THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW.

EDITED BY

CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

APRIL, 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. II.

APRIL, 1861.

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1861.

No. II.

ARTICLE I.—*Education; Intellectual, Moral, and Physical.* By HERBERT SPENCER, Author of "Social Statics," "The Principles of Psychology," &c. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1861.

THIS book is a reprint of four articles first published by the author in different British Quarterlies. The first, entitled, "What knowledge is of most worth?" was published in the *Westminster Review*, nearly two years ago, and was immediately reprinted in this country, both in the *Eclectic Magazine*, and the *New York Times*, thus showing its decided power to command attention. The second, on "Intellectual Education," was first published in the *North British Review*. The third and fourth, on "Moral Education," and "Physical Education," were first published in the *British Quarterly Review*. It is only necessary to read these works to see that the author is furnished with various and affluent knowledge, is a clear and vigorous thinker, and is master of a simple and nervous style. He has already distinguished himself by works on "Social Statics," "Principles of Psychology," and "Essays: Scientific, Political, and Speculative." He is now about publishing a sort of encyclopediac survey, or what may perhaps more properly be called a fundamental and comprehensive out-

line of philosophy, which already numbers among its subscribers some of the first names in literature, science, and philosophy, in Britain and this country. Its main topics are, "First Principles," "Principles of Biology, Principles of Psychology, Principles of Sociology, Principles of Morality."

While the ability and eminence of the author are thus unquestioned, we feel bound to add, that the volume under review (the only one of his works we have had time or opportunity to examine) betrays certain vicious principles which we cannot pass by without a word of protest and warning. His philosophy, so far as it crops out here, and in the programme of the projected work to which we have adverted, is deeply tinctured with sensism, utilitarianism, and positivism. The knowledge which is "of most worth," he maintains, is physical science. Compared with this, he disparages all other studies as "flaunting their fripperies," and about to "sink into merited neglect;" while "science, proclaimed as highest alike in worth and beauty, will reign supreme." P. 96. "For purposes of discipline—intellectual, moral, religious—the most efficient study is, once more, science. . . . . To the slowly growing acquaintance with the uniform co-existences and sequences of phenomena, to the establishment of invariable laws, we owe our emancipation from the grossest superstitions. But for science, we should still be worshipping fetishes; or, with hecatombs of victims, propitiating diabolical deities." Pp. 94, 95.

The positivism, even to the extent of an infidel and materialistic drift, of all this, is too obvious to require comment. Again: "Though, according to their popular acceptations, *right* and *wrong* are words scarcely applicable to actions that have none but direct bodily effects; yet, whoever considers the matter will see that such actions are as much classifiable under these heads as any other actions. . . . The happiness or misery caused by it are the *ultimate* standards by which men judge of behaviour. We consider drunkenness wrong because of the physical degeneracy, and accompanying moral evils entailed on the transgressor and his dependents. Did theft uniformly give pleasure both to taker and loser, we should not find it in our catalogue of sins. Were it conceivable that benevolent actions multiplied human pains, we should condemn them, should not consider

them benevolent." Pp. 173, 174. At the close of this article on Moral Education, he says: "We have said nothing in this chapter about the transcendental distinction between right and wrong, of which wise men know so little, and children nothing. . . . Nor have we introduced the religious element." P. 217. These extracts fully sustain the objections we have indicated to the author's philosophical and religious standpoint.

They do not, however, render the work, in other respects, valueless. If Mr. Spencer ignores those higher and more momentous departments of truth, and elements of humanity, which he is pleased, with an adroit dash of his pen, to turn aside as "transcendental," he examines what he does recognize with proportionate thoroughness, and sets forth the result with extraordinary force. Whatever pertains to the physical side of humanity, whatever bodily organs and phenomena manifest the energies and properties of the soul, these philosophers analyze and classify with the utmost fulness and accuracy. So it has been remarked that the pantheistic philosophy of Germany, amid all its pestilent fruits, has led to the most earnest and successful investigation of all the typical forms, mathematical proportions, and skilful adjustments in nature, which evince unlimited intelligence. Thus they vainly hope to identify nature with its Author. But if they are foiled in this endeavour, they unwittingly furnish the means of proving, not what they wish—that all things are God—but what they impugn, that "He that builded all things is God." So Mr. Spencer shows consummate ability, and sheds important light on those departments of our nature, which he acknowledges, and searches with his penetrating intellect. This is especially true of our physical being, and of the chapter on physical education. If he is one-sided, he presents his side powerfully. We shall, therefore, make occasional reference to this volume, in some observations we shall soon proceed to offer in regard to what we will denominate,

THE PHYSICAL ELEMENT IN LIBERAL EDUCATION.

The training of the children and youth of any Christian or even civilized country for the high, or even the ordinary

spheres of life, involves so large and constant an outlay, mental and material, together with consequences so momentous, that it is the theme of constant discussion. Education in all its grades, liberal, common, intermediate, professional; for every department of the mind, intellectual, moral, and religious; in the family, the school, and the college; has been ably, variously, and continually treated by experts, masters, empirics, and pretenders, in addresses, lectures, pamphlets, periodicals, and massive books. The extent of these discussions by no means exceeds the importance of the subject. It never has been, and probably never will be exhausted. There are certain aspects of it, especially relative to liberal education, on which we are ready, on some opportune occasion, to show our own opinion. Our college systems are, in many cases, susceptible of improvement, not so much in the mere extent of their curriculum—for we believe that they rather overtax their best students with excessive application, than fall short of a reasonable demand upon their diligence—but in the relative proportions allotted to the different branches, the methods of teaching them, the modes of discipline and training, and, as the result of the whole, in the symmetry, completeness, and effective power of the education thus imparted. But it is not our purpose to deal with these matters now, unless in a very subordinate and incidental way. We only remark, that one of the most serious evils connected with these departments of education, as well as that which we propose now more particularly to discuss, lies in the ultra and one-sided views often maintained, alike by radical reformers of education and their extreme antagonists. The human mind, here as elsewhere, is prone to lose its central balance of moderation, and oscillate like a pendulum from extreme to extreme.

The old system of commencing the study of language by enforcing with the rod a mere rote-learning of all its grammatical formulas, inflexions, and rules, before putting the pupil upon any practical exercises which exemplify and explain them, was appalling enough. But, on the other side, is not Mr. Spencer more extravagant when he pronounces "the teaching of grammar to children an intensely stupid custom"? He quotes, in support of his dictum, M. Marcel as saying: "It

may without hesitation be affirmed that grammar is not the stepping-stone, but the finishing instrument." Still further, he adopts from Mr. Wyse the following language: "Grammar and syntax are a collection of laws and rules. Rules are gathered from practice; they are the results of induction, to which we come by long observation and comparison of facts. It is, in fine, the science, the philosophy of language. In following the process of nature, neither individuals nor nations ever arrive at the science *first*. A language is spoken, and poetry written, many years before either a grammar or prosody is even thought of. Men did not wait till Aristotle had constructed his logic, to reason. In short, as grammar was made after language, so ought it to be taught after language; an inference which all who recognize the relationship between the evolution of the race and of the individual, will see to be unavoidable." Pp. 105, 106. It is hard to say whether such language is the more shallow or pretentious. Because men reason before they study logic, and irrespective of such study, does that prove that they may not be assisted in reasoning, and made more prompt, sure, and vigorous in their thinking, by the mastery of the laws of thought, and of the criteria which distinguish genuine from spurious thinking? Are they to throw up the aid of grammatical guidance, in the study of language, till, groping through a wilderness of vocables, they evolve some crude rudiments of grammar for themselves? Is not this very much as if the locomotive builder should ignore the discoveries already achieved by scientists and machinists, and start from the crude iron and the steam-lifted lid of the tea-kettle, to contrive and construct the stupendous machine which is instinct with the powers of a thousand giants? This would be no more "intensely stupid" than a like casting away or ignoring of the treasures accumulated by the labours of the past in the study of language. The truth is, the grammar guides and facilitates the study of language, while language, in turn, explains and confirms the grammar. They should go on together, and interpenetrate and vitalize each other. Because poetry and eloquence appeared before rhetoric and criticism, are rhetoric and criticism therefore useless to the young student who is seeking to make himself master of those

arts? There is no doubt that the ante-Baconian tendency was to an undue exaltation of formal logic in neglect of facts and inductive generalization. This may explain, but cannot excuse John Locke's flippant and vulgar thrusts at logic, which are still more extravagant in the contrary direction. He tells us, "God has not been so sparing to men to make them barely two-legged creatures, and left it to Aristotle to make them rational. . . . . God has been more bountiful to mankind than so; he has given them a mind that can reason without being instructed in methods of syllogizing." Many of our readers will recollect a passage in Lord Macaulay's Essays,* in which he vents a like disparagement of the utility of grammar or rhetoric. The answer of Whately to such flimsy sophistry is alike pointed and conclusive: "All this is not at all less absurd than if any one, on being told of the discoveries of modern chemists respecting caloric, and on hearing described the process by which it is conducted through the boiler into the water, which it converts into a gas of sufficient elasticity to overcome the pressure of the atmosphere, &c., should reply, 'If all this were so, it would follow, that before the time of these chemists no one ever did or ever could make any liquor boil.' "

We do not, however, now purpose to dwell on intellectual education. Our object has been mainly to illustrate the tendency to extravagance, and, in reaction from one extreme, to swing over to the opposite, which has prevailed in these matters. If characteristic of the human mind generally, it is eminently so on this subject; and, as we think, will appear especially so in regard to that branch of it now before us.

It is only within a recent period that the attention of thoughtful men, or even of professional educators, has been decidedly turned toward the physical part of education. Nor has the subject been pursued, for the most part, in any continuous or systematic way. Occasionally, the appearance of a sort of epidemic debility or disease among students, or the sudden prostration and early death of gifted ministers and other professional men, rouses the public mind to some fitful earnestness

* See his Essay on Lord Bacon.

in regard to the academic hygiene. The remedies and reforms proposed or initiated, have been proportionably ill-adjusted, and, therefore, ephemeral. Some thirty years ago, the wide prevalence of dyspeptic, pulmonary, and nervous disorders among students, which rapidly became developed into bronchitis and other disabling maladies in young clergymen and other professional students and speakers, awakened wide and profound attention. A celebrated American *savant* published a book on Dyspepsia, which recommended that we weigh our food before eating, in order to avoid gorging the stomach, and paralyzing digestion. A very short trial, or the merest modicum of common sense, would show that such a dietetic regimen would turn the healthiest men into dyspeptics, or invalids of some sort. Nothing is a more certain sign of disease, present or impending, than such a distempered consciousness as renders us habitually suspicious, that every morsel administered to the cravings of a healthy appetite is freighted with dyspepsia, unless it be weighed in the balances. Such prescriptions, for the short period and few subjects of their influence, produce unmixed evil. They only breed disgust and contempt for matters of the highest importance—the promotion of the health and vigour of students and educated men. Closely akin to, and almost simultaneous with this, was the extensive drifting towards vegetarianism; running into abstinence from all food except the most unpalatable, innutritious, and unwholesome, and even this in quantities the most attenuated and infinitesimal. This tendency took its start and impetus from a far worthier example, the Temperance Reformation. As if, because men had experienced great physical and moral improvement from the disuse of alcoholic stimuli, which fire, consume, madden, and shatter the whole man; therefore, whatever exhilarates, energizes, or gratifies us, among the creatures of God, were to be refused as not good, (1 Tim. iv. 3,) branded as in the same category with fiery and adulterated stimulants. The radicalism which ran riot about this period, favoured such ultraisms. But, in proportion to the extravagance of this tendency, was it sure to be transient, and to avenge its own excesses, by enforcing a proportionately violent reaction, which brought the whole subject into ridicule with those who most

needed to regard it in sober earnest. The young looked upon it as the wretched imposture of charlatans and empirics, and too often rebounded to the opposite extreme of unlimited self-indulgence.

The Manual Labour system also came to the birth during this period, and, with scarcely an exception, speedily died out. Seldom has any scheme appeared, of brighter promise as a grand economic and sanitary agency in education. It was to ensure the health of the student, while it would defray his expenses, and invigorate his thinking powers, by invigorating his brain and whole body. The system perished almost without a trial, for the few students who could be persuaded to try it, found that, after exhausting their strength in the shop or on the farm, little or no spring for study remained. The working energy used up in one way, cannot remain to be exerted in other channels. The most absurd climax known to us, in these schemes of economics for the body and the soul, with which the church and country teemed a quarter of a century ago, was that of a Christian physician personally known to us, who, from seeing the evils of excessive drugging in medication, sprung to the opposite extreme of giving no medicine at all, in any disease whatever. The project to which we refer was this. He proposed to have the tables in the dining-halls of our large literary institutions made circular, with a lecturer's desk in the centre. Thus while the pupils were eating, they could at the same time hear lectures, and save a prodigious waste of time. Other essays in the same general direction, sometimes judicious and reasonable, and sometimes otherwise, were made about this time by the erection of gymnastic apparatus, or instituting military drill, or some rude mimickry of it. But they mostly fell into speedy disuse, because they were too violent or toilsome, and had too little in them to amuse and divert, to refresh and exhilarate. The consequence was, that, for a long time, and until a recent period, the whole subject fell into neglect in our higher institutions of learning. The consequences were disastrous, but inevitable. The shattered health, the early debility or death of great numbers of American students, have again roused public attention to the subject. Extensive preparations have

been made, and are making, in many of our educational institutions, to supply this great desideratum. Many have erected buildings to afford shelter for exercise in all weather, and furnished them with more or less of gymnastic apparatus. Some have gone the length of devoting one floor to a series of bowling alleys. Sometimes military tactics are adopted. The martial routine and drill, and, in many cases, uniform, are adopted or simulated. Where waters navigable by such craft are convenient, boat-rowing and boat-racing are followed with passionate ardor, as the sure preventives of disease and debility, the conductors of vitality, energy, and buoyancy to the system. These methods, within due limits, are useful and important. It is a great error, however, to make them the exclusive reliance for health. Those who do this suppose that the development of muscle is the grand want of the student; that deficiency here is the prolific cause of his disease and debility, and that ample replenishment of it is the great resource for perennial health and vigour. A certain degree of truth underlies all these methods of insuring health by the increase of muscular development. Doubtless, muscle is an important element in the bodily texture. It cannot be seriously vitiated, attenuated, or enfeebled, without proportionate damage to the general health. But it does not follow that the special and abnormal development of muscle is the grand prescription for those whose main business it is, not to task the muscular, but the cerebral and nervous energies. So much muscular development as is requisite to a healthy vitality should doubtless be sought. To this extent, the foregoing and other analogous exercises may be practised with advantage, provided they are not overdone, or are not allowed to supplant other exercises which ensure not only this, but other important benefits. The respiratory, circulative, nervous, digestive, and cerebral functions all claim our care in any modes of exercise and recreation which we may adopt. And the undue development of any one class of functions and energies is sure to be at the expense of the residue, and of the vital powers; at all events, if this exaggerated development pertain to a class of powers not employed in our special occupation. But we will specify some points requiring attention in the premises, which have been too

much overlooked by many of our most forward and successful gymnastic and hygienic reformers.

1. In every normal human organism, the vital energies are sufficient to sustain the healthful working of all the vital functions, and to furnish an available surplus power adequate to the steady and effective prosecution of some special employment. But this vital energy is not unlimited. It varies in different persons according to constitutional vigour and vivacity of temperament. But, besides sustaining us in some regular occupation, it is not more than equal to the diffusion of that equable force through all the members and organs of the body which ensures their symmetrical and successful working, and, through their free and delighted activity, the sustentation of the vital principle itself. This is that energy of life which is expended in its own support, and which, evenly pervading the whole body, sustains those functions of digestion, assimilation, circulation, respiration, etc., which in turn build up and maintain it. Besides this vital energy, which is thus occupied with self-support, there is, as we have said, a disposable surplus, more or less in different persons, applicable to their special pursuits. Whatever such special pursuit may be, it will attract this surplus energy to those members or organs of the body which it employs. Thus the smith, the digger, the woodman, will bring all the vital energy they can spare from the vital processes themselves, if not more, to their brawny arms. The farmer usually has the advantage, over most occupations, of giving even play to nearly all the organs and functions of the body, and this out of doors, thus invigorating all, without extreme development or straining of any. The hod-carrier, and the negro bearing burdens on his head, undoubtedly show surprising strength in the muscles concerned in carrying the load. Examples of this kind might be indefinitely multiplied. But the occupation of the student employs the mind, of which the brain and nerves implicated with it are the physical organs. This is what student-life taxes, and therefore, what attracts to itself all, if not more than, the surplus energies of the system. This being so, we observe,

2. That if any member or organ be so employed as to absorb and develope any portion of this surplus energy of the system,

then it cannot go elsewhere. If it be appropriated by members of the body, not employed in our special occupation, it is so much taken from, but needed by, the parts and organs brought into play in that special occupation. He who developes and maintains the strength of the hod-carrier in his shoulders, will not develope and maintain that of the scholar and *savant* in his brain. By parity of reason it follows, that those students who make the development of muscle their paramount aim, abstract so far forth that energy from the brain which it needs for the vigorous prosecution of its duties. They enfeeble this great organ for its high work. They beget lassitude, inefficiency, and ultimate prostration in study. If the arms and chest have been anomalously expanded to gigantic proportions, the brain has, in many cases, been proportionally attenuated. The effort to diffuse that *extra* strength over several members of the body, which was needed mainly for that chiefly tasked, so far tends to break it down. It is as absurd to attempt to invigorate the brain in this way, as it would be for the blacksmith to attempt to strengthen his arms by intense study during all the intervals of labour. He may thus, indeed, if he be a prodigy, become a "learned blacksmith," i. e., he will unlearn his trade and give himself to intellectual labours. And, conversely, we believe the mania for boat-racing, as distinguished from moderate boat-rowing, *et id genus omne*, may make men of muscle, but it will hardly invigorate the intellect. Not only so; by weakening the organs through which the intellect acts, it prepares them more speedily to break down under the pressure of study. It is a good thing spoiled by overdoing.* This is not all. We think it evident,

3. That such a disproportionate growth of muscle or other special organs not specially worked in our regular callings, is not, irrespective of its bearings on study, even in a physical point of view, wholesome. Enough is enough in all things.

* We speak of boat-racing, not of reasonable and moderate boat-rowing, where there are proper facilities for it; although, so far as we have observed in our colleges, the latter is apt to degenerate into the former. Another great evil of boat-racing in colleges is, that it absorbs the mind and heart, as well as muscle of the students. As the spirit of boat-racing rises, the spirit of study declines. Such is the fact as shown by the most reliable information we have been able to obtain.

There is even a sense, in which we must not be "righteous overmuch." Such a development may give a temporary preternatural vigour in some parts or members. So will the abundant use of narcotic or alcoholic stimulants. But it will be only temporary. It will take speedy vengeance on itself. It will prove unfavourable to ultimate health, vigour, and longevity. According to the views advanced by some, prize-fighters should attain the most hale and enduring old age, if they survive the ring. They are notoriously the contrary—victims of early disease, short-lived, and inefficient for any useful service while they do live. If this "apotheosis of muscle" is well-founded, why are not hod-carriers, miners, and diggers of railroads, the most robust and numerous of octogenarians, instead of being swept away, as they mostly are, in the prime of their manhood? We have recently seen a statement, circulating in the public prints, to the effect, that the most eminent English physicians observe that the adepts and victors in boat-racing, at colleges, or in early life elsewhere, notwithstanding their enormous breadth of chest and massive arms, generally develope formidable diseases at or about the age of thirty, or sooner. We know not on how strong authority this statement rests; but we are confident that, if such be the fact, it harmonizes with all the analogies of the case. For ourselves, we have often witnessed those who had accomplished this artificial and preternatural muscular development, becoming the victims of diseases which astonished themselves and those who had confidence in this species of training. We quite agree with the following well-considered statement:

"The conditions of bodily welfare pertain, variously, to the subjects of light, air, heat, water, diet, clothing, exercise, climate, occupation, and all the mental and moral habitudes of the mind. Health is the nice and even balance of many delicate and subtle elements and agencies, at work in every part of the complicated frame-work of our entire being. Some, in seeking to regain their health, attach quite too much importance to mere muscular exercise, which alone, as many well know, will do but little towards the thorough renovation of the physical system. Here, as in other things, 'bodily exercise profiteth little;' little, if not mixed largely

with other and better things."* This is true, not only of the "renovation" or restoration, but also of the preservation and increase of health. Exercise which, as to time, place, manner, and amount, is congenial to the student, is unquestionably of fundamental importance to him; and without it, he will, in the long run, be unable to keep good health; or, if lost, regain it. But no exercise is scarcely worse than exercise which is excessive, unsuitable, and ungenial; or the exaggerated, abnormal development of the muscular system, or of particular members and parts of the body.

4. Violent, toilsome, or burdensome exercise is injurious. It is undue and inappropriate. It wears, debilitates, and exhausts: but it does not refresh or invigorate. As to violent exercise, it is, of course, exhausting. It often produces injurious strains, fractures, ruptures, or dislocations, either immediate and palpable, or partial and latent, which gradually manifest themselves at a later period. Of this the witnesses and the monuments abound. Toilsome and burdensome are relative terms. They have reference to the previous strength, habits, and aptitudes of individuals. What is laborious and severe to one, is easy and pleasant to another. But there can be no doubt that the student who habitually takes exercise, that in kind and degree is irksome and wearisome, will find himself the worse for it. Instead of refreshing and invigorating the vital powers jaded by study, it is a further tax upon them, and still further reduces them. We have known many dyspeptics whose prostration was due to the lack of exercise *inter alia*, aggravate the distemper by suddenly betaking themselves to dumb-bells, gymnastic frames and swings, wood-sawing, and other laborious exercises. On the other hand, one who had gradually trained and inured himself to the moderate use of these modes of exercise, might suffer no injury, and experience decided advantage from their continued use.

5. Beyond all question, other things being equal, that exercise is most beneficial to the student which is most in the open air, which best brings the various parts of the body into

* "The Higher Christian Education." By Benjamin W. Dwight. New York: A. S. Barnes & Burr. 1859.

due exercise, and gives the most of exhilaration with the least of weariness or exhaustion. This is one of those propositions which scarcely needs proof. Its very statement is its evidence, not only because it seems reasonable on the face of it, but because it is an echo of the consciousness and tried experience of all whose pursuits are sedentary and intellectual. Hence, so far as the body is concerned, that exercise is to be preferred which requires scope for the free activity, and spontaneous spring of all its parts and members. This unforced play and elastic bounding of the limbs and organs, is, in any degree short of being tiresome, alike inspiring and invigorating, beyond the finest cordial, to both body and mind. Another condition of the utility of exercise is, that it be of a kind to cheer, divert, and amuse the mind. What is requisite is not merely a cessation of mental labour, but an interval of mental play—of free, buoyant, glad activity, that makes the whole man sparkle and glow with genuine recreation, and hearty diversion from severe studies. This indeed is the true amusement, *a musis*. It is needless to discuss the philosophy of this. It is enough that all experience shows such genial, mentally exhilarating exercise, to be vastly more restorative and invigorating than that which, whether toilsome and drudging or not, is performed with aversion or indifference, and from a mere leaden sense of duty or necessity.*

* It should not be forgotten by educators that, in many branches the thirst for amusement may be made subservient to, and coincident with the passion for knowledge and study. This is peculiarly true of Botany, Mineralogy, Geology, and that class of sciences, in which the specimens may be found in out-door rambles. As illustrations, we quote the following from a vigorous little tract on "Agricultural Geology," by Josiah Holbrook.

"A teacher in Philadelphia once said to his pupils; 'Boys, all who have their lessons to-day at eleven o'clock may go with me on a geological excursion.' Every boy had his lesson thoroughly at the hour named—the first *thorough* lesson ever got by several of his pupils. Similar experiments continued changed his worst scholars into his best.

"In one of the New York Public Schools the teacher was greatly annoyed by several truant boys, drawn to the docks of the city by the attractions upon the wharves. He at length offered to the punctual scholars exercises in drawing, also an opportunity to form cabinets of Geology for the school, their homes, and sending abroad. His incorrigible truants immediately became his most punctual scholars, and the very worst boy in school was soon known as an artist, and, as such, invited by a clergyman of the city to become the

The drift of our remarks, as has doubtless already struck our readers, is to show that the out-door games and sports of childhood, together with walking, and riding, as far as possible with genial and vivacious companions; the family and social recreations; the out-door movements incident to the requirements of the household and the profession pursued; in the country, supervising the garden, grounds, or farm; and any out-door games which may not be unbecoming one's age and position;—these and other things the like, are more trustworthy and invigorating modes of exercise than the more formal, constrained, and tiresome methods. Gymnastics should be used to supplement, but not to supplant or overbear them.* They

associate and the teacher of his children. Do not 'working schools' and houses of refuge forcibly illustrate the adage, that an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure?

"Some boys in a New York school, much in a mutinous state, were invited by a visitor to take an excursion to collect minerals to be distributed among the pupils in the several departments—girls, boys, and primaries. The proposal was, of course, most gladly acceded to, resulting in specimens showing the elements of the globe, all labelled, and taken at the close of the school, on the same day, by the hands of every pupil, from the largest to the smallest, numbering more than three hundred, for the beginning of 'FAMILY CABINETS.' The same school soon stood among the first in the city in scholarship and orderly deportment."

* The following remarks of Spencer, in regard to the practice of forbidding school girls free out-of-door play, and putting gymnastics in lieu thereof, have a broader application, so far as the principles are concerned.

"In this, as in other cases, to remedy the evils of one artificiality, another artificiality has been introduced. The natural spontaneous exercise having been forbidden, and the bad consequences of no exercise having become conspicuous, there has been adopted a system of factitious exercise—gymnastics. That this is better than nothing, we admit; but that it is an adequate substitute for play, we deny. The defects are both positive and negative. In the first place these formal, muscular motions, necessarily much less varied than those accompanying juvenile sports, do not secure so equable a distribution of action to all parts of the body; whence it results that the exertion falling on special parts, produces fatigue sooner than it would else have done; add to which, that, if constantly repeated, this exertion of special parts leads to a disproportionate development. Again, the quantity of exercise thus taken will be deficient, not only in consequence of uneven distribution, but it will be further deficient in consequence of a lack of interest. Even when not made repulsive as they sometimes are, by assuming the shape of appointed lessons, these monotonous movements are sure to become wearisome, from lack of amusement. Competition, it is true, serves as a stimulus; but it is not a lasting stimulus, like that enjoyment which accompanies varied play. Not only,

are also better than those aquatic or other contests, which over-task, and in the end debilitate, by intensity of exertion and excitement. As to the ten-pin alleys, now so fashionable on the premises of gentlemen, and becoming so prominent in some of our leading colleges, they doubtless meet many of the conditions we have specified. But we confess they have not yet overcome our repugnance to making them academic institutions. The objections to them are, 1. Their association with places of dissipation and gambling, and the tendency, in such a community as a college, to pervert them to such service. 2. They are in-doors. This, indeed, is a recommendation of this, and of housed gymnastic apparatus, in inclement weather; but ordinarily, and as a main reliance, they do not minister sufficiently to that vital want of the student, fresh outer air. 3. They excite to excess. They, so far as we have observed, tend so to enlist the mind, and excite the passionate fevered interest of the young student, as to tempt him to continue at the game till it intrudes upon study hours, and they are exhausted and unmanned for study. If we mistake not, those colleges that were first to introduce them, and have longest tried them, will take good care not to enlarge, if they continue the experiment.

While, therefore, we favour the introduction of gymnastic

however, are gymnastics inferior in respect of the *quantity* of muscular exertion which they secure; they are still more inferior in respect of the *quality*. This comparative want of enjoyment to which we have just referred as a cause of early desistance from artificial exercises, is also a cause of inferiority in the effects they produce on the system. The common assumption, that so long as the amount of bodily action is the same, it matters not whether it be pleasurable or otherwise, is a grave mistake. An agreeable mental excitement has a highly invigorating influence. See the effect produced upon an invalid by good news, or by the visit of an old friend. Mark how careful medical men are to recommend lively society to debilitated patients. Remember how beneficial to the health is the gratification produced by change of scene. The truth is, that happiness is the most powerful of tonics. By accelerating the circulation of the blood, it facilitates the performance of every function; and so tends alike to increase health when it exists. Hence the essential superiority of play to gymnastics. . . . . Granting then, as we do, that formal exercises of the limbs are better than nothing; granting further, that they may be used with advantage as supplementary aids; we yet contend that such formal exercises can never supply the place of the exercises prompted by nature." Pp. 256—258.

apparatus into our literary institutions which shall afford facilities for exercise in all weathers, and which shall supplement the more spontaneous and exhilarating out-of-door activity which our instincts prompt; yet it should be practised only in moderation. It should not be followed to weariness, or so as to induce an unsymmetrical development of any of our faculties or organs. It is no substitute for, and should not be allowed to supplant, the free and spontaneous activities that energize and exhilarate the body and mind. For if a sound body invigorates the mind, it is no less true that a cheerful and joyous spirit enlivens and lubricates all the activities of the body. But a wounded spirit who can bear? Dejection of spirit unnerves the body, and debilitates all its functions. "Their soul abhorreth all manner of meat."

We believe, however, that there can be no intelligent and sufficient prescription to remedy the debility to which so many students are compelled to succumb, either before or after they have completed their education, without searching out the causes of the phenomenon. It is certainly much more common and obtrusive now than forty years ago. In a proportionate degree it has challenged public attention, and called forth numerous ingenious specifics for its removal or abatement. What then are some obvious changes within that period in the condition and circumstances of the student which affect his health and *physique?* We will briefly indicate a few of the more palpable.

1. To prevent misconstruction, we will say that the changes in diet, dress, furniture, in many respects, are conducive to health and vigour. Other things being equal, we have no doubt that those modes of living which, being simple and not luxurious, promote comfort, do, *ceteris paribus*, proportionably promote health and vigour. There is no question that good, nutritious, savoury food is healthier than a hard, tough, indigestible diet. It is far better that men should be comfortably warm, than suffer from excessive or inadequate heat, whether it arise from unsuitable clothing, or warming, shading, and ventilation of houses. We have no doubt that the modern provisions for the nourishment and temperature of the body, are, certain exceptions aside which we shall soon point out,

more conducive to health and vigour than the more uncomfortable methods and usages which they have supplanted. We know it is a common assumption, that the suffering from cold, exposure, inadequate clothing and warming, together with the harder diet which formerly prevailed, made a tough and hardy race, capable of an endurance quite beyond the present more luxurious generation. On this we remark, first, that in advocating varied, pleasant, nutritious food, and due warmth, we are not countenancing the course of those who pamper themselves with luxury and self-indulgence. These doubtless tend to enfeeble and shatter the constitution. On the other hand, that kind of indurating process which trains us to bear exposures from which we naturally recoil, is accomplished by an advance draft on the reserved *vis vitæ*, in which lie the latent and undeveloped resources of our future life. Many succumb to this strain upon their vital resources. Those who surmount it, and are hardened by it, thus show that they had constitutions capable of bearing it. They would have been more hardy than others without the experiment. Their increased hardihood has been purchased, however, by a manifest draft upon the vital powers which will ensure payment in the earlier giving out of those powers. No doubt, children may be inured to thin clothing, bare feet, unwarmed houses, and cease to be seriously sensitive to their privations. The feeblest will sink under, the strongest will outlive, the discipline, hardened indeed for the time, but at the cost of an ultimate enfeebling and shortening of life. Sailors become inured to sleepless nights. The skin on the palms of their hands is stimulated to a triple thickness. They are proof against all exposures to climate and weather. But what of their enduring vigour and longevity? The truth is, that all painful sensations, all abnormal obstructions of the vital functions, all the struggles requisite to sear the sensibility to unnatural exposure, amount to so much expenditure of vital energy. They consume not merely the income of our vital estate; they encroach on the capital itself. While we, therefore, admit and maintain that those changes in modes of living, whereby the present generation are more comfortably housed, clothed, warmed, and fed, are, in themselves, conducive to health, we must mention

certain incidents or accompaniments thereof, which, it is to be feared, with reference to students at least, neutralize, and often more than neutralize, their hygienic efficacy.

The general improvement in clothing is qualified by at least one grave exception. Fashion is the idol to which not a few constitutions are sacrificed in their youngest, tenderest days. It would be difficult to speak in terms of reprobation too severe, of the custom of exposing the bare limbs of young children to the unrelenting cold. It is not necessary, in such a matter, to accumulate facts, or wait for the revelations of experience. The sure ultimate effect, we know *a priori*, must be to sacrifice or injure the health of large numbers. The following observations of Mr. Spencer are their own justification.

"See, then, the folly of clothing the young scantily. What father, full-grown though he is, losing heat less rapidly as he does, and having no physiological necessity but to supply the waste of each day—what father, we ask, would think it salutary to go about with bare legs, bare arms, and bare neck? Yet this tax upon the system, from which he would shrink, he inflicts upon his little ones, who are so much less able to bear it! or if he does not inflict it, sees it inflicted without protest. . . . . We have met with none competent to form a judgment on the matter, who do not strongly condemn the exposure of children's limbs. If there is one point above others in which 'pestilent custom' should be ignored, it is this.

"Lamentable, indeed, is it to see mothers seriously damaging the constitutions of their children out of compliance with an irrational fashion. It is bad enough that they should themselves thoroughly conform to every folly which our Gallic neighbours please to initiate; but that they should clothe their children in any mountebank dress which *Le petit Courrier des Dames* indicates, regardless of its insufficiency and unfitness, is monstrous. Discomfort, more or less great, is inflicted; frequent disorders are entailed; growth is checked, or stamina undermined; premature death not uncommonly caused; and all because it is thought needful to make frocks of a size and material dictated by French caprice. . . . . We do not hesitate to say that, through enfeebled health, defective energies, and consequent non-success in life, thousands are annually

doomed to unhappiness by this unscrupulous regard for appearances, even when they are not, by early death, literally sacrificed to the Moloch of maternal vanity." Pp. 249—251. While this deleterious influence is not peculiar to those who, at a later period, pursue study or other confined occupations, it aggravates other debilitating influences which operate upon them.

2. The improvements in the mode of warming houses, which enable us to secure pervading and equable warmth, at reduced expense, have, almost without exception, involved a change in regard to ventilation, which, for students at least, more than neutralizes the advantage gained on the score of temperature. This is a very serious matter to those who lead an in-door life, as females, merchants, and mechanics. But it is still more serious for students, scholars, and others whose occupations are not only in-door and sedentary, but mental, tasking directly and exclusively the brain and nervous system. The modern methods of economizing and distributing heat, are effected almost exclusively by preventing any free exit or adequate change of the air of the room. Nearly every heat-saving apparatus is some form of, or approximation to, "close" or air-tight stoves, i. e., stoves which save heat by closing or reducing the draughts and flues that admit of that exit of the heated air of the apartment, whence arises the influx of fresh air from without, through the cracks and crevices inevitable in the best buildings, to fill the vacuum. Hence the air, by repeated breathing over, becomes rapidly vitiated—bereft of its oxygen and filled with carbonic acid gas, emptied of its vital properties and saturated with poison. The case is little better, sometimes worse, in apartments warmed with furnaces, and destitute of ventilating flues for the exit of vitiated air. As the currents of hot air from the furnace-chamber press into the room, they fill and crowd it, and prevent the ingress of fresh air through the fissures of the apartment from without. One leading cause of the oppressiveness of air heated by furnaces, is its excessive dryness, when no adequate provision is made to moisten it. Let any one, on a quiet winter's day, enter any public assembly met in a room warmed in either of the foregoing methods, after it has been gathered half an hour, and the odour of it

will evince the poisonous state of the air. Let him enter any small private apartment, warmed in the same manner, after it has been occupied a few hours, and the same thing will appear in a greater or less degree. There is a dead, stifling atmosphere, analogous to that perceived by one who comes from the fresh morning air into a dormitory that has been slept in and kept close over night. This foul state of the room, so perceptible to one entering it from the pure outer air, is usually unperceived by those who have been for some time in it, except in the dulness, languor, and prostration which steal upon them, they know not why. How often does this account for a drowsiness in church which the most vigorous and stirring discourses fail to overcome?

Let any school-room heated by steam, close stoves, or furnaces, without effective appliances for ventilation, be entered, after an hour's session, in a still day, and who can doubt that the "tainted air" thus disclosed, must tell with disastrous effect upon the minds and bodies of the children and youth who are jading their brains, and poisoning their lungs by attempts to study while they breathe these fetid gases? Who can doubt that the constitutions of our growing children often suffer serious injury from confinement and mental application in these laboratories of foul air? And who can doubt that it often tells disastrously on the after-life of the student, as he goes on to continue study in confined apartments? All this was avoided in the ruder system of open wood fires, and of anthracite coal grates, which prevailed before the last quarter of a century. The large and free draught up the chimney, which these fires secured, produced a constant change in the air of the room. Fresh air percolated imperceptibly through all seams and fissures, palpable and impalpable, to fill the void made by the suction up the chimney. And there is no doubt, that this or some equivalent arrangement, which will effect a change of air, without exposing the inmates of the room, while warm, to the danger of taking cold from open windows and doors, would be among the most valuable hygienic arrangements which the student could adopt. It would also contribute powerfully to brace and tone the mind for study. It may be deemed impracticable to warm public or other large rooms designed for assem-

blies in this way. The true method in such cases is to combine this, or some other plan for a safe and effective exit of the vitiated air of the room on one side of it, with the hot-air furnace, which will introduce an ample volume of warm air, on the other side. This warm air will thus flow across to the place of exit, and fill the room with genial currents which are both fresh from without, and warm. However, we do not wish now to extend our inquiries in this direction. We are looking after the causes that debilitate the health of students, young and old. We think we have found one of considerable importance in the close atmosphere they breathe, resulting from modern methods of warming, which economize heat at the expense of fresh air. Another source of foulness in the air of rooms, in the evening, is found in the increased vitiation of the air by the increased amount of artificial light now in use. This whole subject acquires still greater importance from being implicated with the next of which we shall speak.

