended in every field of missionary labour; and they pray, that according to his own example, in answer to his own promise, and his people's intercessions, the Lord of the harvest will send forth more labourers to reap the harvest, to which the great field of the world is ripening."

Minute on Native Churches.

In the following minute are embodied the views entertained by the Conference generally, on the subject discussed during the final session:

"The subject of native churches is, in the opinion of the Conference, equally important with that of native agencies, already brought before them. Native churches are the germs of those

Christian communities, of those christianized nations, which, according to the sure word of prophecy, will at length occupy every country of the world. It is therefore of the greatest importance that they should be based and built up, from the commencement, on perfectly sound principles.

"Such churches should, in their view, be formed of those 'faithful men' who make a public profession of their belief in Christ, and of their consecration to his service; and who desire together to maintain gospel ordinances for their own spiritual benefit, and as a means of usefulness to others. Guided by the teachings of the New Testament, they should in every land aim to maintain pure doctrine, holy life, and active zeal amongst their members; preserve purity of fellowship by the exercise of proper discipline; and fully support church ordinances among themselves, as administered by duly appointed officers. From the first, these essential principles should be pressed upon their infant churches by the missionaries who found them; and from the outset, such measures should be adopted as will steadily tend to accomplish the object in view. Depending, not upon distant and foreign churches, but upon their own exertions and their own spiritual graces; and possessed of those essential elements which underlie the spiritual prosperity of all Christian communities, these churches may, in the opinion of the Conference, very naturally adopt various modes of worship, various systems of church order, and different principles of fraternal association.

"The European missionary is the founder, instructer, and adviser of native churches; and, except in their mere infancy, ought not to be their pastor. The higher Christian civilization from which he has come; his position as a messenger of foreign churches, as a man of superior social rank, and as one of a dominant race, render him unfit to be merely their pastor; while they fall in with his influence as an adviser and friend. It is feared that, from the dependence generated by the continued pastorate of a European missionary, many churches have been kept back from that healthy and vigorous growth which leads to self-support and self-control. Self-reliance grows only by exercise, and learns the most valuable lessons from the experience of mistakes and errors.

"The Conference are of opinion that, in cultivating that self-reliance, and leading it to higher degrees of vigour and of usefulness, missionaries should take advantage of such national customs, notions, and tendencies, as will help to foster and render it efficient. The national independence of the Bghai-Karens, and the village municipal system of Northern India, illustrate the importance of this step.

" Desiring to see increased the number of native pastors, who are merely superintended by a missionary, they judge that in the management of their various churches these pastors should be freed from all needless control, and encouraged to settle all difficult questions by the prayerful exercise of their own judgment. Until they are entirely supported by their people, such income as the churches can give may well be supplemented to a proper amount, by a grant from the Society which was the means of founding them. But the Conference think that, from the outset, it should be kept in view that, whatever forms of union be adopted by the native churches, in every mission-field, dependence for instruction, ordinances, or discipline upon the mother churches is, in due time, to cease; as it does in the case of colonial churches that have sprung up amongst our countrymen in the different colonies of the British Empire.

"In thus starting forward these new communities of converts, on the race of personal and social progress, the Conference consider that everything unsuitable to their national life should be rigidly guarded against. In the salaries given to native teachers and preachers, or sanctioned and supplemented for native pastors and missionaries to the heathen; in the size, style, and cost of church buildings, native parsonages, and dwellings of teachers, due regard should be paid to the customs of the native brethren, and the same scale be adopted from the first, as will probably prevail among them when Christianity becomes naturalized.

" In regard to the formation of separate Christian villages in the midst of a heathen population, the Conference are generally of opinion that Christian converts should not be separated from the heathen community; and they believe that the practice in most missions throughout the world has been to keep them mingled with the heathen. Such a practice they

deem beneficial to the converts in testing their principles, making them watchful, increasing their usefulness, and preventing a great deal of evil; it is beneficial also to the heathen by keeping constantly before their view the practical fruits of the new and pure faith which their Christian countrymen have adopted. They allow, however, that in a country like India, where a small, weak church, may be overshadowed by the great, powerful, and wealthy system of Hindooism, and where its members are, by the laws of caste, cut off from the ordinary social intercourse still admissible in other lands, such Christian villages may be found useful in securing converts from social disabilities and from very severe trials of principle, in the infancy of their community. But they would urge that this be allowed only for a time; and that as soon as converts grow more numerous and influential, they should be encouraged to dwell among the heathen, in order to leaven them with gospel truth.

"The Conference think that, though not their pastor, and though directly interfering but little in their concerns, a missionary should make the general elevation of the Christian communities an object of continual care; he should watch over their growth in knowledge, their improvement in piety, their purification from heathen vices and deficiencies, and in every way strive to raise the tone of their personal, social, and public character.

"On one important topic laid before them, the transfer of European systems of church organization to foreign countries, several members of Conference gave it as their opinion, that while a missionary, in commencing the organization of a church, will naturally begin with the system which he and his supporters conscientiously follow, still, he should apply it to the new country and the new people with considerable latitude; he should endeavour to retain only its essential features; to rid it of mere technicalities, and of those historical elements which all systems, political and religious, absorb into their constitution in the course of years. It was suggested that, in respect to the ordination of native pastors and missionaries, while the scriptural tests of character enjoined by the Apostle should be retained in full, the standards of knowledge should have refer-

ence to the circumstances of the churches, and of their own training; and that in general all these systems should be judiciously adapted to the communities, climates, and people among whom they are introduced.

"The Conference rejoice to learn that in some fields of labour the work of missions has so far been accomplished, that native churches, growing in numbers, knowledge, and resources, are supporting their own pastors; fully maintaining the ordinances of the gospel, supplying seminaries with students for the ministry, and commencing missionary work for themselves. They rejoice to learn that in some places, tried by severe and long-continued persecution, grace has been given according to their day, and the converts, remaining steadfast in their faith, have increased in number daily; and they offer their earnest prayer to the Lord of the whole church that, while missionaries may be wise to win souls, and wise to guide the churches into which they are gathered, these churches may be greatly increased in number, may be enlarged by the Holy Spirit, and filled abundantly with the fruits of his salvation; and that more largely than ever, they may themselves go forth among their heathen countrymen to spread that gospel which has blessed themselves."

It would give us unfeigned pleasure, if we had space, to transfer to our pages copious extracts from the speeches at the great public meeting which closed the sessions of the Conference. Those of the Earl of Shaftesbury and Major-General Alexander were quite equal to the occasion. But the address of the Rev. Mr. Mullens, of Calcutta, speaking as the representative of the missionaries, on the delightful features of the Conference, and the cheering success already achieved by modern missions; and prëminently that of Lieutenant-Colonel Herbert Edwardes, on the illustration which missions received from the Indian mutiny—are among the most masterly and eloquent productions of the kind which we remember to have seen. We close with one of the deliberative addresses at the first session, which gives a dense and vivid summation of the encouraging fruits already achieved by modern missions; and

is a fair sample of the general character of the addresses at the deliberative meetings, for brevity, force, and point.

The Rev. J. B. Whiting, Central Association Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, remarked, that he did not quite like the word "failure" in the programme. It had been his duty, as an advocate of the Church Missionary Society, to plead the cause of missions in various parts of England, and he had endeavoured to acquire some information as to the amount of success with which God had blessed missionary efforts. He found that the Bible had been translated, during the last sixty years, into upwards of one hundred languages. There were 100,000 professing Christians in New Zealand; 100,000 in Burmah and Pegu; 112,000 Protestant Christians in India; 5000 or 6000 in Mesopotamia; 250,000 in Africa; 40,000 in America; and 250,000 in the islands of the Pacific. There were Christians in China, Madagascar, Mauritius, and many other parts of the world. There were 200,000 or 300,000 Negroes under the care of Christian pastors in the West Indies. There are more than a million and a quarter of living Christians who, but for the labours of the missionaries, would all have remained idolaters. We were apt to compare the missionary successes of the present time, in disparaging terms, with the successes which attended apostolic labour. He had inquired, however, from the most competent authorities, as to how many individuals, in their opinion, were gathered out of heathendom by the labours of the inspired apostles, during the first sixty years of mission work, after the ascension of the Saviour; and he had been assured that, as far as they could judge, not more than one million of living Christians were found after those first sixty years. They must remember also the hundreds of thousands who were now sleeping in their graves around the mission churches; and how many had gone to their heavenly home from far-distant recesses of heathendom, who were never known to the missionaries, but who had learnt from tracts, Bibles, and other means, of the salvation which is in Christ. Then, again, the 1600 missionaries who had gone forth from Europe and America, were now accompanied by more than 16,000 native ministers, religious catechists, Scripture-readers, and schoolmasters, who were evangelizing their own father-

lands. The native ministry, moreover, had passed into the second generation; and from our schools and orphan asylums, the native apostles would arise, whose crown of rejoicing would be multitudes of Christian converts. They ought not, therefore, to indulge in a spirit of despondency, but rather lift up their hearts in devout gratitude to Almighty God, for the great success with which he has so far blessed missionary labours; and indulge in the joyful hope of still greater blessings in days to come.

ART. VI.—*Codex Alexandrinus. Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ.* Novum Testamentum Græce ex Antiquissimo Codice Alexandrino a C. G. Woide olim descriptum: ad fidem ipsius codicis denuo accuratius edidit B. H. Cowper. Londini, MDCCCLX. 8vo. pp. 503. Leipzig: Printed by B. G. Tuebner.