3. We do not think the immense increase in the use of tobacco among students and young men, can honestly or intelligently be ignored in any presentation of the causes which damage their physique. We do not countenance any fanatic or censorious views on this or cognate subjects. We would be the last to judge those who are unfortunately addicted or enslaved to this, at least, undesirable habit. We do not presume to say that all use of the article, in severely regulated quantities, is pernicious to all men, of whatever constitution, age, occupation, or condition. But we do say that the moderate use of it constantly tends to degenerate, and in nine cases out of ten does degenerate, into the immoderate, often enormous, at all events, pernicious use of it: that in such cases, it acts first by stimulating, then by a debilitating reaction upon, and ultimate chronic enfeebling of the brain, the nervous system, and, at length, all the vital organs; that not only is the immediate stimulus followed by an immediate subsidence into languor, which in turn craves a renewal of the stimulus in order to its own removal, but that, sooner or later, and often very soon, this forced exaction upon the reserved vital resources reveals its effect in a debilitated constitution, with premature disease

and decay.* There is not one father in fifty, who, whatever may be his own practice, does not dread to see his own sons commencing this habit: scarcely a merchant or manufacturer, who, whatever he may do himself, would not greatly prefer to see his own employees, young and old, free from it; not an educator who does not see that many students are doing themselves serious, sometimes irreparable, injury by this indulgence, and who does not know that the rigid exclusion of tobacco from every literary and professional seminary in the land, would be an inestimable benefit to our rising statesmen, jurists, physicians, teachers, and ministers, and through them, to the church and the world. There is no doubt that the great increase in the use of this article does much to unhinge the nerves and enfeeble the health of this generation of students. We have intimated that this debilitating influence combines with and intensifies that last mentioned—impure and poisoned air. It does so, first, as the use of tobacco by students is largely in the way of smoking it in unventilated rooms. This dead empoisoned vapour remains to aggravate the virus in the air, generated by its repeated respiration, of which we have already spoken. Secondly, in whatever form taken, its irritating and exhausting influence is far greater upon those who lead a sedentary, in-door life, constantly tasking the mind and brain, than upon those whose pursuits enable them largely to counteract its influence by habitual activity in the open air. It ultimately, however, shows its mischievous character, with telling, even if slight, effect upon this class. We cannot doubt, that, if it were unknown, or were utterly and for ever renounced by our youth, students, and others, the health, vigour and longevity of all classes, especially those engaged in intellectual pursuits, would be greatly promoted. It is notoriously commenced, not from any love, but in utter loathing of it, which it requires earnest and persevering effort to surmount. It is usually taken up at that period when all the passions are "fast," springing to anticipate the character-

* A medical friend suggests that the worst effects of this stimulant are experienced, when the conditions of youth and sedentary life, associated with a studious occupation, are found in combination, as in young students.

istics and prerogatives of manhood, and urging to this and other worse than ridiculous follies, in order to display some impressive signals of their rapid approximation to the coveted goal. Thus, too often, a bondage most injurious and tyrannical is fastened on the best of men for life. Whether they would not consult health, comfort, usefulness, long life, and duty, by speedily and for ever bursting their fetters, is a question which each one must answer for himself.

4. The last cause of deteriorated health in modern students, which we shall now mention, is of a very different character, although, as related to the last two, they reciprocally aggravate each other. We refer to the increased requirements for mental application in the established curriculum of liberal education, and in subsequent professional or literary life. This pertains, in no small degree, to all the spheres of life which mainly work the mind. The competition of modern business is so intense, success is so dependent on the magnitude, the complexity, and the closest economy, in the minutest details of its operations, that the wear and strain upon the cerebral functions, often display melancholy signals of their depressing influence. Mr. Spencer states that he had not credited the common saying, that the young men in England, of the present day, were feebler than their fathers, till he made it a subject of rigid inquiry. He had referred it to the disposition which is, in all things, so prone to count the former days better than the present. It is a very common idea that men are not now as long-lived as formerly. The tombstones of almost any cemetery in England or America, will show that if we compare the last thirty with the previous hundred years, the reverse is true. Notwithstanding, Mr. Spencer assures us that, after rigid inquiry, he came to the conclusion that the prevalent idea of the greater slenderness of constitution in the young men of our day, as compared with the last generation, is not wholly without foundation. And he attributes it to the extreme mental tension to which the strenuous competition, now prevalent in business, urges all aspirants for the prizes of life. Our own observation confirms this view; which indeed must force itself upon all who know much of our great cities and manufacturing towns, or of the men who move in, and try to impress

into their own service, the impetuous currents of modern business life.

We apprehend that an analogous evil has been insinuating itself, almost unnoticed, into the course of liberal and professional study now established in the institutions of this country. The requirements of the college course have been steadily increasing without a proportionate advance in the requisitions for admission. In the early days of the older American colleges, the curriculum was mostly filled out with the study of the ancient languages, logic, ethics, some rhetoric, and the elements of divinity. The commencement bills of a century ago are largely made up of some of the tangled questions of casuistry, metaphysics, and theology.* The course in mathematics was slight, and in physical science, then comparatively undeveloped, merely nominal. As the immense departments of modern science have been opened, they have been of necessity, wedged into our college courses. Natural Philosophy, Rational Mechanics, Pure Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Mineralogy, Physical Geography, Botany, and Zoology make large demands on the time and intellect of the student. The first effect of this expansion of the department of Physical Science, was a proportionate decline in classical studies, logic, &c. During most of the earlier half of the present century, the whole course in logic, in most of our American colleges, was some half-dozen recitations in Hedge—what would now be barely respectable in a young misses' boarding-school. We have had personal knowledge of classes going through one of the very foremost of

* The following is from the commencement exercises in Princeton College, September, 1764, as given in Dr. Green's Historical Sketch of the Institution.

"Prima Disputatio syllogistice tractanda—
Thesis est,
Mentiri, ut vel Natio conservetur, haud fas est.
Qui hanc thesin probare ac defendere statuit ascendat. *Foster.*"
"Thesis proximè discutienda, modo pœne forensi,
Lux rationis sola, incitamenta ad virtutem satis efficacia, non praebet."
"The next thesis is,
Nullam veram virtutem habet qui omnes non habet."

A series of like theses and questions may be found in the scheme of one of the early commencements at Yale, lately published in Professor Fisher's Historical Discourse.

New England colleges, within the last thirty years, with scarcely a grammatical question put to them in classical recitations after Freshman year. Of course, this decline in the study of the "humanities," could not endure. They were bound to re-assert their place as an integral and fundamental part of liberal education. Accordingly, all these departments, including metaphysics and rhetoric, have been working up, not to their ancient relative and exclusive position, but to more than their ancient absolute position, i. e., as to the thoroughness with which they are taught and studied. All this makes a great demand upon the close application of the student, a demand that has grown much beyond the preliminary preparation as yet provided to meet it. The consequence is, that, under the prompting of the principle of emulation, (which is an indispensable motive power in college government and discipline) many tax their minds to an extent that makes serious inroads on their health. Especially is this so, when combined with the causes already specified, with inferior preparation for college, with habitual or frequent encroachments on the hours which nature requires for sleep, or with other irregularities.

Of course the extent to which this becomes an evil, depends much on the judgment and tact of teachers in the different departments. They may so adjust their instructions, as to quantity and quality, ease and difficulty, to the capacity of the student and the time at his command, as to make no hazardous demands upon him, while, at the same time, he is stimulated and encouraged to his utmost healthful activity. Or they may, as so many are naturally and unconsciously tempted to do, attempt an order of training so high as to overshoot, or so formidable as to discourage, baffle, and paralyze all but the fraction of pupils who have a special genius for the department, or are willing to sacrifice sleep, health, and everything for college honours. Others again, without overflying their class in the grade or manner of their teachings, overdo as to quantity, in the laudable ambition to give their departments the utmost significance and efficiency compatible with the time they are allowed to work them. Now, suppose all the teachers in an institution actuated by this honourable desire, it is easy to see that the total tendency must be to a constant and hazard-

ous overtasking of the pupils. Of course, there are those whose faults are in the opposite direction—whose exercises are nominal, either in themselves, or because of utter inability to stimulate the minds or command the exertions of the students. There can, however, be no doubt that the tendency in our foremost institutions has been towards overtaxing the most thorough and faithful students. The forcing, hot-house system, which a generation since ushered into being infant schools, has long since given way before the pressure of common sense and dire experience. All agree that the confinement and forcing of infants or very young children, in schools, is dangerous; that it does unmitigated evil; that, if it make an occasional prodigy of precocity, it is at the expense of full normal development, of ultimate strength of body and mind. A worm-eaten apple ripens sooner than a sound one. But it also decays sooner, and never attains its normal size and flavour. While this is conceded with regard to young children, have we not been unconsciously moving in the opposite direction with regard to students at a more advanced age, but still "in the gristle"—not developed or hardened into maturity? In other words, has not the range of studies and the amount of mental labour demanded, greatly increased without proportionate increase of preparation for them—without its having sufficiently attracted the attention of our Faculties of instruction, and leading them to re-adjust the different parts and proportions of their course to the health and capacity of the student on the one hand, and the requirements of a rounded liberal education on the other?*

We wish not to be misunderstood. On the one hand, we think it evident enough from what has been said, that a given collegiate curriculum is not necessarily most perfect, because it is the most extended, lofty, and varied. The question is, how far it is even with the capacities and attainments of the student, and fitted to enlarge and invigorate them, without sooner or later debilitating both body and mind. To enervate

* We have already heard the purpose expressed, on the part of some of the most distinguished educators in our American colleges, to resist all further changes in their courses of study which involve any increased demand upon the student.

the constitution in order to furnish and adorn the mind, is like undermining a house for the purpose of replenishing and decorating it.

On the other hand, we do not think that any of the studies usual in our best American colleges can well be dispensed with. Some knowledge of, and exercise in them, belongs to all symmetrical and rounded culture. But we think the evil in question may be arrested in two ways: 1. By ensuring full preparation for admission to college. 2. By a rigid determination on the part of the heads of the several departments, to proportion their teachings, as to quantity and quality, to the average powers and attainments of their pupils, and the time at their command. This will produce far higher results, every way, than to "cram" the mind with matter which it can neither digest nor assimilate. It is no part of the professor's duty to instruct his pupils in all knowledge, or to make them experts and specialists in his own particular department, or to essay to make that department the specialty of the institution. He shows himself a crude educator who tries to press his own department to a disproportionate prominence in the course, while he again shows himself unfaithful or incompetent, who does not urge it to its due limits, and, within those limits, work it vigorously and effectively. The result sought in a liberal education is not so much to store the mind with large and exhaustive information, or make it master of any single department, as to develope, and train, and refine it. Thus it will be prepared for the subsequent energetic prosecution of any special line of study. This general training is best imparted, not by pre-eminent progress in any one department, but by thorough elementary exercise, and general, or, at least, rudimentary knowledge, in all. *Multum non multa* should be the motto in each department. It does not exalt our estimate of any college to be told that it makes great geologists, or chemists, or astronomers, or logicians, or linguists, or mathematicians, while all other departments except some single specialty sink into relative inferiority. Nor, again, should we think them likely to make any the better astronomers or metaphysicians if they put the *Système du Monde* or the *Critic of Pure Reason* on their catalogue of studies. We have heard of Hamil-

ton's Lectures on Metaphysics, and his discussions on the Unconditioned, in female boarding-schools. But it did not raise our opinion of the culture given at such schools, even in metaphysics, or of the competency of their teachers.

We have thus indicated the direction in which our educators are called to look, each one for himself, and see whether he is unduly straining the powers of his pupils, or is required to relax those demands by a due regard to their health, bodily and mental. These are not antagonistic. Aside from the evils of a shattered body and diminished physical energy, there can be no doubt that he who leaves college with sound and elastic health, but with somewhat less ground drudgingly and slavishly gone over, will soon outrun in intellect, study, and scholarship, one who has gone over more minutiæ or a broader range with the exactitude of a "first honour" man, and broken down, or prepared for a speedy break-down, in the effort. Here is one solution of the fact, that, along with many noble exceptions, there yet remain so many who head college classes, and are never heard of afterwards; but, in the race of life, are distanced by those whom they distanced in the academic contest. Not a few exhausted or enfeebled themselves in the early struggle, and spent their productive vitality in perfecting this one "bright consummate flower." As to substantial scholarship, and whatever discipline and development are requisite to success, whatever may be true of others, he cannot be very greatly deficient who stands among the foremost quarter or third of a large class—as large as the average among our better American colleges. With a little less of minute information in some departments, he may have more of buoyant health and effective mental vigour; in a word, more stamina for future progress and eminence in whatever field of study he may make his specialty. Says Spencer:

"The abnormally rapid advance of any part, in respect of structure, involves premature arrest of its growth; and this happens with the organ of the mind as certainly as with any other organ. The brain, which during early years is relatively large in mass but imperfect in structure, will, if required to perform its functions with undue activity, undergo a structural

advance greater than is appropriate to the age; but the ultimate effect will be a falling short of the size and power that would else have been attained. And this is a part cause—probably the chief cause—why precocious children, and youths who up to a certain time were carrying all before them, so often stop short, and disappoint the high hopes of their parents. . . . . And if, as all who candidly investigate the matter must admit, physical degeneracy is a consequence of excessive study, how grave is the condemnation to be passed upon this cramming system above exemplified. It is a terrible mistake, from whatever point of view regarded. It is a mistake in so far as the mere acquirement of knowledge is concerned; for it is notorious that the mind, like the body, cannot assimilate beyond a certain rate; and if you ply it with facts faster than it can assimilate them, they are very soon rejected again: they do not become permanently built into the intellectual fabric; but fall out of recollection after the passing of the examination for which they were got up. It is a mistake, too, because it tends to make study distasteful. Either through the painful associations produced by ceaseless mental toil, or through the abnormal state of brain it leaves behind, it often generates an aversion to books; and, instead of that subsequent self-culture induced by a rational education, there comes a continual retrogression. It is a mistake, also, inasmuch as it assumes that the acquisition of knowledge is everything; and forgets that a much more important matter is the organization of knowledge, for which time and spontaneous thinking are requisite. Just as Humboldt remarks, respecting the progress of intelligence in general, that 'the interpretation of nature is obscured when the description languishes under too great an accumulation of insulated facts;' so it may be remarked, respecting the progress of individual intelligence, that the mind is overburdened and hampered by an excess of ill-digested information. It is not the knowledge stored up as intellectual fat which is of value; but that which is turned into intellectual muscle. But the mistake is still deeper. Even were the system good as a system of intellectual training, which it is not, it would still be bad,

because as we have shown, it is fatal to that vigour of *physique* which is needful to make intellectual training available in the struggle of life. Those who, in eagerness to cultivate their pupils' minds, are reckless of their bodies, do not remember that success in the world depends much more upon energy than upon information; and that a policy which in cramming with information undermines energy, is self-defeating. The strong will and untiring activity which result from abundant animal vigour, go far to compensate even for great defects of education; and when joined with that quite adequate education which may be obtained without sacrificing health, they ensure an easy victory over competitors enfeebled by excessive study: prodigies of learning though they may be. A comparatively small and ill-made engine, worked at high pressure, will do more than a larger and well-finished one worked at low pressure. What folly is it then, while finishing the engine, so to damage the boiler that it will not generate steam! Once more, the system is a mistake, as involving a false estimate of welfare in life. Even supposing it were a means to worldly success, instead of a means to worldly failure, yet, in the entailed ill-health, it would inflict a more than equivalent curse. What boots it to have attained wealth, if the wealth is accompanied by ceaseless ailments? What is the worth of distinction, if it has brought hypochondria with it? Surely none needs telling that a good digestion, a bounding pulse, and high spirits, are elements of happiness which no external advantages can outbalance. Chronic bodily disorder casts a gloom over the brightest prospects; while the vivacity of strong health gilds even misfortune. We contend, then, that this over-education is vicious in every way—vicious, as giving knowledge that will soon be forgotten; vicious as producing a disgust for knowledge; vicious, as neglecting that organization of knowledge which is more important than its acquisition; vicious, as weakening or destroying that energy, without which a trained intellect is useless; vicious, as entailing that ill-health for which even success would not compensate, and which makes failure doubly bitter." Pp. 272—275, 276, 277.

It is of course quite possible for those who become aroused

to this last danger to which we have called attention, to spring to an ultraism in the opposite direction, and thus furnish another unfortunate illustration of the tendency of men to rebound from extreme to extreme. As we have said, we do not deem it necessary or desirable to make any material change or abridgment of the curriculum established in our American colleges; but only to ensure a more thorough and advanced preparation for entrance, while each professor and teacher sturdily resists the temptation, on any pretext whatever, to overload his class with teachings, which, as to quality, are beyond their average power to appreciate and digest, and with requirements which, as to quantity, are beyond their power to perform well, without encroaching on the hours needed for reasonable relaxation and sleep.

When we consider how, through the organs of sense, the brain, and the nerves, the whole healthy working and manifestation of the mind is dependent on the state of the body; how even the mightiest intellect, with the largest culture and acquirements, may be practically paralyzed by a shattered or distempered body; how much, force of will, practical energy, genial and normal feeling, moral and spiritual health, are conditioned on corporeal soundness; in view of these and like considerations, it is hard to exaggerate the importance of the *Mens sana in corpore sano.*

Art. II.—*The Mode of Baptism.*

The Lord Jesus Christ has appointed but two sacraments in his church, baptism and the supper. This is the faith of Protestants. Agreeing in this, they differ however on various points connected with these ordinances. As to baptism, a difference exists in regard to the mode, the subject, and the practical effect of this institution. We propose, at present, to notice only the first of these points of difference—the mode of baptism.

This subject has not often been discussed in this journal. For years in succession, scarcely a reference has been made to it, except in the transient notice of such publications as have issued from other sources. The ministers of our church do not often refer to it, unless goaded by the constant drummery of those whose practice differs from our own. The explanation of this silence is, not that we are unsettled in our faith, nor that we think the Scriptures obscure, but that we regard the *form* of administering baptism as comparatively unimportant. We cannot believe that the validity of the ordinance depends on the quantity of water employed, or the mode of its application. The validity of the other sacrament, the supper, does not depend on the form of its administration. This, we believe, is universally admitted. It may be received standing, sitting, kneeling, or reclining; in connection with an ordinary repast or without; in the sick chamber or in the church, or the grove, with a larger or a smaller portion of bread and wine. Certainly no definite mode in regard to this ordinance has been enjoined. And the fact is, we believe, that not a Christian denomination on earth even pretends to celebrate it precisely as it was instituted by our Lord. Why then should the form be of so much importance in regard to baptism? No satisfactory answer to this question can be given. As in the supper, the form is comparatively unimportant. This also is the faith of the mass of Protestants. Hence the infrequency of allusion to it. They have other themes of far greater magnitude on which to dwell.

We have no special reason for discussing this subject at present. We are not chafed into it by anything that has appeared on the other side; nor are we vain enough to suppose that any new light will be poured on a subject so old, and so often and ably discussed on both sides. Still there are general reasons which show the propriety of giving it at least an occasional notice. In the first place, it is a Christian ordinance, pertaining to the right ordering of the church, and to the comfort, duties, and privileges of her members. As such, it ought to be understood, as far as practicable, in all its bearings. In the next place, there are in almost every congregation some whose views are unsettled, and whose minds are not fully at ease on this matter. This is especially true where there is collision with those who attach so much importance to the mode as to make it essential, and to be for ever harping upon it. To relieve and guard our own people, it must be discussed occasionally. In the next place, our very silence is sometimes misconstrued into an acknowledgment that our practice is indefensible from Scripture. And lastly, by a large evangelical denomination, whom we rejoice to acknowledge as brethren in Christ, it is made a term of communion and a test of ecclesiastical organization. For reasons such as these it ought to be discussed perhaps more frequently than it is, in our journals and pulpits—always, however, in a mild, candid, and Christian spirit. This we shall endeavour to do on the present occasion. Truth suffers nothing by such treatment.

As intimated above, new light on such an old subject is scarcely to be expected at this day. And yet some of the old materials may perhaps be arranged in a different and clearer aspect. This is all we profess to attempt. So far as our reading has gone, we have not seen the line of argument now to be presented, pursued by any author, just as it lies in the mind of the writer. The sum of what we have to say will be arranged under several distinct propositions.

I. The mode of baptism is not to be determined from the heathen or classical usage of the words employed in regard to the ordinance. Appeal is sometimes taken to this usage as though it were final in the matter. *Bapto*, *baptizo*, *baptismos*, &c., it is alleged, always and necessarily embrace and express

the idea of immersion, when found in profane Greek, and therefore must include the same idea when used by the sacred writers. Our reply is two-fold. (*a*) In the first place we deny the premise *in toto*. These words do not always convey any such idea. They are often used in the sense of pouring upon, washing, cleansing, dyeing, staining, &c., without regard to any particular mode of application. They may express a partial dipping, or dipping under, or imbibing, or pouring upon. All this may be seen by a reference to any respectable Lexicon of the Greek language. It is admitted, in fact, by our Baptist brethren themselves, that all authority is against them. Carson says, "My position is, that it (*baptizo*) always signifies to dip; never expressing anything but mode. Now, as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion, it will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons."* With a desperate courage, worthy of a better cause, he sets himself against "all the commentators and lexicographers." With what success the reader may well imagine. His admission, however, shows that according to the best standard authorities these words have not the exclusive and uniform meaning he would force upon them. Greek writers have used them in various senses. How then are we to decide from their varying usage, in what sense the Holy Ghost uses them in describing or instituting an ordinance of the church? Certainly not from their testimony. (*b*) In the next place, even if their usage were uniform, and Dr. Carson had accomplished the impossible task of showing that they always express the idea of immersion, still it would not follow of necessity that the sacred writers employ them in the same exclusive sense. The word for the other sacrament, (the supper,) is not used in the fixed and uniform sense it bears among profane writers. With them it denotes a full meal—the principal repast of the day. It never indicates simply taking a crumb of bread and a sip of wine. Yet this was evidently all that our Saviour did when he instituted this feast—all that he enjoined, when he said, "This do in remembrance of me." And if, in regard to one sacrament, the original and uniform sense of

* Carson on Baptism, p. 79.

the term employed to denote it, is not preserved, why may not the same be true in regard to the other? A spoonful of water sprinkled or poured on the subject, is as near an immersion, as a crumb of bread or a sip of wine is to an oriental supper. If, therefore, it were even certain that in profane Greek these words always mean or favour immersion, still it would not follow that this must be their force in the New Testament. Many words have an entirely different meaning in the latter from that which they have in the former; *e. g. logos*, as applied to the Second Person of the Trinity. "In the beginning was THE WORD." What profane writer ever employed the term in this sense? Shall we deny the inspired application of it here, on that account? Certainly not. But if in one instance we may depart from all usage, why may we not, for sufficient reason, in another? Nothing absolutely final could be established, therefore, by Dr. Carson's argument, even if he had succeeded in making it good. Heathen usage is not the law of interpretation. It may assist and serve to confirm sometimes, but can never control. To the Bible alone we make our appeal. This is the word of authority among Protestants.

II. Our next position is, that as an act, baptism was not a new thing introduced by our Lord, or the apostles, nor even by John the Baptist; but was a common and familiar ceremony or practice among the Jews. This is different probably from the prevailing impression among private Christians, especially those who insist that immersion is the only mode. With them the idea seems very generally to prevail, that nothing of the kind was known or practised among the Jews; that John the Baptist, when he came preaching in the wilderness, introduced by Divine direction an entirely new ceremony; that our Lord and his apostles gave it a place in the Christian church, when it was about to be organized; and that the very form of this ceremony was intentionally such as to make it a trial to believers—a sort of test of their willingness to do or submit to anything for Christ's sake. Hence the ostentatious profession of not being ashamed to follow Christ into the water, on the one hand, and on the other, the common insinuation, that pride, or an unwillingness to practise self-denial, lies at the foundation of the opposite mode. In opposition to all these assumptions, we

maintain, and shall now endeavour to show, that the practice of baptizing was in constant use among the Jews, long before the coming of our Lord—not indeed in the name of the Trinity, but still as an act of religious purification; and that as an *act*, therefore, there was nothing in the least humiliating about it, or making it peculiarly a test of discipleship. Whatever opprobrium may have ever attached to it, was not the act, method, or manner of baptism, but to the profession accompanying it, of faith in the Nazarene.

This is an important step in the argument we propose to offer. Our first proposition was intended simply to clear away the rubbish—to get clear of the changes, continually rung in our ears, about the original and necessary meaning of the terms. Nothing can be made of them; first, for the unanswerable reason, that they have no fixed and uniform sense; (there is scarcely a word in any language under the sun that has;) and then, if they had, it would not necessarily prove that such is their force in the New Testament. But now to the proof of our second proposition; *i. e.*, baptizing was a common practice among the Jews, long before the birth of Christ. Let the intelligent reader turn to the gospel of Mark vii. 4: "And when they come from the market, except they baptize, they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the baptizing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables." Turn also to Luke xi. 38: "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he (Christ) had not first baptized before dinner." Turn also to Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25: "He that *baptizeth* himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washing?" It will be observed, of course, that in the English translation the words *wash*, *washing*, &c., are used, but in the Greek, *baptize*, *baptizing*, are the terms employed. And that they refer to common standing usages among this people, is unquestionable from the face of the record itself: "When they come from market, except they baptize, they eat not—they have received to hold, the baptizing of cups, vessels," &c. The Pharisee marvelled that Christ omitted this custom. "He that baptizeth after touching a *dead body*," &c., as though the ceremony were common. How they baptized themselves and these other articles, we are

not inquiring just here. The point now is, that they baptized; that baptism, as an act, was common among them; that whatever the word *baptize* or *baptism* necessarily implies or expresses, they did to themselves and various other things, and had been accustomed to do long before the Saviour came. The words used are precisely the same that are used of John's baptism, and of that of Pentecost—the common ones, in short, applied to this ordinance throughout the New Testament. That they baptized, therefore, is just as clear as it is that John did, or any of the apostles. It is expressly and repeatedly stated; in addition to which, one ground of complaint against our Saviour was, that he neglected or disregarded this custom on some occasions—a strange complaint, certainly, if there were no such standing usage.

Nor was this baptismal ceremony a mere human invention. In his Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 10,) the apostle Paul makes mention of "divers baptisms imposed on them until the time of reformation." "*Imposed* on them"—when and where? Evidently in the law of Moses, which prescribed minutely "the gifts and sacrifices which could not make him that did the service perfect," with which also these baptisms were associated. The people, in their superstitious zeal, may have added somewhat to the number or circumstances of their baptisms, as they did to those of their "gifts and sacrifices;" but at the same time, the one as well as the other—the baptisms, as well as the gifts and sacrifices, had their origin in a divine command—were "imposed until the time of reformation." When our Lord appeared, he found them observing these divers baptisms—baptizing themselves, their cups, tables, &c., as an every-day occurrence. This view is confirmed by the common and familiar way in which the whole subject is spoken of in the New Testament. When John came baptizing in the wilderness, no explanations are given, no signs of surprise or ignorance are manifested. He came preaching "the baptism of repentance." There were others, as of cups, tables, persons coming from market, &c.; but his was of repentance. The only thing new about it was the doctrine he proclaimed, not the ceremony he taught. This they had long known. This they expected the Messiah and every true prophet to administer.

Hence when John told them that he was not the Christ, neither Elias, nor that prophet, their immediate inquiry was, "Why baptizest thou then?"—implying clearly both that the prophets were accustomed to baptize, and that they expected the Messiah to do the same, when he came.

In accordance, too, with this familiar use and knowledge of the ceremony, the words of our Lord, when he applied for baptism, are perfectly plain: "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." It was to such a degree known and common, that he could not be considered as properly inducted into his priestly office without it. Olshausen, in commenting on the expression just quoted, says: "The term righteousness denotes here, *what the law demands.* The words contain, therefore, the general principle on which the Saviour proceeded, and which John, too, had to follow on this occasion, viz., to observe all legal ordinances as Divine institutions. . . . . The baptism of Jesus stands, therefore, on a level with his undergoing circumcision and the purification;" *i. e.*, it was demanded by the law, and must, of course, have been known among the people. Baptism, therefore, could not have been a new thing among the Jews. It was a familiar, daily occurrence—not indeed, we reiterate, Christian baptism in the name of the Trinity, but baptism as an act applied both to persons and things inanimate. This certainly will not be denied by any candid and intelligent reader of the Bible.

It was, too, a religious ceremony, not a mere custom of society. This is apparent (*a*) from the mention of these divers baptisms as being "imposed" in connection with their "gifts and sacrifices, which could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience." The former were as truly "imposed" as the latter, and as truly religious in their nature. Both alike were religious ordinances and acts of worship. The same thing is evident (*b*) from the fact that it was to put away uncleanness contracted in the market or other places of exposure, that these baptisms were practised. It was a religious object which they proposed to accomplish by them, just as much as by the sacrifices they offered. In this light baptism had long been known and practised, and, of course, as a common religious custom, there was nothing in the

nature of the act itself to test the faith of those who applied for it. They probably had all been baptized over and over, or had seen it done repeatedly, and could feel no particular repugnance to the thing itself. However much our Baptist brethren may attempt to make now, of the martyr spirit that is required to follow Christ into the water, there was nothing of a trial in this respect at the first. Whatever the form or mode of baptizing may have been, it was a common usage, and as such, could occasion no anxiety to those about to enlist in the cause of Christ. The trial was not in the form or manner of the act, but in the public espousal of a hated cause and a despised name.

III. Our next position is, that as known and practised among the Jews, baptism was not administered by immersion, but by applying the water or other element (for they did not always use water alone in their baptisms,) to the person or thing, by pouring or sprinkling. We might, indeed, call upon our Baptist brethren to show that these baptisms were always by immersion. This, according to their exclusive principles, they are bound to show. But we will not wait for them to perform this impossible task. Contrary to the ordinary rules of logic, we are willing to assume the labour of proving a negative. These baptisms could not have been immersions. This is another important step in our argument, and if it can be fairly established, will prepare the way for what is to follow. Let us look at the proof.

(*a*) Although these "divers baptisms" were "imposed" on the people as much as other parts of the Jewish ritual, (gifts and sacrifices, for example,) yet nowhere in the law of Moses is immersion enjoined. Not an instance can be produced in which the Jew, as a regular religious ceremony, (or, so far as we remember, on any occasion whatever,) was required to immerse himself, or be immersed in water. This is certainly very strange, to say the least, on the supposition that such a thing was "imposed," and was daily performed. Where is the evidence? In the absence of such command, what right has any one to conclude that it was done at all, much less that it was always done to themselves and their utensils? Here, then, at the outset, is a strong presumption that their baptisms,

"imposed until the time of reformation," were not by immersion. Such a form is nowhere enjoined.

(*b*) This presumption is strengthened by the fact, that while immersion is nowhere enjoined, another method of performing these purifications is expressly revealed. A reference to the Levitical law will show at once what that method was: "And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them shave," &c. "A clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the persons that were there. The clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third and on the seventh day." Num. viii. 7; xix. 18, 19. Sprinkling, then, was the mode clearly enjoined under the old economy. To suppose, therefore, that they baptized or purified themselves by immersion, is to suppose that they acted both without authority, and against the plainest positive directions for sprinkling. Is it probable, or even credible, that they would have made this substitution of one form for another, when yet they proudly boasted of their punctilious regard for every jot and tittle of the law? Such a course is extremely improbable. Their baptisms were "imposed" by the law. These baptisms were mere purifications, as is evident from the whole record. Purification was not by immersion, but by sprinkling. Could they then have departed universally from the prescribed method?

(*c*) But farther: not only is sprinkling enjoined, and immersion never even alluded to, but at least one hundred and fifty years before the coming of our Lord, this method of purification by sprinkling is denoted in the Jewish writings by the word *baptize*. We bespeak attention to this point. This very word, which we are told so often and so confidently means immerse, and nothing but immerse, is applied to these Jewish sprinklings. Here is the evidence. In the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25, it is said: "He that baptizeth himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washing?" Now the manner in which this baptizing after touching a dead body was performed, is perfectly clear from a reference to the law of Moses. "Whoso toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord, and that soul

shall be cut off from Israel: because the water of purification was not *sprinkled* upon him, he shall be unclean." Because he was not *baptized* for the dead, by the sprinkling of the water of purification, he shall be unclean. The ninth and twentieth verses of this chapter reveal the same method. Josephus also describes it: "When any persons were defiled by a dead body, . . . they sprinkled with the water of separation, both on the third day and on the seventh, and after that they were clean." Sprinkling, then, was their method of purifying themselves on such occasions. Yet this ceremony is described by the Greek word *baptize*, one or two hundred years before the Christian era. Now, when in the days of our Saviour, or of John the Baptist, we find them observing this same ceremony, and others like it, and denoting them by the word *baptize*, which had been used for sprinkling for hundreds of years, can it be believed that their baptisms were performed in a different manner? We think not. They had read and heard of sprinkling for the dead as a baptizing for the dead, long before our Saviour's day; and now, when mention is made of divers baptisms, it is a mere assumption to say that they were otherwise performed, especially when that other alleged form is never enjoined or even hinted at, while sprinkling is everywhere taught under the old economy.*

* And here, may we venture without presumption to suggest an interpretation of that difficult passage, 1 Cor. xv. 28—"Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead?"—a passage of which Dr. Clarke says, "This is certainly the most difficult verse in the New Testament." It has commonly been assumed that they who baptized for the dead were Christians. On this assumption the difficulties are endless. Where did such a custom originate? Was it by Divine command, or was it from superstition? If the former, where is the command? If the latter, why does the Apostle fail to condemn it? In what sense were Christians baptized for the dead? Is the word baptize to be taken literally, or as equivalent to distress, perplex, afflict? Does *for* mean *over*, or *in the place of*, or *on account of?* Does *dead* mean spiritually or literally dead? Does it mean *the dead* in general, or *dead Christians*, or dead *relatives?* These are only some of the difficulties that beset this theory. In solving them, everything has to be forced most violently, to make out even a tolerable interpretation, and after all, the passage remains about as dark as before. Now, may it not be that the persons spoken of were Jews, and the usage referred to that of baptizing or purifying themselves after touching a dead body? On this theory most of the difficulties attending the passage vanish in an instant. We see at once in what sense the phrase "baptize for

(*d*) Another evidence that these baptisms were not by immersion, is found in the interchangeable use of the words "wash" and "baptize" as equivalent to each other. "The Pharisees and all the Jews, except they *wash* their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they baptize, they eat not." Mark vii. 3, 4. See also Matt. xv. 1, compared with Luke xi. 38: "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they *wash* not their hands when they eat bread." "The Pharisee marvelled that he had not first *baptized* before dinner." "He that *baptizeth* himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his *washing?*" The words *wash* and *baptize* are evidently used as descriptive of the same thing. But was their washing by immersion? Did they immerse themselves for the dead? Did they practise divers immersions "imposed" on them by the law? Where is the proof? Olshausen says of the washings referred to in the New Testament, "The hands seem to have been used alter-

the dead" is to be taken. The form of expression may be somewhat unusual; but is it not easier and simpler to supply what is required on this theory than any other? Does not the contrast between "*they* who baptize for the dead," in this verse, and "*we* who stand in jeopardy," of the next, imply that the former were not Christians? Who could *they* be but the Jews, among whom the custom existed?

As to the relevancy of the passage thus explained to the Apostle's argument, it may be observed, (1) that the logical connection is obscure on any interpretation; so that if we cannot make a fair show, we are only pressed by a common difficulty. But (2) we think there is light in the darkness. The Apostle is proving the doctrine of the resurrection. Verses 29, 30, contain each an argument of the same nature, *i. e.*, that the present course of action in the parties referred to respectively, implies a future state, and, of course, a resurrection. That of verse 30, as unfolded in what follows, is simply this: If there is no resurrection of the dead, why stand we in jeopardy every hour? Why do we incur so many dangers? Why not say at once, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die?" We would, if this world were our only place of existence. But we have faith in another state. Our endurance proves it. And precisely so of the preceding verse. The conduct of the Jews as well as our own, implies that they believe in a future state, and expect a resurrection. If not, why are they baptized for the dead? That is, why do they seek to purify themselves from uncleanness, if there is no hereafter—no resurrection? Why do they concern themselves about guilt, if their being ends with death? The connection is at least as clear, we think, on this theory, as any other, and the other difficulties fewer and smaller by far.

nately, the one in washing the other." That is, one was dipped in the water, to take out what was applied to the other. Does this look like immersion? And yet these very washings are called baptizings. The words being interchangeably used must therefore convey the same idea, *i. e.*, that of applying water to the object to be cleansed.

(*e*) Again: baptism was a familiar, almost daily, custom among the Jews. Not only did they "baptize before dinner," "baptize their hands before eating," but they baptized themselves for other uncleanness, as when defiled by the touch of a dead body, and they baptized their tables or couches when they were contaminated. Now, if this thing were done by immersion, of course it would be necessary for every family to provide a place for the purpose. A baptistery would be almost as essential as a house. And yet in all Jewish and Bible history there is no evidence that such a place was ever provided by a single family, much less by all, rich and poor, permanent and transient. On the other hand, in the absence of all provision for immersion, there is evidently provision for performing it in a different mode. The water pots of stone referred to at the marriage of Cana in Galilee, which were arranged "after the manner of the purifying of the Jews," were intended to facilitate this operation. These were small vessels, containing fifteen or twenty gallons of water each, too large for merely dipping the hands in them, not large enough to immerse the person or other massive articles, but suited perfectly to the process of taking out and sprinkling or pouring on the subject. This was, no doubt, the way their baptisms were administered.

(*f*) A fifth evidence that these baptisms were not by immersion, is the fact that some of the things baptized were exceedingly unlikely to have been immersed. Take for example their tables, or, according to the marginal rendering, their beds. It is not certainly known, indeed, what these tables or couches were, but they must have been of such size and nature as to render their immersion improbable and very difficult. They were probably large enough to accommodate two or more individuals in a reclining posture, and attached permanently to the walls of their houses. Such couches were certainly in common

use among the Jews, and were just as likely to need baptismal purification as any others. To immerse them, however, was out of the question. To cleanse them by pouring or sprinkling, was an easy operation, and was doubtless done. They were baptized as certainly as persons, and by the strength of the probability that they could not have been immersed, do we conclude that the Jews also baptized themselves without going under the water.

(*g*) Only one additional testimony shall be adduced under this proposition. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 10,) mention is made of "divers baptisms and carnal ordinances imposed" on the people. It has been already observed that the law of Moses nowhere enjoins immersion, and consequently these "imposed" baptisms could not have been after that mode. But we are not left to inference or conjecture as to these baptisms. From the immediate context it is evident that they were baptisms by the "blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean." The apostle is contrasting the tabernacle service with the Christian economy. In the former were regulations about meats, drinks, and divers baptisms and carnal ordinances. The blood of various animals or the ashes of the heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh. In the latter, it is the blood of Christ which is efficacious. In the former, "Moses took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people. . . . Moreover, he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry." These were unquestionably the "divers baptisms" referred to in the tenth verse of this chapter. Very little is found here, certainly, to encourage the idea that they were immersions.

Let the reader now glance at a summary of the evidence advanced under this proposition. We aver that the Jews in their frequent baptisms did not immerse, but sprinkled or poured the element on the person or object. The evidence is, (*a*) That while these baptisms were imposed by the law of Moses, yet nowhere in that law is immersion enjoined. (*b*) While immersion is not enjoined, or even hinted at, another mode is definitely prescribed. (*c*) This prescribed mode,

sprinkling, is denoted as baptizing, at least one or two centuries before the Christian era. (*d*) Washing and baptizing are interchangeable terms. In the former immersion was not practised, nor was it in the latter. (*e*) No provision was made in their domestic arrangements for immersion, while there was provision suited to pouring or sprinkling. (*f*) Some of the things baptized could not have been conveniently immersed, but might easily have been sprinkled. (*g*) Such mention is made of sprinkling in connection with these divers baptisms, as to show that they must have been administered after that mode. We submit whether our third proposition is not established. The considerations adduced all tend to the same conclusion, and, like links in a chain, form an unbroken and conclusive argument; while, on the other hand, we should be gratified to see what sort of an argument can be constructed to show that these Jewish baptisms were all immersions.

IV. Our next proposition is, that Christian baptism was instituted after the same mode with that of the Jews—not by immersion, but by pouring or sprinkling. In confirmation of this we begin with one or two remote considerations.

(*a*) The religious use of water by sprinkling, under the Old Testament dispensation, would naturally lead us to expect that if it be used at all under the New, it will be applied in the same general mode. Why should it be changed? If sprinkling were sufficient under the one, why is it not under the other? especially since the end for which it is used is precisely the same in both dispensations. Under each it is an emblem of purification and of consecration. Why then should the form of using it be different? Is there any more significancy or efficiency in an ocean than in a small quantity? Certainly not. If, therefore, the mode of using it has been changed, both the fact and the reason of it should be shown. Neither of them can be exhibited.