Notitia editionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici auspiciis Imperatoris Alexandri II. susceptæ. Accedit Catalogus Codicum nuper ex Oriente Petropolin perlatorum. Item Origenis Scholia in Proverbia Salomonis partim nunc primum, partim secundum atque emendatius edita, cum duabus tabulis lapidi incisis. Edidit Aenoth. Frid. Const. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ. 1860. 4to. pp. 124.

BIBLICAL criticism has already made vast advances toward the accomplishment of its task, and is still urging its way steadily forward. The first printed editions of the Greek Testament, like those of classic authors, were necessarily inaccurate, for they were based upon whatever manuscripts chanced to be accessible to the editors. And the texts of Stephanus and of the Elzevirs—the latter of which became the *textus receptus* upon the Continent, and the former, as adopted by Mill, the *textus receptus* in England—owed this distinction more to a beautiful typography and the repute of the publishers, than to their inherent excellence or superior accuracy. But little was in fact known of the comparative value of manuscript authorities, the extent of agreement or divergence between their several

readings, or the best methods of detecting and eliminating their errors.

Nevertheless copies of the original Scriptures existed in the libraries of Europe, which had never yet been read nor examined. Many more lay hid in the convents of Egypt and the East, which might be recovered from their obscurity. Translations had been made into various languages at a very early period. The writings of the Christian Fathers abound in citations from the sacred volume, exhibiting the text which they respectively had before them. The materials for ensuring accuracy in an edition of the inspired volume are ample. They are sufficient, if not to restore every word and letter as it appeared in the original handwriting of the evangelists and apostles, at least to approximate indefinitely such a result. But the task was herculean; the very abundance of materials was appalling. To examine not cursorily but with careful accuracy these enormous accumulations of ages, to ascertain and record their contents, digesting them within a manageable compass, to determine their respective affinities, judge intelligently of their comparative value, and by the thorough sifting of the entire mass of testimony, to discriminate the true from the false, and the genuine reading from every rival claimant, is a work which seems to be almost endless. Not one nor fifty lives were adequate to complete it. Mill spent thirty years most laboriously upon it, and yet never advanced beyond the threshold of the undertaking.

It is true that all this expenditure of toil may have no very direct or palpable effect upon theology or morals. If the most inaccurate Greek Testament that ever was issued were to be accepted as the standard, the creed of Christendom would undergo no material change, nor would any of the great facts or teachings of revelation be invalidated. The ascertaining of this was, however, worth a great deal. If the whole multitude of various readings and inaccuracies of transcription cannot shake anything that is really precious in Christianity, who would grudge the expenditure of the time and the industry necessary to demonstrate this fact, and thus settle the convictions of the Christian world upon a firmer basis for all time to come?

But the intelligent Biblical student must necessarily look upon it as a matter of high and serious concern to have restored to him the very words of inspiration; to have its surface cleansed from the rust and accretions of ages, which dim its brightness and deform its beauty, even if they do not seriously impair its solidity or value; to have every alteration of an apostle's language, whether made by accident or design, whether it be in itself considered trivial or not, corrected into its original form. If it be a mere question of the collocation of words, or of the substitution of an equivalent expression, or the vindication to each verse of its own precise language, as distinguished from other and parallel passages of equal authority and inspiration, still let it be pressed to a satisfactory answer. Why should there be a careful investigation of all available sources in order to a faithful reproduction of every turn of expression in the writings of Plato, and it be esteemed a matter of indifference what were the precise words of Matthew or of Paul, provided the general sense is not seriously affected? If the point involved were so minute that it could not be made to appear in any translation, yet let us have it as it was written by the pen of inspiration rather than otherwise. Questions, however, are perpetually arising which possess a real intrinsic consequence. Unexpected light has often been thrown upon an obscure clause or a difficult word, by correcting its inaccuracy and restoring its original form. The beauty or meaning of an incident, the value of a note of time for purposes of chronological reckoning, and the bearing of a passage, may depend upon the use of a preposition or an article, or the presence or absence of a single letter, or even a single line of a letter.

In computations of the duration of our Lord's ministry, for example, it is of some moment whether John v. 1, should read *a feast* or *the feast*. If the latter be the correct reading, the passover is, in all probability, the one intended, as that was the principal festival of the Jews; and, in that case, as three other passovers are mentioned in the same gospel, the ministry of our Lord must have lasted for upwards of three years. If the former be the true reading, it becomes an open question whether it was not the feast of Tabernacles or of Purim

or some other of the inferior festivals, and then his public work may be reduced by a year. Tischendorf inserts the definite article ἡ ἑορτή, and finds this, with a great number of other readings of his previous editions, confirmed by the important manuscript which he has recently discovered.

The famous critical puzzle in 1 Tim. iii. 16, rests upon a single stroke. The presence of a horizontal stroke in the centre of the letter, or its absence, will decide whether we are to read *OC* or *ΘC*, the abbreviation for *ΘEOC*, *who was manifest in the flesh*, or *God was manifest in the flesh*. It is well known what a conspicuous part the Alexandrine Manuscript has borne in this discussion, how it has been examined again and again by the naked eye and by the aid of powerful lenses, to ascertain whether its testimony was given in favour of one letter or the other, whether the appearance of a horizontal stroke was real or imaginary, whether it is an original part of the letter or is a subsequent addition, and whether it actually belongs to the letter or is due to the thinness of the parchment, and the existence of a corresponding stroke upon its opposite side. The present editor of this important Codex, who appears to have executed his task with the most scrupulous regard to accuracy, says that the reading at present is unquestionably *ΘC*, but in the existing state of the manuscript it is impossible to ascertain by any diligence of inspection whether this, or *OC*, was the word as originally written. The transverse line is only what may be called a mere shadow, as if a pen almost dry had touched it, and that recently. Woide quotes authorities for the existence of the line, but it is, they say, no more than can be seen now, a mere shadow across the letter, nearly at its centre, rather above than beneath it. On the opposite side of the vellum are the two letters *TE*, of the words *KATEΥCEBEIAN*, 1 Tim. vi. 3, in inverse order of course, so that *E* comes under *Θ* and *T* under *C*. The perpendicular line of the *T* is coincident with the centre of curve of *C*, and at the point of coincidence is a small hole passing through both letters, and caused by the corrosive power of the ink in both. The *E* falling under what we read as *Θ*, although not absolutely coincident with it, increases the difficulty of deciding. The mere absence or invisibility of the cross line of the theta would not of itself

be demonstrative, because it has disappeared in a number of cases about which no question ever has been, or ever will be, raised. There is a line drawn over the disputed letters as a sign of contraction, which would certainly decide in favour of *ΘΕΟC*, were it not that this is plainly modern, and it is impossible to say whether it overlies a more ancient one, because of its extent, and because it is visible on the other side of the vellum, which is here extremely thin. The editor adds in this connection: "It can never be sufficiently regretted that some comparatively modern pen has been rashly employed upon the manuscript, and that modern fingers have been applied to it here with equal discredit to their owners, and the almost entire obliteration of a number of the letters. Certainly no fingers ought to be allowed to play upon these pages save, perhaps, those of *ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς*. We hope that henceforth there will be no more endeavours *demonstrare digito* the true reading of this passage; and, indeed, that the Museum authorities will studiously resist all who wish to have the clause at their fingers' ends." According to Tischendorf, his recently discovered Sinaitic Manuscript originally read *OC* in this passage, but some corrector, of comparatively modern date, has changed it to *ΘC*, so cautiously, however, as to have left the original writing intact. Whether this judgment shall be held to be final and decisive, we shall learn when others have reported the results of their examination.

All critics are agreed that the oldest manuscript is *caeteris paribus* the most reliable; since in proportion as it approaches the age of the original work, the opportunity for the admission of transcriptural errors is reduced. This general principle is so liable to be modified by particular circumstances, that the most varying estimates have been put upon the manuscripts conceded to be of the greatest age. The most recent investigations have tended strongly to increase the esteem in which they are held. Lachmann went so far as to exclude all authorities from any voice in the determination of the text which were later than about the fourth century. Tischendorf, who is the prince of living Biblical critics, adopts a less rigorous rule: he bases his text exclusively on the most ancient manuscripts, and includes under this expression such as were

written before the ninth century. Tregelles proposes to admit later manuscripts of approved value as collateral witnesses, but not to adopt any reading on their testimony alone. Such a preponderance accorded to the most ancient manuscripts as a class, immensely increases the weight attached to each of them individually, inasmuch as they are few in number compared with the multitudes of more modern date.

Priceless as these jewels are, they are exceedingly frail, increasingly so in proportion to their antiquity and value; and a slight casualty might now deprive the world of what has escaped the risks of thirteen or fourteen centuries. Manuscripts known to have been in existence at a comparatively recent period, which have in fact been consulted and described since the labours of modern critics began, have been lost or wholly disappeared. Some have been subjected to wanton injury, and thievish collectors of curiosities have gratified their itching propensity by carrying off a page of some world-renowned Codex. Some have lost their outer leaves through the negligence of those who had them in charge for want of proper binding. Others have been rebound, and thus exposed to fresh hazards. A notable instance is afforded by a valuable palimpsest in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, whose fate Tregelles thus describes:* "The pages have been unmercifully strengthened in parts by pasting paper or vellum over the margins; leaving indeed the cursive writing untouched, but burying the uncial letters of so much greater value. Also in places there were fragments all rough at the edges of the leaves; and these have been cut away so as to make all smooth and neat; and thus many words and parts of words are now gone irrecoverably. And besides, the binder seems to have taken the traces of the ancient writing for dirt marks, and thus they have been in parts industriously obliterated; and in those places in which the writing instrument of the ancient copyist had deeply furrowed the vellum, a new surface of size or something of the kind has been superadded." The Codex Alexandrinus has suffered in this way since it came to England, so far as to have had two or three letters cut off in many places from the inner margin of its leaves. To this must be added the

* Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, p. 167.

attrition of the leaves and of the letters necessarily attendant upon handling it, even if the greatest care were taken, which unfortunately has not always been the case. The New Testament has been read and consulted far more than the Old at all times, and is therefore more worn. The frequent manipulation to which the volume was formerly subjected, apart from direct contact with the fingers, seems to have caused minute particles of ink to fly off in an impalpable and imperceptible powder. Not only the ink but the vellum itself has gone off in the same form, adding to the number and magnitude of the minute holes occasioned by the silent corrosion of the ink, and which in some places assume the appearance of lace work. Some things are now illegible, which must have been visible even down to the time of Woide; and he noticed the difference of the Codex in some particulars from what it had been at an earlier date.

This subject, as it well might, early engaged the anxious thoughts of Biblical critics, and led to making copies of important codices, not only for private use, but for publication. If this were done with sufficient care, it would obviate the necessity of a fresh collation by every successive critic, thus saving the codex itself from additional damage, and increasing its usefulness by making it accessible and available to numbers who could not personally consult it, besides preventing the needless expenditure of time and labour in doing over what had already been performed before. It would definitely fix all the readings which, in the existing state of the codex, could be ascertained, and some of which, in the inevitable course of events, must shortly disappear; and, what is of the greatest consequence, it would preserve these venerable texts from irreparable loss in case of the destruction or injury of the manuscripts themselves. We learn from Bentley's letter to Mill, that the latter critic had it in contemplation, among his various plans, to publish several of these ancient texts together, after the manner of Origen's Hexapla or of a modern polyglott. The volume was to exhibit at each opening the Codex Alexandrinus and the bilingual Codex Bezæ, or where the latter failed, the Codex Laudianus or Codex Claromontanus. The death of Mill within a fortnight after the completion of his critical edition of the New Testament, prevented this project from being carried out.

The texts of these manuscripts and many others have, however, been published since, a work in which Tischendorf has been singularly diligent. Some have even, for the sake of absolute accuracy, been photographed in whole or in part.

The earliest of these publications was that of the Greek and Latin Codex Laudianus of the Acts of the Apostles, issued by Hearne at Oxford in 1715. The New Testament portion of the Alexandrine was first edited by Woide in 1786 in fac-simile. That now before us is not a fac-simile but a reprint of the text in the current Greek letter, like the long-promised and recently issued edition of the Vatican manuscript, by Cardinal Mai. The peculiar orthography of the manuscript, in which it strikingly resembles that of the Vatican, and others of great age, has been scrupulously retained. The plan of the editor was, to alter the text nowhere, however erroneous or defective it may seem to be. Whatever insertions have been made are all in brackets, even when a single letter only has been supplied; and they occur only where there has been a mutilation of the codex, and not where there is an omission in its text. Even manifest *lapsus calami* are retained in the text, though corrected in notes at the foot of the page, where mention is likewise made of corrections in the Codex proceeding from a later than the original scribe, whether erasures, alterations, or additions. Paragraphs are noted in the manuscript by initial letters of a greater than the ordinary size set out in the margin. When a paragraph begins in the middle of a line, it is the first letter of the next line which is thus treated, apparently, both for the purpose of attracting the eye and of saving space. Instances occur in which later scribes, ignorant of the intention of these medial capitals, have preserved them as part of the text. As a rule, no paragraph is admitted into this edition where there is not something similar in the Codex: if the manuscript division seems to be useless or erroneous, it is simply indicated by a capital letter, all other capitals being excluded except at the beginning of a modern chapter or in proper names.

The Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons are also noted in the margin of the Gospels. These have an independent value for purposes of criticism in a certain class of cases.

These sections appear to have been made with a view to a harmony of the Gospels, so that the parallel accounts of the different Evangelists might be arranged side by side, or, at least, ready reference be made from one to another. For still greater convenience of reference, Eusebius distributed the whole into ten canons, the first containing what was common to all the Evangelists, the second third and fourth what was common to three of them, the next five what was common to two, and the tenth what was confined to a single one. The number of the Eusebian canon attached to any particular section, will show in how many and in which of the Gospels it was found; and tables exist showing to which section in those Gospels it answers. This affords a means of correcting any dislocations of the text or transfers of passages from one Gospel to another, which may have taken place since this system of numbering was made out.

The Catholic epistles stand before those of Paul, and Hebrews is inserted in the midst of the writings of this apostle at the end of his epistles to the churches, and before Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. From a statement of the contents made at the beginning of the first volume of the manuscript, it appears originally to have contained, in addition to the proper canon of the New Testament, two epistles of Clement, and eighteen psalms ascribed to Solomon. These psalms, however, together with a part of Clement's second epistle, are now lost. The New Testament is complete, with the exception of the first twenty-four chapters of Matthew, three leaves from second Corinthians, and two from the Gospel of John; these chasms are supplied, in the edition before us, from Kuster's edition of Mill. Unfortunately the gap in John covers the disputed passage respecting the woman taken in adultery. From a computation of the extent of the pages, the editor infers that this narrative could not have formed a part of the manuscript originally. Tischendorf notes its absence from the newly found Sinaitic treasure.

The editor favours the current opinion that the Alexandrine Manuscript was written in Egypt about the middle of the fifth century. To the customary arguments of its Egyptian origin, drawn from the shape of the letters, the peculiar

orthography, the state of the text, and the testimony of tradition, he adds the following interesting corroboration: "At the end of the Catholic epistles two baskets of fruit are depicted in coloured inks. These baskets are of a peculiar form and texture, being narrower at the bottom than at the top, and apparently of fancy wicker work. Each of them is filled with fruit, and this fruit is piled up in a pyramidal form above the basket in regularly decreasing tiers or courses. Happening to visit the Egyptian gallery of the British Museum, we observed upon one of the walls, fragments of an Egyptian painting representing, among other things, baskets of fruit. The resemblance of these to those in Codex A. is so striking that we mentally uttered a *Εὕρηκα*, as we looked at them. We have repeated our comparison of the different representations and we are compelled to regard them as characteristic."

It is claimed that several errors found in Woide's fac-simile have been corrected in this reprint, besides the other advantages which it possesses over that rare and costly edition, of a more convenient size and greater legibility, at least to eyes not familiarized to the uncial character and unspaced words. A page of fac-simile would, however, in our judgment, have been an acceptable addition.

A romantic interest attaches to this volume from its exhibiting a specimen of the New Testament as it has come down to us from fourteen hundred years ago. Critical texts may in certain passages approximate more nearly to the original words of the sacred writers. But, after all, they are made up piecemeal from extracts culled from various quarters, skilfully put together indeed, and uniting in a product of exceeding value. It is, however, a combination of the critic's own, and is in all likelihood not the precise counterpart, in every particular, of any single text that ever existed before. The critical apparatus, by which it is accompanied, may exhibit the respective readings of the several leading authorities. Yet this can, from the nature of the case, only be done in a fragmentary way. But here we have a New Testament in every word and letter conformed to a copy coeval with Cyril and Theodoret, and from which upwards of forty generations of men may have read the words of everlasting life.

The recent discovery by Professor Tischendorf of a biblical manuscript of great value has been repeatedly mentioned in the papers. Our readers may be interested in a more particular account, extracted from his own statements, regarding it. His first journey to the East in 1844,* led him to the Convent of St. Catharine at Mount Sinai. As he was there rummaging in a basket of torn and mutilated fragments of manuscripts which had been thrown aside as useless, and were destined to the flames, he drew forth several pages of a very ancient copy of the Septuagint. A few, which were the least seemly, he was allowed to take with him. But the monks, who thus suddenly obtained some idea of their value, refused to part with the others, containing Isaiah entire, first and fourth Maccabees, and portions of other books. In his second visit, in 1853, he was not able to find these precious fragments, nor to learn any thing respecting them, whence he was led to suppose that some one else had obtained them and carried them to Europe. On the 31st of January, 1859, he visited St. Catharine for the third time. He had already sent his servant for camels, and made his arrangements to leave for Egypt on the 7th of February; when, upon the 4th, in a walk with the Superior of the convent, he spoke of the Septuagint, and of his own edition of it, copies of which, as well as of the New Testament, he had brought to present to the monks. On returning from the walk they entered the Superior's chamber, who remarked that he possessed the Septuagint, and laid it before him wrapped in a cloth. Upon opening it he saw what he had never ventured to hope for, the oldest Greek manuscript in existence. There were the identical pages which he had snatched from destruction in 1844, with a goodly number more, forming together a considerable portion of the Old Testament; and, what was more precious still, a perfect copy of the New Testament, *ne minima quidem lacuna deformatum*, to which was added the Epistle of Barnabas complete, and the first part of the Pastor, neither of which was previously known to be extant in Greek. The volume, or rather fragments of a volume, for many of the leaves were torn, and there was no cover but the cloth, he at

* See Biblical Repertory for January, 1857.

once took to his own room, by permission of the Superior. The first night was spent in transcribing the Epistle of Barnabas, *quippe dormire nefas videbatur.* On the next day he came to an agreement with the monks that, upon the receipt of an order from their superiors at Cairo, this manuscript should be sent thither to be transcribed.