(*b*) Again: not only is there a reasonable presumption of the sort just indicated, but the prophetic glimpses of Christ's kingdom tend to strengthen this expectation. "So shall he sprinkle many nations." "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness; and from all your idols will I cleanse you." These are figurative

expressions it is true, but still they are significant. They imply the continued religious use of water, in the same method as before. Not a word about immersing. Not a hint even, that any change would be made in this respect. In the absence of any such intimation, we contend that the implied use of it in the same manner is an argument in our favour.

(*c*) Add to this another consideration, and the presumption becomes still stronger. When the Saviour came, and was about to perpetuate the emblematic use of water in his kingdom, he found the Jews employing the term "baptize" to denote their method of purification, which was by pouring or sprinkling. He employs the same term to denote his own ordinance, without any indication that the sense was changed. Would this have been done if he had intended to introduce a new mode of baptism? We think not. The supposition is utterly untenable. By the use of the same term he unquestionably meant to denote the same act or action which they had designated by it.

(*d*) We come now to the more direct proof of our proposition. The way in which the baptism of the Holy Ghost is mentioned is utterly opposed to the idea of immersion as the mode, and in favour of pouring or sprinkling. Let the reader observe the language employed on the subject: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts i. 5. In the next chapter, the fulfilment of this promise is recorded. They were all together in one place, when the Spirit came upon them in mighty power; and the apostle says, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Here unquestionably was a baptism by pouring out—a baptism, too, in the highest sense. The method of the Spirit's operation, it is true, is a profound secret to us; but since the Holy Ghost has himself represented it as a pouring out, a descending upon, and has called it a baptism, there certainly is a propriety in conceiving of it as represented, rather than after any notions of our own. It was by the outpouring of the Spirit that these thousands were baptized; and when, in immediate connection therewith, their baptism by water is mentioned, we cannot believe that they were to be plunged into the element, instead of having it applied to them. The highest baptism,

that of the Spirit—that of which the other is only typical—is by pouring out. Shall the type be after a totally different mode?

(*e*) The Scriptures invariably represent the element as being applied to the subject, not the subject to the element: "I indeed baptize you with water, ... he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." "I am come baptizing with with water, ... the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." "John truly baptized with water, ... but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" In all these cases, the element is applied to the subject, not the subject to the element. This is the uniform representation of Scripture. It bears very hard, we think, against the idea of immersion.

(*f*) There is significance in the fact, that wherever persons were converted, in the times of the apostles, there they were baptized. Whether in the city or in the wilderness, whether in the private chamber or in the public highway, whether in the prison or by the river-side, whether in winter or summer, there was no delay, no preparation of changes of raiment, no going out to a convenient place for immersion. Whenever and wherever any believed, there they always had the conveniences for their baptism. That this could have been the case, if immersion were the mode, it is very hard to believe. It may be supposed, perhaps, but the supposition is very improbable.

(*g*) The various instances of baptism recorded in the Scriptures, agree far better with the idea of pouring or sprinkling as the mode, than of immersion. On the one hand, there are three things (and only three) connected with these baptisms which are claimed as favouring immersion. These are, (1.) the alleged meaning of the word *baptize*, *i. e.*, that it always and of necessity expresses the idea of submerging; (2.) the use of the words *into* and *out of;* and (3.) the expression applied to John, "He was baptizing in Enon, because there was *much* water there." The force of these considerations, however, is easily set aside. As to the first, we deny that the word *baptize* means immerse or submerge. Nebuchadnezzar was "baptized" with the dew of heaven; the people were baptized unto Moses

in the cloud and in the sea. The Holy Ghost *fell* on the people, fulfilling the promise, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit." The people were baptized for the dead, (*i. e.* after touching a dead body,) and on coming from the market. There was no immersion in any of these baptisms. We deny, therefore, the alleged meaning of the word *baptize*.

As to the words "into" and "out of," the Greek is more commonly rendered "to" and "from," and might with equal propriety have been so translated in these instances. "The disciple did outrun Peter, and came first *to* the sepulchre." "When he shall return *from* the wedding." Here the same words are translated *to* and *from*. This is their common rendering. We submit, therefore, that nothing can be proved by them, as to the mode of baptism. They may mean simply *to* and *from* the water. And even if it were certain that they are to be translated *into* and *out of*, immersion would not necessarily follow. Standing in the edge of a stream or pool, sprinkling still, or pouring, is quite as natural and quite as easily inferred as the opposite. And again, as to the expression, "much water," every Greek scholar knows that the original is "many waters," *i. e.*, many fountains or streams of water. These were undoubtedly small, because there could not have been "many" large rivers around or in the one village of Enon. They were small fountains, therefore, suited to the supply of water for drinking, as required by the multitudes who attended John's ministry; but not suited for their immersion. And besides, if it were for the convenience of immersing that "much water" was required, why should the phrase be "many waters"? One stream was all that John could occupy, and would have answered his purpose as to this. And why, again, if this were his reason for going to Enon, did he leave the Jordan to go thither? Water abounded where he was. Why seek it elsewhere? This expression, then, can have no force whatever in determining the mode of baptism. Thus it appears, that the only considerations which seem to favour immersion, are easily set aside. The word does not mean what the friends of immersion allege. "Into" and "out of," might just as well be "to" and "from." And "much water" means simply *many streams*, or fountains, required for the convenience of the people. We

submit, therefore, that these shadowy arguments afford but a weak foundation for the exclusive dogmas of our Baptist brethren. Aside from these, everything else, in the facts and circumstances recorded, is strongly against the opinion they entertain, as we shall now endeavour to show.

The first instances of baptism are those of the forerunner of Christ. His, it is true, was not Christian baptism, but yet, as to the mode, it was doubtless the same as that adopted by our Lord and his apostles. Did John immerse those who came to his baptism? We think not. (*a*) In the first place, there was not time. If he had done nothing but baptize during the whole period of his ministry, he could not have immersed the multitudes who flocked to his baptism, consisting of "Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan." His ministry did not last more than eighteen months or two years at most. Most of his baptisms were administered before our Lord's public appearance. All these multitudes flocked to him before that event. That he could have immersed them in so short a time, is utterly incredible. (*b*) In the next place, his strength would have failed if time had not. To stand in the water and immerse these multitudes, would have required superhuman energy and endurance. A miraculous endowment with strength and energy alone could have enabled him to perform such a work. (*c*) In the third place, he did not introduce the ceremony of baptism. He found the people baptizing themselves, their vessels, couches, &c., as a common ceremony of purification. This they did, according to all the indications of the Levitical law, by pouring or sprinkling. There is no evidence that it was ever done by immersion. Even if it be admitted that they dipped their hands when they came from market, still it does not follow that they immersed them. One bird was "dipped" in the blood of another, the hands were dipped in the dish, without immersion. There is no proof that they immersed hand, or body, or anything else in these ceremonial purifications. There is abundant reason for believing that they sprinkled. It was baptism, however; and as the same term is used to denote the rite administered by John, the inevitable conclusion is that he practised the same mode.

Take, next, the baptisms on the day of Pentecost. They

were all in one place—were baptized from on high by the pouring out of the Spirit upon them—spake with other tongues —multitudes believed and were baptized with water. And the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls. Were these converts immersed? In the affirmative is solely the alleged meaning of the word *baptize*, which has been already set aside. There is nothing else that could ever suggest the idea to the mind of the reader. In the negative, a cluster of circumstances all join to forbid such a supposition. There was not time. So far as we know, only the eleven apostles were present to officiate. They certainly could not have immersed so many in part of a day. Even if it be supposed that the seventy disciples assisted, it was more than they all could have done in the time given. There was no place, either in or about the temple where they were assembled, where it could have been done. There was no place in the city even, or near it, where such a multitude could have been immersed in so short a time. If there had been, there is no evidence that they went in search of it. There is no evidence that they delayed a moment to procure a change of raiment, or that they went in their wet and dripping apparel through the streets after their immersion. All these things, together with the fact that their first and great baptism was by the *pouring out* of the Spirit upon them, bear strongly against the idea that they were immersed, while they are in harmony perfectly with the idea of pouring or sprinkling. There was time enough for this. The place they were in was sufficient. No other need be sought. No changes of raiment were necessary. None were procured. No dripping multitude was sent home at night. No contrariety between the Spirit's baptism and that with water is presented. The word *baptize* is used in the same sense throughout, both the Spirit and the water being poured out upon the people. Are not all these things sufficient to counterbalance the only considerations in their favour claimed by the Baptists, *i. e.*, the alleged meaning of the word, while, as Dr. Carson acknowledges, "all the commentators and lexicographers" are against the view he takes? We cannot believe that these three thousand souls were immersed.

Consider, next, the baptism of Saul of Tarsus, and the same

conclusion is forced upon us. On his way to Damascus, and breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples, the Lord Jesus appeared to him in dazzling splendor. Having fallen to the ground, he heard a voice saying, "Why persecutest thou me?" Trembling and astonished, he asked, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Being led by the hand, he was taken to a certain house in Damascus, where he remained three days and nights, and did neither eat nor drink. In these circumstances Ananias comes to him by Divine direction. After instructing him awhile, he says, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized;" and forthwith, "having stood up," he was baptized. Was it by immersion? The only evidence claimed in the affirmative is again the alleged meaning of the word *baptize*. Nothing else favours it. All the circumstances are against it. There in the house, and standing up, without any delay for place or preparation, without going out or coming in, he at once enters the service of Christ. To *suppose* that there was a pool in the house, or that they went elsewhere to find one, in his weak state of body, after fasting three days and nights, and that no allusion would be made to these circumstances, is to take the liberty of supposing just what we please to supply the weak places of an argument. None are more loud in disavowing and condemning such a course than the friends of immersion; and yet we aver that none are so much addicted to it as themselves. They suppose everything—that *baptize* means immerse, against all authority; that *into* and *out of* are the proper translations of the Greek particles *eis* and *apo*, against the common usage of the New Testament; that much water was required for immersing the people, and yet that in Jerusalem, in or about the temple, where much water could not be found, three thousand souls were immersed in a few hours—that they went somewhere, or found water somehow—that they needed no changes of raiment, or were supplied without mention of the fact. They suppose Paul found a place in the house of Judas, or went somewhere else to find it. They suppose—what do they not suppose? And yet these are the brethren who cry out, "Show me a Thus saith the Lord;" as though they were in the habit of walking by such a light!

The remarks just made concerning the baptism of Saul, apply in all their force to that of the jailor and his household. Converted in prison, at a midnight hour, and baptized with all his, straightway, before leaving the place of their confinement—was there any provision there for immersion? Did they go out to a stream of water in the dead of night? Did they erect a large bath in the prison? What suppositions are needed to make out a plausible immersion here, all too, because of, and built upon the assumption against "all commentators and lexicographers," that *baptize* means immerse! One thing assumed against all authority and everything else supposed, according to the necessity of the assumption. On the other hand, how plain and simple the record, when we remember that baptizing by pouring or sprinkling was a common operation among the Jewish people. Paul and Silas were in "the inner prison." There the trembling jailor found them disentangled from the stocks. Thence he "brought them out" into the court, where he dressed their wounds and was baptized, he and his, straightway. Then he brought them "into his house," *i. e.*, his own private apartments, and gave them refreshment for their bodies. All is simple and natural on this theory.

Let us examine next the baptism of Cornelius and his household. Of these persons it is said: "The Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word." "On the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." "The Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Then I said, Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" These are the facts. Did Peter cause them to be immersed? On the one hand is the standing assumption against all authority. Nothing more. On the other, the facts that it was done apparently in the house of Cornelius, that it was brought to mind by the pouring out of the Spirit upon them, that "baptizing, pouring out, and falling upon," as applied to the Spirit, evidently point to a similar idea as applied to water, and that the question about forbidding water, in the first place, implies that *it* was to be brought for the purpose, and in the next, would have

had no significance, if they were to be immersed in some public stream or pool. Who could forbid their going to such places and immersing all that chose to apply? But there in the house, as about to be done at once, the question is significant, Can any one forbid it here and now?

We come, lastly, to the case of Philip and the Eunuch, commonly thought to be the strongest and clearest in favour of immersion. This thoughtful Ethiopian, in his journey, was reading that beautiful portion of Isaiah where clear and emphatic mention of Christ and his kingdom is made. "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter," &c. In the same connection it is said, "He shall sprinkle many nations." Philip seems to have expounded to him this whole passage; and when they came to a certain water the Eunuch said, "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? . . . and they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." Was the Eunuch immersed? On the one hand is the double assumption that *baptize* means immerse, and that *into* and *out of* are the proper rendering of the Greek particles, the answer to each of which is already familiar to the reader. The first, *baptize*, does not mean what is claimed, and the others are commonly translated *to* and *from*. They may mean only that in this instance. Or if they be understood as denoting an actual entrance into the water and coming up out of it, immersion does not necessarily follow. Their sandals were easily removed, and that they should descend into the edge of the water, and there administer the rite by pouring or sprinkling, would well accord with Eastern manners and customs. On the other hand, they were in a desert where they would not be likely to find a stream for immersing the Eunuch. They do not seem to have delayed at all to procure baptismal dress. It is not probable that the traveller was provided with one, or, that receiving the ordinance by immersion, he went forward in the same raiment. The connection in which he was reading from the book of Isaiah, and which led Philip to discourse of Christ and baptism, might easily suggest sprinkling as the mode—but not immersion. "He shall sprinkle many nations."

These, it is believed, are all the instances of baptism recorded in the New Testament, where the circumstances are given in such detail as to throw any light on the mode. It has been seen that in every case, save two, the only argument for immersion is the groundless assumption that *baptize* means *immerse*. In the excepted cases, there is the additional assumption as to the particles (*eis* and *apo*,) *into* and *out of*, or *to* and *from*. These are the only considerations on the Baptist side. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that Dr. Carson should feel himself called to the herculean task of establishing an exclusive and final meaning to the term baptize. If he cannot do this, he has nothing to say. If baptize may have been the term applied to various purifications of persons and things, which purifications were by pouring or sprinkling, then his cause is hopelessly lost. As applied to an ordinance of the Christian church it means, as to the mode indicated, the same thing. This is the belief of more than nine-tenths of the Christian world, among whom, to say the least, is to be found an equal proportion of the learning and piety of the age. And yet the remainder, less than one-tenth of the family of Christ, tell us there is no baptism but by immersion—accuse us of ignorance or insincerity in our belief—refuse to eat with us at the table of the Lord, and many of them desire a new translation of the Bible, which shall bear more strongly to their side of this discussion. They have already a lion's share in the translation we now use. It favours their views far more than does the original. We verily believe that the translation of those two particles (*eis* and *apo*) by the words *into* and *out of*, when it might have been, and we think *ought* to have been, *to* and *from*, has done more to multiply immersionists than all other arguments that have ever been used. But on this we must not dwell. We have not written these pages because we desire to have controversy with our Baptist brethren. Believing that the mode is not essential to the validity of the ordinance, we can and do acknowledge them as a true branch of the church of Christ, though not following the primitive and scriptural model as to this institution. They rest their cause indeed on exceedingly narrow grounds—the assumed *meaning* of one verb and two particles, while everything else is against them. If they are content, so be it. Only let them

not attempt to curtail our liberty, or bind us with such ropes of sand. We claim that ours is the scriptural mode, and the most edifying mode; the mode best adapted to all ages, climes, and constitutions. Had we the same conviction in regard to immersion, we should of course practise that mode. But as we have not, we feel constrained to maintain and defend our usage.

ART. III.—*Covenant Education.*

THE annual observance of our Day of Prayer for Colleges and educational institutions, like that of our national Thanksgiving, has come, within a few years past, to fill a large place in the hearts of American Christians. It is "like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season," and whose leaf, we trust, "shall not wither," until every school and seminary of our country shall become a nursery of Christ. To it our numerous colleges already look forward with high and confident expectation, that it can hardly pass without a rich blessing to them.

This day has, indeed, become a significant trait of the Christian church in America—significant, especially, as it seems to us, of two things, both of which are coming to be more and more generally recognized and felt. The first of these is a great *truth*, that there is a vital connection between education and the Christian religion; the second is a great *want*, that of clearer and stronger, more full and constant manifestations of saving power in the ordinances of our educational institutions. Upon these topics, therefore, included under the general theme of Christian or covenant education, we propose to offer here some observations and reflections.

And, first, there is a vital connection between the Christian religion and the education of children and youth; such that neither can attain to its true and highest aim, divorced from the other. Religion supplies to education its moral life and

its expansive power—the idea of universal education is an outbirth of Christianity—whilst education supplies to religion its intellectual life, and the great means by which it propagates itself in the world. Religion without education is superstition; education without religion is infidelity. The union of the two is indispensable to the life of each.

This truth is shadowed forth, not obscurely, in the original terms of that covenant which God made with the father of the faithful before the birth of the first child of promise; and which yet remains the foundation of our faith, and the charter of all our privileges and hopes. For this covenant guaranteed to Abraham, and through him to us, that God would be his and our God, the God of his and our children through all generations, and that they should be his people. "As for me, ... I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." And the inspired and authoritative application of this promise to believers in Christ of every subsequent age, is in such words as these: "The promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. . . . . They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." But in the original terms of this covenant there is a certain means, or instrumental agency, expressly ordained as indispensable to its fulfilment, and to the constant realization of its promised blessings. "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord . . . . . in order that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." Here we see that the religious training of the children of the covenant, so that they should keep the way of the Lord, is laid down, with entire explicitness, as the divinely ordained means, or instrumental agency, of realizing in them its promises and blessings.

This truth, however, is more clearly unfolded in the subsequent instructions which the covenant people received from God through the mediation of Moses and the prophets. For he who had adopted them as his own children, seemed to watch for occasions and opportunities to impress upon their minds that the appointed means, through which only the covenant could be

made to take effect in their generations, was the same instrumental agency in view of which it had been ratified at first with their great forefather and covenant head.

Thus Moses reiterates many times, in circumstances of the deepest solemnity, such precepts as the following: "These words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart . . . . . and in thy soul . . . . . and thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand; and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes; and thou shalt write them upon the doors of thine house, and upon thy gates." That is to say, their own hearts and minds were to be filled and replenished with Divine truth; not only for their own sakes, but also that they might be able to teach it to their children with informing life, and transforming power. For this purpose they were to surround themselves and their children, from earliest infancy, with its doctrines and precepts bodied forth in expressive symbols, and written out in words, upon the doors of their private houses, and upon the ornaments of their women, as also in the places of their solemn assemblies and courts of justice.

This view of the covenant enables us to understand that remarkable enactment of the Mosaic law, which required that when any child or youth should rebel against his parents in the exercise of this prescribed discipline, they should bring him before the magistrate, who, upon their testimony, should cause him to be judicially put to death. "If any man shall have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother; and that, when they shall have chastened him, will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his people, and the gate of his place, and shall say, This our son is stubborn and rebellious; he will not obey our voice. . . . . And all the men of his place shall stone him with stones that he die. So shalt thou put away evil from among you, and all Israel shall hear and fear." This might seem to be a law of unparalleled severity, if we did not consider the relation which the offence bore to the national covenant and

promises upon which the Theocracy was founded. For such rebellion against parents and lawful instructors, in the exercise of the ordained religious discipline, was not only the crime of treason, but it also aimed a fatal blow at the only means through which the promises given to Abraham for the benefit of "all families of the earth," could ever be fulfilled.

This truth is still further developed in the seventy-eighth Psalm, in which it is expressly declared, that the means appointed of God for moulding the character of the children of the covenant in their generations, so that they should not be "stubborn nor rebellious," and should "not forget the works of God," but should "set their hope in God," should be "steadfast with God," and should "keep his commandments," was that the parents should diligently "make these known unto their children, that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them unto their children."

Hence it was that Solomon could enunciate this principle of the covenant in precise form, and with unqualified certainty, in the words, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it:" which promise also is implied with equal certainty as if it had been fully expressed, in the exhortation of St. Paul, "and ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Perhaps, also, it was with this covenant principle in his mind that our blessed Lord delivered that solemn charge to his disciples, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" "Feed my lambs;" whilst it is this which discloses the dread significancy of that woe which he pronounced, at another time, upon all those, in every age, who should cause little children to offend. For it is hard to conceive of any other way in which the children of the covenant can be made to offend, at all comparable with that which they suffer from the failure of their parents to bring them up in the enjoyment of the covenant privileges and blessings.

Such, in skeleton view, is the connection between religion and education, in this great charter of Christian faith, privileges and hopes: from which we now proceed to educe some of those

rational considerations by which it is to be understood and appreciated.

And first, it teaches us with all simplicity and plainness, that education is a divinely appointed means of promoting religion, of bringing men to God and securing their progress in the divine life. This truth lies also in our Lord's last command, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations." Nor apart from teaching, in some form, is there any other way known to us in which saving knowledge can be acquired. The reason is that the substance of true religion, and the heart of true piety, is the truth, which can be received in no other way except in the form of knowledge. In fact, teaching is no more indispensable to the learning of science or languages, than of religion. Teaching is one of the great means upon which we are to rely for making men Christians. Education is one of the most effectual ways of preaching the gospel—it is one of the chief converting ordinances. Of course, we do not mean that any saving result can be attained apart from the regenerative act, and effectual co-operation of the Holy Spirit. But this does not limit the truth upon which we now insist. For it is precisely here, in the use and application of this means, that we have the original covenant right to reckon upon this regenerating grace and effectual co-operation, especially in the education of the children of believers. For this is certainly included in the "everlasting covenant ordered in all things and sure . . . . the sure mercies of David. . . . To the end that the promise might be sure to all the seed."

And secondly, it teaches us no less clearly that education under this covenant, is a matter of religion. This is illustrated when we consider the simplest idea of education, which is that of preparation for life. But the life of every human being is a continuous whole, lying partly on this, and partly on the other side of death; whilst death is not death, but barely life's passage over the narrow stream which separates time from eternity. Consequently preparation for life cannot logically, and ought not morally to be limited to the present. It ought to and must extend to the whole future. It is irrational to confine our views of preparation to one stage, and that the shortest, whilst we leave out the other which is of endless duration. Education at all adequate to the present is not possible, whilst the endless

future is neglected. Right preparation for either must needs embrace both. The error which regards the two as diverse and separable, is fundamental, and fatal to both. And among its least baleful influences is that it nourishes and perpetuates that pestilent moral habit which treats human life as partly secular, and partly religious, in part devoted to God, and in part to the world.

This truth, that education must embrace preparation for the life to come, is further evinced, when we consider that the faculties to be educated are chiefly those which belong to the spiritual and immortal nature. For the human intellect itself, as distinguished from the animal mind, is rooted in a moral and spiritual nature, over which the death of the body has no power. This may be the reason why it is capable of endless development and growth, whilst that of the brute is stationary through all generations. For there is ever something of the infinite and exhaustless in that which is moral. Whence it follows, that the necessary condition of this continued growth of the intellect in man, must be the culture of the moral and spiritual in which it is rooted, by which it is supported, and from which it is nourished and replenished. The attempt to educate the mind apart from the soul, is as if the arborist should busy himself with sticking artificial flowers and fruits upon a living tree, instead of enriching and working the soil out of which it grows. For even science itself, in its purest and most abstract forms, is an outgrowth of the moral nature of man, under the culture of Christian influences. The proof of this is that it cannot flourish outside of the boundaries of Christian nations. Whilst the three great elements of moral character are the affections, the conscience, and the will—how is it possible to educate these otherwise than by faithful instruction in moral truth, and by religious training? Education is formative of right character in so far as it trains these faculties aright; and surely whatever calls itself education, but leaves out of its aims the formation of character, is unworthy of the name, "and unto every good work reprobate."

Moreover, it is necessary that education should embrace the idea of preparation for the future life, on account of its influence upon educators and instructors themselves. For apart from this, the work of education has no more attraction for

Christian, faithful, conscientious man, than it has for the ungodly and the worldling. And such is the high and solemn nature of this work, that if it be not performed in singleness of aim to glorify God by fidelity to the trust, it sinks down, almost of necessity, into an unprincipled striving after the accomplishment of merely selfish and worldly aims. Thus it becomes one of the most demoralizing of lawful employments. For a merchant or a mechanic, with none but worldly aims in his vocation, may yet be a moral and an honourable man; but not the minister of the gospel, nor the educator of youth, who have to deal with the interests of immortal beings. Here there must be that conscientiousness which has its root in a living faith, and a true piety, that self-sacrificing devotion to the highest welfare of those concerned, which is derived only from the self-sacrifice of Christ—or the employments themselves become demoralizing. This is the explanation of those mere money-making establishments in the name of education, where great numbers of the sons and daughters of the wealthy among us are unfitted for every duty of life, and from which they not unfrequently return home with ruined health, enfeebled minds, and poisoned hearts.

Add to this, that the government and discipline of educational institutions, no less than of the family, in order to be effective, must be a religious and Christian influence, because this only can reach the conscience and the will. For it is well nigh impossible to bring up a family of children in filial obedience where family prayer is neglected. What then must become of our schools and colleges if their government and discipline are not imbued with the influences of faith and piety! All government, indeed, which does not reach the conscience and the will, must ultimately prove a failure. This great nation of ours has just been reeling and tottering on the brink of destruction, of the utter and irretrievable extinction of its nationality, more, as we are fully persuaded, from the neglect of the religious element of civil government than from all other causes put together. And no amendments of our national constitution, it seems to us, can ever reach the evil of our case, which shall not include a catholic acknowledgment of the God of the Bible, and of the Christian religion.

Such considerations as these afford us abundant rational grounds, and appreciative views, of that system of religious education which the Christian church inherited under the Abrahamic covenant. For this was the view of education substantially, which was held by the primitive Christians. Armed with this instrumentality they went forth to conquer the world. For they counted, with assured certainty, upon retaining by this means all their children under the saving influences of the covenant. We have the best evidence that among them it was a matter of as confident expectation that all their children would be Christians, as it ever was among the Jews that all their children would be Jews. This principle gave form and efficiency to the educational institutions of Christian countries, from the times of the Apostles, and the Alexandrine Academy, under the great Origen, to the Reformation; and from the Reformation until within the memory of some who are now living. *Ad studendum et orandum*—for study and prayer—this was the fundamental idea upon which they were founded, and have been supported largely by the wealth and sacrifices of Christian people. One hundred years ago, there never had existed in all Christendom, so far as we have been able to discover, a single college or school for the education of children or youth, (excluding such as were strictly professional,) in which the curriculum of study did not embrace a course of instruction in Christian doctrine: for, as it would seem, no Christian had ever imagined it possible to educate his children apart from the supreme object of making them intelligent and faithful Christians by means of their educational instruction and discipline.

But a great change of late has passed upon all this. About the beginning of the present century, a revolution in the ideas of the American people upon this subject, was initiated, (although its seeds had been planted long before) which, for its deep significancy, and far-reaching, all-transforming influence upon our national character and destiny, is hardly comparable, in our minds, to anything else that has ever occurred in the world's history. Silently and gradually evolving itself out of one germinal principle, and tending ever more and more towards a complete divorce of education from religion, thus putting asunder what God had married together, it overspread

our whole country, until this covenant idea of education had become extensively supplanted in the popular mind, and well nigh lost to the world.

The germinal principle or cause of this change was the existence, rapid multiplication, and controlling influence of different sects or denominations in our American Christianity. This was the reason, perhaps to a certain extent, unconsciously operative, why the framers of our national and state constitutions acted upon the principle that civil government among us could have no distinct religious character or aims. Such governmental indifferency with respect to all forms of religion, was indispensable to exact equality of the citizens before the government, whatever might be their differences or conflicts of religious belief. Whence it followed, that when the several States came to organize their vast and all-moulding systems of governmental education, in order that these might be universal by the votes of a population with endless diversities of religious belief, might be equally for the benefit of all, and might be in harmony with the principles of the governments, all distinctive religious character and aims had to be excluded from them. But in as much as the department of morals is inseparable from religion, and must follow its fate, the next step, inevitable in logic, was to exclude from the government schools all moral instruction, and to reduce the idea of education to that of a mere intellectual culture. This last consequence, indeed, was never fully realized; but it was expressly avowed by one of the ablest superintendents of public instruction the State of New York has ever had; and it was certain to come in time, unless a reaction against the whole movement should set in. Thus much, however, was accomplished; when the first generation which had been educated in the public schools came upon the stage, it was found that the once prevalent idea of education in the popular mind, with respect to its connection with religion, was completely revolutionized.

In the mean time, what became of our colleges, academies, male and female seminaries, select schools, and of all our educational institutions which had no connection with government? All these had now to be manned, controlled and administered under the pressure of this new public sentiment, in which re-

ligious instruction was divorced from school education. This alone could not but obscure in them the covenant idea, and tend to frustrate the best intentions, and to paralyze the best endeavours of the many faithful men who continued to struggle against the popular current. But besides this, sectarianism, the original cause of the whole movement, operated in all the institutions which were not connected with government, with more directness, and hardly less power, than in the government schools themselves. For they were all in free competition with each other, and generally straitened for means of support. Each, therefore, naturally aimed to secure the greatest amount of patronage for itself. And here, by a very natural though fallacious process of reasoning, they could barely escape the conclusion, that parents of one sect would not send their children to an institution where religion was taught in the doctrinal forms of another. The pious Calvinist could never consent to have his children educated in Arminianism; nor would the Arminian send his children to a Calvinistic school. Hence, in order to secure patronage from each of these persuasions, both Calvinism and Arminianism had to be left out of the religious instruction of schools. In like manner, the Unitarian would not patronize an institution where the Divinity of our blessed Lord was distinctly taught; nor the Universalist, where the doctrine of a future punishment; nor the Jew, where the obligation of the Christian Sabbath; nor, in fine, the infidel, where the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures was insisted upon. Hence, as before, in order not to offend the patrons who denied any of these doctrines, all of them had to be dropped from the course of school instruction. And when everything that could offend anybody had ceased to be taught, what of Christianity would remain? Of course, we do not affirm that all these consequences were ever perfectly realized; but we exhibit here that remorseless logic, and inevitable tendency of our sectarianism, which had already gone to an alarming extent, and which threatened in time to banish every distinctive doctrine and truth of the Christian religion from the school education of our children and youth: when nothing would remain but that bathos and vast inane of a mere intellectual culture, where only pantheism and atheism could live and breed.

But there is one particular sectarian influence in the same direction which ought not to pass unnoticed here—the rise and rapid growth among us of the Baptist denomination, with their peculiar view of the relation of children to the Christian church. A similar conception also was deeply embedded, as its subsequent historical development has proved, in the principles of the Puritans, when they emigrated to this continent; and the great influence of New England has done much to extend it throughout the country. But strictly taken, it is a Baptist idea, and its consequences are most legitimately chargeable upon that denomination of Christians. For our Baptist brethren, strenuously denying the church membership of infants, that is to say, denying the covenant of Abraham as the true and final basis of Christianity, could not fail to lose the significancy of the divinely prescribed means, or instrumental agency, through which the blessings of that covenant must be realized. In their view, religious education and discipline could not remain a Divine ordinance, to which the promise of regeneration and salvation for their children was sealed by covenant engagements resting upon the faith of God. Whatever the education of children might be, they must still be regarded and treated, not as Christians, but as "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise," until they should come to years of moral accountability, should, on the evidence of regeneration, be introduced into the church by baptism. The influence upon education of this sorrowful denial of the covenanted rights and privileges of children, has been, and still is, very great. For it has penetrated deeply into the ideas of almost all other branches of the church, until it may be said to predominate over their own original views. Even Presbyterians, in no inconsiderable numbers, have fallen away from the principles of our Confession of Faith, with respect to the children of the church, which are drawn purely out of the Abrahamic covenant; and are powerfully influenced, often without being aware of it, by Baptist ideas and tendencies. Hence, instead of regarding and treating their children as presumably of the elect, instead of reckoning with covenant assurance upon the regenerating grace of God for them, and aiming thereupon to train them up in the way they should go,

to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, they assume—a fearful responsibility!—that they are not in the church, not "in the way," not "in the nurture." How widely this view prevails among us, can be measured by the general currency of the expression, "to join the church," as applied to baptized children, when they come to their first communion. Thus it is that religious education and discipline, the Divine ordinance, to which the promise of regeneration and salvation for the children of believers is sealed by covenant engagements, resting upon the faith of God, and the great means prescribed of God for the realization of the covenant blessings, has been extensively supplanted by spasmodic efforts, in revivals and otherwise, to bring a sudden marked and sensible change of religious experience.

To obviate misunderstanding, it can hardly be necessary for us to state that we do not hold to the possibility of salvation for the children of believers, any more than for others, without that instantaneous change wrought in them by the Holy Spirit, which is commonly called regeneration; nor have we any sympathy with that view which ties this grace to the moment of time when baptism is administered. But we hold that this gift of grace is to be assumed as a covenant grant, by the faith of the parents. To us it seems plain that the Pharisees never shut up the kingdom of heaven against their disciples more effectually, than we do against our children, whilst we harp upon the one string, that they cannot love their Saviour until they are regenerated and born again—images of spiritual things which it is impossible to explain to children—instead of teaching them to count upon God's covenanted work in their behalf, whilst we seek to win their hearts to Jesus by opening to their minds with what manner of love he has first loved them. It does not lie within the scope of these remarks to exhibit the evils of this departure from the principles of our faith; otherwise it would be easy to show that it has borne the apples of Sodom and the clusters of Gomorrah in the American churches.

But we must hasten to consider what remains of our subject—the want which is now so generally felt of stronger manifestations of saving power in the ordinances of our educational institutions.

The general recognition and feeling of this want is due, in great part, to a reaction which is now going on among us against this whole movement, whose tendency was to sequester education from religious teaching and influence. Some twenty years ago it began to be apparent to many reflecting and prayerful people, that this adulterous divorce, if the expression may be allowed, continuing to develope and realize its legitimate consequences, must, in no long time, produce such a bloom of infidelity in this country as the earth had never beheld. Among the first to raise a cry of alarm and warning was this *Review*, and our Presbyterian Board of Education, with its late, lamented Secretary, Dr. Van Rensselaer. This great and good man, who has just been called to his reward, entered into this reactionary movement with all the energy and persistency of his ardent and constant nature. To it he devoted himself, with a large share of his ample fortune; in it he enlisted the influence and resources of the Board, and, to a considerable extent, of the church herself. His abundant labours and sacrifices, we doubt not, will be appreciated, in time to come, as among the most important and fruitful of all that have ever been devoted to the edifying of Messiah's kingdom in this country. It is in this view that an earnest effort is now making to establish the Memorial Institute, a preparatory school for boys, which shall bear his name, and perpetuate through all future generations, the memory of a man who ought never to be forgotten by our church. We desire heartily to commend this enterprise of the Board to the liberality and prayers of all Christian people; especially, as one of the greatest wants of education, at the present time, is that of adequate and thorough preparation for College; in which department this institution is intended for a model school.

It is true, however, that some among us are still inclined to regard the efforts of Dr. Van Rensselaer to found and build up parochial schools, Presbyterial and Synodical academies and colleges under immediate ecclesiastical control, as a failure. And it may seem strange that a reaction against the influence of sectarianism upon education, should take on this form; yet nothing is more certain than that it did. For it was in the very opposite of a sectarian spirit and aim that this work was undertaken, and has been prosecuted; otherwise it could have found

no sympathy in the Presbyterian church, one of whose glorious characteristics it is that she is truly catholic, and cordially embraces all other branches of the church of Christ, even to the admitting of their ordinances as no less valid than her own. But among all her members where could a man be found of a more catholic heart than Cortlandt Van Rensselear? No—it was for other than sectarian objects that he devoted himself to this work; in which he favoured denominational institutions in all other branches of the church, as cordially as in his own. And we happen to know that his influence and advice were as cheerfully given in the late reconstruction, upon a thoroughly religious basis, of one of the colleges of our country, under the control of another denomination of Christians, as if it had belonged to the Presbyterian church.

But it was plain to see that religious instruction in schools and colleges, in order to be anything more than a farce, must be given in some definite, doctrinal form; that is to say, as understood and held by some denominational body of Christian people. And Dr. Van Rensselear became convinced that the only hope of accomplishing this object, and of restoring religious instruction and discipline to its true position, as a saving ordinance in our educational institutions, was to place these under immediate ecclesiastical control. Perhaps he carried his idea too far—it was natural that he should; perhaps it would not be wise to disturb the established relations of our venerable colleges to the church, which were founded in her faith and prayers, and which for all practical purposes, have always been as completely under her control as they could be in any possible arrangement.

But it is a great misunderstanding of these ecclesiastical institutions to regard them as a failure. This is to measure them by an object which they were not designed to accomplish. For they were not intended to supersede all other institutions, nor to furnish an adequate basis for universal education. This they could never do. But they were intended to embody the solemn protest and reactionary struggles of our church against the prevailing idea, that education was a merely secular thing, a purely intellectual culture, into which the teaching of religion in any definite doctrinal form, might not enter. They were intended to symbolize and represent, in their several localities, and thus to

operate for its restoration to the popular mind, the displaced and well nigh lost idea of a covenant education;—that it is, and must be, a religious training from beginning to end, vitally inseparable from religion; that it is a preparation for life, both for that which now is, and for that which is to come; and that such education is an ordinance of God, to which the regeneration and salvation of the children of believers are sealed by covenant engagements. For this object the influence of these institutions, and of the labours and discussions with which they have been connected, is no failure. It has been, and still is immense; of greater worth a thousand fold than all the cost and sacrifices with which it has been exerted. We have seen the public sentiment of a large community powerfully influenced, in the course of a few years, by one of our Synodical academies. And though it be true, that much, very much, remains to be done in this land, it is also true, that much has been already accomplished; in proof of which, if all others were wanting, we have now the annual observance of our Day of Prayer for deeper and stronger and more saving influences of the Holy Spirit, in the ordinances of our colleges and other seminaries of learning. For this was a thing unthought of and unknown during those times of darkness which preceded the reaction, which is now going on, for the restoration of the supplanted idea of a covenant and Christian education.

But our readers, we trust, by this time are impatient for the question, What ought we to do for this great object, which has brought our Day of Prayer into general observance, and in behalf of which we have lately united our supplications with those of so many of our Christian brethren? It is very necessary to raise this question in connection with our prayers. For in order to pray in faith for anything, in which our instrumental agency is at all concerned, it is indispensable that we should find out what God requires us to do, in furtherance of the object, and that we do it. In all such cases, our agency is no less necessary as instrumental, than if it were itself the power. Moses may pray for water, but it will not come until he smite the rock with the prescribed wand. He may pray for Israel's victory, but Amalek will begin to prevail the moment he ceases to hold up his hands. And all the people of God may pray for

the overthrow of Jericho, but the walls will stand until the prescribed trumpets are blown around them the prescribed number of times. Thus it is in all human agency for the accomplish- of the Divine purposes of mercy in this world.