Tischendorf reached Cairo on the 13th of February, and by the 24th he had the coveted treasure in his hands. Within two months, the whole Codex containing upwards of one hundred thousand verses was transcribed by himself, with such help as he could obtain from a couple of friends, whose work he revised letter by letter. The difficulty of the task was greatly enhanced by the careful examination necessary in about eight thousand places containing corrections, which, though ancient, were of a date posterior to the text. Meanwhile, the monks of Sinai were persuaded to offer the original manuscript to the Russian emperor, Alexander II., under whose auspices this journey was undertaken. As the archbishop of their order was dead, however, and his unanimously elected successor had not yet been consecrated, on account of the opposition of a pretender to the place, the college consented that Tischendorf might take the manuscript to St. Petersburgh, in order to prepare an accurate edition of its text, and that it might be regarded as a temporary loan, until the archbishop should signify in their name that the gift was perpetual. With this understanding the manuscript was surrendered to him at Cairo, September 28.

The intervening time was spent in visiting Jerusalem, Beyrout, Laodicea, Smyrna, Patmos, and Constantinople. At the latter place, he learned from Prince Lobanow, the ambassador of the Czar, that the Sinaitic Manuscript had been seen in 1845 by Porphyry, the Superior of a Russian monastery, and described by him in a volume published at St. Petersburgh in 1856, in the Russian language.

Two editions are to be issued of this ancient text. The first and most splendid will be published at St. Petersburgh in 1862, the thousandth anniversary of the founding of the Russian empire. Three hundred copies only will be issued, all of which are intended for donation, none for sale, the Czar bearing the entire expense. In this the letters of the manuscript and its

whole appearance will be reproduced with the utmost possible exactness. The extant portions of the Old Testament will occupy two volumes, the first having four columns throughout; the second, which is to contain the poetical books, disposed stichometrically in two columns. The third volume will embrace the entire New Testament with the Epistle of Barnabas and the fragmentary portion of the Pastor. The fourth and concluding volume will contain twenty lithographed or photographed pages, including what is most important for purposes of criticism or palæography; also prolegomena treating of the history of the Manuscript, of its age, accompanied by representations of other ancient codices in fac-simile, and of the character of its text as compared with that of the Codex Vaticanus, Codex Ephraem, and Codex Alexandrinus; and finally a critical commentary upon the eight thousand ancient corrections, and whatever else may appear to call for palæographic remarks.

The second and minor, or manual edition, is to be published by Brockhaus, at Leipsic. This is to contain the text of the Manuscript in the ordinary Greek character, a page of fac-simile, the main portion of the prolegomena and the critical commentary. The lines, columns, and abbreviations of the Codex will be perpetuated in the reprint, but the separate words will be distinguished by intervening spaces as in modern books. The first volume, containing the New Testament, Barnabas and the Pastor, is promised in 1862, and the Old Testament is to follow in about a year after. This extraordinary dispatch in an undertaking of such magnitude, will appear the more remarkable, if it is contrasted with other enterprises of a similar nature. Baber's edition of the Old Testament portion of the Alexandrine Manuscript was fourteen years in publishing. Cardinal Mai's edition of the Vatican Manuscript, which is a simple reprint of the text, was begun in 1828, and published in 1857.

There are three hundred and forty-five and a half leaves belonging to the Manuscript at present; one hundred and ninety-nine of which contain what has been preserved of the Old Testament, the rest are devoted to the New Testament. Of the former there are, in addition to a single leaf from

1 Chronicles, the books of Tobit (from chap. ii.,) Judith, 1st and 4th Maccabees, Isaiah, six leaves at the beginning of Jeremiah, the minor Prophets, with the exception of Hosea, Amos, and Micah, which stand first in the Septuagint; Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Wisdom, Sirach, Job. The books of the New Testament are arranged in the following order: the Gospels, the Epistles of Paul, with Hebrews placed between Thessalonians and Timothy, as in the Alexandrine Manuscript, Acts, the Catholic epistles, Revelation, Barnabas, Pastor.

Tischendorf's more deliberate opinion respecting the age of this Codex is the same that he expressed upon its first discovery. He regards it as unquestionably belonging to the fourth century, and is only doubtful whether it should be referred to the first or to the second half of the century. The following particulars are mentioned as conducing to this conclusion. The purity of the uncial character, and the consistency with which it is preserved even in letters much below the customary size, which are sometimes crowded in at the end of the line, show it to be earlier than the sixth century. The uncials approximate in form those of the papyri of Herculaneum and the Egyptian tombs, and have an appearance of antiquity not inferior to those of the oldest parchment known: these would consist with any date from the first to the fifth century. There are no capitals, as in the Alexandrine Manuscript, and in all writings of the fifth century and onward. Marks of punctuation are as rare as in the very oldest class of manuscripts, such as the Vatican and Papyri. It even goes beyond the Vatican and every other known manuscript in one criterion of great age. This latter is one of the very few Codices which exhibit three columns upon a page; the like occurs in the famous fragment of Dio Cassius in the Vatican library, two extremely ancient copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch at Naplous, and a fragment of the Latin Pentateuch at Lyons. These, when opened, present six columns to the eye, in this resembling the rolls which were the oldest form of books, so old that they went out of use before any existing manuscript of the Scriptures or of classic authors was written. They are consequently thought to represent the stage of transition from rolls of one continuous sheet

to the later and more convenient style of separate sheets bound together in a volume. They seem to have been written when the reading public was still accustomed to the sight and the use of rolls, and required, even in volumes of another shape, the same general appearance to be preserved. The Sinaitic Manuscript is the only one in existence, so far as is known, which has four columns on a page, thus exhibiting eight at each opening, and simulating more exactly the primitive rolls. Of course this must be associated with other evidences of great antiquity to be of any weight, as is shown by the existence of at least two tricolumnar manuscripts of the eighth or ninth centuries, which perhaps owe this peculiarity to the imitation of the much more ancient copies from which they were made.

Other points more or less insisted on, are the general agreement of its orthography with the Vatican Manuscript, the order observed in the books of the New Testament, the brevity of the inscriptions and subscriptions to these books, the non-insertion of accents even by the correctors, who were some centuries later than the original scribe, the fact that the sections of Ammonius and the canons of Eusebius were not noted in the Gospels *ab ipsâ primâ manu*, whereas these came into general use about the middle of the fourth century, and are found in the oldest manuscripts except this and the Vatican.

The presence of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Pastor in a volume containing the New Testament, is thought to be best accounted for by the fact, that they appear to have been thought canonical in certain quarters in the second and third centuries. Whence Eusebius, in the early part of the fourth, reckons these two, together with the Acts of Paul and the Revelation of Peter, as *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, or books of disputed authority. The whole of these may have belonged to this manuscript originally, for six leaves are missing between Barnabas and the Pastor, and it is again defective at the end. They could hardly have been admitted after the Councils of Laodicea, A. D. 364, and Carthage, A. D. 397, had formally pronounced upon their exclusion from the canon. The presence of the two Epistles of Clement in the Alexandrine Manuscript, must, in the judgment of Tischendorf, be differently accounted

for, since even the first of these Epistles was not raised to the rank of an antilegomenon by Eusebius. It is indeed stated by Jerome that it was publicly read in some of the churches; no such honour was ever accorded, however, to the second Epistle.

There are two circumstances connected with the text of this manuscript from which its great age is likewise inferred. Eusebius states that in the generality of accurate copies, the last twelve verses of Mark are wanting. Jerome says similarly, *Omnes Græciæ libros pœne hoc capitulum non habere.* Now while the whole five hundred copies and upwards, dating from the fifth and subsequent centuries, agree in containing these verses, the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts alone represent the text referred to by these ancient authorities. Again, the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, Eph. i. 1, were not in Origen's copy; and Basil, in the middle of the fourth century, says that they were wanting in "old" copies in his day. Here again the Sinaitic and the Vatican alone correspond with these ancient texts. The words have, however, been supplied in both by later correctors.

Besides this rare treasure, Tischendorf brought back with him to Europe, as the fruits of this exploration, twelve Palimpsests, twenty Greek uncial manuscripts, eighteen codices minusculi, nine Syriac, eleven Coptic, seven Arabic, nine Hebrew, consisting of a synagogue roll of Esther, and some Jewish writings, together with a copy of Banberg's Rabbinical Bible; two very old Samaritan Pentateuchs, three Slavonic manuscripts, eleven Abyssinian, five Armenian, two papyri, a Greco-Egyptian astrolabe of the fourth century of a singular construction, and some other curiosities. One of the minusculi, which he has retained for further examination, contains several books and parts of books from the Old Testament in a translation different from the Septuagint; he suspects that it will prove to be from Theodotion, or some other of the old translators, followed by Origen in his Hexapla, and of which nothing but detached sentences has been possessed before. A second contains some marginal notes, corresponding with extracts made by Jerome from the "Gospel of the Nazarenes," and which it

is thought may throw some light upon the question of what that so-called gospel was. The concluding forty-seven pages of the volume before us, are occupied with Origen's Scholia on Proverbs, which Tischendorf spent four days in copying from a manuscript in the Convent of St. John, on the isle of Patmos. This has never been found separate before. The edition published by Cardinal Mai, in 1854, was extracted from a *Catena Patrum* in the library of the Vatican, in which it was difficult and well nigh impossible to sunder the remarks of one writer from those which belong to another. The comparison of the two shows how much Mai's edition stood in need of correction.

P. S. to the article on the "State of the Country."

We wish the sentence on page 2, of this number, at the close of the first paragraph, referring to Arnold, to be considered cancelled. On reading it in print, we see that it will bear an interpretation which the writer did not intend.

SHORT NOTICES.

Thanksgiving Sermon, delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, New Orleans, on Thursday, November 29. By the Rev. B. M. Palmer, D.D.

THE doctrine that Christian ministers as such, and church courts, have nothing to do with politics, as all other theories either false or half-true, has given way like tow on the touch of fire, when the test occasion comes. If by politics be meant the policy of states in reference to secular affairs, then it is true that the gospel minister has nothing to do with them in the pulpit. But if by politics we mean the principles of civil government, and the duties thence resulting, then politics belong to the higher sphere of morals: and morals is the science of duty, and duty is determined by the law of God. If ministers are not set to expound that law, to declare to the people what God would have them do, then they have in all ages sadly mistaken their calling. The faithful messengers of God under all dispensations of the church, have felt officially bound to teach kings and people their duty, and tell them what God, who is King of nations, as well as King of saints, requires at their hands. We accordingly find ministers of all denominations, especially at the South—Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians—from the very instincts of their office, in the present emergency, setting forth views on the political obligations of the people. We do not blame them for so doing. The misfortune is, that the clergy and the church have not hitherto faithfully discharged their duty in this matter. We had escaped all our present agitations and dangers, had the clergy of the North duly expounded and inculcated the teachings of God's word as to slavery and obedience to law; had they followed the example of the apostle, and told their hearers that slaveholders may be "faithful and beloved brethren," towards whom they are bound to exercise Christian fellowship and love; that slaves are bound to be obedient to their masters, and therefore that all attempts to render them disobedient or rebellious, are violations of the law of God; that men are commanded to be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; that conscientious objections to laws legally enacted, although a good reason for refusing obedience, are no valid reason for resisting their execution. Had these and similar plainly revealed principles been inculcated on the people of the

North, where had been the grievances of which our Southern brethren justly complain? And on the other hand, had the clergy of the South duly taught the people that masters are bound "to give to their servants that which is just and equal;" to do to them as they would wish that they (under a change of circumstances) should do to themselves; that they are required to regard their slaves "as of one blood," and "heirs together of the grace of life;" to grant them their rights as men and as Christians, to grant them the right of mental and religious culture, the right of marriage, the right of parents, and the right of property—had these scriptural and acknowledged principles been so inculcated as to control private practice and public legislation, how little occasion would Northern fanatics have had for their defamations! The Scriptures also say, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." These are very solemn words. Had the truth which they inculcate been duly enforced, could Southern Christians believe that government is a partnership concern to be dissolved at pleasure; that men can innocently throw off their allegiance to the state, and combine to overthrow a union which they had sworn to support? The people of the South blame the clergy of the North; and the people of the North blame the clergy of the South. It is probable that we are all to blame. And now, if instead of mutual criminations, we could all agree by the grace of God to cleave to his word, and to make it the standard for magistrates and people, for communities and individuals, He might yet deliver us out of all our troubles. It may be one of the gracious ends which he designs to answer by our present afflictions, to rouse the church to a higher estimate of her vocation; to make her feel that it is her prerogative and duty as God's witness on earth, to testify in behalf of all truth, and against all sin, whether in magistrates or people, whether in legislation or private conduct, and to teach publicly and effectively, that states as well as individuals are bound to make the law of God the rule of their conduct.

Among the numerous sermons which the present crisis in our national affairs has called forth, this of Dr. Palmer's stands by itself. It bids fair to mark and to make an epoch in our history. It evinces the deepest and most sincere conviction. It is so elevated in its spirit, so solemn in its tone, so earnest and so bold: it is so clear in statement, and so forcible in expression, that, with the advantage of an eloquent enunciation,

its effect on an audience must have been exceedingly great. But this is a small part of its power. It propounds a theory suited to an emergency. It proposes a doctrine which reconciles men's wishes with their conscience. It teaches a privileged class that it is their high religious duty to be lords and masters, to conserve and perpetuate in their own hands, and in the hands of their children, a monopoly of wealth and power. Such a doctrine propounded by a man pure in character, eminent for talents, and elevated in position, must have been hailed almost as a revelation from heaven. We are not surprised, therefore, to learn that several thousand copies of it were demanded before it could be published.

Dr. Palmer is very clear in the statement of his doctrine. Every historic people, he says, has its peculiar character and its special providential trust. "What that trust is," he adds, "must be ascertained from the necessities of their position, the institutions which are the outgrowth of their principles, and the conflicts through which they have preserved their identity and their independence. If then the South is such a people, what, at this juncture, is their providential trust? I answer, that it is *to conserve and to perpetuate the institution of* domestic slavery as now existing." He speaks of the duty of the present generation, without pretending to predict what changes may take place hereafter in the state of society, or the productions of the earth. "Without determining the question of duty for the future generations," he adds, "I simply say that for us, as now situated, the duty is plain of conserving and transmitting the system of slavery, with the freest scope for its natural development and extension." He argues that "duty to ourselves, to our slaves, to the world, and to Almighty God, establishes the nature and solemnity of our present trust, to preserve and transmit our present system of domestic servitude, unchanged by man, to go and root itself wherever Providence and nature may carry it."

Providence has indeed committed a fearful trust to the people of the Southern States of this Union. Without the agency of the men of this generation, they find among them four millions of human beings of a different race, the great majority of whom are in a state of ignorance, helplessness, dependence, and semi-barbarism. We presume no enlightened Christian man would hesitate to say that the superior race, that is, the race superior in knowledge, civilization, and Christianity, to whose care these millions have been committed, are not bound to concede to them the same degree of domestic and civil liberty as that which they themselves enjoy; but are entitled to exercise all

that authority over them that is necessary to secure their being rendered diligent and useful to the community, and prevented from sinking back into barbarism, to their own increased degradation, and to the destruction of society. A parent to whom God has entrusted a family of feeble and dependent children is entitled to exercise all the authority over them which is necessary to render them diligent and useful, and to prevent their becoming a curse to him and to others. In like manner a man whom God has raised to supreme command over a half-civilized and degraded nation, is authorized to exercise all the restraining and constraining power that may be required to promote the general good. Any appeal to natural equality of men, or to inalienable rights, or to mere abstract principles of liberty, to prove that children should be independent of their parents, that the command of God that they should be obedient in all things, can be safely disregarded, would be pronounced absurd. No less unreasonable would be any such appeal to the principles of democracy to prove that uncivilized and unchristianized nations should all be resolved into free republics. In like manner we hold that no enlightened Christian man can demand that the four millions of Africans in our Southern States should be freed from those constraints which are necessary to their own good and to the good of society. Any appeal to the equality of men and to inalienable rights would be as absurd in this case as in either of the others. This is plain. But does it follow from these premises that the trust imposed upon the parent is "to conserve and perpetuate" the subjection, dependence, and inferiority of his children; or that the trust committed to the despotic ruler is to conserve, perpetuate, and extend despotism? If not, why should it be inferred from the same premises that the trust imposed on the people in the Southern States of this Union, is to conserve, perpetuate, and extend the system of domestic slavery as it now exists among them? Is not this a monstrous perversion of the nature of the trust confided to them? It is surely the duty of the parent and of the despotic ruler, so to use the authority confided to them, that those under their control should be developed intellectually, morally, and socially, leaving the question of relative authority and subjection to adjust itself by the inscrutable laws of God and nature. No man can tell when the authority of a parent over his children ceases to be absolute, and when it passes from authority to mere superiority in years and wisdom. The preservation and perpetuity of that authority is not the end to be arrived at, but the culture and improvement of his children. In like manner the great and noble

trust committed to Southern slave-holders is not to perpetuate slavery, but to promote the intellectual, moral, religious, and social culture and elevation of the four millions of Africans entrusted to their hands. They are called upon to use their power not for their own advantage, not for the purpose of rendering its tenure permanent, but for the purpose of benefitting those dependent on their care. If it is true of the power of the parent and the ruler, that it is to be exercised for the benefit of those subject to its control, why should it not be true of the power of the slave-holder? The doctrine of this sermon, as we are forced most reluctantly to understand it, and as we know it to be generally understood by others within the sphere of our observation is, that the trust reposed in the South is to perpetuate slavery as it now exists; that is, to perpetuate the inferiority and dependence of four millions of human beings and their descendants indefinitely. What can this mean, if it does not mean that they must be kept in their present state of ignorance and semi-barbarism? This is the light in which the doctrine of this sermon is generally regarded. It has, therefore, given a fearful shock to the public mind. It has alarmed the North, as though indeed a great gulf does exist between the North and South, a gulf which neither civil nor religious institutions can span. We cannot but hope that this sermon is not to be taken as an index of the settled convictions of Southern Christians, nor even of the eloquent and admired author himself. We hope that it will prove to be the product of an enthusiastic nature, carried beyond the bounds of its own convictions, by the excitement of a great emergency.