What then ought we to do for the promotion of a more general, constant, and efficaciously saving influence of the Holy Spirit in our educational institutions? One thing, omitting many others, we venture to suggest, with all deference for those who have the immediate control of our educational interests. Ought we not to supply our colleges, at least, with all those ordinances of God through which he has covenanted, and is accustomed most effectually to work by his Holy Spirit, for the salvation of his people, and the influence of which is necessary to complete the idea of Christian education? In other words, ought we not to organize and maintain, in the colleges over which we have any control or influence, the church of Christ, with all her accompanying ordinances and sacraments? Is it not remarkable that we Presbyterians, who lay so much stress on church ordinances, as of Divine authority, universal obligation, and indispensable necessity to the Lord's work of salvation in the world, should have neglected this matter so long, whilst, in some instances at least, it has not escaped the attention of our Congregational brethren, with whom the church partakes much more of the nature of a voluntary society. Several of the New England colleges have within themselves complete organizations of the church, according to their ideas; whilst we are not informed of a single educational institution under Presbyterian control or influence, which has anything of the kind. Notwithstanding, we must regard this as one of those anomalies which are almost incapable of a rational solution, yet, in proceeding to offer some arguments for the church organization in colleges, we are especially desirous not to be misunderstood. For, even with this want, our Presbyterian colleges do more fully intermingle religion with education, and have provided themselves with a greater abundance and variety of appliances for Christian training, than any others known to us in the country. In the College of New Jersey, for example, the oldest of such institutions, and the one with which we are best acquainted, besides the daily morning and evening prayers, and

the public worship, including preaching on the Sabbath, the several classes have each a separate recitation in the Scriptures on the Sabbath afternoon; and they also meet separately in the evening, each with a clerical member of the Faculty, for prayer and exhortation. Meetings for prayer and brief lectures are also held on all the other evenings of the week, mostly conducted by the clerical professors. Each class recites separately every Monday morning in the Greek Testament, or in the Evidences of Christianity. The Freshman class recites once a week in Coleman's Christian Antiquities, the Sophomore in Hodge's Way of Life, and the two more advanced classes in some branch of Apologetics. All the departments of instruction are largely taught in their Christian aspects and bearings. Besides this, the clerical members of the Faculty exercise an active and diligent pastoral care over all the students. These influences result in the growth of the pious students in grace and knowledge; and every year some, often many, of the careless are awakened and hopefully converted. The late Dr. Van Rensselaer, himself a trustee and patron of this college, moved by his earnest zeal in behalf of Christian education, spent some days, including a Sabbath, shortly before his death, inspecting and otherwise ascertaining its religious condition; and, as the result, he expressed his opinion, that religion was brought to bear upon the students through every available channel, and in every effective way. Fully persuaded, as we are, that all these agencies would derive new life and efficiency from the regular church organization, we do not wish to leave room for the inference or suspicion, that we do not place the highest confidence in the Christian power and influence of our educational institutions, as compared with any others in the country. We mean, only, that this power and influence, however great, would be largely augmented by the regular college church.

First, then, in support of this view, we have in every one of our colleges abundance of excellent material for the organization of a church, and for the administration of all its ordinances and sacraments. A goodly number of our pious students are young men of irreproachable Christian character and conduct, also of sufficient age and gravity to render them eligible to the offices of the church in any other community. And what pastor

does not know that a proportion of young men is indispensable to the greatest efficacy of the eldership? But if this were not so, a sufficient eldership and deaconate could always be formed from the officers of college. For even ministers of the gospel, according to the latest decisions of the General Assembly, may, where occasion requires it, serve as lay elders in the Presbyterian church. The pastor might always be the president of the college.

Also, the necessity of the church in the college is just as great and indispensable as it can be in any other community whatever. What, then, would become even of the truly pious in our cities, or anywhere else, without the church, her pastorate, her sacraments, and all her ordinances? Can any human arrangement stand in the place of the church? Have we any right to make such a substitution? Is there any salvation for the families of God's people from the deluge which drowns the world, if they refuse to build the prescribed ark for themselves? Will the red sea of opposing obstacles divide, and give passage to the sacramental host? will the living waters, to quench their thirst in the wilderness, burst from the rock, under any other rod but that of Moses? No more can we supply the place of the church with other and human arrangements, in any community; least of all in the college.

Nor can this necessity be supplied by the church in the city or village where the college is located. For that is composed of strangers, with whom very few of the students ever become acquainted. The pastor of the church, its officers and members, are strangers to them. Consequently the pious students seldom or never transfer their church relations to such. During their whole college course of four years, they are left without the ministrations of their own pastor, deprived of the beneficent watch and care of their own church officers and fellow-members, and of the communion of saints, at least in its most edifying form. Thus they are educated to think lightly of their church relations, and of the necessity to their spiritual welfare of the prompt transfer of these, with every change of residence in after life; the neglect of which is one of the most frequent occasions of fatal backsliding. For when professed Christians remove from one place to another, and remain a number of years without

transferring their church relations, in a great number of cases they wander and stray like lost sheep, lose their Christian hope, sink back into the world, and not unfrequently become the most hopeless reprobates.

To guard against this, it is necessary that the pious students should be encircled and bound together in church relations with each other; as, also, for their growth in grace; for the promotion of brotherly love, and Christian communion; for mutual watch and care over each other; and for the exercise of church discipline, with its preserving influences, and all its covenanted blessings. Surely it is indispensable for the spiritual safety and prosperity of the people of God, that they should enjoy all these benefits of church membership, in every place or community where they may have residence for a time. Is it surprising, then, that without these, some of our promising youth do make shipwreck of their piety in college? The wonder is that this is so seldom the case: which shows us how strong the religious influence in our colleges must be, and the faithfulness of the men who exert it under such disadvantages; as also, under what precious advantages the church in the college would exercise her saving power. It may be doubted whether there is any other community where she could act with equal efficiency.

No less is the church in the college a spiritual necessity for the proper organization, effective concentration, and wise direction of the efforts of the pious students for the salvation of their unconverted associates. What would become of the influence of Christians, as "the salt of the earth," and "the light of the world," in our cities, or anywhere else, if they were left without church organization, without pastoral direction, to their individual and scattered efforts alone? They could make little impression upon the outlying masses of an ungodly world; they would soon be absorbed and lost; true religion would, in no long time, become extinct. But there is in the college also this same outlying mass of an ungodly world, upon which disorganized, individual efforts can make comparatively little impression. These efforts need to be concentrated in organization, encouraged by free conference in church prayer-meetings, and guided by mutual counselling together of the people of God, under pastoral advice and direction. Whilst apart from such training as

this, how can we expect our college graduates to have that freedom, and that zeal and boldness in religious meetings and exercises, which, in educated men, is one of the greatest wants of our time?

Nor can the services of the college chapel, however excellent in themselves, compensate for the want of the regular church organization. The one all-sufficient reason for this, if there were no other, is that they have no sacraments. Above all, we need the church in our colleges on account of her sacraments—for their covenanted blessings to the pious, and no less for their influence upon the unconverted when administered in their presence.

For who can estimate the power of these Divine ordinances in strengthening the faith, awakening the penitence, inflaming the love and zeal, promoting the communion, and assuring the hopes of the Lord's people? How is it possible for Christians to live without their gently edifying, their sweetly comforting influence —without that covenanted fulness of blessing which is attached to their regular and faithful observance? What is the effect upon a Christian congregation of the preparation-week, with its solemn services, for the communion of the Lord's supper? And when the children of God assemble around their Father's table, renewing their covenant engagements, preferring their chosen requests before the throne of the heavenly grace, eating from the same platter, and drinking from the same cup of consecrated bread and wine, in memorial of the Lord's death, and in token of their Christian brotherhood, separating themselves from the world, and devoting themselves to the Master's service—who shall venture to declare how indispensable all this is to their being made partakers of the fulness of Christ? Of course, we do not intimate that the sacraments are not accessible to the students in college. They may find them in the church of the city or village where the college is located. But, as before stated, this is not their own church, but one composed of strangers; and whether they avail themselves regularly of this privilege, or neglect it through their whole college course, there is no one with spiritual authority over them to inquire.

But apart from the direct benefit of the sacraments to all the true children of God, it is impossible to estimate how much the

saving influence upon the impenitent of the preaching of the gospel, depends upon their regular and orderly administration in Christian congregations. For amidst the solemn and tender scenes of the Lord's Supper, how often are the eyes of the lookers-on moistened, and filled with a tearful interest? How often, by occasion of the outward symbol of their separation from his table, are they pierced to the heart with the conviction that they are alienated from Christ, are no part of his family, and have in his covenants and promises neither part nor share? And when a gay and thoughtless, or an immoral young man, has been arrested by the effectual calling of the Holy Spirit, and brought to sit at the feet of Jesus, in his right mind, it is necessary to his own spiritual separation from the world, and he owes it to the cause of his Saviour, to make profession of his faith, and to confess Christ, in the presence of his former companions in levity and folly. The influence of this is always great, sometimes overwhelming. Who has not seen a whole congregation melted to tears—how often do the most extensive and precious works of divine grace begin—with just such scenes as these! And nowhere else in the world, again we are bold to say, could the sacraments exert these, and all other of their blessed influences, more powerfully than in the college church. How then can we expect the preaching of the college chapel to produce the best fruits of the gospel, where the baptism of new converts, the profession of their faith before their fellow-students, and the scenes of the Lord's supper are never witnessed? How can we look for the most effectual and saving influences of the Holy Spirit where the essential element, the church, is wanting to the ordinances and means of grace?

For such reasons as these, it seems plain to us, that in order to obtain the fulness of saving influences in our educational institutions for which we pray, we ought to supply at least in our colleges, all those ordinances through which God has covenanted, and is accustomed most effectually to work, in accomplishing his purposes of mercy; especially, and in as much as this is indispensable to the complete idea of our covenant education.

To this, however, there is one sole objection, that the college church must be organized in our denominational form, which

would give a sectarian cast to our educational institutions, such that they would lose all patronage and support except from our own branch of the church. Ah! yes, it has come to the surface again—that sunken rock upon which, as we have seen, Christian education in this country had been almost fatally shipwrecked. But thanks be to God, the returning flood of a Christian sentiment has floated our good ship once more; and now this rock is laid down in our charts; we know all its bearings by a sorrowful experience, never more, we trust, to be repeated. For experience has proved that never was there a more short-sighted policy, to say nothing of the sacrifice of principle which it involves. We are well acquainted with the history of an academy, established at no inconsiderable expense, in one of the most beautiful villages of our country, and at whose head for some years, was a man who is now the president of one of the oldest and most flourishing Universities in America. He has been found more than adequate to his present position; but his talents, and learning, and executive ability could not bring prosperity to that academy. From the first it drooped, and for a number of years it struggled to maintain its existence; until it was about to be given up in despair; when its beautiful and valuable property passed into other hands, and it was reorganized on a thoroughly religious foundation. The Westminster Shorter Catechism was made an integral department of its regular course of study; and it became strictly a Presbyterian school. What has been the result? Why, contrary to many doleful vaticinations, immediately it filled up with pupils to overflowing. Methodists, Baptists, Universalists, Unitarians, skeptics, and infidels were among its patrons, and they yet continue to prefer it to any other school. Soon it became the scene of a great work of Divine grace, the influences and fruits of which continue to this day. It is estimated that within a few years, more than one hundred and fifty of the scholars have been converted within its walls; many of whom are in a course of preparation for the ministry, and some have already entered upon the work.

And what more natural than that it should be so? For the moral safety and benefit of their children at school is one of the strongest objects of desire with all parents, whether believers

or not. Anxiety upon this point is a controlling reason with multitudes for declining to send their children away from home, even for the priceless advantages of a public education. Consequently, as the religious character and influence of education declined, under the influences we have described, the relative proportion of our youth who could be induced to avail themselves of college privileges declined with it; until there arose a great outcry, among parents and guardians of every denomination, for deeper and stronger moral and religious influences in the educational institutions of our land. That cry we hear in the exercises of our Day of Prayer; we believe that God hears it. And where it is understood there is most of such influences, there the parents will send their children, whatever may be their own denominational preferences, and whether they themselves are Christians, or worldlings, or infidels. Abundant experience has proved it. The straightest way to increase the patronage of our schools and colleges to the greatest extent of which they are capable, is to establish their reputation for the most thorough and effectual religious instruction, training and influence. *Hoc signo vince;* and without this, even in the present state of public opinion, we shall hardly succeed in maintaining that position in education which has distinguished our Presbyterian church in all ages of her glorious history. Whilst, for reasons into which the limits of this article forbid us to enter, it is certainly true that our prosperity and growth, more than that of any other Christian denomination, depends upon our education. Our church, without our system of covenant education, is a tall and stately ship becalmed at sea. With every spar standing, and every sail set, she rolls upon the smooth swell; her sails are flapping the masts; unmindful of her helm, she makes no progress, yawing from side to side, sometimes swinging round, and looking away entirely from her course; whilst her crew are listless and idle—some are asleep, and some are at play. But suddenly the breeze strikes her, and she heaves over to leeward; when every sailor is on his feet in a moment; with a loud cheer they spring to their places; the ropes are all manned, the sails fill out, the steersman bends himself on the wheel; and now the noble vessel is all alive; now she minds her helm; now she knows her course;

and already, dashing the waves from her prow, she is far on her way towards her desired haven. Such is our Presbyterian church under the impulse and full efficiency of her covenant education.

ART. IV.—*The History of Herodotus*, a new English version, edited with copious Notes and Appendices, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent sources of information; &c. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford; assisted by Colonel Sir Henry Rawlinson, K. C. B., and Sir J. G. Wilkinson, F. R. S. 4 vols. 8vo. London. 1859. Reprinted New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1859.

ANCIENT oriental civilization had no historian of itself as a whole; but when it was drawing to a close, and the various characters of the drama were arrayed upon the stage, in a final group, a spectator appeared, who drew them, as they stood, with a pencil of light, and handed down the picture to posterity. The final attitude and character of the old epoch, its last grand effort of sovereignty and first admission of a rival, were thereby recorded, while the two parties still stood face to face, and the old had not yet submitted to the new. Before the Greek world, at length, a broad area of reliable fact was established in the past, and a clear starting point for subsequent history. Few junctures in the progress of nations have ever occurred of equal importance, and none has met with a more suitable delineator.

The reputation of Herodotus has been subjected to a remarkable, if not a singular fortune. Undeniably, and at all times, the most attractive of classical historians, the degree of credence awarded to him has varied with the intelligence and culture of his readers. In passing under so many judgments, from the approbation of contemporaries and the supercilious skepticism of later Greeks, down, through the wondering belief or the helpless doubt of less informed and less intellectual generations,

to the interrogatories of reviving learning and the more comprehensive views of recent criticism, his work has received the various treatment of an epic story, of substantial truth, of libellous romance, of a medley of fact and fiction, and of the most valuable, though not faultless, narrative of the period of which it treats. Its honesty has been successively admitted, doubted, impugned, taken as oracular, rejected, questioned, tested, and finally, at the end of more than two thousand years, established by the most irrefragable evidence. In order to estimate his work aright, we need to view him in his relations to the literary progress of history, to the period whose events he recorded, and the world he instructed.

Ancient Greek historians belonged to two classes or series, differing in spirit, in dialect, and in aim. The object of the older was to entertain, that of the latter to instruct. The former was epic in spirit, the latter was philosophical. The dialect of the former was Ionic, of the latter Attic. The series of epic historians flourished from about the middle of the sixth century B. C., to the last quarter of the fifth, when the founder of critical history appeared. They are divided by the period of the Peloponnesian war. Accustomed, as we are, to decisions drawn from the critical school, it is not easy for us to judge fairly, or even to think ourselves into a position from which to judge fairly, of the earlier class. To that end it becomes necessary to consider the position of literature in ancient Greece, and the models, if any, which the older historians had to follow.

What knowledge Greeks possessed of Egyptian, or Hebrew, or Phenician prose, we are unable to say; it is not possible that they could have been entirely ignorant of it, but, in their own language, they had no prose writing as ancient as their epic poems. Brief notes of great or memorable events were kept on record in public archives, such as lists of Olympic victors, of Spartan kings, prytanes of Corinth, ancient treaties, determinations of boundaries, and other records of a like nature, but nothing that could be called prose narrative. Earliest Greek history had therefore to be moulded into shape from such materials, and by the example of epic tales. The one presented a continuous and flowing narrative, and the other carefully

recorded facts. It naturally retained some of the features of both, and, as might be expected in such a case, not those features which were best in each; rather the fabulous character of the poem, with the baldness of the register. And the aim was, in the first instance, as truly to entertain by recital, as it had been that of the epic rhapsodist. Of Cadmus of Miletus there is not now an extant fragment, and of Acusilaus of Argos, only few, but the titles of their works coincide with the report of them in indicating a nearness of kindred to epic subjects. Cadmus's narrative of the settlement of Ionia belonged to a similar class of topics with the siege of Troy, the preliminary movement to the settlement of the adjoining Æolic States; and Acusilaus, in rendering Hesiod into prose, clung closer still to the spirit of the past. Hecataeus of Miletus, Pherecydes of Leros, and Charon of Lampsacus, and others, cultivated the new form of composition, gave greater range to their inquiries, and sought more careful conformity to the truth of fact. And it may be a matter of safe inference that they also carried forward the culture of style. But, in the fragments of their works which remain, the rude, curt, and bald manner of the register still prevails; while no tact is evinced in discriminating fact from fiction. And yet, notwithstanding these defects, their loss is deeply to be regretted. Historians of the present day would be too happy to have the chance of selecting from such masses of material, to find fault with the style, or with the lack of any principle of criticism, which would have made their number fewer. This remark will apply with special force to the works of Hecataeus, inasmuch as a large part of his writings recorded his own geographical and ethnological observations, and that extending to a great part of Asia, Egypt, and Libya, as well as Europe.

One of the grand difficulties with primitive historians was the lack of a connected chronology and of a common era. How were dates to be assigned, and the true chronological relations of events determined? It is likely that most of them floated entirely at sea, as loosely as the epic poets. Many of the episodes of Herodotus are rendered unmanageable from that cause. Though containing a chronology within themselves, it is disjointed from that of his proper subject. This difficulty Charon

of Lampsacus first met in his history of the Prytanes of Sparta, and Hellanicus of Lesbos, in one of his works, attempted to surmount by adopting the order of the priestesses of Juno in Argos. In other respects also, it is probable that Hellanicus carried forward the improvement of his art. In selection and arrangement of his materials, he expended more care and judgment than the earlier historians. Like Hecataeus, he was also a traveller into foreign countries, and part of his numerous works consisted in description of the lands and nations to which his journeys extended. Hellanicus was a contemporary of Herodotus, and by several years survived the opening of the Peloponnesian war. But even he, as appears from extant fragments, was not emancipated from the cramped and bald style of the primitive registers, nor from the habit of writing without criticism of his materials.

The place of Herodotus, in the sequel of such a series of historians, was therefore that of him who, improving upon, and by all the labours of his predecessors, carries his art to its proper perfection. He introduced no new style of composition, is truly one of the primitive epic series, aims at the same ends as his predecessors, and adheres to the Ionic dialect; but he succeeded in combining all the proper excellences of that style, and in maturing the whole into the utmost perfection it was destined ever to attain. For, after Thucydides had declared the principle and set the example of critical history, with such force and majesty and severity of science, it was impossible that succeding efforts, however far short they might come of maintaining the lofty position thus assumed, should ever again succeed after the manner of the old epic simplicity. As Thucydides was the founder of critical history, so the work of Herodotus is the final and culminating effort of the preceding epic style. Herodotus is the father of Greek history, not as being the first to write history, but as the first who carried it to excellence.

His subject is the rise and progress of the Medo-Persian empire; and the main plot, as we may call it, is the conflict in which the states of Greece were involved thereby. It was a subject, which concerned the whole civilized world, and extended to much beyond those bounds. All Asia, from the plains of India to the coast of Ionia, and from the Caucasus to the Ara-

bian Sea, as well as Egypt, Æthiopia, and a great part of northern Africa, was either absorbed in, or annexed to, the new empire. And in Europe, the then wilds of Hungary and Southern Russia had been overrun by its armies, and Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, and the Ægean islands had been reduced, or had submitted to recognize its superiority. The history of that vast empire comprehended the history of many subordinate nations, some of which had once been leaders in civilization.

On the other hand, the work of setting forth the successful resistance of Athens and Sparta, imposed the dependent task of narrating a great part of the foregoing history of each of those states, and of their more important allies and European rivals, for, at least, a century before.

The event to which the whole narrative tends, and in which it terminates, was of universal interest, and still so recent as to have lost nothing by the lapse of years, except the petty details, which would have detracted from its grandeur. The historian was himself born in the midst of the conflict and partook of the enthusiasm which it excited. And the date of his manhood was just far enough removed from it, to command a complete view of the whole battle ground, and to fairly compare the movements of both parties. Chronologically, the wars with Xerxes stood to Herodotus as those of the first Napolean stand to us. At the same time the facts were far from trite to the public for which he wrote. Hecataeus and others perhaps, had gone over some of the ground, but their habits of writing were not to be relied upon, and in laying before his countrymen a view of nations beyond the immediate neighbourhood of Greece, Herodotus did not feel free to assume that they were rightly acquainted with any of the previous events.

After mentioning the hostile attitude in which Europe and Asia had stood towards each other from ancient date, and thereby giving intimation of what the issue is to be, he enters upon the history of Lydia, through the subjugation of which the Persians first came in contact with the Greeks. Having carried that narrative down until the conquest of Lydia by Cyrus, he proceeds, in the most natural order, to set forth the means whereby the Medes and Persians had, at that date become the lords paramount of Asia. Following chronological order, he recounts the

previous history of the Medes, as far as he could learn about it; then the legends of the early life of Cyrus, the revolt of the Persians from the yoke of Media, and the union of the two nations. Then taking up the campaigns of the united forces, under Cyrus, from the conquest of Lydia, he goes on to narrate the course of the war whereby the Ionians, and other nations on the Ægean coast, were subdued; throwing in, as is his wont, episodical accounts of each. Turning from those achievements of the lieutenants of Cyrus, he next follows the great general himself to the siege and capture of Babylon, and afterwards, on his unfortunate and final expedition against the Massagetae.

As the great exploit of Cambyses, the son and successor of Cyrus, was the conquest of Egypt, and as Egypt was the most interesting of all countries to the Greeks, Herodotus, at this point, dwells to great length upon the description and history of that country and of the neighbouring parts of Africa. The whole of his second book and part of the third, are thus occupied. Next follows the death of Cambyses, and the troubles attendant upon the succession, in the sequel of which Darius the son of Hystaspes came to the throne. The organization adopted by Darius leads to an account of the revenues of the empire, as well as to a general description of its extent and divisions.

Soon after he came to the throne, Darius found it necessary to punish Orætes, satrap of Sardis, for the murder of Polycrates and Mitrodates, and for other acts of cruelty and injustice. He was thereby led into that series of events whereby his ambition was directed against Greece, while his success in reducing the revolt of Babylon, completely crushed the last struggles of opposition to his rule, at the seat of his power.

The campaign of Darius in Scythia gives the historian occasion to describe that country and people, otherwise so scantily known to the Greeks of his day; and a Persian expedition into North Africa as far as Barca, leads to a similar description of what the Greeks called Libya, especially of Cyrene and Barca. With the fifth book he takes up the movements of the Persians in Thrace and Macedonia, and proceeds to the revolt of the Ionians. The Ionian appeal to the European Greeks for help, brings before his reader the States

of Sparta and Athens. And in the progress of that revolt to its defeat, many portions of Greek history, especially touching those two States, are woven into their proper places. The punishment designed for Athens, on account of her part in aiding the Ionians, was averted by the issue of the battle at Marathon. And the sixth book, in which these events are given, closes with the death of Miltiades. The seventh is almost entirely occupied with the celebrated expedition of Xerxes, until after the battle at Thermopylæ. A more concentrated interest actuates this and the remaining books. Fewer digressions occur. One grand action enlists the attention, as if all the rest of mankind had stood still, awaiting the result. In the eighth book are arrayed, in most effective grouping and delineation, the momentous events of, and connected with, the invasion of Attica, the capture of Athens, and the battle of Salamis. And the ninth consists of a similar handling of the military movements of the succeeding year, which resulted in the battle at Plataea, and the naval engagement of Mycale, whereby the Persians were expelled from Europe, and the independence of Greece defended; and, we may add, whereby the integrity of European civilization was secured.

No grander subject ever occupied the secular historian's pen; and its importance, however highly estimated by contemporaries, has magnified before the eye of the world with the lapse of ages. Who shall even now attempt to compute the value of that conflict, whereby the paralysis of Persian rule was averted from Europe, and that freedom maintained, which gave to the world the refining and elevating influences of Athens, her philosophy, her literature, her arts, her self-government, her enterprise, and the reflex of these in Rome, and repeated more or less in all the most flourishing nations of succeeding times, and which has contributed so large an ingredient to modern prosperity? It was such a crisis as cannot often occur.

The work of Herodotus thus becomes a general history of the area of civilization and its borders, as far as materials were accessible to the author, down to the battle of Mycale, and final expulsion of the Persians from Greece. It is thereby possessed, at once, of unity of purpose, and plan, and great diversity of details.

Only a small proportion of the narrative reaches to a high antiquity. It is chiefly concerned with events which occurred in the sixth, and first twenty-one years of the fifth centuries before Christ. In the preliminary remarks, and in many of the episodes, facts, and legends of greater antiquity are introduced, but the proper subject of the work is contained within those chronological limits.

On most heads which he touches, Herodotus evidently gives all the information which he possessed, and deemed worthy of record; but on some, his collections were so extensive, that only a part is given, with the intimation that the rest is reserved for another occasion, or another work. Thus, his notices of the history of Babylon are very scanty, inasmuch as he contemplated a separate history of that country.

The style of the work is flowing and graceful in an eminent degree, while imbued to the very core with antique simplicity. Its structure as a work of art, approaches the symmetry and proportion of an epic poem, a resemblance which the many episodes go rather to sustain than to impair. Consisting of most carefully investigated facts, such is the presentation of them, in the very colours of life, and so true to the order of nature, as to effect a romantic interest not inferior to the brilliant fictions of the Odyssey.

That the facts of which it consists were not recorded without honest and laborious efforts to ascertain their reality, can be shown from internal testimony. Besides the works of his predecessors, of which it is clear that he had made himself master, Herodotus had also ransacked the public archives, and the temple records of all those places in Greece, which promised anything to the subject in hand. Written documents, however, on much of what he treats, were not to be obtained in his native country. He could not sit down in his study, collect his authorities around him, and make up his judgment with confidence that he possessed all the means thereto in already recorded testimonies. In by far the greater number of cases his materials had to be collected by himself from foreign countries; those countries had to be visited by his own observation, their respective national records to be examined by his own inquiries of their official custodians, their popular and sacerdotal

legends, taken down from his own hearing, and the necessary geographical details, by travelling over the ground himself. The labour of thus preparing a work of such range, at a time when travelling was so difficult and tedious, goes far to evince the honesty and love of truth of him who undertook it. No doubt much of that earnestness and native grace, which pervades the work of Herodotus, is due to the fact that it is the growth chiefly of his own personal observations and inquiries.

Born in or about the year 484 B. C., when Halicarnassus, his native city, was under the dominion of Persia, it is probable that he spent the earlier part of his youth as a Persian subject; and thereby may have enjoyed as his birthright the protection of that government in his travels. These were pursued over a large part of that empire. He ascended the Nile as far as Elephantina, carrying his inquiries to great length and minuteness into the history, government, religion, manners, and customs of Egypt. He travelled also into Cyrene, to the island of Zante, to Dodona, and the opposite coast of Italy. On the east, he went into Phœnicia and Assyria, and visited the country and city of Babylon. The whole southern and western coast of Asia Minor, and most of the islands of the Ægean, as well as Greece proper, underwent his personal observation: also parts of Thrace and Scythia, and the shores of the Black Sea, to some extent, both northern and southern, as far as Colchis. After many years spent in travel, he took up his residence in Athens, where it is probable that he first read publicly some portions of the work which he was then engaged in writing. Subsequently he joined an Athenian colony, which settled in Thurium, on the south-eastern coast of Brutium, in Italy. There it is probable that he spent the remainder of his days, excepting some brief excursions, like that to Attica, about 436 B. C., employed in completing the structure of his history, and working into its texture the results of his multifarious researches. And beyond the bounds of his own travels, he had collected such reports and descriptions of other travellers as he could anywhere obtain.

That his work was really published, in the first instance, by being read, in portions before an audience, we have not a doubt, notwithstanding all that has lately been written to the contrary.

Even had we no direct and special testimony thereto, it would be difficult for an unbiassed mind, thoughtfully versed in the pre-Athenian literature of Greece, and in the style of Herodotus, to believe that his work was not written for the very purpose of being so read. All Greek literature, up to that date, had been written with a view to public delivery. The epic was chanted by the professional rhapsodist. The dithyramb was performed by a chorus. All other kinds of poetry were either chanted or sung. Philosophy was taught in song, in conversation, and in lecture. Greece had great orators before she could boast of any writings in prose. The drama, which reached its prime in the days of Herodotus, was the very culmination of that oral literature, the union and harmony of all its possible excellences. The view to recital before an audience is a feature that distinguishes the more ancient Greek literature from the more recent, as well as from the Egyptian and Hebrew, and perhaps all others that preceded it. An exception may be made of some portions of the Hebrew; but in Greece, until the latter part of the fifth century B. C., everything was shaped with a view to the popular ear. That such was the practice of the historians who preceded Thucydides, is testified unequivocally by that author himself, in those passages where he blames them for having more regard to the ear of their auditors than to the truth. Indeed it was largely due to this practice that, although reading was perhaps not a common accomplishment in those days, the Greek populace were so far superior to their neighbours in point of intelligence and taste. Such literary entertainments were of frequent occurrence in all the principal cities. And hence, nothing is more likely than that the historian, who brought the epic style of history to its highest excellence, should have presented his work before his countrymen in the way in which all previous literature had been published.

To this consideration must be added the popular and attractive manner of the work itself, evidently designed, not like that of Thucydides, for the studious reader alone, but to interest and instruct the popular mind. In fact this condition is almost necessary to account for some of the peculiar features belonging to it.

It by no means follows that we are to believe that he wrote

every word of his history in some particular year, and then never touched it again, or that he read it all through at one recital, or that every person assembled at the games must have listened to him, if he read at all, or that he really read at any of the games, as some have ridiculously assumed; the number of ancient testimonies to the fact that he did read his work in public is such as not to be accounted for on any other hypothesis than that of the ancient belief of the fact. Such a work is not to be dashed off at a heat. It doubtless cost years of composition. And what was to hinder his recital of the more entertaining passages of what he had written, long before the whole was complete? Were not the epic poems recited in precisely that way—that is, by portions? It was the very method to which the Greeks of his day were accustomed, and to which the structure of his work is eminently adapted.

With his sincere regard for truth and solemn natural piety, Herodotus combined much of the spirit of the logographer, which regarded history in the light of an entertainment. Accordingly he yielded free play to his unrivalled narrative powers, and dwells with evident gratification upon tales of romantic interest. We have no reason to say that he ever permitted that taste to pervert his representation of facts; but it leads him to give in detail what might otherwise have been summed up in brief, and to recount legends of which a critical author would have used only the outline, or indicated the bearing. At the same time, it is proper to say for him, that a legend, if told at all, is best for whatever historical value it may have, if given in its own shape and manner. Were it his practice indiscriminately to set down tradition as indubitable fact, there would have been ground to censure either his unfaithfulness or his credulity; but so far is the case otherwise, that no historian more frequently confesses that the best he has been able to learn, does not meet his own credence. His fidelity is in nothing more apparent than in the scrupulousness with which he relates what he does not himself understand. Well for history that the oldest extant historian of Greece was honest without being critical; and that the founder of criticism confined himself to the events of his own time. Had it been otherwise we should have lost many an interesting fact of the prior antiquity, which Thu-

cydides would certainly have rejected, but which to the eye of modern science reveals important truth.

Investigations so extensive as those of Herodotus were beyond the capacity of his countrymen to estimate. Few Greeks deemed foreign affairs of such importance as to take the trouble to verify them, or even possessed the means of so doing. Unless it may have been Aristotle, or some of the scholars of Alexandria, none of his ancient critics were furnished with information competent to measure that of Herodotus; while the soaring self-esteem of later Greeks indisposed them to make any allowance for their own incapacity. The more honest wondered and admired, the more pretending sneered, or sought to pick insignificant faults in a work, which they were impotent to weigh as a whole. These remarks will apply equally to the frivolous charges of the pseudo-Plutarch, and to the more favourable but hardly less puerile judgment of Dionysius. It is only as the result of recent research that juster notions have been established of Herodotus, touching either his merits or the nature of his faults.

It would be too much to assume that modern geographical features, in all cases, coincide with the ancient, which Herodotus describes, or that in disinterred ruins, we have the means of completely restoring the structures, which he beheld in their beauty, or that the monuments of the past, which have been recently deciphered, are all, or even the best authorities of the kind, to which he had access; but this we claim, that large and invaluable materials have, within the present generation, been added to the illustrations of Herodotus, furnishing better means of rightly estimating his rank as a historian, than we ever possessed before.

The chief sources from which these materials are drawn, have been laid open by comparative philology, by the deciphering of ancient hieroglyphic and cuneiform writing, by antiquarian research, by the labours of minute scholarship addressed to history, and by enlarged geographical and topographical observation.

Of these agencies, the first mentioned is due to British dominion in India, and sprang out of a scientific study of the Sanscrit language by European scholars. In 1784, the

Asiatic Society was founded at Calcutta, by Sir William Jones, who had gone out from England in the previous year. Its object was the cultivation of the languages, literature, and history of Asia, and especially of India and the further East. Previously it had been known to some European scholars that Sanscrit was the ancient language of the Brahmins, in which were written their laws and religious ritual. Sir William Jones was the first European to address himself to its study with a true philological purpose. His observations were given to the world through the journals of the Asiatic Society. In the course of a few years he, together with Halhead, Colebrooke, Wilkins and others, had laid open its grammatical structure, carried investigation far into its literature, published their views of its importance, not only to the service of the East India Company, but to general philology, and to enforce their opinion of its value, accompanied their announcement with translations of some Sanscrit books.

Those early explorers of Brahminical lore were most surprised and delighted to find in the ancient language of a people so far separated from European contact, the most remarkable resemblances to European languages, in words and inflections which reminded them of Greek, of Latin, and even of their own English tongue. Sir William Jones was the first to announce the philological value of the discovery. The subject was taken up by scholars in both India and Europe. In Sanscrit was found the reconciliation of Greek and Latin. It was obviously related to both, and threw light upon both. The whole Germanic class of languages were soon shown to be similarly related to it, and thereby their kindred to the Greek and Latin came out the more clearly. A knowledge of Persian, so important to British officers in the East, discovered similar relations to the Sanscrit and German in that language. In short, Sanscrit was found to occupy a central point, from which a large group of languages, including most of the European, could be studied with the greatest advantage. It was the key to the whole.

Comparison of those languages with each other was a step inevitable in the process of thinking, while further investigation continued to enlarge the boundaries of recognized affinities.

Principles and laws of affiliation and variety in language, more comprehensive than had previously been conceived of, were consequently established—principles, which in another aspect became laws of ethnic growth, dispersion and reunion, thereby revealing facts touching the state of human society long antecedent to the earliest written history. Thus arose the new and still progressive science of comparative philology. It was between 1816 and 1819 that its position as such was distinctly assumed. In the former year appeared Bopp's "Conjugation System of the Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, Persian, and German languages." This was the real foundation. In 1819, Bask's Classification of the Indian, Median, Lithuanian, Slavonic, Gothic, and Celtic languages, as all belonging to the Arian family, the publication of Wilson's Sanscrit Dictionary, the establishment of Schlegel's "Indian Library," and the first instalment of Grim's "Teutonic Grammar," vastly enlarged the structure, and determined its value.

At the same time, the Hebrew, Arabic, and other branches of the Semitic group, were undergoing a similarly thorough analysis in the light of comparative philology, and successful entrance was made upon the Chinese and other languages of the farther East. It was also during that active first quarter of our century, that physical geography, under the auspices chiefly of Humboldt and Ritter, claimed for herself a new niche in the temple of science; and that Pritchard, almost by the force of his own strong arm, molded into proportions worthy of its name, the Natural History of Man, and by calling in the aid of geography and philology, drew also the outlines of the resultant science of ethnology.

While these new sciences were springing into existence, a key was unexpectedly found to the long lost meaning of Egyptian hieroglyphical writing. The first efforts to decipher the Rosetta Stone were made in 1814, and in 1819 its secret was successfully elicited, and in a few years afterwards was presented to the world in a practical shape. The new field of scholarship thus thrown open, has well repaid the labours of the many illustrious men who have given themselves, with a noble enthusiasm, to its culture; among whom may be men-

tioned Champollion, Wilkinson, Rosellini, Lepsius, and the late lamented Bunsen.

The latest, and perhaps the most ingenious achievement of the series, is the deciphering of the arrow-headed characters of Assyrian and Persian monuments. Here no Rosetta Stone furnished a key. A number of inscriptions on ruined structures, on rocks in the mountains, and on bricks and cylinders, alone presented their mysterious signs to the eye. Nothing was given as a known starting point; what the nature of the written signs, whether symbolic or alphabetic, and what the language sealed up in them, alike unknown. Conjecture alone could take the first step; and no doubt, many a fruitless attempt was made, many a step taken, which had again to be abandoned, before a footing was obtained on solid ground. Although the method was indicated, to some degree, by Grotefend as early as the year 1815, no real progress was made until about five and twenty years ago. The acumen and perseverance of Burnouf and Lassen, in Europe, addressed to copies of Persian inscriptions, and of Major, now Sir Henry Rawlinson, in the East, in presence of the monuments themselves, ultimately succeeded in deducing the alphabetical nature of cuneiform writing, and in satisfactorily translating the Persian variety.

But a difficulty has been encountered which was not at first anticipated. It is found that no less than three languages, belonging to three fundamental divisions of mankind, the Arian, Semitic, and Turanian, are represented in these writings, and in connection therewith, some difference in the style of the writing itself. The discoveries in Assyria have brought this matter more prominently to light, and, while enlarging the resources of cuneiform scholarship, have made to its task an unexpected addition. In the main, the Persian variety may be said to be satisfactorily deciphered, but the Assyrian and Babylonian, although important facts have been obtained from them, present several points which are still subjects of investigation. It is to be hoped that, under the continued scrutiny of the same ingenious scholars, the whole will be finally cleared up.

Preceding and contemporaneously with these discoveries in

the writing of antiquity, explorations have been going on to a great extent among the ruined buildings, cavern tombs, and other monuments, to which the writings belong. From the French savans, who accompanied the army of Napoleon, down to the Prussian expedition, conducted by professor Lepsius, and the volunteers of private enterprise, some of whom are still at work, a host of industrious explorers have laid open the evidences of many centuries of civilization in Egypt; while the labours of Botta and Layard, on the sites of ancient Assyrian cities, have spread similar stores before the readers of the cuneiform writings. Among the former, an American should not fail to record the name of Dr. Abbott, whose invaluable collection of Egyptian antiquities has recently been added to the treasures of the New York Historical Society. Perhaps it is due to our extravagant system of advertising, that a matter presented with modesty is overlooked. The curiosity, which yearly takes many of us to Egypt, has not, it would appear, found out the treasure nearer home. Often as we have visited those rooms, we have never seen more than one or two visitors there; yet it is asserted, by competent authority, that one might travel from one end of Egypt to the other, without finding so much of Egyptian antiquity as is laid before his eyes in that one collection.

During the same early years of our century, a new and superior style of historical criticism was introduced by Heeren and Niebuhr, and by themselves expressly applied to ancient history. After such example, minute scholarship learned the art of eliciting from incidental remarks, and fragments of classical authors, information touching the earlier antiquity. which had previously lurked there unsuspected. That art, which has given shape to such works as Müller's Dorians and Movers' Phœnicians, would seem to be most aptly prepared to take hold of the new materials thus laid to her hand, and to apply them to the purpose of filling up the blanks which time and violence have made in the records of our race.

Now all these discoveries and improvements most intimately belong to the field of history handled by Herodotus. Upon no other classical author do their rays converge so largely. A scholar cannot glance at their results without perceiving

their bearing and importance to the elucidation of that author. It might almost be said to be chiefly due to Mr. Rawlinson's good fortune, that he has been in a position to carry out, sooner than any other could, a design which must have suggested itself to many. But that remark would not be just, without also admitting that he has used his good fortune to excellent purpose; and has executed, with the very essential aid of his two celebrated coadjutors, a work, for which the learned world, and, we hope, also the general reading public, must owe him lasting favour.

On the first book, which contains the history of Lydia, Media, Persia, and the first siege of Babylon, the amount of commentary and dissertation is the largest, consisting of copious notes, and an appendix, which amounts to fully half the volume, consisting of eleven essays with additional notes. Of these essays, the first is a critical treatment of the history of Lydia in the light of minute historical scholarship. The third handles, in a similar manner, the history and chronology of the Median Empire, in which some of the benefits of Assyrian researches and Arian philology are turned to account. The second treats of the geography, physical and political, of Asia Minor, drawn chiefly from the works of Leake, Hamilton, Fellowes, and Rennell. The fifth is a short essay on the ancient Persian religion. The fourth, sixth, and tenth, are from the pen of Sir Henry Rawlinson, and treat of the ten Persian tribes, of the early history of Babylonia, and of the religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians. They consist of almost entirely new material, the fruit of his own studies of Persian, Babylonian, and Assyrian monuments. It is unnecessary to remark upon their importance, or the interest which they possess for the student of antiquity. The seventh and eighth essays restore, at considerable length, the history of the Assyrian Empire, and that of the later Babylonian. Their value consists in the skill with which the fruits of antiquarian research and discovery have been woven together with those of classical scholarship and the narrative of Herodotus. In the ninth, we have a treatment of the geography of the countries lying between India on the east, and Armenia and the Mediterranean and Red Seas on the west, drawn chiefly from the

recent works of Chesney, Layard, Robinson, Kinneir, Burnes, and Rawlinson. And the eleventh, on the ethnic affinities of the nations of Western Asia, owes its existence to the labours of the new philology, and researches into the natural history of man. Over the whole treatment of this book the supervision of Sir Henry Rawlinson is apparent, not only in the presence of essays and notes from his pen, but also in the reverent eye to his discoveries, which characterizes all the rest, and in the occasional occurrence of a paragraph, sentence, or clause, appended by him to remarks of the editor.

Copious and valuable also are the illustrations and additions to the second book, which treats of Egypt. In this case the mass of recently discovered material is so great, that it was important to exercise judicious selection of what was most to the point, in order to avoid the evil of overloading the text. Good judgment is manifested in the selection made. The foot notes are copious, but apposite, both literary and pictorial, and are followed by an appendix of eight chapters, on the antiquity, ethnology, religion, writing, amusements, science, and ancient history of Egypt. By far the greater number of these notes, and the whole of the appendix, are the work of Sir Gardiner Wilkinson. In fact, the editor seems to have consigned the second book almost entirely to the hands of that long experienced and most reliable of Egyptologists; and has evinced his own good judgment in so doing.

The same illustrious pen pursues the course of the third book, as far as it pertains to Egypt and the adjoining desert. It also appears in the appendix to the same book, in an essay on the worship of Venus Urania, in Scripture called Astaroth, throughout the East. Three other essays with additional notes make up the rest of that appendix, treating of the Magian revolution, of the Persian system of administration and government, and of the topography of Babylonia, followed by accounts of the standard inscription of Nebuchadnezzar, and of the labours of M. Oppert at Babylon, with a copy of the Behistun inscription, and a translation of the same into English.

Of the fourth book, the first one hundred and forty-three chapters concerning the Scythian expedition of Darius, and the country and people of Scythia, including an outline of

ancient geography, receive their illustration from the pen of the editor, drawing from classical scholarship, recent travels and researches, some of which were made during the late Crimean war. A few notes have the initials of Sir Gardiner Wilkinson. These inviting marks occur more frequently in the latter part of the book, where the author returns to the north of Africa, and the borders of Egypt. In the appendix are three essays on the Cimmerians of Herodotus, and the migrations of the Cymric race, on the ethnography of the European Scyths, and on the geography of Scythia.

Upon the fifth and sixth books the annotations are fewer. The subject, more familiar to ordinary readers, did not require the same amount of commentary. Two essays in the appendix to the fifth book, present the early history of Sparta and of Athens. And following the sixth are two, on the circumstances of the battle of Marathon, and of the traditions respecting the Pelasgians, with a note on the derivation and meaning of the proper names of the Medes and Persians.

The seventh book, especially in the grand review of his forces by Xerxes, furnishes more occasion for illustrative remark and commentary. And the appendix to it includes essays on the obscurer tribes contained within the empire of Xerxes, and on the early migrations of the Phœnicians, one little tract by Sir Henry Rawlinson, on the Alarodians of Herodotus, followed by a copy of an inscription on the sepulchre of Darius, and a long and valuable note on the family history of the Achæmenidæ.

To the eighth and ninth books, as conversant with what is completely within the range of well known Greek history, fewer notes have been added, and no appendices. The additions of most importance are the notes on Delphi, Salamis, Platæa, and on the inscription recently found on the stand of the tripod, dedicated by the Greeks at Delphi, out of the Persian spoils.

Prefixed to the whole is an outline of the life of Herodotus, drawn from his own work, and from otherwise known history of the times in which he lived, and of the places where he resided: also two chapters on the sources from which he compiled his history, and on his merits and defects as an historian. Under all these heads, large use is made of the excellent work

of the late Colonel Mure; but with that discrimination, which needs to be applied to the opinions of that much lamented scholar.

In the additions thus made, we are furnished with matter of great historical value, bearing upon Herodotus in various ways. In some cases they correct his mistakes. Thus, in respect to the kings of Egypt, it is now clear that he must have misunderstood the chronological arrangement, and that he has put a part of the Memphite dynasties last, which really belonged to the first series, and otherwise presented, as in immediate succession, princes actually separated by many intervening reigns. His geography, as respects the countries less familiar to his own observation, has also received important correction. The essays on that subject have been prepared with good judgment, and contain a clear and concise summary of what has been ascertained by the latest and best authorities.

In other cases these discoveries expose the falsehood of the historian's informants, and almost demonstrate their motives in misleading him. Thus, the Egyptian priests "concealed from him altogether the dark period in their history, the time of their oppression under the Shepherd Kings, of which he obtained only a single dim and indistinct glimpse, not furnished him, apparently by the priests, but by the memory of the people. They knowingly falsified their monuments by assigning a late date to the pyramid kings, whom they disliked, by which they flattered themselves that they degraded them. They distorted the true narrative of Sennacherib's miraculous discomfiture, and made it tend to the glorification of one of their own body." And they succeeded in concealing all other invasions of their territory by the kings of Assyria and Babylon, even when subsequent to the settlement of Greeks in their country.

More frequently, however, these discoveries vindicate the historian's truth, against the aspersions of Ctesias and others. Professing to derive his relation of oriental affairs from examination of Persian archives, during a residence of seventeen years at the court of Artaxerxes, Ctesias proceeded to contradict Herodotus, "whenever he could do so without fear of detection. He thus acquired to himself a degree of fame and of consideration to which his literary merits would certainly

never have entitled him." "By the most unblushing effrontery he succeeded in palming off his narrative upon the ancient world as the true and genuine account of the transactions, and his authority was commonly followed in preference to that of Herodotus, at least upon all points of purely oriental history. There were not wanting, indeed, in ancient times, some more critical spirits, *e. g.*, Aristotle and the true Plutarch, who refused to accept as indisputable the statements of the Cnidian physician, and retorted upon him the charge of untruthfulness, which he had preferred against our author. It was difficult, however, to convict him of systematic falsehood until oriental matters of an authentic character were obtained, by which to test the conflicting accounts of the two writers. A comparison with the Jewish Scriptures, and with the native history of Berosus, first raised a general suspicion of the bad faith of Ctesias, whose credit few moderns have been bold enough to maintain against the continually increasing evidence against him. At last the *coup de grace* has been given to his small remaining authority by the recent cuneiform discoveries, which convict him of having striven to rise into notice by a system of 'enormous lying' to which the history of literature scarcely presents a parallel." On the other hand, the statements of the same monuments are found to sustain the honesty of Herodotus and Berosus.

Of course the advancement and general diffusion of knowledge has completely dispelled the necessity for contradicting some notions which the ancient historian took pains to refute, as well as some others which he admitted; but a most interesting result is that modern science and discovery, in some instances, demonstrate the correctness of what he declares he could not believe, and, in so doing, bear testimony to his fidelity in recounting even what his own faith rejected, when he did not feel free to withhold it. At the command of Pharaoh Necho certain Phœnicians sailed out of the Red Sea, down the eastern coast of Africa, and returned, after the lapse of two years, by way of the Straits of Gibraltar. One particular in their report, Herodotus says he could not believe, that, when rounding the southern point of Africa, they had the sun on their right hand. His incredulity on this point was the

incredulity of his age; but, while proving that such voyages were not of frequent occurrence, it gives the most indubitable evidence that a Phœnician expedition had rounded the Cape of Good Hope more than two thousand years before Vasco de Gama.

In some cases, they explain, from natural causes, what appears mythical in his handling, and was regarded as mysterious by himself. But by far the most valuable use is, that they carry the view of history, with greater or less distinctness, to a depth of antiquity of which Herodotus had no knowledge, revealing the existence of a long period of primitive civilization of which he knew little save the decline. Ethnology, following up the footsteps of human language, and the characteristics of races, through a dreary waste of unrecorded time, determines, somewhat vaguely, but yet with certainty, great ethnic movements which constitute the basis of nations and the starting-points of history. It beholds the Hamitic and Semitic races in their original homes and primitive culture, and the Arian in the general course of its migrations more than a thousand years before the rise of the Median Empire, the point from which the main action of the work of Herodotus begins. Antiquarian industry and hermeneutic skill have explored the track of empire, prior to the rise of Persia, up to the very verge of original dispersion, and established most important epochs of which Herodotus had never heard. Ruins, of course, are fragmentary; and of these fragments there are many to which we can yet assign no chronological place; but, after all, the mass of the legible and connected is such, upon many epochs, as to furnish a breadth and a certainty of information which even written history by itself could not afford. Whatever debate there may be on the subject of greater Egyptian antiquity, no person, competent to form an opinion on the subject, will now deny that monumental evidence has restored to their proper order in history the dynasty founded by Shishak, five hundred years before the time of Herodotus, that of the Ramesses several centuries before Shishak, that of the Sesortosens, long anterior to the Ramesses, as well as that of the still more ancient pyramid-builders of Memphis, reaching to more than seventeen hundred years before the

Greek historian visited that country. Of all that time, the Egyptian priests had records in their keeping, but what they told Herodotus was, in many particulars, erroneous, if not deliberate fiction, as appears from the discovery of the records themselves. They may, indeed, have communicated to him more than he either understood or remembered; but certain it is, that after all contained in his book, the existence of that long period of prior Egyptian history is a real discovery to us. Nor is that discovery merely a list of kings; there is far more in it going to illustrate the state of society, than to restore the order of dynasties.

Cuneiform scholarship is of a later date, but to it also are we already indebted for a large extension of the field of historical knowledge. By aid of a remarkable sequence of dates found among the inscriptions, a positive chronology has been established, upon a few important points, for Babylonian and Assyrian dominion, up to the nineteenth century before Christ; from which it is possible to look beyond, into still greater antiquity, upon certain earlier events, of dimmer outline and less ascertainable place, but not less certain existence, as far as a Babylonian prince, whose approximate date, whose name and title, correspond closely to the Chedorlaomer of Scripture.

Few and far apart are the facts yet ascertained of ancient Babylonian and Assyrian history; but they give us points of truth where formerly we had nothing, or, worse than nothing, fictions of Greek fabrication covering up or misrepresenting even the traditions of the country. At some epochs, especially from about the twelfth century B. C., to which belongs the cylinder of Tiglath Pileser I., the earliest contemporaneous monument yet brought to light as belonging to the Assyrian empire, a considerable amount of valuable information has been recovered, touching several nations of western Asia, and throwing light upon Scripture narrative not less than upon that of Herodotus.

A similar work has been executed for Phœnician antiquity, by the labours of minute scholarship, and especially by the indefatigable investigation and discriminative tact of Movers, who, although called away before his contemplated task was

done, has left an invaluable legacy to history. We regret that Mr. Rawlinson has not seen fit to draw more largely from this quarter. It really belonged to the demands of his undertaking to give a connected view of what has been ascertained on the subject of ancient Phœnicia, such as he has given for Egypt and Assyria. During the same long period when the two great monarchies founded upon the agricultural wealth of the alluvial plains on the Nile, and on the Euphrates, and Tigris, were vieing with each other for dominion over the world, the Phœnicians, commanding the sea-coast, actually conducted the commerce of the world, and constituted themselves the principal channel of intercourse among its nations, carrying their enterprise even to India and Ethiopia, and, contrary to the belief of Herodotus, to the British isles, and to the Baltic Sea, and round the Cape of Good Hope.

Perhaps the most valuable of the additions thus made to the learning of Herodotus, consists in the settlement of so many points of ethnic affinities, whereby a broad foundation has been laid for philosophical history, where formerly all, which was not a blank, was in helpless confusion.

In effect of the discoveries, from which these elucidations of Herodotus are drawn, a whole period of civilization is restored to history; not in all its proportions, nor in all its features; but substantially and distinctly enough to determine its place and extent, its character in the main, that it was of long duration, and the nature of its bearing upon that which came after. That period extends to more than fifteen hundred years back, from the rise of the Persian empire. It is the same to which Old Testament history and literature belong. Until recently we had very little knowledge of it, except from Scripture. Out of the vast mass of its writings, Hebrew literature alone had come down to us intact, as to its sacred canon. And such was our ignorance of the epoch out of which those Hebrew books came, that many of us found it hard to believe that they could be as old as the marks upon their face claimed for them. Within the recollection of men still young, learned critics could argue that writing was unknown at the date commonly assigned to Moses, and some very ingeniously conjectured that it might have been a revelation to that prophet. We can now look with

our own eyes upon roods of autograph, five hundred years older than Moses, with the evidences upon them of still more ancient literary culture. The information derived from these sources bears, in fact, more largely and directly upon Scripture than upon Herodotus, and goes to connect the two in a most interesting manner, thereby bringing the old Greek author into the number of commentators upon the word of God. So distinctly has this fact been perceived by the editor of the work before us, that he has already published a volume* to expound and apply it: although, as to that, we are constrained to say that it is not equal to the service he has done for the Greek.

As already remarked, the work of Herodotus pertains, in the main, to only the latter part of that ancient period, inasmuch as the Medo-Persian empire was that which, in overrunning and subduing the whole of its area, absorbed the vitality of all its members. And consequently when Persia died, the whole ancient oriental world died also. Herodotus narrates the rise and prosperity of that empire and closes with the beginning of its decline. From the invasion of Greece, the Persian empire never recovered; that calamity exhausted her resources, destroyed her best troops, and, worst of all, dispelled the might of her self-reliance. The conquest achieved by Alexander, about one hundred and fifty years later, was only the crushing of a hollow shell. Before the rise of Persia, the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Hebrews, Assyrians, and Babylonians had all seen an end of their respective epochs of prosperity, and were already sinking into disorganization. That fate was averted by throwing around them the firm compression of the laws of the Medes and Persians. Until that work was effected, the Medo-Persian arms were invincible. Their first step beyond it, met the barrier which they were destined not to pass. It was there stood the boundary between ancient oriental civilization, and that which arose under the auspices of Greece.

Such another historical crisis did not occur until Rome, by a greater effort, having discharged a similar office for the Hellenic world, on a greater scale and over a longer period of

* The Historical Evidences of the truth of the Scripture Records stated anew, &c., in eight lectures delivered in the Oxford University pulpit, at the Bampton lecture for 1859, by George Rawlinson, M. A. London, 1859.

decline, handed down her dominion to the broader civilization of modern times. And that event has also received its historian from the first maturity of the succeeding epoch. Herodotus is not, in any sense, a Gibbon, but he stands to his oriental subject, as the greater modern does to the mightier empire, whose departing glories he records.

Until lately, the only antiquity which we distinctly recognized was that which lay behind the decline of Rome; we are now favoured with a somewhat more competent insight into the character, duration and proportions of that which lay behind the decline of Persia. From the later we inherit the Greek and Latin classics; from the earlier the Hebrew Scriptures. As every discovery in the antiquities of the later is turned to account in elucidation of the classical authors, so let us hope that competent hands will be found to employ the knowledge, now revived, of the earlier epoch, with similar effect upon the ancient books of revelation.

Art. V.—*The Apostolic Benediction.*

The full form of the Apostolic Benediction is found only at the close of the second Epistle to the Corinthians: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." In most of the Epistles it is used in an abridged form; "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all;" and in several, it is still more abridged, "Grace be with you all."

The Spirit of Christ takes up the natural and conventional usages of men, and consecrates them to his own spiritual purposes. We may observe as an instance of this, how the Christian form of greeting comes in the place of those which only expressed a natural sentiment of civility; and how it is thus made to suggest and to convey the substantial blessings of the gospel. As in parting compliments, so in introductory salutations; where common usage says "Greeting," or expresses the

courteous wish for health and peace, the Christian spirit says, "Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ."

When the Lord suddenly appeared among his disciples, he saluted them with, "Peace be unto you." He directed the disciples when they entered a house on their mission, to say, "Peace be to this house;" and to watch for the effect of their greeting, as a sign that they were welcome, or otherwise. From this they were to decide whether they had any good work to do in that house. These were intended rather as greetings, than as blessings; rather to ascertain the conditions of blessing, than to confer the blessing itself. In the apostolic writings, the form of Christian blessing appears with great decision and uniformity. It may be marked as one of the strong characteristics of apostolic Christianity. It is remarkable as to its matter and its manner. We have no record of the course by which this epistolary form of blessing passed into use in the public assemblies of Christians; but as the earliest liturgies contain it, and as the substance, and even the full form of it occurs constantly in the patristical addresses to Christian individuals and churches from the apostles down, it must have been adopted on authority of unquestionable validity. It is not improbable that the apostles used it no less in the public assembly than in epistolary correspondence; and that it passed from the apostolic age into the subsequent times as an established form of blessing, agreeable to the spirit of Christian faith and worship. Our authority for using the ceremony may be safely presumed to be apostolic, and therefore Divine. It must hence be considered as having a sacred import. It is not an empty ceremony; not a mere sign of kind wishes on the part of the leader of divine worship, for the spiritual edification of the people; but like preaching, prayer, sacred song, and the sacraments, it has a deep spiritual significancy, and when properly used, an efficacious power, through the Holy Spirit, for Christian edification. As the church regards her dependence on the grace of Christ for prosperity, and the necessity of complying with those established laws of the kingdom of grace, by which redeeming influence is dispensed, she will consider, in connection

with her other ordinances of worship, the nature, the design, and hence the proper use of the apostolic benediction.

As to its nature and design, it is undeniably and strictly a benediction. In speaking, as above, of expressions of Christian good wishes, and of social, friendly salutations at parting, or at the close of a letter, we do not thereby state any of the distinctive characteristics of this ceremony as a public usage in the church. If, as we have no ground to deny, it was used by the apostles in the Christian assemblies, it must have carried with it the significance not of a mere wish or prayer, but a form of blessing. It could not have been one of the forms of public prayer. According to our theory of worship, nothing is properly prayer in the religious assembly, as part of the public exercises, but that in which the congregation and the minister are considered as uniting, and the language of the united address is always in the first person. But in the benediction, the minister and the people stand as two parties, one addressing the other.

The pronouncing of a blessing by one religious person upon others, has prevailed wherever we discern the feeblest traces of the true religion. The patriarchs pronounced their dying blessing on their children. Melchisedek pronounced a blessing on Abraham. This was an act of official authority, the less having been blessed of the greater. The patriarchal blessing was official also, if the family be considered as a religious organization, of which the patriarch is the priest. This was the true view of the constitution of the family before the larger religious organizations were formed; and it is the true view still. The patriarchal blessing was properly a blessing, so far as it signified good to come for the children. It was partly prophetical, and partly, as with Jacob in blessing his sons, a pious effusion of wise and trustful forecast respecting the natural course of Providence with the children, according to their predominant characteristics.

When the children of Israel took a national organization as "the congregation of the Lord," and had ceremonies of religious worship multiplied among them immensely beyond those of previous ages, and of other nations, we find a form of blessing divinely composed and enjoined as a part of their ritual.

The same Divine Spirit which prompted the extemporary forms of blessing among pious individuals and families, and which dictated among many people outside of the covenant of Abraham, the use of the benediction among their means of religious culture, now incorporated among the positive and regular conditions of obtaining and cherishing gracious influence, a most beautiful and impressive ceremony as an official act of "blessing the people." The high priest was directed to say to the people, "The Lord bless thee and keep thee: The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." It is then added, to explain the import of the ceremony, and to ensure its validity, "And they shall put my name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them."

This Jewish form was most strictly a benediction, a blessing of the children of Israel. And it was a type of the Christian form of blessing, in this respect that it came from the same Spirit, working according to the law of grace, and producing its form according to existing conditions. And as Christians trace, in the doctrinal outlines of Moses, the rudiments of the Christian Trinity, it will be found no mere work of imagination to indicate an essential correspondence between the Jewish form of blessing and the Christian.

The name of God, to be thus put upon the people, was Jehovah, the name announced in the advanced revelations to Moses; the most comprehensively descriptive name by which the true God has ever made himself known. Corresponding to this, as there was no new name of broader import, by which to distinguish the Christian position in blessing, we have the specific personalities included under the term Jehovah, with the form of good proper to each: Love, grace, and communion. God loved the world, and gave his Son with the fulness of grace, who brings men into the communion of the Spirit; that is, into the participation of the Spirit common to them with the Father and the Son. Since the one Jehovah is now known as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he requires this name to be put upon his people in baptism; and he would also require that those who bless his people, and his people who bless one another, should bless in this name. This is his new covenant name, the name by which

his people are ever to be distinguished, and by which he is to be known among them, in all the world and to the end of time.

We notice then the three-fold form of the Jewish benediction, and the corresponding three-fold form of the Christian; and how the several parts of the one coincide with the several parts of the other, each with each; the Holy Ghost thus testifying, though with an obscurity like that of other revelations of the time, the three-fold personality of the one true God, executing his triple office in the scheme of redemption. Thus,

1. The first contains the general invocation and declaration of Divine favour as proceeding from the infinite fountain of indiscriminate goodness, of which the people of God are the happy and distinguished partakers. "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee." The Lord bestow upon thee the blessing of his Almighty protection. From Abraham down to Moses, the idea of exposure to violence had been peculiarly associated with the covenant families. As the father of the faithful sets out from the land of his nativity to go, he knows not whither, he hears the voice of his covenant God assuring him of favour in the form which his circumstances would require. "Fear not, Abraham, I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward." Among the unfriendly and barbarous clans of the country, where he and his friends were so exposed to violence and robbery, it was his only security, that the God in whom he trusted would be his defence. The Lord would stand between him and his enemies. This protection was also gloriously symbolized in the cloud which hung behind the camp of Israel in the wilderness, luminous toward the camp, but dark towards any pursuing foes. So suitable a form of Divine favour could not fail to become a leading object of desire and prayer among the people who so felt their need of protection. It must give them their leading idea of the Divine beneficence. Hence the most general expression of Divine favour to meet the pious desire of that time, would be substantially that of the first sentence of the Jewish benediction: The Lord bless thee with protection. The more general of the three parts of the Christian benediction is the second; and this corresponds with the first of the Jewish, in being comprehensive of all blessing, and in using the form which expresses the leading Christian idea of Divine favour—

the love of God. The New Testament gives Christ to the church as the manifestation of God, in whom all fulness of blessing dwells. The prominence of Christ in the New Testament and in the whole administration of the new covenant is good reason for placing his name first in the fervid and grateful conceptions of Divine favour, which prevail in the animated exercise of blessing. Hence "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" is the first part of the formula. But in the second, we have the general mention of the love of God, which describes the original, undivided idea of the Divine favour as revealed in Christ. Thus the first sentence of the Jewish form answers to the second of the Christian.

2. The second specifies the gracious source of the benefit received; the principle in the Divine nature from which protection and all other favours from God to men proceed; the aspect of love in showing favour to the ill-deserving. "The Lord be gracious unto thee." Here the Jewish benediction recognizes sin, and the grace of God which forgives sin, and renews the sinful heart. The Spirit of the covenant could not permit this glowing annunciation of Divine goodness to the chosen people to be used in the form of public and solemn benediction, without the emphatic admonition, that this goodness would avail them only in the character of unmerited favour. Now what could appear more like a New Testament version of this second clause of the Mosaic benediction, than the first clause of the apostolic—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ?" And even the first part of this second clause of the Jewish blessing is framed in language beautifully typical of the full idea of grace as revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ. "The Lord make his face to shine on thee." The Lord Jesus was full of grace and truth; and his person is the "face" of God; "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person." It is the height of Christian blessedness on earth to have "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;"—a beautiful example of the New Testament light and grace opening out of the Old, as the flower from the bud. In the old benediction, the grace is mentioned in the second place; in the new, it is named in the first. The gospel magnifies the grace of God towards man. "Grace and truth came by Jesus

Christ." So commanding in the gospel is this great idea of grace, that it takes the lead in all the religious thoughts of true Christians; and therefore, in a form of speech intended to express the blessings bestowed on men through the gospel, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is naturally mentioned first. We have thus in the second part of the Jewish benediction a type of the second part of the apostolic.

3. The third part of the Hebrew benediction presents even a still brighter and clearer type of the gospel blessing. "The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." Peace is the effect of grace. Grace is considered as a disposition in God, peace as an inward condition of his people. Now as God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, dwells in his people, and exercises within them his gracious disposition, he reveals himself in the office of the Comforter. While the grace of God is considered objectively, the Lord Jesus Christ fills the whole field of the believer's vision; because it is in Christ that the fulness of this grace is personified. A step in advance transforms the object into subject, the grace seen into grace felt. Contemplation passes into experience. The view of Christ as person now becomes sense of Christ as power. For, since the power of Christ is the Holy Ghost, the sense of Christ as a comforting power in us, proves the living communication between God and the soul to be established and complete; and so the office of mediation has been magnified. Now the Comforter has come; and the condition of his coming is the receding of the Mediator. "If I go not away the Comforter will not come to you; but if I go away I will send him unto you." Till then the mediation itself is not fully seen. For it is not till the Comforter fulfils his office in the soul, that the purport of Christ in his mediation is truly shown. "He shall testify of me; for he shall take of mine and shall show it unto you." And this he does by becoming, according to his name, the peace [the comfort] of Christ in the soul. The peace is not a consequence of the showing; it is the showing itself. The consciousness of peace is the only eye of the soul that can read this testimony of the Spirit concerning Christ. "Not as the world giveth," says the Saviour, "give I unto you." The world gives peace through thought; and thought in order to peace. Christ often gives

peace in order to thought; for then can we think most truly of Christ when we feel his peace. This precious part of the Hebrew benediction, interpreted thus by the New Testament, cannot have been placed after the other by accident; since we know that the omniscient Spirit of peace, who knew the true relation of the thoughts to one another, in the gospel order, must have governed the order of expression by the same rational law by which he governed it afterwards in the apostle. It intentionally shows an advance of the thought from the grace of God, to the effect of that grace in us. Precisely this is the order and import of the closing member of the apostolic benediction—"The communion of the Holy Ghost." The grace appeared in its fulness in Christ; but that fulness of grace consisted in the measureless gift of the Holy Spirit, which was upon him. God gave not the Spirit by measure unto him. That Spirit wrought in him not only more mightily than in Moses or David, but also after a different sort. It wrought Moses in the mould of a servant; Jesus in that of a son. In those who are united to Christ by the new covenant Spirit, it tends to produce the feeling of sonship. The Holy Spirit is the spirit of sonship in them, and tends or strives always to manifest himself as such, in their experience and conduct. He is the Spirit of adoption in this sense. It is because he is sent forth into our hearts, that we can call God our Father, as Christ did, and with an instinctive and confiding discernment of the meaning of the term. The possession of this common Spirit is the communion of the Holy Ghost. The love of God, appearing in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, is thus "perfected in us." The Spirit of peace in Christ becomes the Spirit of peace in us. "My peace I give unto you." The indwelling of the Holy Ghost is enjoyed by Christians, in fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ, and with one another. "Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit." This unspeakable gift the Saviour promised. "I will not leave you comfortless." He breathed this same assuring word, though less articulately, upon his people, through the last part of the Mosaic benediction; "The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace." In other and gospel words; The

Spirit take of Christ's, and show it unto thee, in giving thee peace. And the peace which thus comes to the people of Christ, is the peace of God which passeth all understanding; the true result of the presence of the Holy Spirit of peace in the soul. The fellowship, the common possession of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.

This correspondence of the several parts of the Jewish benediction with those of the Christian, is not imaginary nor incidental. It is from the one unchangeable Spirit of the two covenants. Under both the people were taught to look for the same blessing of the Lord upon them. It is the same Holy Spirit in both, working to the same beneficent purpose under different forms; speaking the same things in diverse language. In both he speaks and acts through an appointed ministry. The spirit and life of Christianity was in Judaism, partly active and partly latent. It spoke and acted rather through precept than doctrine, requiring rather particular acts under authority and direction, than a self-guided obedience under light.

Here then is a beautiful, emphatic, and inspired form for blessing those who profess to love the Lord in sincerity, and who endeavour to worship him in spirit and in truth. It was commended to the church by apostolic example; and continues to be used as a part of the exercises for edification in the public assembly. Its use in the church is warranted by ample authority, even if authority were needed to commend it, besides its fitness. The Holy Spirit plainly offers his gracious operation in connection with the use of this ceremony. If we consider the nature of the means of grace, and how they become effectual for Christian edification, we shall see this brief but solemn and significant ceremony to be, in its peculiar way, one of the most edifying among them all.

The means of grace consist partly of religious exercises enjoined by the Lord upon his disciples, with the promise of his blessing; partly of exercises suggested by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christians, and found conducive to edification; and partly such as arise from the course of Divine Providence with men. "The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption," are all held by the church as occasions of edifying and saving intercourse

between God and his people in this world. We will briefly explain the operation of our appointed and customary forms of public worship.

It is true of all these ordinances, as our Catechism declares of the sacraments, that they "become effectual means of salvation, not by any virtue in them, or in him that doth administer them, but only by the blessing of Christ, and the working of his Spirit in them that by faith receive them." We are certainly right in not ascribing spiritual efficacy to the outward form of any religious rite, or to any thing natural or solely official in the administration. The external ceremony in itself is nothing. "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but a new creature." Indeed, no branch of the church considers outward ordinances efficacious, without the blessing of Christ and the operation of the Holy Spirit. Christians differ in their ways of explaining the connection between the outward form and the inward power, but all agree in ascribing the efficiency of ordinances entirely to the working of the Spirit of God. We must not attempt to magnify the value of the Christian benediction, or of any other form of worship, solely as an outward form; but carefully inquiring into the reasons of our faith in the efficacious working of the Spirit, we strive to secure the proper use of this as well as of the other ordinances of the gospel.

In describing the nature and explaining the effect of the means of grace, we must refer to the living union between Christ and those who use his ordinances with profit. None can have either the beginning or increase of the grace of Christ, except through vital union with him. Then by the habitual submission of the mind to his revelations of himself, and by endeavours after new obedience in all things, we favour the work of his Spirit upon us. A well-trained faith, free and familiar intercourse with outward ordinances, delight in recognizing the presence of the Lord, observing the tokens of his gracious power, and grateful confidence in its good effects upon us, are the established conditions of a rapid growth towards the perfection of the spiritual man. Under these conditions the voice of Christ is always heard in his ordinances, and his power is felt. Without a participation with Christ in his Spirit of

life, there can be no effectual use of ordinances. The water of life wells up in the church to those who observe the ordinances of Christ in faith; but for those who have no faith, the well is deep, they have nothing to draw with, and remain athirst.

Our Lord said to his disciples concerning his own words, that they were spirit and life. His words came direct and alive from the measureless gift of the Spirit within him. The whole visible person of Christ was peculiarly a product of the Holy Spirit. He was the pure, full, and proper embodiment of the power, wisdom, truth, and love of God, in human form. His personal being as the Son of God is from an eternal motion of the Divine nature, making him as Son, eternal like the Father. In him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead; and that invisible fulness had its true image in his visible manhood. In his vital connection with all the powers of the world, he has but to will, and the thing he wills is done. Thus by his silent will, he causes the water, as he walks upon it, to bear up his body, and a celestial splendor to invest his earthly form on the mount of transfiguration. And when his will was expressed in words, the words bore the same relation to the Spirit of life within him that the miracles did. While he spoke as never man spoke, his words were felt by such of his hearers as were disposed to receive them with candor, and not to resist them through prejudice. The Spirit of Christ was silently abroad among the people where Christ was present. His presence was widely felt even where no signs of his personal activity appeared. It draws the multitude to John the Baptist; moves Andrew to look for Jesus; causes the infirm woman to press through the crowd that she might touch the hem of his garment; blind Bartimeus to cry unto him by the way-side; Zaccheus to climb the tree to obtain a sight of him. Such evidences of his influence upon the people around him, without words, show the spirit and life in the midst of which his words were spoken. The common laws of human influence were in full force in him, but Divine powers were working under them. They explain the motions of his grace in the hearts of those whom he addressed in words. They account for the impressions felt and acknowledged by those who heard his doctrine, and the strange submission with which they always obeyed his

commands. John the Baptist, at his mild suggestion, yields all modest and humble scruples, and baptizes him. James and John, Simon and Andrew, leave their occupation and their home at his word, to attend upon him. Matthew leaves the receipt of custom, to follow him. The centurion goes his way, expecting to find his servant alive and well. The worldly traffickers in the temple withdraw at his bidding. While he was teaching and doing his mighty works, his disciples were receiving the impression, which flesh and blood did not make upon them, but only the Father in heaven—the conviction that he was the Christ, the Son of the living God.

The Scripture theory of Christianity presents Christ as the universal medium through which all the works of God are done; and the Holy Spirit as the agent by which the motions of this universal medium are produced and propagated. "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Christ is all in all. His Spirit does, under his direction, and according to his good pleasure, all his works of power, wisdom, and love, in creation, providence, and redemption. Of him, and through him, and to him are all things; and as the Holy Ghost, who is the same in all, diversifies his operations and his gifts in the church, agreeably to the will of Christ, so he carries on his diverse works in all the departments of life, according to the laws imposed by the Mediator. In Christ all the works of the Spirit are done. In this mediatorial element, thus pervaded by the powerful agency of the Holy Spirit, all men live; and all are affected by it, according to their diverse susceptibilities; and these are determined, according to the sovereign will of God, by the laws of the covenant under which the individuals live, and by the course of Divine Providence with them.

There must be a susceptibility not belonging to the natural man. The people heard the words of Christ with gladness, because they had somewhat in them congenial to him. "My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me." The sheep, in this case, have the nature of the Shepherd. His Spirit is in them. They can feel his influence because they have a kindred life. His influence is not so much *upon* the heart as *within* it. It

is the motion of his own Spirit dwelling in the soul. The day dawns, and the day-star arises in the heart. The sun of the firmament enlightens according to distance. The Sun of Righteousness enlightens according to faith. The susceptibility of the soul for the influence of Christ is its faith. This faith comes by the law of the covenant; and the development of the faith depends on the course of providence. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" becomes the law of the believer's life. The words of Christ, therefore, as they *express* the Spirit of life in him, *impress* the Spirit of life in them. Now, the ordinances of Christ are of the nature of his words. They are effectual for edification to those who have his Spirit and life. "To him that hath shall be given." The way is prepared in them for the effectual use of Divine ordinances. It may be said of his ordinances, as of his words, "they are spirit, and they are life." We mean by ordinances of Christ, not outward ceremonies in themselves; but the doing of what he has appointed, and what he approves, in obedience to him, and with the expectation of his blessing. In such acts, the conscience of obedient intent is the testimony of the Spirit within us. The spirit and life of Christ's ordinances are then testified in the hearts of those who worthily and profitably observe them. They have concurrent motions of the omnipresent Spirit, and therefore know the voice of Christ in all his institutions.

Even when the Spirit of Christ speaks through the lips of unworthy men, and of men unconscious of his presence and of his influence with them, the same Spirit in the hearers may recognize itself in the things that are spoken, and present the concurrent impression. A profane person may read the Scriptures in the religious assembly with spiritual effect; and may be the instrument of edification to the children of God, by delivering thoughts, and representing affections, which are not the thoughts and affections of his own mind. Accordingly, we teach, against the Romanists, that the efficacy, or the practical validity of an ordinance, does not depend on the intention of him who administers it. The words and the acts in an ordinance of Christ may be effectual through faith in the hearers and partakers, even without faith in the administrator. Still, it must

be remembered that an ordinance administered by a sincere person, with the lively exercises of the spiritual mind, will be far more edifying to the same believing and earnest participant, than if administered by an infidel. The inestimable law of spiritual sympathy, at the foundation of the fellowship of saints, secures this important advantage to the church; and this is even independent of the import of the words. The words and acts of Christ were spirit and life to many of his hearers, who knew little or nothing of his meaning for their understanding, and who only obtained, through what they saw and heard, a glimpse of his manly dignity and love. The case of Martha at the grave of Lazarus is a beautiful example. The Lord's conversation with her about his being the resurrection and the life, and his saying that those who believed in him should never die, were all an enigma to her uninitiated thoughts; but they conveyed to her the growing assurance that he was the true Messiah, and the Saviour. "Believest thou *this*" [that I have just said]? "Yea, Lord," she answers, "I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, that should come into the world." So, also, those who pray "in the Spirit," have often devout motions immediately caused by the Holy Ghost, who intercedeth within them, according to the will of God; while the things thus prayed for are not expressed in words, nor conceived in thought by the suppliant. These most profound and silent risings of undefined and indefinable desire, these "groanings not uttered," are assuredly the most effectual of the prayers of the church; and that, undoubtedly, because they are offered more purely, *κατὰ θεὸν*, divinely, Rom. viii. 27, and partake less of the infirmities of our earthly humanity. They are not dimmed and distorted in the mirror of our opaque and shattered intellect. They are not, like many desires in our habitual prayers, first given to our own conceptions in ill-fitting language, and uttered, with circumstantial excitement, in thoughts and words that recur as in the cycles of an automaton. Words which are spirit and life are not signs, but forces. Such were the Saviour's words; such are his ordinances. "His word was with power." "The word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and

spirit, of the joints and of the marrow; and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." The words and the ordinances of Christ, when used "in the Spirit," as in the case of availing prayer, operate, through that Spirit, as occasions of Divine motion in the soul. Christ and his covenant people are one, by virtue of the one Holy Spirit in him and them; and the use of his ordinances, as spiritual exercise, originates with him, while the action is proper to them; and the Spirit, who prompts the obedient exercise, takes occasion, from the exercise, to diffuse his own healthful forces more copiously through the man, in body and in soul; to bring forth more of the power of righteousness into the happy experience, and the dutiful practice of conscious life, and more fully to secure the continued abiding of the soul in Christ. It is thus that the ordinances of Christ accomplish, with those who are in covenant with him, the thing whereunto they are appointed.