A Selection of Hymns: Designed as a Supplement to the Psalms and Hymns of the Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien. 1861.

The need of some supplement to our excellent Book of Psalmody has been long and widely felt. The standard character of the hymns which, as a whole, compose it, is beyond dispute. They have found their witness and sanction in the Christian consciousness of our people. This fact, however, does not supersede the necessity of adding to the richness and variety of our resources for singing the praises of God in public and private devotion. Such necessity arises from two causes. 1. Since the publication of our hymn-book, some twenty years since, the hymnology of the church has been amplified by original compositions in our own language, and translations from the German, Latin, and other languages. Many of these compositions are such that devout and cultivated minds, after

having once been brought into contact with them, crave that free use of them which is impossible, unless they are contained in the collections of psalmody regularly employed in private and public worship. 2. As every collection of hymns adopted by any Christian communion is an exponent of the predominant thought, sentiment, and feeling of the body for the time being, so our own book reflects the state of thinking and feeling consequent on the conflicts from which our church had just triumphantly emerged at the time of its compilation. In other words, it is preëminently rich in doctrinal hymns, sometimes set in logical and didactic phrase, as in the following stanza:

> "Adam in Paradise was placed,
> Our natural and our federal head;
> With holiness and wisdom graced,
> In his Creator's image made."

This doctrinal wealth of our hymn-book constitutes one of its chief merits. The jealous vigilance with which its compilers evidently guarded this feature of it, has obviously had the effect to winnow out of it all flashy, sentimental compositions, having poetry and rhythm without divine truth; and all those drivelling fanatical verses which substitute fleshly excitement for spiritual exhilaration, and animal transport for divine hope. In short, this underlying basis of divine truth imparts to our hymns spiritual strength and substance.

While this is so, it cannot be denied that the collection is susceptible of enlargement and improvement in other respects. Notwithstanding the number of precious hymns it contains, we find it difficult to understand why so many that, even at the time of its publication, had long been familiar favourites with the people of God, were omitted. How often have we craved to find that grand hymn of Doddridge, beginning,

> "Awake, my soul, stretch every nerve;"

or, such as those of Watts, beginning,

> "Earth has engrossed my love too long;"

and,

> "Eternal wisdom, thee we praise."

Who that has once sung the hymns, beginning,

> "In thy name, O Lord, assembling,"

or,

> "The festal morn, my God, is come,"

does not feel disappointed, as he looks into any hymn-book in which he cannot find them?

The object of the volume, which we are now noticing, is to

supply the deficiency in our collection of hymns arising from the two causes above indicated. The known ability and taste of the editor (Dr. H. A. Boardman,) are a sufficient guaranty of the manner in which the work has been executed. It consists of more than five hundred hymns, gathered from all accessible sources, ancient and modern, whether originally composed in our own, or in foreign tongues. It draws, however, most largely from Watts, Doddridge, C. Wesley, and Montgomery. The selections from ancient hymns are among the most precious in the book. They have a certain chasteness, grandeur, and devotional fervour, which we rarely meet in other compositions—as in the *Dies iræ*, and the 69th of this collection, beginning,

"Glory, laud, and honour,
To thee, Redeemer, King!"

The volume is particularly rich in hymns for private and family worship, also with reference to other special occasions and objects. The hymns are thoroughly evangelical, and, with rarest exceptions, chaste, elevated, devout. They have, especially one prime quality—they are hymns of WORSHIP. As it contains none of the hymns of our book, it is, of course, deficient when taken alone. They are mutual supplements of each other. Together, they furnish the best collection of hymns known to us. This new volume is, therefore, a valuable, and, we trust will prove, a welcome addition to our hymnology. It will probably, with other causes, prepare the way for the ultimate revisal and enlargement of our own book. This has frequently been the case in other communions. Supplements have preceded and led the way to revisals and enlargements of their authorized works of Psalmody.

After all, there is no sphere in which the varieties of taste, among equally capable and accomplished editors and critics, are more unaccountable. We are unable to see why such lines as the following should have been admitted into our present collection—so generally free from such blemishes:

"But when I am happy in him,
December's as pleasant as May."

Or on what principle a collection, evincing the good taste generally displayed in the hymn-book of the General Association of Connecticut should reject the unsurpassed old doxology:

"To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
The God whom we adore,
Be glory as it was, is now,
And shall be evermore."

Had it been left to us to decide, we should doubtless have

preferred the exquisite rendering of the 23d Psalm, beginning,

"The Lord himself, the mighty Lord,
Vouchsafes to be my guide;"

or, that sweet and tender hymn, beginning,

"There is an hour of peaceful rest,
To mourning wanderers given, &c.,

neither of which appears in our hymn-book, nor in Dr. Boardman's Collection, to some which we find in each of them. Others would have other preferences. But all competent judges will agree that the latter book furnishes a copious and well-selected supplement to our excellent hymn-book, which few could have equalled, and probably none could have surpassed.

The Last Week in the Life of Davis Johnson, Jr. By J. D. Wells, Pastor of the South Third Street Presbyterian Church, Williamsburgh, Long Island. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861.

The following, from the introduction, will show the scope and aim of this volume:

"On Saturday, the 18th of July, 1857, Davis Johnson, Jr., received a mortal hurt while bathing in the East River, Williamsburgh, Long Island.

"At the post-mortem examination, it was found, that the sixth cervical vertebra was broken into six pieces, and thrown out of place. There was consequently a compression of the spinal cord, and an entire paralysis of the nerves of motion and sensation, below the chest.

"In this condition of body, and in the full possession of all his mental powers, he lived a whole week, expiring on Saturday, the 25th of July, just before night. He was not quite twenty years old.

The following pages are a simple record, chiefly from notes taken at the time, of his experience, the efforts made for his salvation, and the result, which, through the tender mercy of God, it is believed was secured, during that last week of his life."

The narrative is exceedingly well told by Mr. Wells, who has given us a volume of fascinating interest and high religious power.

Work and Conflict, or the Divine Life in its Progress; a book of Facts and Histories. By the Rev. John Kennedy, M. A., F. R. G. S. Revised by the Editor of the Board. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

A former work by this author, on the "Divine Life," has found a wide acceptance. The present appears to be a continuation or development of the former, with special reference to the labours, trials, and conflicts which the Christian is called to confront. Both these volumes are, like many others, evangelical, discriminating, experimental. What, however, distinguishes them, and appears to be the author's specialty, is the extent to which he illustrates the principles he inculcates, by appropriate and salient incidents in the biographies of eminent Christians. This lifts up the work above the common-place dulness to which so many books on such subjects sink, and invests it with a vivid and buoyant interest.

The Little Pilgrims in the Holy Land. By the Rev. Henry S. Osborn, Author of "Palestine Past and Present," etc., etc. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1861.

Many of our readers have been made acquainted with Mr. Osborn's knowledge of the Holy Land, either by reading his books or hearing his lectures. The accuracy and thoroughness of his descriptions are enlivened by the enthusiasm which animates him. This little volume portrays scenes and objects in Palestine in a style designed to interest and profit children. It is rendered the more attractive and instructive by some very good pictorial illustrations. Indeed, the publishers have done their part, in all respects, well; and as a whole, it ranks among the decidedly better class of children's books.

The Beautiful City, and the King of Glory. By Woodbury Davis. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1860.

The prominent feature of this book is its advocacy of the doctrine of the pre-millennial advent of Christ, and his subsequent personal reign on earth. The author has frequent occasion to combat Mr. Barnes's "Exegesis of Scripture." He has sought to cast his own reasonings in a form adapted to popular reading. We have not time to examine the volume with sufficient care to ascertain whether any of its arguments are cogent enough to require special attention on the part of those who reject this theory.

Historical Pictures Retouched: A volume of Miscellanies in two parts. Part 1. Studies. Part 2. Fancies. By Mrs. Dall, author of "Woman's Right to Labour." Boston: Walker, Wise & Company. 1860.

This is a book substantially in the interest of the "Women's Rights" movement. The author advocates their right to vote,

and, in general, their essential equality with men as to political rights and duties. We suspect that no surer method could be contrived for debasing both sexes. The work, however, is written with an earnestness and skill that will command readers, but not, we imagine, converts. The large number of fresh biographical portraits of eminent females serve to render it readable.

The Romance of Natural History. By Philip Henry Gosse, F. R. S., Author of "Aquarium," "Popular British Ornithology," "Natural History of Birds, Animals, Reptiles," etc., etc. With elegant illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1861.

This is not a scientific treatise on Natural History, but, as its title indicates, the "Romance" of it. Those facts are presented which rouse the sensibilities, and stir the æsthetic emotions, i. e., in the author's language, "surprise, wonder, terror, revulsion, admiration, love, desire, and so forth." He says, "I have sought to paint a series of pictures, the reflections of scenes and aspects in nature, which in my own mind awaken poetic interest, leaving them to do their proper work."