Our Christian institutions fail sadly in their efficacy, when the people so misunderstand them as not to expect uniform and rapid progress in religion from their proper use. If the office of the ordinary means of grace, and the manner of their operation be such as has been above described, we cannot expect the full blessing of Christ through them, and the working of his Spirit in us by their instrumentality, without a practical faith in their uniform efficacy under the appointed condition. "Therefore, I say unto you, whatsoever things ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." Of all practical matters for the people of God, the most important is, that they have full and abiding faith in the blessing of God, through the ordinances of the church. The absence of this faith renders the means of grace a nullity. When people so mistake the efficacy of their ordinances as to measure it by the degree of outward excitement they experience or observe, and not by the quiet and steady growth of faith in things unseen, and of the comfort of hope, and the work of love in themselves and their children, they have departed from the true path of spiritual edification; and no means which they can substitute, will be found to have in the end, the desired effect. Our most common ordinances, those of most ordinary and familiar use, are intended to be effectual instruments of

the power of God, as the hand is the instrument of our mind. Our observance of them must be viewed as occasions of his real and effectual working. Without such a faith, the mind is in a state of resistance against God, who is working through his ordinances in us; and no arbitrary, special measures of our own, can make that resistance any less. Let the children of the church but grow up in the bosom of a genuine and lively faith in the ceaseless and uniform operation of God through his ordinances in the church, and we should see a very different religious character in the children and the youth of our land, from that which we have now to deplore.

With the views now stated, we are prepared to show how the apostolic benediction should be understood in the church, and in what spirit it should be pronounced and received.

And first, by no means should it be regarded as a mere form of dismissing the assembly. That it comes last in the order of time in the public service, is not determined by anything in the sentiment it expresses, or in the effect to be expected from it. It is used to promote the work of the Holy Spirit within us. The Jewish benediction was not given as a form for dismissing the assembly. We know not that in the public ceremonies of the congregation it was used at the close at all. It was a form of public blessing, appointed as a part of Divine service. It is so employed in the Christian church. The liturgies of the Greek, Roman, and English service, place the apostolic benediction at the close of the order for public prayer; thus signifying that the prevailing Christian idea of the ceremony was not connected with the dismission of the congregation. It was rather understood as a solemn and emphatic form of pronouncing a blessing in the name of the Lord upon the people.

Neither, in the second place, should it be regarded as a prayer. Not but that it might be proper, in itself, that a short, sententious prayer should be used as the last exercise of the congregation, before dispersion; and if such had been recognized as the import of this ceremony through the course of its history, and especially in the Scriptures, or if the higher Christian sentiment of our assemblies tended towards regarding it as a prayer, there might be no sufficient reason for insisting on the opposite view. The Jewish high-priest was commanded

to bless the people in the name of the Lord; and this was to be one of the ways of putting the name of the Lord upon the people, and also one of the ways of imparting his blessing to them. This was not a sacerdotal function, inappropriate to the Christian ministry; but like any other service, properly ministerial, as in the sacraments for instance, it was fulfilling an office which conveyed a blessing to the faithful. The Christian benediction is not a prayer addressed to God, by minister and people united; it is not a prayer by the minister in behalf of the people. We never witness any form of its use which answers to the idea of prayer; but on the contrary, in that mixed style of expression which comes nearest to the style of prayer: "*May* the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with *us* all;" the address is never to God, but to the people; and it thus amounts to an expression of the minister's kind, and Christian wish, to the people of whom he counts himself one. For the most part, however, the form which is used shows that the minister does not think himself offering a prayer, or even expressing a wish of his own; and that he would not have the people think so; though neither he nor they would appear to consider it an authoritative and effectual act of blessing, as it really is.

The Christian benediction, we next remark, should be regarded as an act of solemn worship. It was a most reverential ceremony for the Jewish high-priest, when he officially pronounced the blessing of Jehovah in his name, upon the people, and for the people, when they stood to receive that blessing. No solemnity of the Jewish ritual could exceed that of publicly blessing and being blessed in the name of the Lord. No profounder reverence for God could be felt or expressed than that of the ancient patriarch, when he commended his children and friends to him, and with glowing confidence in his holy and faithful covenant, pronounced his blessing on them. And when can a Christian minister, or a Christian assembly ever have a frame of more intense and worshipful devotion, than while pronouncing and receiving the blessing of the Lord? Wherever in the course of public worship it may occur, it is one of the most solemn and expressive parts of our reverential service, and may be one of the most acceptable and useful.

And, we add, it should therefore be numbered among the more important and effectual of our means of grace. That it has always been considered edifying for religious people, on solemn occasions, to bless each other in the name of the Lord, is evident from the general practice of the pious from the earliest times. When king David had been awakened to lively devotion by some marked event, he returned to bless his household; and this record describes a part, at least, of those domestic exercises by which the pious monarch sought the spiritual welfare of his household. Would something like this be out of place in the families of the Christian church? The apostles certainly employed it as a means of engaging and strengthening the pious affections of their Christian friends; and their example commends it to the use of the pious in every age for the same purpose. In the public assembly, especially, should it hold an important place, as a means of grace. The Spirit, undoubtedly, would have it so. He suggests it to his people, in every age, as one of the social exercises which may be "good to the use of edifying." It was an eminent means of grace to the Hebrews. When the priest blessed the people in the name of the Lord, the Lord blessed them. "They shall put my name on the children of Israel, and I will bless them." When the congregation, by a public and united act of reception, took thus upon themselves the name of the Lord, and solemnly owned him as their God, he took them into closer union with himself, by the quickened working of his Spirit within them. When a Christian congregation observes the ordinance of baptism, in relation to one of their members, they express a public recognition of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as their God, and receive, through the sacrament, not only for the member baptized, but for all the faithful present, a quickened spiritual operation, which they would not otherwise enjoy. The same is true of the observance of our other sacrament; and all other exercises of pious faith, not distinctly sacramental, contribute, according to their measure, to the same end of spiritual edification, and in the same way. And certainly, not one of the least of the non-sacramental means of enlivening the spiritual operation in the heart of the church, may be the devout use of the Christian benediction.

We mention, also, as a special part of the import of this ceremony, connected with the one last mentioned, that it publicly and impressively recognizes the dependence of the church on the grace of God through Christ. The blessing pronounced by Melchizedek on Abraham implied, in both the parties, a declaration that all human works depend for success on the blessing of God. No Christian could have witnessed the Jewish ceremony of blessing, without understanding it to signify a lively sense of dependence on the Divine favour. When the high-priest blessed the people, and the people stood to receive the blessing, how solemn was their united acknowledgment of dependence, and their profession of reliance on God for prosperity in all their ways! And the apostles, in their parting salutations, felt, and wished their Christian friends to feel, that the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ was the only security for their welfare. As used in our assemblies, the Christian benediction is one of the happiest and most significant forms of confessing our own insufficiency for either duty or enjoyment, and of looking, with the trustful glance of a moment, to Him in whom is all our strength. This awakening impulse upon our Christian sentiment of dependence and of reliance on the grace of God, is certainly not inappropriate to a parting moment; and therefore, to the close of our public service. It is even a more emphatic and impressive sign of our united desire and expectation of the grace of God than the language of the public prayer. The benediction supposes the assembly to take the position, not of suppliants, but of humble and grateful recipients; looking with all assurance for the grace previously sought in prayer, and recognizing the appointed ceremony as an instrument by which the grace is conveyed. And in this view, the exercise acquires some peculiar solemnity, when, as in our assemblies, it occurs only at the close of service, and the moment before dispersion; and when the posture of the congregation expresses unanimity and animation, and is taken for the purpose of receiving the blessing.

This ceremony, moreover, as hinted already, is useful as an act of formal and thankful acceptance of the grace of God, sought and presented in the ordinances of public worship. The Divine favour conveyed through all the ordinances of the occa-

sion, may be thus solemnly recognized and devoutly accepted by a separate and significant rite. When the congregation stood to receive the blessing of Aaron, they presupposed the gracious promises in which they hoped, and felt, for the time just past and then passing, a kind of consummation of their fulfilment. This was one of the ideas implied in their form of blessing. The promise of blessing seemed just then transformed into blessing itself in the very act. Such an act of acceptance has somewhat quite peculiar, as an exercise of faith. It is believing that we have the favour. It is what it purports to be—the receiving of the blessing. The pious among the Jewish people recognized the Lord, indeed, habitually, as their God; they received his promise as true and faithful; they looked for its continuous fulfilment in the devout use of all the ordinances of their law; but their act of faith in receiving the blessing, in obedience to his own appointment, seemed a comprehensive and crowning act, a committing of themselves to his blessing, and a testimony of their assurance that his gracious presence is actually with them, and will abide with them to the end.

It should be added, that the repetition of this blessing, by the Divine command, has the nature also of the renewal of a pledge on the part of God himself. It must have had great force in assuring a believing and intelligent Israelite of the kind interest of God in him. For he knew that Aaron pronounced only words which were appointed by express statute to be used "for ever throughout their generations." The voice of the priest was the voice of the law. Every repetition was like a new pledge of its perpetual efficacy. In the time of the apostles the people had the important doctrine of the Holy Spirit. They knew that the apostles spoke by the Spirit; and that their words of blessing were like the words of Christ. When an inspired apostle said, The grace of the Lord be with you, it was to them like Christ saying, "Peace be unto you." As the Lord had said, "I will not leave you comfortless," they could now recognize him, speaking by his Spirit in the apostles, and actually giving them the promised peace according to their faith. The perpetual use of this benediction in the church, is

like the perpetual announcement of the Saviour's actual blessing in pursuance of his promise.

We therefore have yet to remark, that to all hearts complying with the conditions on which ordinances become efficacious, the benediction conveys the grace it signifies. The manner of this conveyance and in what it consists, we have explained as far as we could, in our remarks above on the efficacy of ordinances in general. The blessing is effectual to those who receive it in faith. If any object and raise questions respecting this statement, we have no reply, but to repeat the statement. We cannot reason about it. It can be received only by faith; and this faith is never the offspring of argument. The blessing is efficacious only to faith, and it is faith only that receives the fact of its efficacy. All objections and queries against this fact show incapacity to realize the fact. To the mind that harbors them the blessing signified cannot come. We admit the benediction in our churches to be mournfully ineffectual. But this is nothing against its uniform and precious effect under the due conditions. All our ordinances are deplorably unprofitable to great numbers of our people. But under the appointed conditions, they are uniformily attended with a blessing. Let our dear Christian people consider this matter in the scriptural light. Who of us ever doubts that Abraham was effectually blessed by the blessing of Melchizedek? Who of us, standing in the presence, and under the lifted hands of the Lord Jesus to receive his benediction, would not feel himself blessed indeed? What parent among us in covenant with God would not have rejoiced to see the hands of Jesus laid on his little child, and hear him pronounce his blessing on it? Would he not think the blessing spoken to be a blessing given? And who of us would not feel himself blessed, in hearing pronounced upon him a distinct and emphatic benediction of the apostle Paul? Let our people realize that there is a blessing in the apostolic benediction. Every ordinance of the house of the Lord becomes effectual unto salvation, "by the blessing of Christ and the working of the Spirit in them that by faith receive them." The benediction is an ordinance of Christ. The servants of the Lord have the same authority for blessing his people as for instructing them. The blessing

is pronounced in his name. Its very words were dictated by his Spirit, to be his standing form for blessing his people. The church recognizes its solemn import, in concurrence with her Lord, by requiring it to be publicly pronounced only by those who are duly clothed with ministerial authority. The words used are not the words of man. It is the Lord's blessing, pronounced on his people as his own signal for actually blessing them. And shall it be made of no effect? When Christ, by his appointed ministry, pronounces his blessing, in the forms of his new covenant, upon his people in those public congregations which are convened in his name, and where he is in the midst of them, is it not one of the due occasions for the quickened working of his purifying and peace-giving Spirit, in the whole body? Does not the New Testament suggest this as the law of spiritual operation? Are we not to consider the laws of the Spirit's operation uniform? Where the requisite faith is, and where the circumstances in all cases are the same, are not the means of grace to be regarded as always equally efficacious? God maketh men to differ, indeed, and that most strictly according to the counsel of his own will. But are we therefore to presume, that he does this independent of all conditions of his working, and so as to indicate no law of dispensing his gifts? The whole church believes that her ordinances are efficacious according to a revealed law. And our ardent longing is to make this conviction appear as the very best and most powerful action of that faith by which we are justified, and by which we receive Christ as he is offered in the gospel. Let us believe that when Christ our Lord pronounces his blessing upon us, we are truly and effectually blessed.

It follows from all that has been said above, that the apostolic benediction, as used in our public worship, is an exercise of some peculiar solemnity. The Christian sentiment in the church should be trained to hold it in very high esteem and reverence. The Holy Ghost has given it to us, and we have received it as among the ordinances of the Lord; and why should it be considered less solemn and important than the corresponding ceremony was among the ancient people, or the ceremony of blessing used by the apostles? Abraham evidently held the blessing of Melchizedek in high and most devout

estimation; and the apostle's way of speaking of it invests that mysterious transaction with great spiritual validity. Patriarchal blessings were highly prized by the members of religious families, according as they had been faithfully instructed in the fear of God. Esau could hardly endure the actual forfeiture of his father's dying benediction, though, in a freak of impiety, he had despised his title, and bartered it away. The Israelites unquestionably ascribed to the blessing of the Lord, pronounced in his name by their high-priest, a peculiar and sacred value, in proportion as they cherished a solemn regard for any of their religious ordinances. There could not have been, in the view of the disciples, a more solemn act of our Lord in all his ministry, than that of laying his hands on the little children and blessing them as heirs of the kingdom of heaven, or that of lifting up his hands and blessing them at the ascension. And as the solemnity of blessing was eminent among the gracious acts of our Lord and his apostles, so may the solemnity of our Christian benediction, which is taken from the apostles, be eminent among our ordinances of Divine service.

With these views of the nature, the design, and the proper efficacy of our form of blessing, we are prepared to offer a few thoughts on the manner and the spirit in which the benediction should be used by minister and people. We should be happy to succeed in drawing the attention of our ministers and people to this subject throughout the church. Though some may, at first thought, incline to consider it a matter of inferior importance, yet if the foregoing views are just, they are of serious importance to the spiritual interests of the whole church. The part of our religious exercises of which we are speaking, affords a striking instance of imperfection in our way of conducting religious exercises; for there is probably no other part of our public worship which we perform so unworthily as this. In the present imperfection of the church, the efficacy of our ordinances must of course be imperfectly realized; but on several accounts the benediction is liable to peculiar abuse. It will require earnest and patient attention to the subject, to effect the desired improvement in this part of the public conduct of our congregations; and it will require also great improvement in other respects, in order to secure

this; and particularly in respect to the views of the people as to the nature and efficacy of Divine ordinances in general. But serious attention being once drawn to this will very naturally extend to all the forms of Divine service of which this is a part. And it will still farther aid in redeeming the benediction from misuse, if we can secure due attention to the following suggestions, respecting the manner and spirit in which minister and people should employ it.

And first, of the Minister.—He should consider himself as pronouncing a blessing on the people by the authority of Christ. The whole work of the ministry is to be done indeed by the authority of Christ; and the servant of God should recognize his dignity as an ambassador of Christ, and a representative of his authority in all his official work. But in preaching and prayer, in which the imperfect human faculties have so prominent an activity, it seems often to the self-distrustful minister, too much like an approach toward presumption, to allow the vivid and confident feeling of Divine authority in all that he says and does. It might rather suit the humble and unassuming spirit, to think of the authority as an apology for the acts, than as a ground of their claim to reverence and submission. And in those of bolder faith, who habitually recognize the full Divine authority of their official functions, the consciousness of a large mixture of human imperfection, especially where great prominence is required for intellectual agency, abates very much from the full and hearty feeling of Divine authority in particular ministerial functions. But in pronouncing the blessing there need be no such bar. And according to the view we have taken, the whole propriety and fitness of the ministerial act depends on its being done most strictly and consciously in the name, and by the authority of Christ. It should seem like saying to the people, *By the authority of Christ, I bless you.*

The words of blessing should also be spoken under a sense of the presence of Christ. The minister should perceive the presence of Christ through faith, at least as clearly as the presence of the congregation through sight. For this is one of the fundamental operations of faith in Christ unseen, which gives his disciples command of spiritual powers. "He that

believeth in me, the works that I do he shall do also." A simple, habitual recognition of the presence of Christ, is one of the most important forms of that piety in a minister, which qualifies him for the suitable performance of all his official duties. It gives his words great sway over those susceptible of gospel influence. In preaching, in prayer, in conversation, in all official acts, his influence will be felt the more, the more he feels the influence of Christ. And no official act of a minister with this spiritual qualification, would seem to carry more of "the blessing of Christ" to his people, than that in which he is consciously and devoutly engaged in pronouncing a Christian blessing upon them. Let his own heart be firmly and peacefully settled in the conviction of the Lord's presence with himself and the congregation, while he pronounces the words. It is perhaps a common failing of our ministry, that the sense of the Lord's presence, according to his promise to his servants, fades into a very dim apprehension of some delegated power committed to them, to exercise the ministerial office with his approbation, and the promise of his aid. We speak this only from much comfortless experience in the matter. We do not imply any indiscriminate censure on the ministry in general; but supposing this experience of ours to arise from a common infirmity of human nature, we venture to judge others so far by ourselves, as to make it the occasion of offering a brotherly admonition. It is not enough that we perform the office now referred to as a matter of ceremonial common-place. But in the nature of the exercise, there are some reasons for special pains to secure that mental frame in which a lively sense of the presence of Christ shall be a prominent element. The assembly is convened professedly in the name of Christ. The believing members humbly claim his promise to be in the midst of them. They plead it in their prayer. And it would assuredly be a peculiar violence against the propriety of this part of the public service, if the minister should perform it without due recognition of the presence of Christ, in those scenes where he has so specially promised to be.

In pronouncing the benediction, the minister is permitted to regard himself as an instrument of imparting the blessing of Christ to his people. This is an important idea connected

with the ceremony, and it would, if borne in mind at the moment, increase the interest and effect of the service on the part of the minister. The idea agrees entirely with the scriptural view of the office of the gospel ministry. It involves nothing belonging exclusively to the Jewish ministry, as a priesthood. The peculiar function of the Jewish priesthood, which could not be carried over into the Christian church, was a propitiatory function. It consisted, not in acting as a medium of communicating good from God to his people, but in presenting offerings as means of propitiating Divine favour in behalf of the people. The duty of the Jewish priest in giving the people Divine knowledge, in guiding their religious conduct, in offering comfort in their sorrows, in doing for them and among them in public and in private, whatever would most promote their obedience to the Divine laws, and make those laws the greatest blessings to the people—all such duty belongs equally to the Christian minister. When he blesses a believing people, as when he teaches them, he imparts a gift. It is his own privilege to feel this. And when he does thus feel that the present Saviour is making him the instrument of communicating a blessing to his people, the blessing will be the greater. It is one of the peculiar pleasures of ministerial service to have this impression lively and deep. While not unfavourable to the purest humility, it makes one feel the sacredness and the dignity of his office, and his responsibility to his Lord for faithful service to his people. It especially qualifies for the effectual execution of this particular service. And it is a state of mind most congenial to the heart of a minister in all his pious exercises, and adapted to promote his fitness and readiness for every good word and work. And furthermore, when the minister recognizes the Lord actually blessing his own people through this established part of solemn worship, his own feeling of earnestness and solemnity will impress and benefit the people. Let him adopt this idea of his own effective instrumentality in communicating spiritual gifts to the Christian assembly, through a ministry which receives a part of its efficacy from the qualities of his own mind and heart. There is danger that the idea of the ministry degenerate into that of a mere labourer in a natural field. The Scripture admonition that

"Paul may plant, and Apollos water, but God giveth the increase," may seem to look that way. And without some careful thought on the subject, a minister may come to think carelessly of himself, as one who merely plants the seed, and weeds and stirs the ground, and repairs the hedge, while the warming sun, the moistening clouds, and the nourishing soil do all the real work of vegetation. Thus the minister would be employed not as an agent himself, but only as applying a sort of force to agents, in which the living powers concerned in the work are conceived to reside. He is thus only like the labourer who does in the field what might be done by the power of the horse or of steam. He is only like the musician who turns a crank; or the photographer, who adjusts his chemical agents under sunlight. But "ye are the light of the world." This thought of a Divine, efficient vitality in the agent, is liable to disappear. We must remember that this is a living agency. The work of the labourer in the spiritual vineyard consists largely of the action of his own spiritual life; and he is considered as promoting and propagating life, by exercising life himself, and that of the same kind which he would promote. It is life acting on life. The Holy Spirit, by whose working the ordinances are made effectual to believers, makes them the more effectual, other things being equal, the more mightily he works in those who administer them; and the words of blessing spoken under the full persuasion of imparting a blessing, will carry a personal power like that of the words of truth spoken under the living conviction of the truth. The minister should recognize himself as an instrument of the Holy Spirit, to increase, by pronouncing the Christian benediction, the gift of spiritual peace in the hearts of the people.

He should also pronounce the benediction as a part of the word of God. The church has taken the words of this ceremony from the apostles; much as she has the words of the form of baptism, and of the Lord's supper from Christ. There is great propriety in using Scripture language in all such cases where the idea to be expressed is precisely the same with that of Scripture, and is as fully expressed to all minds in the language of Scripture as it could be in any other. As to the particular words, we need not insist, in a dogmatical way, that

no other words should be used than those which occur in the forms preserved in the apostolic writings. Yet since the full form we have considered is found to have prevailed in the church with so extensive unanimity and such unbroken succession, we are amply justified in presuming that such prevalence and preservation of the usage is of the Holy Spirit himself in the church; and we cannot now conceive any true Christian principle which, under any possible circumstances, would require the church to depart from the form referred to, or which would permit such departure, as by a dictate of the Holy Spirit. While we express no conscientious disapprobation of variety in the scriptural terms employed in the benediction, and would not insist that any Divine injunction was violated even by the entire disuse of what is currently understood as the apostolic form, we doubt not it will seem to the great body of the Christian people of every land, both pertinent and forcible to ask, What truly religious motive can urge to any deviation? What words can more fitly express the Christian form of Divine favour for which the church is looking habitually, and by her living instinct, to her Head? What Christian ideas are more suitable to the purposes of public benediction than those presented in connection with the names, the persons, and the appropriate redeeming offices of the holy and ever blessed Trinity? The language is so direct, so comprehensive, so concise, that no variation can possibly be an improvement. It is the only form that either good taste, or refined Christian sentiment would endure in uniform and exclusive use. And a very brief attention to this consideration will strengthen and confirm a tendency in the mind of our ministry, to adhere, in the formula of blessing, not only to some selection of scriptural terms, but to the particular form prepared to hand by the apostle, so obviously prominent in the preference of the church in all ages, and so well adapted to all the ends ever contemplated in the observance of the rite. There will be found this advantage in uniformity; that the minister, when rising to pronounce the blessing, instead of being occupied with extemporaneous intellectual motion to select a form, or even to compose one, may feel himself supplied with choicest language, and yield himself in full to the rich and sweet inspiration of the words, as words

of the Lord's blessing to his people. It is therefore with such a special meaning, that we recommend to the minister to pronounce the benediction as the word of God. Above all, if there is any part of public religious service, in which the slightest intention or appearance of eccentricity, and the use of any unusual form which might strike and distract as a novelty, should be avoided, it is this—that these words of Divine blessing may be so used as to acquire a peculiar sacredness in the minds of the people and to become the more useful on that account, is certain; and for that reason, with others, they should be fully appreciated by the minister.

He should pronounce the benediction, with the living warmth of devout emotion, in an audible voice, and with emphatic solemnity. We know how little can be done in this way under prescription; and also, if rules should be given and followed, how far short they must fall of the desired end. Books on politeness, for example, do little of themselves to produce graceful manners; and yet that they constitute an ingredient of the social atmosphere in which the true cultivation of personal grace advances in a community, is altogether probable. The mental texture, and the physical also, which would exactly qualify for the most effectual use of our personal endowments in the public worship of God, may present points of great uniformity in all persons, while the manifestations and the effects may be various. There is great delicacy in suggesting anything more, on a subject like this, than what may relate to the views of the exercise and the general spirit required for its best effect; leaving all that pertains to the manner, to flow by the natural laws "out of the abundance of the heart." But some of the defects in our practice respecting this service are so great, that to treat them with such delicacy would seem affectation. We do not say that the words are ever pronounced with marked irreverence; and yet we have witnessed the ceremony, when the voice of the speaker was scarcely heard in the centre of the house, and when it would not have been heard even if the congregation had been still. Not unfrequently is a part or the whole of the blessing pronounced while many of the people are rising, and while no sign appears, that a large part of the assembly is attending at all to what is said or done.

Sometimes the speaker begins to pronounce the words before the congregation have begun to rise. In large congregations the blessing is frequently pronounced in so low, so hurried and inexpressive a manner, that, so far from commanding the solemn respect of the great body of the people, it hardly secures the attention of those most predisposed to receive it with reverence. We need not say that in such cases the service is wholly without effect. When the assembly has to rise to receive the blessing, surely the least the minister can owe to an ordinance of Divine worship, and to the people, is to give full opportunity for assuming the posture, and becoming fully prepared to hear with reverential silence and attention, the very first words of the ceremony. It would be better that a moment of silence should intervene before the commencement, than to begin to speak before silence is made. The need of this caution is relieved when the proper posture for receiving the blessing has been taken in singing the doxology, or in prayer, and where kneeling is the posture in public prayer, and the blessing is pronounced at the close of the prayer, the kneeling posture in receiving the blessing is both convenient and appropriate. In all cases, the words of benediction should be pronounced in that distinct and emphatic manner which proceeds from the consciousness of acting in a matter of solemn import, and which will make the mere word and act of a moment the means of good impression to an attentive, devout, and susceptible assembly. Even the small matter of gesture is not unworthy of notice. The spreading and uplifting of the hands, or some motion approaching this full gesture, is practised so universally, that we can hardly hesitate to ascribe it to a universal tendency in imitation of Christ, and under the influence of the Spirit. It seems in this respect, like that reverential posture in prayer which all people tend to adopt, unless interfered with by some incidental influence connected with their history or circumstances. Whatever be the origin of the usage, or its significancy, it seems more properly to respect the speaker himself, than the people; on the natural presumption that the eyes of the devout portion of the congregation, as in the exercise of prayer, will not be on the speaker. Sometimes the hands of the speaker were laid on the persons addressed. Jacob laid

his hands on the heads of the sons of Joseph. The Saviour laid his hand on the little children in his act of blessing them. It gave great animation and solemnity to the scene. Christian persons in leaving their dying blessing with the young who are dear to them, frequently do the same. With the apostles the imposition of hands was a signal for imparting miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, and in the ceremony of setting apart persons to the work of the gospel ministry, it was a form of consecration, and a sign of conferring authority, and may have been also with the apostles a sign of conferring special personal endowments of the Spirit for the ministerial work. The imposition of hands in blessing, undoubtedly rises from somewhat felt by the speaker in his relation to the persons addressed. The lifting up of the hands, in blessing a company or an assembly, would seem to rise from the same source, and to be intended as the nearest convenient equivalent to actual imposition. The Saviour, at the ascension, lifted up his hands and blessed his disciples. The fact that this gesture has always prevailed so generally in the church, and that apparently without design, is a sufficient recommendation of its fitness, and indicates the possibility of making it contribute, by its union with the proper mental state of the minister, to the good effect of the service. Standing thus with a congregation of the Lord's people before him, lifting up his hands towards them, with the delightful consciousness of his authority to pronounce the blessing of the Saviour upon them, he cannot fail to pronounce the benediction impressively, and to secure the sympathetic concurrence of a devout assembly in a ceremony adapted and appointed to be a blessing indeed.

Secondly, of the People.—The duty of the people in their share of this interesting office would seem almost too plain to be made a matter of didactic statement. We must become as little children, in order to enter into the kingdom of God; and there is no ordinance for imparting or receiving any of the benefits of that kingdom which depends for its efficacy more than this on the childlike spirit in the recipient. Think of Jacob asking and receiving the blessing of his father; of the disciples receiving the blessing of their Lord; and we can understand somewhat of the spirit in which the apostolic benediction

should be received. The main features of the spirit are common, of course, to minister and people. He must receive the kingdom of God as a little child; and he will realize this, while he humbly regards himself as an unworthy partaker with them in the blessing dispensed through his ministry. He is blessed in giving a blessing; and on the same condition as the people. His own heart of childlike faith receives its full portion of the heavenly gift. In his official exercise he differs from the people. He has an activity which does not belong to them; but is still one with them as a passive recipient.

The people as well as the minister should recognize the presence of Christ in the benediction. In this they are even more liable to fail than he. The service is so short, that no time is given for collecting wandering thoughts; and the preparation must consist in a habit. At the close of service, too, the people are easily distracted by the very thought of departure; even if not occupied, as too often they may be, with preparation to go. A caution here is therefore needed. The ceremony cannot profit them without active faith at the time. Though the same is true of all ordinances, it is specially important in this case, because the service itself tends so little to assist any endeavour of a struggling faith to realize the presence of the Lord. They should recognize the presence of Christ so vividly, that the blessing will seem to be sanctioned and increased by his personal indorsement. There is a special and precious significance for us in the presence of Christ in such a service. In the Lord's supper, it is a needful qualification of the worthy partaker, that he should be able to discern the Lord's body. Is it not equally important to the full efficacy of our form of blessing, that the people should discern the gracious presence of Christ in the act of blessing them? Let the people diligently cultivate the habit of thus recognizing the Lord as present, to bless them, whenever his blessing is pronounced; consider him present, to do in them what is expressed in words to the outward ear.

When the people stand up to hear the appointed benediction pronounced upon them, let it be not to hear a declaration merely of what may be done, but to receive the blessing itself which the words denote; not a promise, but a deed of blessing.

They should expect to receive some new impulse of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ within them. Let them have so clear and decided an apprehension of things spiritual and eternal, that they will have an awakened sense of the peace and joy of their faith. Their faith in this blessing must be like the faith of effectual prayer. "Believe that ye receive it." Faith feels the bestowment of the blessing. The believing soul is conscious of its own peace. We dwell in the wholesome element of heaven, if indeed we are in Christ, and we feel the strengthening pulsations of reviving health. The member of the flock knows the voice of the true Shepherd. He discerns his kind, restoring influence. "He restoreth my soul; he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake." Do not expect the Saviour only to be present with you in his own appointed ordinances; but let the ordinance itself be to your faith, as his healing hand in soothing contact with your broken heart. "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more, but ye see me; because I live, ye shall also live." All such words have a progressive application to the Christian. They are an immovable ground of hope; they offer the inspiration of hope, and they show the way for that hope, even in the present, to realize its progressive fulfilment.

In receiving the blessing, the people should consider that they are receiving not only the benefit of this separate ordinance, but also a collective benefit of the other ordinances enjoyed on that occasion of public worship. The services of the sanctuary are properly one service, composed of several parts, all contributing to the same end; all lying, like so many open ways, convergent, from the broad region of thought and contemplation, towards the great centre of security, of repose, and of perfect satisfaction in Christ. Where the apostolic benediction comes after the appointed form of prayer, as in the liturgies of several Christian communions, it may come to the heart of lively faith like the voice of gracious answer to the believing and penitent supplications just presented. In congregations where it occurs at the close of all the exercises, the Christian people may find it the act of Christ in applying, in bringing home to their hearts, as by a finishing deed, the blessing of all the ordinances of worship observed on that occasion.

The forms of our worship are means through which the Lord communicates his merciful influence to our hearts, and brings forth its fruits within us. And when we have been engaged, through the services of the hour, in praise, in humble and believing prayer, in preaching and hearing the Divine word, seeking in all these exercises the grace of God that bringeth salvation, how appropriate and significant, that we are permitted statedly to hear the Divine voice of benediction, in words of direct assurance and condescending love; "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all!" It comes with somewhat of the force of a sealing and applying act of God. Having applied to the source of sanctification and comfort in the acts of worship, with the desire to receive some gracious token, what better word could we hear, than this blessing actually pronounced upon us, in the name and by the authority of Him from whom all blessings come?

We cannot omit to notice the interest which this ceremony has for the children of the church. Believing parents, who felt an interest in Christ themselves, were the persons who brought their children to Christ to receive his blessing. They were the persons whose children he took in his arms, laying his hands on them and blessing them, and saying concerning them, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." As these children were growing up, the parents, if they retained their interest in Christ for themselves, would not fall away from their desire that their children should continue to receive the blessing of Christ, whenever it was communicated to themselves. The children, therefore, during infancy, would be considered as standing with the parents in the covenant, having the promise which the parents had, and receiving the blessing which the parents received. As a part of the nurture and admonition of the Lord, in which the children are brought up, the exercises of public worship will be offered them as early as they can attend upon them with any profit; and they can profit by being present in the solemn exercises of worship much earlier than they can understand the particular meaning of what is said and done; for right training in this respect will prepare them to sympathize in the parent's reverential emotions and join in his

reverential acts, as they do in all other things. But, besides all that is merely sympathetic and imitative, the covenant child has a gracious susceptibility of solemn impression from all such commanding suggestions of God, as are given in an assembly of devout worshippers. When he begins to understand the import of particular services, then the special utility of the benediction to him will appear. The parent who endeavours, by private instruction, to inculcate on his children the sentiments set forth in the public exercises they attend upon, will find those connected with the benediction among the earliest and the easiest he can employ. The children can take a lively interest in the ceremony by standing with the rest, and, while thus engaged for the moment, they may receive a valuable impression through the simple and unuttered faith which the Holy Spirit may work in their hearts. There is thus no part of our public worship, not even the sacred song, in which they can receive a deeper or more profitable impression. It is short, and does not tax and exhaust their attention. It is an awakening address for children, who delight to inquire into the meaning of what they see and hear on public occasions. It is easily explained to them as to what it signifies and why it is used. Its import, when explained, is simple and intelligible to children, engaging their thoughts, and awakening their lively emotions. They should be so instructed at home, that they will feel a special interest in receiving the blessing of the Lord among his people. It may be thus a stepping-stone for early faith towards a clear and well-balanced understanding of all the ordinances of Divine service, and thus contribute to their permanent edification in the knowledge and worship of Christ. Here we have the great advantage of the simple earnestness of childhood, before the worldly habits and propensities have come up to confirm the resistance against the Holy Spirit; and parents are encouraged, nay, they are required to believe, that in all early, trustful, and hopeful endeavours for the blessing of Christ on those dear ones whom they bring to him, they shall be seconded, and mightily supported by his Spirit, in their own hearts and in the hearts of their children. They have no such positive promise in relation to any others whom they may benefit by gospel ordinances, as they have in

relation to their children. And, in addition to all this, our Lord expressly teaches that this simple, earnest, submissive disposition of the little child, is a chief qualification for receiving the gracious influence—the characteristic which all must possess, in order to enter the kingdom of God.

In the above remarks on the apostolic benediction, we trust the reader will see that the nature of the ceremony, as a part of the stated forms of our public worship, has been fairly and justly represented. We think it will be considered by all readers, worthy of the intelligence and piety of the church, to secure the greatest benefit that is offered to us in this part of Divine service, and to guard against all negligent and empty formality, to which the familiar use of this brief, but impressive exercise may be liable. Like all other means of grace, this part of our worship should be used in faith; and, when accompanied by that special exercise of faith which is appropriate to the mind of the Spirit, as expressed in the service, it will convey its appropriate blessing. A large part of our remarks on the benediction, apply equally to our other ordinances; and the whole will not, therefore, be found disproportioned to the importance of the subject. We have this pleasing alternative for our hope of good, from what we have here presented to the reader: if it raise this short and simple ceremony, in the estimation of the churches, to equal rank with our other ordinary forms of worship, we shall greatly increase its usefulness by this means; if the others are still to be held in superior esteem, our remarks may be applied the more to them, as an argument from the less to the greater.

ART. VI.—*The Church and the Country.*

THE dissolution of the union of these states, should that event be finally consummated, unavoidably brings up the question, Must our church also be divided? This question not only interests the feelings of all true Presbyterians, but it touches their consciences. The consideration of it, therefore, cannot now be untimely. The first position which may safely be assumed on this subject is, that the separation of the church is not a necessary consequence of the dissolution of the union. There is nothing in the nature of the church, nothing in its relation to the state, nothing in the duties which its members owe to the commonwealth, which confines it, as an independent organized body, to one particular political community. A man may live in Canada and be a faithful subject of the crown of England, and yet a member of a Presbytery in New York or Michigan. There is no conflict of obligations, or of duties arising from political allegiance to one government and ecclesiastical allegiance to another, the majority of whose members may belong to another nation. Should, therefore, the Gulf States of this union form a permanent independent confederacy, there is nothing in that event which renders necessary the secession of the Presbyterians in those states from our General Assembly.

As a matter of history, it is indeed true that the churches of one nation have shown a tendency to unite in separate independent ecclesiastical organizations. The Reformed Churches in France formed one body, those of Holland another, those of the Palatinate another. So the Lutherans of Saxony, of Denmark, of Sweden, constituted separate churches. This occurred where there was perfect agreement as to doctrine and polity. Presbyterians in Canada have united among themselves without seeking ecclesiastical union with their brethren in the United States. There must be some reason for this fact. In many of the cases referred to, the sovereign assumed more or less control over the church within his territorial jurisdiction,

which, of course, would lead to separate ecclesiastical organization. In other cases, geographical considerations determined this course as a matter of convenience. It would be almost impossible for the Presbyterians of America to meet in annual assemblies with those of Scotland or Ireland. In other cases still, the relation in which independent nations stood to each other rendered ecclesiastical union between their members undesirable or difficult. Wars were too frequent, and the means of communication too uncertain or imperfect, to allow of the requisite frequency and freedom of intercourse. Besides this, difference of language, of political and social institutions, and other obvious causes, naturally led the Protestants of separate nations to form themselves into independent national churches. Union in the one form tended, of itself, to produce union in the other. Few, if any, of these causes of separation exist in our case. Neither state nor federal authorities have any control over the courts of the church. No appeal lies from ecclesiastical decisions to civil tribunals. We are not separated by broad seas or by impassable mountains. We are not aliens to each other in language or political institutions. We remain substantially one people in despite of the disruption of the Union. After the present excitement has subsided, the intercourse between the North and South will be as free and as frequent as ever. Should, therefore, our country be divided into separate, independent confederacies, there is no consequent necessity for a corresponding division of the church.

A second proposition on this subject is, that as the dissolution of the union does not render the separation of the church necessary, neither does it render it desirable. All antecedent reasons for our ecclesiastical union remain in full force. So far as the command of Christ, that his people should be one, and that they should all be subject to their brethren in the Lord, involves the obligation of subjection to a common church authority, that command remains in force. Christians are bound to be thus united so far as their circumstances permit; and when union is refused or broken, there must be some reason to justify separate organization. Union is the rule, separate organization is the exception. Besides the continued obligation of this general command, there is in our case the

duty arising from agreement in doctrine and in order. There has been no renunciation on either side of the common standards of the church. No secret defection from the faith is suspected or charged; we are at this moment as much united on all those points which are the conditions of ecclesiastical union, as we were six months, or six years ago. We are, moreover, historically one church. We have grown by the blessing of God, and by the natural process of development, from one Presbytery to a hundred and seventy-one. A century ago we had ministers and churches South as well as North. We have grown up in each region as one church. Separation in our case would not be resolution into bodies originally independent, but the dismemberment of a body originally one. Our thirty-three Synods, and one hundred and seventy Presbyteries, have not confederated under one General Assembly, but one original Presbytery has unfolded itself into this great organic whole. The grain of mustard seed has become a tree. To tear apart such a body is an act of violence. It cannot be innocently done. There must be great sin in those who do it, or those who cause its being done. The Presbyterian church in this country has, by its numbers, its union, its harmony, its soundness in doctrine, its adherence to the Scriptures as the only standard of morals, of practice, as well as of faith, by its compact and symmetrical organization, by its combined freedom and order, by its extended and efficient benevolent operations, stood as the great conservative body, a rampart against error and evil, and the powerful advocate of truth and righteousness. To diminish the influence of such a body, to lower its character, or to impair its strength, would be a great calamity to the country and the world. There is a kind of egotism which blinds men to considerations of this kind, and renders them reckless of evil which does not immediately concern themselves. They put a small part, to which they themselves belong, above a far greater whole. Allegiance to a state is to them a higher principle than allegiance to the nation; the interests of a presbytery or parish, more important than the interests of the church. This disposition is the more dangerous, as men are apt to glory in it, and to exalt themselves just in proportion that they ought to be

abased. What is needed now in the church and in the state, is a forgetfulness of self and of mere sectional interests, and an enlarged spirit of devotion to the welfare of the church, and of the country as a whole.

Besides the considerations which render the union of our church in itself a matter of duty and of importance to the whole country, there are special reasons arising out of the peculiar circumstances of our times, why it is more than ever to be desired. So far from the separation of the Gulf States being a reason for the division of the church, it is a strong reason against it. The North needs the South, and the South needs the North. There is a tendency in both to a one-sided development. If a church be confined to a slaveholding territory, and especially to a confederacy organized as a separate community in the interests of slavery, human nature must alter its laws, if the result does not prove disastrous. A church distinguished from all others by one peculiarity, is sure to magnify that one distinctive point out of all proportion. It matters not whether it be baptism, episcopacy, or slavery, it cannot fail to exert an undue and perverting influence. Should therefore Presbyterians in the cotton states separate from their northern brethren on the ground of slavery, slavery will become to them a controlling element. Not less obvious is the danger that the northern church will succumb to a fanatical anti-slavery spirit, in the event of its being placed in antagonism with an exclusive slaveholding church. It is hard to say which of these evils is most to be deprecated. A church which regards itself as commissioned to conserve and perpetuate slavery, and a church instinct with the principles and spirit of modern abolitionism, must both alike be offensive to God, and injurious to men. The great body of northern Presbyterians, at least, would deplore such a separation as an injury to themselves as well as to their brethren. It would greatly impair the power of our church for good in the presence of other denominations. The General Assembly at Charleston, Richmond, or Rochester, composed of three hundred ministers and elders, representing almost every state in the union, is a far more imposing and influential body than any sectional assembly could possibly be. It would be a wanton waste of power, a criminal neglect of

talents committed to our trust, to dismember and weaken such an organization which God has hitherto so highly honoured and blessed. It would, on the other hand, be a new revelation of the power of God's Spirit in the hearts of his people, a new exhibition of the true nature of the church, should it remain united in the midst of civil commotions and the disruption of political bonds. It would be seen more clearly than before, that Christ's kingdom is not of this world; that the church has a life independent of that of the state; that it can continue to live and act as one body, in despite of the separation of all other ties. To our minds, therefore, it seems clear that God has called our church to a new trial; he is putting the fidelity of its members to the test, to determine whether principle is with them more powerful than passion. He may be calling her to perform a great work in the history of the country, in holding united in the bonds of ecclesiastical communion and Christian brotherhood, the dissevered members of our political union; thus making us still one, and preserving for better times the basis of national union.

When the ten tribes separated from Judah, "Jeroboam said in his heart, Now shall the kingdom return to the house of David. If this people go up to do sacrifice in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again unto the Lord." So long as the religious bond of union was preserved, he feared lest the political separation might not prove secure or permanent. We may, on the same ground, hope that the preservation of the unity of the church may contribute to the restoration of our political union.

A third position, however, which we are forced to assume in reference to this subject, is, that while the division of our church is neither a necessary, nor a desirable consequence of the dissolution of the union, it is a very probable consequence. There is the greatest danger that the one event will lead to the other. This danger arises, in the first place, from the alienation of feeling which has been produced by the political agitation of the country. There always has been more or less of antagonism between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding portions of the country, arising from difference of institutions, and consequent difference of character, and from a real or

supposed conflict of interest. To this has unhappily been added the unfriendly feeling produced by discussions of the slavery question, and by the unwarrantable denunciation of slaveholders so common at the North. From this latter source of alienation, our own church has been, and still is, in a great measure, free. There is nothing in the acts or decisions of our General Assembly on the subject of slavery, which gives any just ground of umbrage to our Southern brethren, or in which they have not themselves concurred: and there is nothing in the feelings or spirit of the northern portion of the church, in reference to slavery, at the present moment, any more than there has been for years past, to irritate or offend Presbyterians of the South. It is vain, however, to shut our eyes to the fact, that recent events have produced or revealed a deep seated hostility of feeling. We are speaking, and desire to be understood to speak, only of the Gulf States. Those states alone, at the time of this writing, have seceded from the union. They alone have as yet avowed or extensively manifested the alienation of feeling to which we refer. So far as the secular press, the language of public speakers in legislatures, conventions, and other assemblies, can be taken as an index of public sentiment, the conviction is irresistible, that a feeling of decided hostility to the people of the North has taken control of the public mind in those states. We will not quote the contemptuous and bitter language with which such papers and harangues abound. This would only increase the evil. It is enough to say, that the people of the North are spoken of as enemies, as hostile to the interests and rights of the South; as, in fact, their most malignant enemies on the face of the earth. When such a spirit takes possession of the public mind, it would be almost a miracle if private Christians and ministers should escape its influence. It is the most lamentable feature in the present aspect of our country, that Christians and ministers of all denominations in the Gulf States, seem to be among the foremost in this sectional strife. Men on whom the North relied to correct misapprehension, to bear testimony to the sincerity and fidelity of their Christian brethren in this section of the country, to allay unfriendly feeling, and to prevent the disruption of our national union, have

disappointed such hopes. They have increased the misunderstandings unfortunately prevailing, and have fanned the fire of contention. They doubtless think they are right in so doing. Our fathers acted thus in the days of the Revolution, and these brethren, no doubt, conscientiously believe that they are justified in pursuing a similar course. Of the propriety of their conduct we are not to judge. To their own Master they must stand or fall. All we have to do with is the fact. That Southern Christians and ministers, even of our own church, share in this alienation of feeling, is lamentably apparent. The religious papers in the Gulf States, in many instances, speak of the most conservative men at the North as "Black Republicans," "Kansas Shriekers," &c. They call them abolitionists, and stigmatize them as enemies, actuated by rabid hostility to the South. Of all the journals at the North in any way connected with our church, the New York *Observer*, the Philadelphia *Presbyterian*, and the *Princeton Review*, have been considered the most "pro-slavery," and southern in their proclivities. They have been so stigmatized at the North, and so regarded at the South. They have generally been joined together by anti-slavery men and journals, as illustrations of subserviency to the South. Dr. McMaster does the editor of this *Review* the honour of saying, that he has done more (principally, however, on account of his official position,) to pervert the public mind on the subject of slavery, "than any hundred men in the church." He groups together the three journals above-mentioned in a sweeping condemnation. Yet we not only hear that the New York *Observer* has been returned from Southern post-offices as "an incendiary publication," but a Presbyterian paper of the South speaks of the *Presbyterian* as "having gone over to the enemy," and asks, "When men like Hodge, Engles, and Prime, join in the rabid denunciation of the South; when Christians leave their safe moorings by the cross of Christ, and launch out in the turbid sea of Black Republicanism, what hope can we have in our good brethren of the North? It is time for us to learn the painful lesson, that the only union we can have, is between our own true hearted people." Words lose their meaning when such men as those above-mentioned, are charged with

"rabid denunciation of the South." They are not expressive of thought, but mere revelations of feeling. Dr. Rice is joined in the same condemnation. The *Southern Presbyterian* says, "Dr. Rice, who has heretofore been distinguished as a defender of slavery and the South, now has wheeled about with Dr. Hodge, and like him, appears on the other side, against the South and slavery." What is true of ourselves, we doubt not is true of Dr. Rice. We have neither wheeled about, nor gone back. We stand on the same ground to the square inch, that we have always occupied on this subject. People rushing along on a railroad see the trees and fences flying in the opposite direction. So our brethren in the Gulf States who are hurrying from all their old positions, think that it is not they, but others who are in motion. Their train, however, must stop somewhere, and then they will discover what extreme point they have reached.

The views of men on any subject are in a great degree determined by the state of their feelings. The same speech or article is praised, as to its ability or spirit, by one party, and treated with contempt and disapprobation by another. Such judgments are notoriously nothing more than expressions of like or dislike. The fact, therefore, that communications emanating from Christians in the North, and which are here regarded as moderate, just, and kind, are in so many instances stigmatized at the South as rabid, unjust, and malevolent, is a painful revelation of alienation of feeling. How can any Southern man regard the New York *Observer* or Philadelphia *Presbyterian* as hostile to the South, whose mind is in a normal state? We may be excused for referring to our own experience in this matter. The article in our January number, on the State of the Country, was written in November—before any secession had taken place, before the meeting of Congress, or the publication of the President's annual message. It contemplated the state of things then existing. Consequently, many points since rendered prominent, many principles since urged as of special importance, are only slightly touched upon. The article was prepared with a sincere desire to allay evil feeling, to correct misapprehensions, to controvert erroneous principles under which good men, especially at the North,

seemed to be acting. The article admitted that the South had serious grievances of which to complain. Denunciations of slaveholding as a crime; attempts to produce dissatisfaction among slaves; and opposition to the restoration of fugitives from service, were shown to be antiscriptural and wrong. It was admitted that fairness demanded a just division of the common territory belonging to the union; and therefore we urged the restoration of the Missouri compromise line.

This article received the approbation, as to its moderation, justice, and good feeling, of men of all parties at the North. Men of the highest character and position—lawyers and merchants, as well as clergymen; men who, in the recent presidential election, had voted for Mr. Breckinridge, Mr. Bell, or Mr. Douglas, as freely as those who voted for Mr. Lincoln, gave it their sanction. A gentleman nearly seventy years old, who voted for Mr. Bell, who stands in the front rank at the Philadelphia bar, whose character and position are second to those of no man in that city, to whom the article was submitted before its publication, says: "I have read your article very carefully, and I believe it contains a clear and temperate discussion of the questions of which it treats. I can see nothing in it to which any reasonable man ought to object; and I cordially assent to the conclusions at which you arrive." Another gentleman of equal eminence at the bar of New York, says: "I thank you for the pamphlet—for having sent it to me, and for having written it. Nothing could be more true, judicious, and Christian than it is." One of the most venerable and venerated ministers of our church, in a recent letter, says: "Your article struck me as most seasonable, and eminently due to the character and standing of the Presbyterian church, and expressive of the views of a great majority of our church. Events have since shown the wisdom if not the necessity of such a declaration." He adds: "The sermons and papers with which the Southern press is teeming, convince me that our church, even among the union people of the South, would be utterly misunderstood and ruined without such a testimony. . . . We may well feel grieved that, so far as I know, the very extremest vindications of all the revolutionary measures of the South, come from promi-

nent Presbyterian ministers. But, the sooner hot, the sooner cold; and all this will pass away, and the views which you have expressed, while they will commend themselves to all good men at the North, will gradually take possession of the Southern mind."

We could fill pages with similar testimonials, we do not say to the merit of the article, for that is a small matter, but to its fairness and moderation, from men of the highest eminence in the church and the state. These testimonials are not exclusively from the free states. A ministerial brother in Kentucky, writing in the Louisville *Herald*, says, "As to the article of Dr. Hodge, of which the *Central Presbyterian* complains so bitterly, I have to say, I regard it as the fullest, fairest, I have yet seen on the state of the country. And I am as out-and-out a Southern man as any body; and I am in interest, blood and feeling, as much identified with the history and welfare of Virginia and Kentucky as any man can be." So far as we know, no secular Republican paper has endorsed the article. The leading Republican papers of this part of the country, are the New York *Tribune*, *Times*, and *Evening Post*, no one of which has recognized its existence; except the *Post*, in a short and slighting notice, which expresses no approbation. On the other hand, the abolitionists have denounced it in unmeasured terms. Dr. Guthrie of Edinburgh, has poured over its author the burning lava of unintelligent wrath, and Dr. McMaster in the *Presbyter* of Cincinnati, is not a whit behind him either in bitterness or blindness. This article then, which if we are to believe the testimony of eminent and competent witnesses, expresses the sentiments of the great body of intelligent, conservative, Christian men at the North, has been received by the majority of our brethren in the cotton States, with the strongest disapprobation. It has been attributed to the silliest motives—motives which would disgrace a schoolgirl—it has been stigmatized as unjust, unchristian, slanderous, injurious, as breathing a spirit of rabid hostility to the South. A respected minister in South Carolina writes to us, saying, Dr. Hodge "has done more to widen the breach between the North and the South, than any writer of the age, because his article will have the effect of dividing the Presbyterian church

into a Northern and Southern section. I venture to assert there were not ten men in the Presbyterian church in this State who had serious thoughts of separating from the North before the publication of this article. And I venture with equal assurance to predict that the South will never again meet in General Assembly with the North, if Dr. Hodge is the true exponent of Northern sentiment." Another minister from Tennessee writes, "Your article on the State of the Country, and your remarks on Dr. Palmer's sermon, do indeed show that we are two people, and the sooner we agree to separate in peace, the better for the human family." Even Dr. C. C. Jones, a model man, who cannot forget that he was born a gentleman, allows himself to say, among many other things of like kind, "The jubilant notes with which the Northern anti-slavery and abolition papers welcome Dr. Hodge to their ranks, ought to convince him that we have not erred in our judgment of his article. . . . . The article is an assault upon the South, and a defence of anti-slavery and abolitionism in their baleful effects upon the country; and savours throughout of the principles of a party, which, like iron bands girt about the mind, and possessing a certain power of contraction, gradually tighten, until humanity, courtesy, patriotism, and religion are forced out of the victim."

The unfriendly feeling which is thus painfully revealed in the Southern mind, is not directly against individuals only. It is against the people of the North. Of course, this is to be understood as a general statement. It is not meant that every man in those states is thus alienated from every man in the free states. There are, doubtless, many of our Southern brethren who do not share in this feeling; and there are many persons at the North whom the most excited men at the South are still willing to acknowledge as friends. We are speaking of a general state of feeling, of the existence of which there can be no doubt. The father whose letter was quoted on a preceding page, says in the same communication, "it is amazing that good people at the South should insist that we are all abolitionists, and then call us enemies and Black Republicans." This last has become as bitter a term of reproach as Red Republican ever was in Europe, and in the sense in which it is

commonly used, and especially as it is applied to Christians at the North, it is offensive and injurious. As it has been repeatedly applied to ourselves, we think it right to say, that we are no Republican, in the party sense of that word. Every drop of blood in our veins is of the old federal stock. Our mother, then a child, sat on the knees of General Warren not long before he fell on Bunker Hill. Our father, a physician in the Revolutionary army, suffered in a British dungeon, in the service of his country. We never had a blood relation in the world, so far as we know, who was not a federalist in the old sense of the word. For ourselves, however, we have never taken any interest or part in politics as between one party and another, between bank and anti-bank, tariff and anti-tariff, but only as between righteousness and unrighteousness. We voted for Mr. Lincoln, not as a Republican, but as the opposition candidate. We have never read the Chicago Platform, and know nothing about it. We, in common with hundreds of thousands, looked on Mr. Lincoln as representing the great body of good men who were shocked at the iniquities and corruptions of the administration, and were determined, if possible, to effect a change. We have never regretted that vote. We would, under similar circumstances, renew it to-day. We are not glorying, even in the sense in which Paul gloried. We are simply shaking off the mud with which we have been covered.

Another danger of disunion arises from a mutual loss of confidence between the North and the South. This is inevitable. When one man thinks that a thing is morally wrong, and another that it is morally right, their mutual confidence is of necessity impaired. The bond of sympathy is loosened, and they are disposed to stand apart. This does not mean that the one regards the other as wicked, or even as insincere. It only means that the respect which arises out of confidence in the moral judgment of others, is lessened. In the time of the Revolution, British Christians doubtless thought that their brethren in America, who took part against the mother country, were sincere, and yet criminal; and the Americans, while giving their English brethren the credit of sincerity, regarded them as unjust and oppressive. Neither party denied the Christian character or church standing of the other, but their

mutual confidence was so far impaired, that it would have been difficult for them to mingle in the same society, or to sit together at the same table. There was a like division among the Americans themselves. Some were Tories and others were Whigs. Yet they did not excommunicate each other, but their mutual respect was very small. We have fallen on similar evil days. The country is distracted and divided. The South accuse the North of injustice and oppression; they say that we deny them their plainest rights; that we tempt their slaves to escape; that we encourage and uphold the party which canonizes insurrection and murder; that we are infected with the principles which deluged France with atheism and blood; that we have designedly brought into power men who are pledged to violate the Constitution of the country, and to work out the destruction of the South.

There is every evidence of sincerity and deep conviction in those who give utterance to these charges. They really believe themselves to be thus injured and endangered. They are fully persuaded of the truth of these terrible accusations. On the other hand, the great body of Christian men of all parties at the North regard secession as a crime; they believe that it involves the guilt of treason and of violation of an oath. Yet secession is justified, defended, and gloried in by Christians in the Gulf States. The seizure of the national forts, armories, and money, by state authorities, is pronounced by such men as Holt and Dix, to be spoliation and robbery, and is so regarded by the majority of Northern Christians. Yet such seizure is called self-defence by our Southern brethren, or the just resumption of state sovereignty over her own territory. A distinguished officer of the army is dismissed from the service for "treachery," one of the basest of crimes, not by an abolitionist, but by a Kentucky slaveholder, and is received with public honours by the authorities of a city and state. It is impossible that there should be this diversity of judgments on moral questions, without a mutual loss of confidence. If our Southern brethren would examine their own consciousness, they must be sensible that their respect for their Northern brethren is not now what it was six months ago. And we are very certain that Christians at the North have not the respect

they once had for those brethren at the South, whom they see to be among the most open and zealous advocates of measures and acts which they regard as morally wrong. This is a lamentable state of things. But it is not wise to ignore it. It is one of the conditions of the problem which we have to solve: How is a church to be held together whose members are thus alienated and divided? We answer, that transient states of feeling are no adequate ground for permanent ecclesiastical changes. What right have ministers or members to tear Christ's church asunder, because they do not like each other? It may indeed be asked, How can two walk together except they be agreed? But we are agreed as to everything which legitimately constitutes the basis of church union. We are agreed in the same confession of faith and form of worship, government, and discipline. Personal likes and dislikes are not in this matter to be taken into account. Those who do not like each other, may keep apart, so far as social intercourse is concerned, but they have no right to tear the church to pieces to gratify their feelings. Should the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States unhappily be on bad terms with each other, it would be no just reason for disbanding the court. If the officers of the army should not have the personal kind feeling and mutual respect, which are desirable, that would not be a sufficient cause for the dissolution of the army. Besides, we may hope that the present alienation of feeling, so far as it exists in our church, will soon pass away; that when the country is restored to peace, the passions engendered by conflicts of opinions and interests, will subside, and brotherly love and confidence once more prevail. In the mean time, every man is bound to set a watch over his heart, lips, and pen, and do as little as he can to foment unkind feeling, and to remember that his feelings are not the rule of duty to the church.

A still more serious source of danger of division than either of those just mentioned, is found in difference of opinion in matters of vital importance. In the first place, the country is engaged in a conflict for life or death. Its existence is at stake. In this conflict, Presbyterians in the Gulf States, (so far as appears) and Presbyterians at the North, have taken

different sides. On the one hand, our Southern brethren say they are contending for their dearest rights, for liberty, for property, for life. The conflict with them, they say, is *pro aris et focis.* It has a religious character. They appeal to God with confidence for approbation and protection. In all this they are doubtless sincere. On the other hand, we at the North feel that our national life is in danger. It is no mere question of the predominance of this party, or that; the ascendency of one portion of the country or of another. It is not a question simply of the extension, or the non-extension of slavery, of the triumph of one system of labour, or form of social life over another. But it is the question, whether we are to continue to exist as a nation, or become a congeries of independent nations: whether our government shall remain as the Parthenon was when Pericles left it, the admiration of the world, or become what the Parthenon is now, with scarcely one stone upon another. It is a question of national existence; a question whether we constitute a nation—not whether the Gulf States shall be included in that nation, that no one insists upon—but whether we are, ever have been, or shall continue to be, a nation at all. Nothing can be more dear or sacred to a people than their national life. The destruction of the life of a nation is a thousand times worse than suicide, for it is not merely self-destruction, but the destruction of posterity. Our national life we have received from our fathers, we hold it in trust, and are bound to transmit it unimpaired to future generations.

Let it be distinctly understood that it is not the dissolution of the union of which we speak as the destruction of our life as a nation. The separation of these states from Great Britain did not destroy the national life of England. Its resolution into a heptarchy would work such destruction. In like manner, we might restore Texas to Mexico, Florida to Spain, or Louisiana to France, and remain the same glorious nation we were before. It is not separation which destroys our national life, but the practical recognition of the right of secession. That right is founded on the assumption that we are not a nation, and have no title to its prerogatives, no right to exercise its functions. This is national death. It is not

the loss of a member, but the extinction of the life of the body. We are not giving expression to a doctrine peculiar to any party. It is not a federal, as opposed to a democratical doctrine; neither is it the doctrine of consolidation as opposed to that of state rights. Mr. Madison, who drafted the Virginia state right resolutions, was as much opposed to the doctrine of secession as any man in the country. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, whose distinguished father was principally instrumental to the passage of the similar resolution of Kentucky in 1799, takes the same ground. He says expressly, that any ordinance of secession passed by the legislature or convention of any state, is null and void. William Collins, Esq., of Baltimore, in his recent address to the people of Maryland, uses the same language. We have been denounced as holding an exploded whig heresy, in maintaining that the union is indissoluble, except by common consent. We do not intend to argue the point. We only rebut the imputation of being party politicians. Questions of constitutional law are moral questions, because they affect our conscience and our duties. We wish to show that the doctrine in question is held by all parties, federalists, democrats and republicans; men of the North, and men of the South. It has been the common faith of the country from first to last. Even in the ordinance for the government of the territory north-west of the Ohio, adopted in 1787, before the present constitution was in force, it was assumed that the union was indissoluble. "The following articles," it is said, "shall be considered as articles of compact between the original states and the people and states in the said territory, and for ever remain unalterable, unless by common consent." One of those articles is, "The said territory, and the states which may be formed therein, shall for ever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States, subject to the articles of confederation, and to such alterations therein as shall be constitutionally made; and to all the acts and ordinances of the United States in Congress assembled." If such was the character of the old confederation, how can it be assumed that the present constitution, adopted to effect a more perfect union, should resolve us into a rope of sand? If a nation is an independent political community,

having a common constitution, a common executive, legislature, and judiciary, whose laws are supreme in all parts of its territory, then are these United States a nation. If we are citizens not only of our several states, but also of the United States, then the United States constitute a commonwealth, or political unit. If treason is a breach of allegiance, then, as the constitution defines such a crime as treason against the United States, the constitution assumes that allegiance is due to the union. If the constitution and laws of the United States are the supreme law of the land, anything in the constitution or laws of any particular state to the contrary notwithstanding, then any law or ordinance of a state in conflict with the constitution of the union is null and void. Then, too, in the language of Henry Clay, the Henry IV. of our republic, is allegiance to the union a higher and more sacred duty than allegiance to any individual state.

This is no abstraction. It is not merely an idea. It does not merely hurt the understanding and shock the common sense of men to deny our national character. It affects our vital interests. If secession concerned only the rights and well-being of the seceding states, it would be a different matter. It affects equally the rights and welfare of all. The doctrine of secession throws the whole country into chaos. If one state may secede, any other may. If Florida, at the extremity of the union, may go off and connect itself with a foreign nation, and thus command the Gulf of Mexico, so may Ohio in the centre of the union. If Louisiana may secede and obtain exclusive command of the mouth of the Mississippi, she thereby assumes the right not only of disposing of her own interests, but of controlling the whole Mississippi basin. Should Virginia secede, she would reduce Maryland to the condition of a helpless dependent. Should Rhode Island go out of the union and give herself to Great Britain, then an English fleet in the harbour of Newport would have command of the whole commerce of the United States north of the Delaware. It is very evident that the people of this country will never give up their life in this way. They will never sanction a doctrine which not only destroys their existence as a nation, but which subjects them to intolerable wrongs.

It is not against the dissolution of the union, be it remembered, that we are now arguing; we presume few persons at the North would desire to retain the Gulf States against their will. If the people of those states really desire a separate confederacy, the great body of Northern people would say, Let them have it. There are, however, three ways in which this union may be dissolved. The one is the assertion of the right of secession. This is the plan which the cotton states have seen fit to adopt. This can never be recognized nor submitted to, without self-destruction on the part of the whole union. Legally and morally, those ordinances of secession are null and void, and should be so regarded and pronounced. The second is, by a convention of all the states, called to alter the constitution agreeably to its own provisions. This is the safe, and honourable, and peaceable method. In this way all the incidental questions of boundaries, division of property, apportionment of the public debt, and provision for mutual security could be arranged and determined. This is the method which Mr. Buchanan suggested, and which the whole country have a right to demand. As the honour, rights and interests of all are concerned, all are entitled to be heard. As the union was the product of coöperation, its dissolution can be righteously effected in no other way. Those who refuse to submit to this method, must bear the responsibility of the consequences, whatever they may be. The third method is by revolution. This, under adequate provocation, is admitted to be right. If the Gulf States will put themselves on this right, then their case can be understood, and it is to be hoped, adjusted to mutual satisfaction. Revolution, if justified by adequate considerations, may be an act of the highest virtue. If entered upon for inadequate reasons, reasons which do not in the sight of God absolve a people from their allegiance and the obligations of their oaths; which do not justify civil war, it is one of the greatest of crimes. When a people rebel against a government to which they owe allegiance, and throw themselves on their inalienable rights as men, then it becomes that government to determine what is to be done. It may, 1. redress the grievances and endeavour to secure a voluntary return to allegiance; or, 2. should it deem the grounds of complaint unreasonable, or the

concessions demanded inadmissible, it has the undoubted right to use all its resources to enforce its laws; or, 3. should it be convinced that the exercise of that right would only aggravate the evil, it may consent to dismemberment upon conditions mutually agreed upon.

When this country revolted against England, these several plans were at the option of Great Britain. She unfortunately chose the second. She might have adopted either of the others. And, we presume, no one now doubts that it would have been wiser to have taken the third, instead of the second. She might have granted in 1776 all she granted after seven years of carnage, in 1783. We do not pretend to counsel our rulers. We, in common with the humblest individual in the country, have the right to discuss principles which bind men's consciences. The application of those principles rests with those to whom the people have committed the authority to decide. It is very evident, however, that while the country is thus convulsed; while one portion of the people have thrown off their allegiance to the general government, and are preparing to resist, by the force of arms, any exercise of its authority, and another part remain true to that allegiance, it can be no easy task to hold these conflicting parties in ecclesiastical union. It would, however, be sheer fatuity to close our eyes to the fact, and to come together in the General Assembly as though nothing had happened, and as though men's minds were in their ordinary state. We must deal with the case as it really is. And one feature of the case is but too apparent, viz., that the Presbyterians of the North, and those of the Gulf States are widely separated from each other in their convictions as to their political rights and duties. The one party is in open opposition to a government which the other holds to be binding by the laws of God and man. A second point, as to which serious difference of opinion has recently been developed, is slavery, and that in a two-fold aspect; the one moral, and the other political. Strange as it may appear, we are not agreed as to what slavery is. In the year 1836, we adopted the definition of slavery given by Paley in his Moral Philosophy, Book III. ch. 3, "I define," he says, "slavery to be an obligation to labour for the benefit of the master, without

the contract or consent of the servant." In the *Princeton Review* for April of that year, p. 279, we said, "All the ideas which necessarily enter into the definition of slavery are, deprivation of personal liberty, obligation of service at the discretion of another, and the transferable character of the authority and claim of service of the master." And, on p. 289, it is said, "Slavery is a state of bondage, and nothing more. It is the condition of an individual who is deprived of his personal liberty, and is obliged to labour for another, who has the right to transfer this claim of service, at pleasure." Slavery, therefore, and involuntary servitude, are convertible terms. This definition is authenticated by an analysis of the subject. Slavery has existed in different ages, and in different parts of the world, under very different systems of laws. But in all times, and in all places, men, who without contract or consent on their part are bound to labour for another, are called slaves. The nature of the condition expressed by the word is not determined by the extent or the limitation of the power legally committed to the master, to render secure and available his claim to service. In one case, the master may have the power of life and death; in another, his power even to punish may be restricted within narrow limits. These diversities in the slave laws do not enter into the nature of slavery itself; and therefore cannot be comprehended in its definition. The definition above given has the sanction also of authority and general assent. The Hon. Thomas R. R. Cobb, in his elaborate work on the "Law of Negro Slavery" says, "Slavery, in its more usual and limited signification, is applied to all involuntary servitude, which is not inflicted for the punishment of crime." He quotes from the Institutes the definition copied from the Stoic Philosophers, according to which slavery is: Constitutio juris gentium, quâ quis domino alieno, contra naturam, subjicitur;" and from Heineccius, who says: "Servi sunt personæ, qui ad dominorum utilitatem operis suis, vel pro certâ mercede alimentisque, vel pro solis alimentis promovendam obstricti sunt." Jus. Nat. et Gent. cap. iv. § 77. In the Constitution of the United States, and in the laws and ordinances of the old Confederation, and in those of Congress, "persons held to service" is the common periphrasis for slave; and slavery and

involuntary servitude are used as explanatory terms. We suspect that if Dr. McMaster was obliged to labour when, where, how, and as long as another man chose to appoint, without having any will of his own in the matter, he would come to acquiesce in this idea of slavery.

As to the sense in which slaves are property, it is said, in the article in this journal, just quoted: "When it is inferred from the fact of the slave being called the property of his master, that he is thereby degraded from his rank as a human being, the argument rests on the vagueness of the term *property*. Property is the right of possession and use, and must of necessity vary according to the nature of the objects to which it attaches. A man has property in his wife, in his children, in his domestic animals, in his fields, and in his forests. That is, he has the right to the possession and use of these several objects, according to their nature. . . . . When, therefore, it is said that one man is the property of another, it can only mean, that the one has the right to use another *as a man*, but not as a brute or as a thing. He has no right to treat him as he may lawfully treat his ox, or a tree. He can convert his person to no use to which a human being may not, by the laws of God and nature, be properly applied. When this idea of property comes to be analyzed, it is found to be nothing more than a claim of service, either for life or for a term of years. This claim is transferable, and is of the nature of property, and is consequently liable for the debts of the owner, and subject to his disposal by will or otherwise." p. 293. This view of the nature of slavery, and of property in slaves, was sanctioned universally, as far as known, at the South. No objection was raised against it, and the article in which it was presented was widely circulated through the country by the agency of Southern men. The same view is presented by Dr. Thornwell in his recent article on "The State of the Country," republished from the *Southern Presbyterian Review*. On page 16 of that article, he asks, "Morally considered, to what class does the slave belong? To the class of persons held to service. The two ideas, that he is a person, and as a person, held to service, constitute the generic idea of slavery. How is his obligation to service fundamentally differenced from that of other

labourers? By this, as one essential circumstance, that it is independent of the formalities of contract. Add the circumstance that it is for life, and you have a complete definition of the thing. You have the very definition, almost in his own words, which a celebrated English philosopher gives of slavery. 'I define slavery,' says Dr. Paley, 'to be an obligation to labour for the benefit of the master, without the contract or consent of the servant.'" Again, Dr. Thornwell says, "That upon which the right of property terminates in the slave, is his service or labour. It is not his soul, not his person, not his moral and intellectual nature—it is his *labour*. This is the thing which is bought and sold in the market, and it is in consequence of the right to regulate, control, and direct this, that the person comes under the obligation to obey."

It will not be assumed that the Hon. Mr. Cobb, of Georgia, and Dr. Thornwell, of South Carolina, are disposed to reduce slavery to a mere figment, or to curtail the full legal prerogatives of masters. Yet the Rev. Dr. McMaster's denunciations of the editor of this *Review* are founded on our having, years ago, presented this view of the nature of slavery and of the master's right of property in his slaves. He charges us with having, thereby, done more to pervert the conscience of the church than any man alive. In his review of our recent article on "The State of the Country," he says: "Although there is in this article no distinctly enunciated definition of *slavery*, yet the article assumes and everywhere proceeds upon the false definition, elsewhere given, that 'slavery is nothing but involuntary servitude.' It is true, this definition is in the face of the authority of the church, in all its testimonies previously to the year 1845, which former testimonies, it is admitted, used the term in a wholly different sense; and in the face of the universal usage of the laws, and the judicial decisions which relate to slavery, and of almost all writers on the subject, legal, and political, and ethical, who are of any authority. It is hard to understand how a man, like the editor of the *Review*, whose whole life, it ought to be presumed, has led him to understand the value of precision in the use of language, and especially the necessity of clear and true definitions of terms on subjects which are in controversy, can fail to see that

his definition of slavery is no definition at all; and that, if it were admitted, it would make all condemnation of slavery simply absurd. What rational man ever thought that it is immoral to hold in involuntary servitude any one who is, by his own mental state, unfit for freedom, till he is twenty-one, or forty-one, or eighty-one years of age? Yet the editor of the *Princeton Review* clings to this obviously false definition of slavery, with dogged pertinacity as great as if he thought the salvation of the church and the country depended on his maintaining it. This false definition of slavery is the source of much of the confusion of thought and ambiguity of language which have pervaded all his articles, through twenty-five years, on the subject, and of the wide-spread mischief which they have wrought. Let it be admitted that slavery is what all competent authority defines it to be, the system which makes the legal status of men, and women, and children, to be that of *property;* that is, of *real estate*, or *chattels personal*, as the case may be; and *slavery* is condemned as a sin against God, and the most gross outrage upon man."

It often happens when one man complains of the want of discrimination in another, the fault is with himself. We think it is so in the present instance. Dr. McMaster presents the two definitions of slavery—the one, that it is a state of involuntary servitude—the other, that it is the system which makes the legal status of the slave to be that of *property*, as contradictory. Whereas they are perfectly consistent. What does the law mean when it says that slaves are property? It means, and it can mean nothing more, than that the master has a legal right to their services. In this sense, and in this alone, has the master property in the slave. When the law says that slaves shall be deemed chattels personal in the hands of their master, it only decides that the claim or right of the master belongs to the class of personal property, that it is to be regulated by the statutes which relate to such property. It has the same liabilities, may be transferred or disposed of in the same way. We may be excused for again quoting what we wrote in 1836. In the article already referred to, it is said, "Another very common and plausible argument on this subject is, that a man cannot be made a matter of property. He cannot be degraded into a

brute or chattel without the grossest violation of duty and propriety; and as slavery confers this right of property in human beings, it must, from its very nature, be a crime. We acknowledge the correctness of the principle on which this argument is founded, but deny that it is applicable to the case in hand. We admit that it is not only an enormity, but an impossibility, that a man should be made a thing in distinction from a rational and moral being. It is not within the compass of human laws to alter the nature of God's creatures. A man must be regarded and treated as a man even in his greatest degradation. That he is, in some countries, and under some institutions deprived of many of the rights and privileges of such a being, does not alter his nature. He must be viewed as a man under the most atrocious system of slavery that ever existed. Men do not arraign and try on evidence, and punish on conviction either things or brutes. Yet slaves are under a regular system of laws, which, however unjust they may be, recognize their character as accountable beings." Then follows the passage above quoted, stating that the right of property in man can only mean the right to use him as a man, as a fellow-creature, and one of God's children, and not as a brute or as a thing. After which the article goes on to say, "When the law declares that the slave shall be deemed and adjudged to be a chattel personal in the hands of his master, it does not alter his nature, nor does it confer on the master any right to use him in a manner inconsistent with that nature. These legal enactments are intended to facilitate the master's claim of service, and to render that claim the more readily liable for his debts."

According to this view of the subject, by a slave is to be understood a bond-servant, one bound to labour for another, not as a punishment for crime, not on the ground of a mutual contract, but because of the legal relation which the one sustains to the other; and by slavery is to be understood involuntary servitude. If any one chooses to give the words any other definition, and make them include what is not essential to the relations which they indicate, he is at liberty to do so. But the above, as we believe, is the true sense of the words. It is the sense in which they are defined by moralists and legislators; the sense in which they are explained by slave-

holders themselves. It is the sense in which the words have been defined by our General Assembly, and in which they must be taken, when the church has declared that slaveholding is not in itself criminal; that it is not inconsistent with a credible profession of Christianity, and therefore does not furnish any just ground for church censure. This of course does not imply any sanction of the laws which may be enacted in reference to slaves. Those laws differ in different ages and nations. They differ very much in the several states. Neither Christians in those states, nor the General Assembly by any of its decisions, have incurred the responsibility of those laws. In many instances the slave-laws are unjust, cruel, and anti-Christian, which no man can approve, without forfeiting the confidence of God's people the world over. Nor does the doctrine above stated involve the assumption that slavery is in itself a good and desirable institution—something to be cherished and perpetuated. We may hold that absolute monarchy is not sinful, without sanctioning the laws of any and every state thus governed, and without teaching, that having the life, the liberty, and property of millions of men at the sovereign disposal of one man, is a form of government to be desired, cherished, and perpetuated. In this view of slavery, the great body of our ministers and members North and South have been, and we doubt not still are agreed. We know, indeed, that a very different view has been presented by leading statesmen and politicians at the South, which is obviously taking more and more hold on the public mind, but which, until recently, so far as we know, has not received the sanction of any of the leading men of our own church. That view assumes that slavery is a good and desirable institution, which should be cherished, perpetuated, and extended. This doctrine rests on one or the other, or on both of the following assumptions. First, that it is best that capital should own labour—that the most desirable organization of society is that in which the people are divided into two classes, masters and slaves; that this secures the labourer from degradation and suffering, to which, under the system of free labour, he is often exposed, and that it affords the occasion and stimulus for the highest development of the master race. The second assumption, is

the essential inferiority of the negro race; whether this inferiority is due to difference of origin, or to historical circumstances, does not alter the case, provided it is essential and permanent. Both these assumptions have been publicly avowed. That any large class of Presbyterians hold either of these views, that they believe it to be consistent with the word of God, with the spirit of the gospel, with the laws of human nature, that the few should be masters, and the many slaves; that all power, property, and every post of emolument and honour should by law be confined to one small class of the people, and the mass of mankind should be held as property, we are very loth to admit. Nor can we believe that men who receive the Bible as the word of God, can be readily persuaded that he has doomed the black race to be the perpetual slaves of the white. Although the principles which lie at the foundation of the theory, that slavery is a desirable institution, seem to be so repugnant to Scripture and all right feeling, yet the theory itself has been avowed by some of the most prominent ministers of our church in the cotton states. Dr. Palmer's sermon has for its theme the proposition, that the divinely appointed mission of the South is "to conserve and perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery as now existing." This certainly is a new and startling doctrine. We see, indeed, from a communication in a recent number of the New York *Observer*, that Dr. Palmer complains that our strictures on his sermon in our last number did him injustice in two respects; first, in representing him as teaching that slavery should be indefinately perpetuated; and secondly, in saying that the abuses of the system should be continued. We did not so interpret his sermon, nor did we attribute either of those opinions to him. We never supposed that he was so forgetful of the limits of the human mind, as to undertake to say what would be the duty of men in reference to slavery a thousand years hence; we expressly stated that he spoke only of "the duty of the present generation." Nor did we presume that he or any other Christian man could hold that the prohibition of legal marriage to four millions of human beings, should be continued for an hour, much less indefinitely. We understood him to say just what he does say, viz., that the mission of the South

is to conserve and perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery as it now exists. This is a view of slavery which the church we are persuaded will never sanction. If individuals are content to hold it as their private conviction, well and good. But if they insist on others holding and professing the same doctrine, then there must be division. We do not say, and we do not think, that the diversity of opinion on this subject, which recent events have developed and revealed in the Presbyterian church, is any just or adequate ground for its division; but we do say, that the existence of such diversity greatly increases the difficulty of holding the church together. The mass of the people in our church, North and South, will as indignantly reject this apotheosis of slavery, as they do Garrisonian abolitionism. We are willing to stand where we are, but we cannot consent to be carried along by the flood of pro-slavery fanaticism, which threatens to overwhelm one portion of the church.