In this effort he has been quite successful. A glance at almost any page, reveals uncommon power of graphic portraiture, life-like sketching, and poetical representation. Those objects in the animal and vegetable world are seized upon as subjects for his glowing descriptions and kindling narratives, which are best suited to awaken a passionate interest in his readers. One of the most interesting portions of the work is that devoted to the sea-serpent. In proof of the real existence of this animal, heretofore generally counted mythical, he accumulates a mass of evidence that must make a strong impression. The pictorial illustrations add to the value and interest of the book.

The Physical and Moral Aspects of Geology, containing the leading facts and principles of the science, and a discussion of the great moral questions growing out of modern geological discoveries. By William J. Barbee, A. M., M. D., Principal of the M. F. Institute, Senatobia, Mississippi. James Challen & Son. 1861.

This title has the merit of giving a somewhat adequate idea of the scope and contents of the volume it denotes. Such a book will be welcome to many who desire to possess themselves of the outlines of Geology, without the labour of investigating more profound and elaborate treatises. The author is quick to extract the moral and religious lessons implied in the successive geological facts which he brings to view; and is

especially vigilant to prevent infidels and sceptics from twisting them into seeming antagonism to Christianity. His method of conciliating the Mosaic cosmogony with geology is substantially that of Buckland and Chalmers.

Bengel's Gnomon of the New Testament, newly translated from the original Latin. By Charlton T. Lewis, A. M., and Marvin R. Vincent, Professors in Troy University. With additions and corrections from the best modern Commentaries. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins. New York: Sheldon & Company. 1860. 8vo. Pp. 925.

This work of Bengel is peculiar in its character and permanent in value. The fact that two translations, in immediate succession, one from Edinburgh and the other from Troy, United States, have issued from the press, is sufficient evidence of the light in which it is regarded. It seems that Professor Lewis had projected and commenced his translation before the Edinburgh work was announced. To avoid the inconvenience of two competing versions of the same work, Professor Lewis concluded to abandon the enterprise. But on the examination of the Edinburgh translation, although the work of English University scholars, he was so dissatisfied with its execution that he determined to carry out his original purpose, and to connect with the translation of Bengel's text, notes from recent and eminent commentators. He enumerates in his list all the most distinguished German interpreters. This feature of his work will give it an additional advantage. The first volume has already issued from the press; the second is promised for July next. The two together will make about 1800 pages, to be sold for $5.00, which is wonderfully cheap for a work of such size and value.

History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V. By Henry Hart Milman, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. In eight volumes. Vol. I. New York: Sheldon & Company. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. Pp. 554.

The unity of the subject treated of in these volumes, the space occupied by the Latin Church in ecclesiastical history, the world-wide influence exercised by that church, make the exhibition of its rise and progress, the development of its theology and power, one of the most important enterprises in which a Christian scholar could be engaged. Dean Milman has executed this work with an ability and success which have secured for him a place in the very first rank of ecclesiastical historians. As to his honesty of conviction, diligence of research, and felicity of exhibition, there is but one opinion. That his own subjective theological views should not colour in a measure the light in which he presents the important questions of which he treats, would be impossible. The book, therefore,

as all other books of the kind, should be read with caution; each man making the allowance and qualifications which his own convictions of truth must supply. The American edition of this standard work is issued in a form worthy of its high character. It is everything as to typography and external appearance that could be desired.

Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. By Dr. A. Tholuck. Translated from the fourth revised and enlarged edition. By the Rev. R. Lundin Brown, M. A., translator of "Ullmann on the Sinlessness of Jesus." Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. New York: Sheldon & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 8vo.

Some of the exegetical works of Tholuck bear the marks of hasty composition. Rapidity of execution is indeed one of his most remarkable characteristics. Although a man of learning, he is still more a man of genius. His Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount is among his most elaborate works. He has striven to make it exhaustive, and it is, beyond doubt, the most copious and instructive exposition of that wonderful discourse of the Divine Teacher.

Plants of the Holy Land with their Fruits and Flowers. Beautifully illustrated by original drawings coloured from nature. By Henry S. Osborn, author of "Palestine, Past and Present." Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1861. Pp. 174.

This is a truly beautiful work both in its typography and illustrations. Mr. Osborn, being himself a traveller in the Holy Land, gathering and delineating its plants and flowers, may be regarded as altogether trustworthy. It is not only a great satisfaction but a real utility to have definite conceptions of the things mentioned in Holy Scripture. No description can convey such conceptions of visible objects so well as a truthful drawing coloured from nature. Such works as this, therefore, are a valuable contribution to the knowledge of those who have never visited the scenes of Biblical history.

The Protestant Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia: Being a condensed translation of Herzog's *Real Encyclopedia*, with additions from other sources. By the Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D. Part XII. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston.

We have already frequently noticed this exceedingly valuable work. The publication of this 12th part brings it down to JOS in the alphabetical arrangement. Nearly one-half of the whole is therefore in the hands of the public. The work is carried on as rapidly as the laborious nature of the enterprise admits, and as each part contains, or rather is made up of, finished dissertations on particular subjects, its value does not depend on the completion of the whole work. The reader has all that the work promises to give, on every point included under the titles beginning with the letters of the first half of

the alphabet. This is an advantage which does not ordinarily belong to serials.

The Pulpit of the American Revolution; or the Political Sermons of the Period of 1776. With a Historical Introduction, Notes, and Illustrations. By John Wingate Thornton, A. M. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1860. Pp. 537.

This work opens a view into the interior history of the American Revolution. The religious element in that great struggle has never been duly appreciated. The defect of this work is that it does not correspond with its title. "The Pulpit of the American Revolution," leads the reader to expect specimens at least of the sermons preached at that period, in every part of the country, whereas the volume contains only nine discourses by clergymen of New England. New England however is not all America. The clergy of the Middle and Southern states took as active a part in promoting the Revolution as their brethren of the East. This volume however is one of great interest, and must serve to increase our respect for the principles and spirit which animated the descendants of the Puritans, in their efforts to defend and perpetuate the principles for which their fathers came to this country as a refuge. It serves to prove the correctness of the judgment of John Quincy Adams, that the great glory of the American Revolution is, "that it connected in one indissoluble bond the principles of civil government with the principles of Christianity."

The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, &c. Collected and edited by James Shedding, M. A., Robert Leslie Ellis, M. A., Douglas Derom Heath, all of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vol. XII. being Vol. II. of the Literary and Professional Works. Boston: Brown & Taggard.

The Works of Francis Bacon. Edited as above. Vol. XIII., being Vol. III. of the Literary and Professional Works. Boston: Brown & Taggard.

We have already called the attention of our readers to this new, complete, and elegant edition of the works of one of the great masters of thought. In no other form can the productions of Lord Bacon, which have exerted so extensive and permanent an influence on the human mind, be accessible to American readers.

Essays in Biography and Criticism. By Peter Bayne, M. A. Author of "The Christian Life, Social and Individual." First Series. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1860. Pp. 426.

Some of these papers were first published in the Edinburgh Magazine, others have not previously appeared. The former were written when the author was only twenty-two years old. The essays on Mrs. Browning, on W. Tennyson, and Ruskin,

are now first published, and to these the writer attaches greater weight. Mr. Bayne, since the death of Macaulay, holds perhaps the first rank among the English Essayists of the present day. The publication of the productions of his pen, therefore, will doubtless meet a hearty welcome.

Blue Laws of Connecticut. A Collection of the Earliest Statutes and Judicial Proceedings of that Colony; being an Exhibition of the Rigorous Morals and Legislation of the Puritans. Edited, with an Introduction, by Samuel M. Smucker, LL.D., author of the "History of the Four Georges, Kings of England." Philadelphia: Duane Rulison, No. 33 South Third Street. 1861. Pp. 232.

The legislation of any free country is an emanation of the mind of the people. It reveals what they were or are, and what they conceived themselves to need. That the laws of one country or age do not suit the taste or wants of other ages and countries, is what must be expected. To make our own present views the standard of judgment of the laws enacted by men of other times, and under other circumstances, is to be very narrow-minded. We are glad to see the Blue Laws of Connecticut reproduced. They will serve to show not only how different were the men of that generation from us, but what real men they were: how determined to carry out their principles into action. New England will never be understood unless we bear in mind what the venerable Mr. Higginson of Salem told the people in 1663, that "New England was a plantation for religion, and not for trade. If any man among us," he adds, "make religion as twelve, and the world as thirteen, such an one hath not the spirit of a true New England man."

The Rock of Ages; or, Scripture testimony to the One Eternal Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. By Edward Henry Bickersteth, M. A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Hampstead. A new and revised edition. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 182.

This is a beautiful reprint of a very valuable work. It is addressed to the heart quite as much as to the understanding. It exhibits the evidence of the Godhead of our Lord in its connection with the religious experience of his people, and leads them to see that their religion consists in the love, worship, and service of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Logic in Religion, and other Essays. By Isaac Taylor. With a Sketch of the life of the author, and a Catalogue of his writings. New York: William Gowans. 1860. Pp. 297.

The greater part of the first of these Essays was printed as an introduction to "Edwards on Free-will." The second appeared in the *Eclectic Review;* the remaining five are now published for the first time. Mr. Taylor's essays on Enthusiasm, Fanaticism, Ancient Christianity, Physical Theory

of another Life, have made him extensively known in Europe and America, and taught the public what to expect in any new production of his pen. He is an original thinker, with great acuteness, eloquent in thought and language, but too untrammelled by the restrictions which God has placed on human speculation in his word and in our moral nature.

Driftwood on the Sea of Life. By William Ware. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. New York: Sheldon & Co. Boston: Brown & Taggard. 1860. Pp. 300.

This volume is a collection of short fugitive pieces, most of which were originally published in newspapers and magazines. The writer informs us that he is as yet "a mere youth," and has ventured on this publication only on the solicitation of numerous friends. All we can say is, that he will find the public ready to receive, and favourably to judge his writings, all the more on account of his youth and the modesty with which he presents them to the world.

Charles Norwood: or Erring and Repenting. By Catharine M. Trowbridge, author of "Dick and his Friend Fidus," &c. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, No. 606 Chestnut street. 1861. Pp. 273.

An interesting tale, designed to teach parents the necessity of firmness and mildness in the government of their children, and children the sin and danger of casting off parental authority.

Memorial of the Life and Services of the Rev. Henry A. Rowland, D. D., Pastor of the Park Presbyterian Church, Newark, New Jersey. With the Sermon preached at his Funeral, by E. R. Fairchild, D. D. New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway.

Dr. Rowland was a man extensively known and admired for his gifts as a preacher, and his attractions as a man. This Memorial will serve to preserve and to extend his reputation, and to the friends of the deceased especially, will be a grateful memento of one whom they sincerely loved.

The Skeleton Monk and other Poems. By Francis De Haes Janvier. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1861. Pp. 148.

Our time has permitted us to read but little of this volume. We can only announce its publication. It is beautifully printed on fawn-coloured paper.

First Greek, comprising an Outline of the Forms and Inflexions, a complete Analytical Syntax, and an Introductory Greek Reader. With Notes and Vocabularies. By Albert Harkness, Ph., D., Professor of Greek in Brown University, author of Arnold's First Latin, and Second Latin Book. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 443 and 445 Broadway. London: 16 Little Britain. 1861. Pp. 277.

This is a clear, condensed, and satisfactory outline of Greek grammar, peculiarly well adapted to the wants of beginners. The reception already given by the public to the other works of Professor Harkness, is evidence of their adaptedness to the end for which they are designed.

Fred Lawrence; or, The World College. By Margaret E. Teller. New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway. 16mo. Pp. 226.

This is a little work designed to make the struggles of young men, in their course through the world, minister to their intellectual and spiritual development.

Glenarvon, or, Holidays at the Cottage. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1861. Pp. 389. 16mo.

An interesting book for children, for the holidays. The scene is laid in England.

A Book for Young Men. The Boy Inventor. A Memoir of Matthew Edwards, Mathematical Instrument Maker. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co., 245 Washington street. 1860. Pp. 109.

The Church, its Constitution and Government. By the Rev. Stuart Mitchell. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 132.

The Holy Child, or, The Early Years of our Lord Jesus Christ. By W. M. Blackburn. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 260.

Paul Winslow, or, Blessings in Disguise. By Helen Chapman. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 106.

Young Hop Pickers. By the late Sarah Maria Frey. American Tract Society. Pp. 85.

Joyful Suffering. A Memorial of Mrs. James E———. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 52.

Grandmother Wise, or, a Visit to Rose Cottage. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 18mo. Pp. 192.

The Life of the Rev. Richard Knill of St. Petersburgh: being selections from his Reminiscences, Journals, and Correspondence. By the Rev. Charles M. Birrell, of the Baptist Church, Liverpool. With a review of his character, by the late Rev. John Angell James. American Tract Society. Pp. 358.

Working and Waiting; or, Patience in Well-doing. By Mrs. Carey Brock, author of "Children at Home." Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien. 1861. Pp. 288.

Walter Stockton; or, My Father's at the Helm. By E. L. Lewellyn, author of "Mary Humphrey." Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 230.

The Benefit of Christ's Death; or, the glorious riches of God's free grace which every true believer receives by Jesus Christ, and him crucified. Originally written in Italian, by Aonio Paleario, and now reprinted from an ancient English translation, with an Introduction by the Rev. John Ayre, M. A., minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampstead, and domestic chaplain of the Earl of Roden. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George L. Blanchard. 1860. Pp. 160.

Presbyterian Manual, containing forms for the records of the Session, Presbytery, and Synod, and for the judicial and other ecclesiastical proceedings required by the polity of the Presbyterian Church. By the Rev. John M. Lewis, lately Stated Clerk of the Synod of New York and New Jersey. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee, No. 1334 Chestnut Street. New York: A. D. F. Randolph, 683 Broadway.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE AND THE BRITISH REVIEWS.

L. SCOTT & CO., NEW YORK, continue to publish the following leading British Periodicals, viz.

1. THE LONDON QUARTERLY (Conservative).
2. THE EDINBURGH REVIEW (Whig).
3. THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW (Free Church).
4. THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW (Liberal).
5. BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE (Tory).

The present critical state of European affairs will render these publications unusually interesting during the forthcoming year. They will occupy a middle ground between the hastily written news-items, crude speculations, and flying rumors of the daily journal, and the ponderous Tome of the future historian, written after the living interest and excitement of the great political events of the time shall have passed away. It is to these Periodicals that readers must look for the only really intelligible and reliable history of current events, and as such, in addition to their well-established literary, scientific, and theological character, we urge them upon the consideration of the reading public.

EARLY COPIES.—The receipt of ADVANCED SHEETS from the British publishers gives additional value to these Reprints, inasmuch as they can now be placed in the hands of subscribers about as soon as the original editions.

TERMS.

	Per Annum.
For any one of the four Reviews,	$3 00
For any two of the four Reviews,	5 00
For any three of the four Reviews,	7 00
For all four of the Reviews,	8 00
For Blackwood's Magazine,	3 00
For Blackwood and one Review,	5 00
For Blackwood and two Reviews,	7 00
For Blackwood and three Reviews,	9 00
For Blackwood and the four Reviews,	10 00

Money current in the State where issued will be received at par.

CLUBBING.—A discount of twenty-five per cent. from the above prices will be allowed to CLUBS ordering four or more copies of any one or more of the above works. Thus: Four copies of Blackwood, or of one Review, will be sent to one address for $9; four copies of the four Reviews and Blackwood for $30; and so on.

POSTAGE.—In all the principal cities and towns these works will be delivered FREE OF POSTAGE. When sent by mail, the postage to any part of the United States will be but TWENTY-FOUR CENTS a year for "Blackwood," and but FOURTEEN CENTS for each of the Reviews.

N. B The price in Great Britain of the five Periodicals above-named is $21 per annum.

THE FARMER'S GUIDE

TO SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL AGRICULTURE.

By HENRY STEPHENS, F. R. S., of Edinburgh, and the late J. P. NORTON, Professor of Scientific Agriculture in Yale College. New Haven. 2 vols. royal octavo. 1600 pages, and numerous engravings.

This is, confessedly, the most complete work on Agriculture ever published, and in order to give it a wider circulation the publishers have resolved to reduce the price to

FIVE DOLLARS FOR THE TWO VOLUMES!!

When sent by mail (post paid) to California and Oregon the price will be $7. To every other part of the Union, and to Canada, (post paid) $6.

☞ *This book is* NOT *the old "Book of the Farm."*

Remittances for any of the above publications should always be addressed, post paid, to the publishers,

LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,
No. 54 Gold street, New York.

TERMS FOR 1861.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW is published quarterly, in January, April, July and October, at THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

1. Subscribers for one copy, who remit THREE DOLLARS *in advance*, to the office of publication, will be entitled to payment of postage on all numbers issued after the receipt of the money.

2. Subscribers who remit FIVE DOLLARS *in advance*, to the office of publication, will be entitled to one copy for two years, postage paid.

3. Six or more persons uniting in a club, and remitting *in one sum* to the office of publication at the rate of TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS each, will be entitled to payment of postage on the numbers issued after the receipt of the money. Payment at club-rate will not be received from a less number than six subscribers in one association. If payment is delayed by members of a club until after the expiration of the year, the full price of THREE DOLLARS will invariably be charged.

4. Theological Students, Missionaries, Young Men's Christian Associations, &c., are furnished with the Review, at TWO DOLLARS per year; or $2.25 by mail, postage paid.

5. All arrearages are charged at THREE DOLLARS per year.

The above are the only terms upon which the Review is furnished to subscribers in the United States or British possessions.

Bills of all solvent banks in the United States or British Provinces received in payment, and may be sent by mail at the risk of the publisher; but those who send are requested to keep a memorandum of the contents and date of their letter till they receive a receipt. Those who act as agents, or remit in large amounts, are requested to procure a check or draft. Subscribers in Canada may send their orders and money to the Rev. A. KENNEDY, London, Canada West; and those in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, to the Rev. WM. ELDER, St. Stephen, New Brunswick.

PETER WALKER,
821 *Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.*

☞ It is a standing rule of the Office to send the Repertory to those subscribers who do not give notice of discontinuance by the first day of January. And even when due notice is given, the work will not be discontinued, till all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Publisher.

☞ NOTICES *of Removal or of Discontinuance must be sent direct to the office of publication*, 821 *Chestnut st., Philadelphia.*