It is not however so much from the moral, as the political aspect of the question that danger is to be apprehended. It is from this source that the conflict of rights and interests arises. On this subject there are the three following views publicly advocated. First, that property in slaves rests upon the common basis of all property. Slavery is not contrary to nature, or natural law. It is just as reasonable, right, and natural that one man should own another, as that he should own a horse. His claim in the one case is just as much entitled to general recognition as in the other. It is therefore subject to no peculiar restrictions. Any nation indeed has the right to prohibit the importation of any particular kind of property into its own limits. It may forbid the introduction of opium, or other noxious plants or animals, or anything else which it may deem injurious or inconsistent with its own policy. On the same principle it may forbid the introduction of slaves. But apart from any specific enactment, or established state policy, slaves are as much entitled to be recognized as property the world over as books or clothes. A slaveholder has therefore the right to take his slaves to any part of Europe, and to hold them there, so long as he is a mere sojourner, provided there is nothing in the laws or institutions of the kingdom or

state in which he may reside, to forbid it. The comity of nations requires that the status of the man in a foreign land should be determined by that of his domicile, and not by that of his temporary sojourn. Such is the ground taken by Mr. Cobb. He says, "That slavery is contrary to the law of nature, has been so confidently and so often asserted, that slaveholders themselves have most generally permitted their own minds to acknowledge its truth unquestioned. Hence, even learned judges in slaveholding states, adopting the language of Lord Mansfield, in Somerset's case, have announced gravely, that slavery being contrary to the law of nature can exist only by positive law." P. 5. In controverting this doctrine he discusses through several pages the idea of the law of nature, and arrives at the conclusion that "the law of nature, when applied to man in his intercourse with his fellow-man," is "that obligation which reason and conscience impose, so to shape his course as to attain the greatest happiness, and arrive at the greatest perfection of which nature is susceptible." He very candidly admits "that the enslavement, by one man or race, of another man or another race, physically, intellectually, and morally their equals, is contrary to the law of nature, because it promotes not their happiness, and tends not to their perfection." The negroes, however, are, as he argues, physically, intellectually, and morally inferior to the white race; and, therefore, reducing negroes to slavery, and retaining them in that state, are not inconsistent with the law of nature. Mr. Cobb is the most candid, the most philosophical, and we may add, the most Christian advocate of the extreme pro-slavery doctrine we are acquainted with. He confines the application of his principles to the negro-race. He rests the justification of slavery on the assumption or presumption of the inferiority of that race; and he makes the legitimate object of the institution to be the highest happiness and improvement of the slaves themselves. As he founds the master's right of property in his slave on "natural law," he claims that it should be recognized wherever any other kind of property is recognized, and on the same conditions, and with the same, and no other limitations. He cites numerous cases to prove that the master's right to hold his slaves in European states where slavery does

not exist, has been recognized by Continental authorities. He asserts that Lord Mansfield's decision (even to the extent to which he is willing to concede that decision went) was an innovation. Of course, *a fortiori*, he holds that slaveholders are entitled to hold their slaves in all the territories of the United States, and within the limits of free states, so long as they are merely sojourners therein.

Dr. Thornwell's language on this subject is as follows: "Wherever communities have been organized, and any rights of property have been recognized at all, there slavery is seen. If, therefore, there be any property which can be said to be founded on the common consent of the human race, it is property in slaves. If there be any property that can be called natural, in the sense that it spontaneously springs up in the history of the species, it is property in slaves. If there be any property founded in principles of universal operation, it is property in slaves. To say of an institution, whose history is thus the history of man, which has always and everywhere existed, that it is a local and municipal relation, is of 'all absurdities the motliest, the meanest word that ever fooled the ear from out the schoolman's jargon.' Mankind may have been wrong—that is not the question. The point is, whether the *law* made slavery; whether it is the police regulation of limited localities, or whether it is a property founded in natural causes, and causes of universal operation. We say nothing as to the moral character of the causes. We insist only on the fact that slavery is rooted in a common law, wider and more pervading than the common law of England—*the universal custom of mankind.* If, therefore, slavery is not municipal, but natural, if it is abolition which is municipal and local, then, upon the avowed doctrines of our opponents, two things follow: 1st. That slavery goes of right, and as a matter of course, into every territory from which it is not excluded by positive statute: and, 2d. That Congress is competent to forbid the Northern states from impressing their local peculiarity of non-slaveholding upon the common soil of the Union." According to this view of the matter, slavery is not only national, but it is cosmical. It goes of right, and as a matter of course, into

every state and kingdom of the earth in which it is not specially prohibited. The only reason that fugitive slaves cannot be reclaimed from European governments is, that they, or some of them, have established it as a principle of law, not to accord to strangers a right of property which they refuse to their own subjects. But this principle is said to be contrary to the whole current of continental authorities, and to be intensely English. This doctrine, that slavery is natural and not municipal, of course makes all the territories of the United States slaveholding. Mr. Buchanan very properly declared that, on this ground, Kansas was as much a slaveholding territory as South Carolina; and the same must be true with regard to all territory hereafter to be acquired.

A second general principle adopted on this subject amounts to the same thing as the preceding, so far as this country is concerned. The two, however, are distinct, and do not necessarily imply each other. This second principle is, that the constitution of the United States recognizes slaves as property, and, therefore, spreads over it its protection, wherever that constitution is the supreme law. It is obvious that a man who holds that slavery is founded on natural law, will not fail to hold that it is recognized by the constitution. But a man may hold the second, without holding the first. The logical consequences of the assumption that the constitution recognizes slaves as ordinary property, are stated differently by those who adopt it. A very distinguished Southern gentleman, in a private letter to the writer, states those consequences thus: "Let us leave wholly aside the question whether property in the labour of bondmen should be considered as natural, or as a local species of property; and lay down these postulates. The federal government is the agent of the states, holding its functions from them, and for their joint and equal benefit. All powers not expressly or impliedly granted to the federal government, are therefore reserved to the states. The federal government recognizes property in the labour or service of our bondmen, in the states in which the property is recognized by the state's own laws. The general government is the common trustee of the territories, for the equal behoof of all the states, and the citizens thereof. Hence we infer that the genera

government should be *perfectly neutral* as to the introduction of any and of every sort of property into its common territories, which is property to any citizen of any of the states to which it is trustee. That is, it should do absolutely nothing, positive or negative, to carry in, or keep out, any of those kinds of properties. And, an inevitable corollary is, that it shall compel all its creatures deriving power under it (*e. g.*, a territorial legislature) to observe the same neutrality, while the territorial condition lasts. And this is *all* which moderate Southern men mean by that obvious claim, so much decried under that odious name of 'congressional slave codes.'"

We of course are not authorized to speak for anybody but ourselves, much less for any party. We are, however, free to express the conviction, that four-fifths of the people of the North would consent to this neutrality of the federal government. They would agree that slaveholders should take their slaves into any part of the common territory, provided the general government were not called upon to pass laws for the security and protection of that property. To enact such laws, would be to establish slavery in all the territories of the United States. We fear, however, that Southern men generally would not be satisfied with mere neutrality. They would not be content that the general government should do nothing, either positive or negative, in this matter. If they have the right to carry their slaves into all the territories of the Union, they will claim legal protection for their property; that is, they will claim to have all the territories, by act of Congress, made slaveholding. This seems to us the logical consequence of the principle, that the constitution recognizes property in slaves as resting on the same basis as other kinds of property. This is therefore the conclusion which is commonly drawn from that principle.

We find this subject clearly and ably presented in the *Sentinel and Witness*, of New Orleans, for January 12, 1861. "True," says that journal, "slavery is a municipal institution, and its municipal boundaries are the limits of the constitution of the United States. Lexicographers give just this definition of the term, and Blackstone applies it exactly in this sense to the state, or British kingdom, as em-

bracing the nation, the kingdom, the empire; and just to the same degree to which the constitution gives rights to the citizen of one state in another state, exactly to the same extent is slavery entitled to go into any free state, and then receive the protection not only of the constitution of the United States, but also of the state itself—*of every state in the Union.* Each state is bound by covenants and oaths to maintain the federal constitution, which constitution guarantees the rights of every citizen of the Union vested in slaves, and to the same extent binds each state not to interfere with these rights. The extent of this duty on the part of a state is exactly co-equal with the right of any citizen of the United States to sojourn in said state. . . . So soon as the time elapses for said sojourner to become a citizen of said state, then the state laws apply—not before. . . . Carolina cannot justly claim that her slave laws should have authority in France or England, or in the Northern states; nor does she claim this for her *state* laws; but she claims the right of each of her citizens, as above shown, under the constitution. . . . So long as slavery exists in any one of the states of the Union, it must be federally legal in every state of the Union, and each state must legalize and protect it to the exact extent of federal obligations. . . . A faithful adherence to this principle, to which each state is bound by covenants and oaths, would calm the present fearful convulsions the very day it was made known, and secure an abiding harmony in the Union; and in fifty years this nation would command the commerce of the world, and be incomparably the first nation on the globe. But without this, we firmly believe the Union is impossible."

We cannot answer this reasoning. It seems to us perfectly conclusive. If the constitution recognizes property in slaves as resting on the same foundation with other kinds of property, it must be protected where any other kind of property is protected. If the general and every state government is bound to protect a man in the possession of his books or clothes, wherever they have authority, why are they not bound to protect him in the possession of his slave, if his right to his slaves, in the view of the constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, rests on the same foundation as his right to his books?

Slavery is thus nationalized. It is carried by the constitution, *proprio vigore*, wherever the constitution goes. Mr. Cobb reaches the same conclusion, although by a somewhat different process.

If such be the true interpretation of the constitution, then we are all bound to submit to it, just as we are bound to submit to the provision requiring the restoration of fugitive slaves. It is of no avail to plead scruples of conscience or convictions of policy in such a case. Our only duty is submission until the constitution can be regularly altered, or the Union legitimately dissolved. We are free to say that if the admission of this interpretation would lead to the actual extension of slavery over the country, we should prefer to see the Union separated into a hundred parts. We do not believe slaveholding to be sinful, but we believe slavery to be an evil and a burden; to be disastrous in its influence, especially on the non-slaveholding whites. At the same time, we believe that this is rather a theoretical, than a practical question. Slavery will not go where it is unprofitable or insecure. It has not gone into New Mexico to any extent, although it is there legally established. It is probable, therefore, that the actual extension of slavery would not be greatly promoted by the adoption of the principle that it is entitled to legal protection in all the territories of the Union. The principle itself, however, we believe to be false and revolutionary.

The third general view on this subject is, that slavery is a municipal institution, resting on the *lex loci*, and therefore cannot claim legal recognition or protection beyond the limits of the state in which that law is in force. Mr. Cobb begins his elaborate work by proposing as a necessary preliminary question: "By what law or authority does this dominion of one man over another exist? by the law of nature, or by municipal law?" He says it is by the former, and not by the latter. He admits, however, that the opposite view, viz., that slavery does not rest on natural law, and therefore, that it is a municipal institution, "has been almost universally adopted by courts and jurists." "Even learned judges in slaveholding states," he adds, "have gravely announced that slavery being contrary to the law of nature, can exist only by force

of positive law." Pp. 4 and 6. This is true enough. Such has been the almost universally received doctrine, and the introduction of the opposite view is now revolutionizing the country.

But what is municipal law? A writer in the New York *Observer*, who signs himself "A Pennsylvania Elder," and who, the public papers say, is supposed to be "an eminent jurist, who has had much experience in public life, and wide acquaintance with public men," in a review of our article on the State of the Country, says, "The fallacy upon which the whole argument is based, is, that slavery, as it exists in this country, is purely a municipal institution, and it is asserted that until within the last twenty or thirty years, there was but one opinion on this subject. There could not be a greater error." In support of this declaration, he appeals to the fact, "that slavery was, in the beginning, universal in this land. It was part of the common law of the country. It was not established by any local or municipal enactments, but every man who could afford to buy and keep a slave, had an undoubted right to do so." "Municipal laws were made to restrict and abolish it. None were required to establish it." This argument has been reproduced in various quarters, and in different forms. With all due, and with very sincere deference, we must be permitted to say that clergymen, who the writer says have no right to meddle with such questions, are trained to reason better than this. He does not define his terms. What is municipal? He assumes that it is synonymous with statute. What is not due to positive enactments, he says, is not municipal. Such, however, is not the meaning of the word. It does not indicate the source or ground of a law, but simply the extent or sphere of its operation. Slavery may have been universal at one time in this country; it may rest where it now exists on the common law, nay, it may rest "on the universal custom of mankind," and yet be at this time, and in this country, a purely municipal institution. "Municipal law," even the dictionary tells us, is "the law of a city, state, or kingdom." It matters not whether it rests on special enactment, particular usage, or immemorial custom. Municipal is local, as opposed to international or universal. Polygamy does not

rest in the East on special enactments. It had its origin in immemorial usage. It can be traced back to the times of Lamech. It prevailed over the whole earth. It can claim its origin from the fallen nature of man, as legitimately as slavery or any other human institution. Yet polygamy is, in relation to Christian nations, purely municipal. Christianity has abolished it throughout Christendom. It has there no law for its protection. Should a Persian or Indian ambassador come to this country with his harem, no one would molest him. The magistrates would not arrest him for bigamy, nor would any court grant a writ to deprive him of the custody of any of the inmates of his house. But if any one of his wives chose to leave him; if, on the ground of conscience, or for any other reason, she refused to continue in his harem, to what law could he appeal to enforce his claim? The laws, whether statute or common, of his own country have no force here. Our courts would not be bound by the courtesy of nations, to give effect, in such a case, to the laws of Persia, or of Hindostan. They would not only not be bound to coerce such a fugitive back to the custody of her master, they would have no right to do it. It would be a violation of her inalienable rights of conscience. It is precisely so with regard to slavery. It may plead immemorial usage or general custom for its origin. But as a historical fact, it has been abolished in almost the whole of Christendom. Where it continues to exist, it is of necessity a municipal or local institution. If, therefore, a master takes his slaves into a state or kingdom where slavery does not exist, he has no law to which to appeal to enforce his authority. If his slaves are willing to remain with him, well and good. The courts will not disturb him. But if they choose to renounce his authority, the courts are not bound to enforce it. There is no law of such state giving the master dominion over the slave. It is only on the principle that the comity of nations requires that the legal status of a person in a foreign state shall be determined by his status in his own domicile, that such interference can be defended. But this, in the first place, is a mere matter of comity. It is not a matter of right, and must from its nature, apart from treaty stipulations, be a matter of discretion. And in the second place, this principle is not, and

cannot be carried out. As just remarked, comity would not require that our courts should decree that a woman should be a man's concubine, because the law of Persia made her so. An English nobleman cannot bring his peerage to this country. An order of nobility, although founded on immemorial usage, and although adopted in most of the nations of the earth, is, as far as we are concerned, a municipal institution. A nobleman can plead no privilege of his order in the United States, and he cannot call upon our courts to give legal effect to any of those privileges. If he commits a crime, he must submit here to be judged by commoners. Why then should it be maintained that a Russian serf should be treated not as a free man, but as a serf in this country, and have his degraded legal status in the land of his birth, follow him to a land which recognizes no such state?

In asserting, therefore, that slavery is a municipal institution, we say nothing as to its origin. We do not say that it is created by statute law. We only say that it rests on the *lex loci*, and that it has no legal existence beyond the operation of that law. In this respect it is on the same foundation with polygamy, orders of nobility, serfdom, and other local institutions, for which no natural or Divine law universally obligatory can be pleaded. What are the logical consequences of this doctrine? Many of our Southern brethren seem to think that "free soilism," that is, the doctrine that we are to have no more slave territory, no new slave states, is the inevitable consequence of that principle. This is a mistake. The free soil doctrine is not an interpretation of the constitution, but a rule of policy. We may hold that under the constitution slavery is a municipal institution, and yet it may be our policy to extend it over our whole territory. The logical consequences of the principle in question are, 1. That if the United States acquire any territory where slavery already exists as a legal institution, it continues to be slaveholding, and slaveholders from abroad may claim protection for the slaves legally introduced into such territory. Thus, we acquired Louisiana, Florida, and Texas; and should we acquire Cuba, it would be slaveholding and open to all the slaveholders in the Union. 2. If the territory acquired be free, then slaveholders may take their slaves

into it, provided they are willing to trust to the affection or fidelity of their slaves, or to the public sentiment of the community, as their security for this peculiar kind of property. Just as a Persian may bring twenty wives to this country, provided he is willing to trust to their devotion to his person. 3. Slavery may be legally introduced into free territory by act of Congress, if such introduction be deemed right and politic. 4. It may be introduced by an act of the territorial legislature. In this way it now exists in New Mexico. These are the principles on which the constitution has been interpreted and administered until a recent period of our history. What has been the practical result? Has this doctrine worked injuriously or unjustly? Has it hemmed slavery within its original limits? Has it deprived slaveholders of the liberty of expansion? The reverse is notoriously true. Almost all our accessions of territory have been in favour of slavery. Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Florida, and Texas, have all been introduced as slaveholding. The area of slavery has been nearly doubled since the beginning of this century. There are about twenty-eight millions of white inhabitants in the United States. Of these the slaveholders and their families do not exceed two millions. Of the whole territory belonging to the Union 1,795,965 square miles are free, and 1,298,711 are slaveholding. Or, if we throw out of the view the territories, which are mostly a wilderness, and confine the comparison to the organized states this side of the Rocky Mountains, where the life of the country is, we find that the slaveholding states have 890,382 square miles, and the free states only 674,045, although the white population of the latter is more than double that of the former; and although slaveholders (including their families) are to the whole body of non-slaveholders as two to twenty-five. It cannot be said, therefore, that the constitution, as hitherto interpreted and administered, has worked unjustly to slaveholders.

But is this the true interpretation of the constitution? It is necessary to understand the question. We admit that the constitution recognizes slavery. We admit that it recognizes property in slaves. It certainly recognizes the master's claim to the service of his slave. But this claim is of the nature of

property. It can be bought and sold; it can be seized for debt; it can be transferred at pleasure, and it can be bequeathed by will. In recognizing, therefore, the master's claim to the service or labour of the slave, it recognizes his property in him, as far as one man can be the property of another. But this is not the point. The question is, whether the constitution recognizes slavery as a municipal, or as a natural, or, at least, a national institution; whether property in slaves, or, which is the same thing, the master's authority over his slaves and his right to their service, is regarded by the constitution as something peculiar and local, depending on the *lex loci*, or as something natural, to be everywhere recognized and enforced, as any other kind of property. But one answer to this question, as it seems to us, can be given. 1. In the first place, it must be admitted on all sides, that there is no decided or express recognition of property in slaves as ordinary property anywhere in the constitution. It is only arrived at by inference and implication. This seems to be admitted by the Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, who, in a speech delivered at Savannah, March 23, 1861, says that the new constitution of the Southern Confederacy determines "the proper status of the negro in our form of civilization." He says that the prevailing ideas at the time of the formation of the old constitution were, "that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically. It was an evil they knew not how to deal with, but the general opinion was that, somehow or other, in the order of Providence, the institution would be evanescent and pass away. This idea, although not incorporated in the constitution, was the prevailing idea of the time." "This," he says, "was an error. It was a sandy foundation; and the idea of a government built upon it, when the storm came, and the winds blew, fell. Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man;—that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition. This, our new government, is the first in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth. This truth has been

slow in its process of development, like all other truths in the department of science. It has been even so among us. Many who hear me, perhaps, can recollect well that this truth was not generally admitted, even within their day."

No doubt. This is precisely the revolution which has been going on in the Southern mind, and is now working the dissolution of the Union. It is well, however, to note that it is a revolution; that it is a new doctrine; that it is in direct contradiction to the old doctrine, on which, as Mr. Stephens says, the constitution of our fathers was founded. They did not spring to the monstrous conclusion that the superior race had a right to enslave the inferior. It is indeed undeniable, that the negroes as a class in this country, are inferior to the cultivated whites. But so are the modern Greeks to the Turks; so were the Christian Copts to the Mamelukes; so are the Esquimaux and Laplanders to the French and English. The relative position of the different races of men, depends on the conditions of climate, soil, political and social institutions. In Barbadoes, by far the most degraded part of the population, those who are the least intelligent, the most dependent, and most hopeless, are the poor whites. The same is true in certain parts of our own country, where the climate and social institutions are unfavourable to their development. The strong, physically or mentally, are not entitled to enslave the weak. Unless the inferiority be such as to render the less gifted race for ever incapable of freedom, it can form no justification in the sight of God or man for their perpetual bondage. This, however, is not the point now in hand. Mr. Stephens's speech is a frank and full admission that the old constitution was very different in its bearing on slavery from that of the new Confederacy. This is just what we say. The old constitution, which the seceding states had sworn to support, did not contain this idea that negro slavery is a natural, normal institution, or that property in slaves rests on natural law.

2. A second argument in proof that the constitution regards slavery as a municipal institution, is derived from the language of that instrument itself. In the words of the constitution, a slave is "a person held to service." But by what law? The constitution answers, *by the law of the States.* "No person

held to service or labour in one State, *under the laws thereof*, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to which such service or labour is due." It is here expressly stated, that the claim of the master to the service of the slave is founded on the *lex loci*. This is, therefore, a negation of the idea that it rests on the general principle of property, to be recognized wherever the rights of property are regarded. It is represented as something special and peculiar, founded on the municipal regulations of the States in which slavery exists. The constitution provides that this municipal regulation shall be respected by the non-slaveholding States to a certain extent, and for a specific purpose. This of itself implies, that were it not for that stipulation, there would be no obligation to respect it. We do not see how any implication can be clearer, than that slavery is regarded in the constitution itself as a local institution.

3. This is further plain, from the fact that a special article securing the restoration of fugitive slaves was considered necessary. A father has the right to the custody of his minor children. Why was it not deemed necessary to stipulate that runaway children should be restored to their parents? A man has a right to the possession of his domestic animals. Why is it not prescribed that horses or cattle, strayed or stolen, should, on proof of property, be returned to their owners? The very fact that such a stipulation was deemed necessary in the case of slaves, and not in the case of other kinds of property, shows that property in slaves was regarded as a purely local or municipal institution, having no legal foundation beyond the limits of the States in which slave laws were in force.

4. We could fill our pages with judicial decisions in support of this doctrine. The Supreme Court of the United States, the courts of Kentucky, Georgia, Missouri, Louisiana, as well as those of the free States, have, on numerous occasions, assumed and adjudicated that slavery is a municipal institution; that it rests on the law of the States in which it exists, and that the slave becomes free if taken by his master beyond the limits of those States. The principle laid down by Lord

Mansfield, that "so high an act of dominion must be recognized by the law of the country where it is used," has been generally adopted by our courts. In the case of Prigg *vs.* Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in 1842, Judge Story, of the Supreme Court, says: "The state of slavery is deemed to be a mere municipal regulation founded on and limited to the range of territorial laws." In Jones *vs.* Vanzandt, in the same year, Judge McLean said, "Slavery is local in its character—it depends on the municipal law of the State where it is established. And if a person held in slavery go beyond the jurisdiction where he is so held, and into another territory where slavery is not tolerated, he becomes free." Judge Washington in 1806, and again in 1823, ruled, "that where a master voluntarily brings his slave into a free State and remains there, the slave is entitled to his freedom." The courts of Mississippi, June 1818, decided that "slaves within the limits of the northwestern Territory became freemen by virtue of the ordinance of 1787, and can assert their claim to freedom in this State." It is not necessary to multiply citations of this kind, as it is generally admitted, as by Mr. Cobb, that the current of judicial decisions is in favour of the doctrine that slavery is a municipal institution.

5. An argument which is itself more conclusive, and which will be more generally appreciated, is, that the whole administrative or constitutional history of the country is founded on this doctrine. The true interpretation of the constitution can hardly be more certainly determined than by the conduct of its framers and its legitimate expounders and organs. The principle now so confidently set forth that the constitution recognizes property in slaves as analogous to other kinds of property, and entitled to the same universal recognition and protection, avowedly assumes that any law of Congress forbidding slavery in the common territory is unconstitutional. But Congress has from the beginning passed such laws. They were passed by the framers of the constitution. They were sanctioned by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, by Calhoun, by Clay, by Jefferson Davis, and by statesmen of all parties. The opposite doctrine is verily a new idea, which has been slowly developed, and only recently adopted. In the

ordinance of 1787 it was ordained, "There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, (*i. e.*, the territory north of the Ohio,) otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted. Done by the United States in Congress assembled, the thirteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord 1787, and of sovereignty and independence the twelfth." This ordinance was solemnly ratified and confirmed by the first Congress which sat under the present constitution in 1789, "with but one dissenting voice, and that a delegate from New York; the entire Southern vote being cast in its favour." *Cobb*, p. clxx.

The same year, 1789, North Carolina ceded to the United States the territory now constituting the state of Tennessee, with the condition "that no regulation made or to be made by Congress shall tend to the emancipation of slaves."* This is another contemporary recognition of the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery in the territories. When Georgia ceded her Western territory, it was agreed that it was to be erected into a State "on the terms and conditions contained in the ordinance of 1787, for the government of the territory northwest of the Ohio, 'that article only excepted which prohibits slavery.'" The Commissioners on the part of the United States by whom this compact with Georgia was framed, recognizing, as it does, by providing against its exercise, the power of Congress to prohibit slavery in the territories, were Madison, Gallatin, and Lincoln. Five times in four years, Indiana petitioned Congress for a suspension of the prohibition of slavery. The first time, in 1803, when John Randolph, as chairman of the committee to whom the petition had been referred, reported against its being granted; and the last time, in 1807, when Mr. Franklin, of North Carolina, made another adverse report, which, as no division was called for, seems to have received the unanimous concurrence of the Senate.† Thus universally at that period was it admitted that slavery is a local institution which could not enter free territory without special legislation.

* Hildreth's History of the United States, vol. i. p. 150.

† Benton's Thirty Years in the Senate, vol. ii. p. 760.

Congress, in subsequent years, without resistance or objection, exercised the same prerogative of prohibiting slavery, as Illinois, Michigan, and other portions of the country northwest of the Ohio, came to be organized as separate territories. Again, on the passage of the celebrated Missouri compromise, by which slavery was prohibited north of 36° 30′, the same power was exercised. In this act the South, as a body, concurred. Mr. Monroe submitted to his cabinet the distinct question, "Has Congress the constitutional power to prohibit slavery in a territory?" To this question they unanimously answer, Yes. The cabinet consisted of John Quincy Adams, William H. Crawford, John C. Calhoun, Smith Thompson, John McLean, and William Wirt. "This compromise," says Mr. Benton, "was the work of the South, sustained by the united voice of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, the united voices of the Southern senators, and a majority of the Southern representatives."* Among the distinguished men who voted for this measure, were Governor Barbour and Governor Pleasants, of Virginia; Mr. James Brown and Governor Henry Johnson, of Louisiana; Messrs. Elliott and Walker, of Georgia; Mr. Gaillard and Judge William Smith, of South Carolina; Messrs. Hersey and Van Dyke, of Delaware; Colonel Richard M. Johnson and Judge Logan, of Kentucky; Mr. William R. King and Judge John W. Walker, of Alabama; Messrs. Leake and Thomas K. Williams, of Mississippi; Governor Loyd and the great jurist, William Pinckney, of Maryland; Mr. Macon and Governor Stokes, of North Carolina; Messrs. Walter Lowrie and Jonathan Roberts, of Pennsylvania. In the House of Representatives, the vote stood, *ayes* 134, *nays* 42. The ayes included a majority of the Southern delegates, and among them, William Lowndes, of South Carolina, "whose opinion," says Mr. Benton, "had a weight never exceeded by that of any other American statesman." It would be difficult to select any equal number of names from our whole history, entitled to greater deference than those above-mentioned. This is a company, in the presence of which it becomes every man to stand uncovered. He must be bold, indeed, who can pronounce a law unconstitu-

* Thirty Years in the Senate. By T. H. Benton. Vol. i., p. 8.

tional, which these men passed under the sanction of their official oaths!

This however is not all. The country, men of all sections, and of all parties, acquiesced in this law. There were, no doubt, differences of opinion as to its wisdom, its fairness, and the fidelity with which it was adhered to, but as to its constitutionality, there was for a long series of years a general acquiescence. The same power, therefore, continued to be exercised. In 1845, when Texas was annexed, it was with the provision that "in such State or States as shall be formed out of the said territory, north of the said Missouri compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited." In supporting this measure, Mr. Buchanan, then a member of the Senate, said, "He was pleased with it, because it settled the question of slavery. These resolutions went to re-establish the Missouri compromise, by fixing a line within which slavery was to be in future confined. . . . . Who could complain of the terms of that compromise? It was then settled that north of 36° 30′ slavery should be for ever prohibited. The same line was fixed upon in the resolutions recently received from the House of Representatives, now before us."* Every one knows that the annexation of Texas was a Southern measure, and it was by Southern votes and influence that the right of Congress to prohibit slavery in the territories was then asserted and exercised. Again in 1848, when Oregon was erected into a territory, the bill for that purpose endorsed the anti-slavery clause of the ordinance of 1787. On that occasion Mr. Douglas moved to amend "by inserting a provision for the extension of the Missouri compromise line to the Pacific Ocean."† In support of this amendment all the senators from the South voted. When he signed this Oregon bill, President Polk sent a message to Congress, in which he gives as one reason for approving it, that "the provisions of the bill are not inconsistent with the terms of the Missouri compromise." "Ought we," he asks, "now to disturb the Missouri and Texas compromises? Ought we at this late day, in attempting to annul what has been so long estab-

* Thirty Years in the Senate, vol. ii., p. 633.
† Thirty Years in the Senate, vol. ii., p. 711.

lished and acquiesced in, to excite sectional divisions and jealousies; to alienate the different portions of the Union from each other; and to endanger the existence of the Union itself?" Again, as late as 1850, when Mr. Clay introduced his measure in reference to the territory acquired from Mexico, Mr. Jefferson Davis insisted on the extension of the Missouri line to the Pacific Ocean; thus, up to that period, acknowledging the right of Congress to prohibit or to introduce slavery into the territories.

It is admitted that the three following principles stand or fall together, viz. 1. Congress has the right to prohibit slavery in the territories. 2. The constitution does not give the right to introduce slavery into the territories. 3. Slavery is, in view of the constitution, a municipal institution resting on the *lex loci*. He who affirms one of these propositions affirms them all; he who denies one denies them all. That these principles are all true and sound, we have argued from the fact of their recognition from the beginning by men of all parties. We now adduce the fact, that these principles have received the highest judicial sanction, including that of the Supreme Court of the United States. Judge McLean asserts, that the great principle decided by Lords Mansfield and Stowell, against which, he says, *there is no dissenting authority*, was "that a slave is not property beyond the operation of the local law which makes him such." The Supreme Court of the United States, he also says, has decided that "slavery is a mere municipal regulation, founded on and limited to the range of the territorial laws." "This decision," he adds, "is not a mere argument, but it is the end of the law, in regard to the extent of slavery. Until it shall be overturned, it is not a point for argument; it is obligatory on myself and my brethren, and on all judicial tribunals over which this Court exercises an appellate power." "The Constitution of the United States," he argues, "in express terms recognizes the *status* of slavery as founded on municipal law: 'No person held to service or labour in one State, *under the laws thereof*, escaping into another, shall, &c.'"* Judge Curtis, of the same Court, makes

* Howard's Reports, vol. xix. p. 549.

a similar declaration. "Slavery," he says, "being contrary to natural right, is created only by municipal law. This is not only plain in itself, and agreed by *all writers on the subject*, but it is inferable from the Constitution, *and has been explicitly declared by this Court.*" He further says, "I am not acquainted with any case or writer questioning the correctness of this doctrine."*

According, then, to the old theory of the constitution, the extension of slavery into the territories is a question of policy. It may, should Congress see fit, be introduced into all, or excluded from all; or introduced into some, and excluded from others. According to the new theory, it goes, as a matter of constitutional right, into all. That a man should honestly believe that this new theory is the true interpretation of the constitution, we can readily understand; but that any man can assert, in view of even the imperfect array of facts and authorities above given, that it has been the generally received interpretation, and that the introduction of the opposite doctrine is a revolution, is what we cannot understand.

"The dissolution of the American Union" has been pronounced "the crime of the century." Where lies the guilt of that crime? The South charges it upon the North, the North charges it upon the South. Beyond reasonable doubt, there is guilt on both parties. People and States at the North have erred in spirit, principles, and measures, and given just cause of complaint and umbrage to the South. The National Government, however, which up to the present time has been mainly under control of the South, has done nothing to justify complaint, much less revolution. Whatever provocation may have been afforded by a portion of the northern people, the Gulf States have done the thing. They have dissolved the Union so far as in them lies. What is their justification for this act? Numerous pleas have been presented, and little discrimination has been made between the motives and the reasons for the severance of the Union. The motives may have been as numerous as the individual agents in the measure; the reasons or principles on which the act of disunion is justi-

* Howard's Reports, vol. xix. p. 624.

fied are few. Some take the ground that the act needs no justification beyond the good pleasure of the States concerned. They had a right to enter the Union, and they claim an equally sovereign right to leave it whenever they see fit. Others, recognizing the fact that the Union imposed solemn obligations on all parties to preserve and perpetuate it, and especially that the northwestern and southwestern territories were admitted to the Union on the express stipulation that "the said territory and the States formed therein, shall for ever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States of America," have felt that a decent regard to public opinion called for a vindication of the act of secession. The ground of justification most distinctly and confidently assumed is this. According to the true interpretation of the constitution, "Slavery goes of right, and as a matter of course, into every territory from which it is not excluded by positive statute; and Congress is competent to forbid the Northern States from impressing their local peculiarity of non-slaveholding upon the common soil of the Union." *Dr. Thornwell on the State of the Country*, p. 14. Mr. Lincoln's election is considered as committing the country to the opposite doctrine. Hence "the constitution, in its relation to slavery, is virtually repealed." His election is said to be "nothing more nor less than a proposition to the South to consent to a government fundamentally different, upon the question of slavery, from that which our fathers established." P. 9. "If the constitution recognizes slaves as property, that is, as persons to whose labour and service the master has a right, then upon what principle shall Congress undertake to abolish this right upon a territory of which it is the local legislature?" The assertion of that right on the part of Congress is said to be "a thorough and radical revolution—it proposes new and extraordinary terms of union. The old government is as completely abolished as if the people of the United States had met in convention and repealed the constitution." P. 26.

We have already remarked, that the right of Congress to prohibit slavery in the territories is a constitutional question. The exercise of that right is a question of policy. The mere unwise or even unfair exercise of a constitutional right, cannot, we think, be revolutionary. Congress may make an injudicious

tariff, and not thereby repeal the constitution. It is the assertion of the right to prohibit slavery in the territories that is pronounced a revolution, which substitutes a new government, and new terms of union, to which the South is bound not to submit. But we have seen that this right was exercised from the beginning by the very authors of the constitution; that it was exercised or sanctioned by all our early presidents; that every Southern senator voted for the prohibition of slavery north of 36° 30′ in 1820; that the same power was exercised in 1845, in 1848, and claimed and advocated by Southern statesmen, who called for the extension of the Missouri line to the Pacific in 1850. How then can the assertion of that right be revolutionary? Such, however, is the vindication of the dismemberment of the Union. The fact that the country adheres to the principles and practice of our fathers; that it avows the doctrine which Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Polk, Buchanan (when Senator,) all held, which Calhoun, Lowndes, and even Jefferson Davis himself, with the vast majority of our public men, professed and acted upon, is made a justification of the overthrow of our government. We know not how this matter may appear to others. To us it is overwhelming. We cannot understand how such things can be. We can see how men may honestly believe that Congress has no right to prohibit slavery in the territories, but how they can say that the assertion of that right is new and revolutionary, and of right dissolves the Union, is what we cannot comprehend. Nor can we see how good men, on this ground, can justify the disregard of "covenants and oaths," the dismemberment of the Union, the initiation of civil war, with all the frightful evils of disunion present and prospective.

It is replied to all this, that the Supreme Court of the United States has decided in favour of the new doctrine; that it has declared the Missouri compromise to be unconstitutional, because Congress has no right to prohibit slavery in the territories. Suppose it has thus decided—such decision, so far from justifying disunion, would only render it the more inexcusable. It would secure, notwithstanding the counter practice and judgments of former judges and statesmen, the constitution being administered according to the new interpretation. Does this

justify disunion? The Supreme Court is supreme. It does control, and must control all the other departments of the government. Congress may pass as many laws as it pleases, prohibiting slavery in the territories; they are all so much waste paper, if the Supreme Court pronounces them unconstitutional.

With regard to the Dred Scott decision, however, on which so much stress is laid, there are two questions of interest to be answered. The one, What did the court actually decide? And the other, What is the legitimate operation of such decision, and the authority due to it? The case was substantially this: Dred Scott, a person of African descent, and a slave, was taken by his master, first into Illinois, and afterwards to Fort Snelling, situated in a territory north of 36° 30′, and from that place was removed to the state of Missouri. He claimed his freedom, and brought suit before the Circuit Court of the United States. To enable that court to entertain the case, the plaintiff, Dred Scott, described himself as a citizen of Missouri, and his master as a citizen of New York. The court decided against him, and he appealed to the Supreme Court. This brought up, as Chief Justice Taney states, two questions for consideration: 1. Had the Circuit Court, from which the appeal was taken, jurisdiction in the case? 2. If it had jurisdiction, was its judgment correct? The first question the Supreme Court decided in the negative. Dred Scott, being of African descent, was not, as he claimed, a citizen of Missouri, and therefore could not be heard as such in the court. The second question brought up, as one of the points involved, the Missouri compromise act, which six judges out of the nine pronounced unconstitutional. In reference to this whole case, the ground is taken by many, that when the Supreme Court decided that the court below had no jurisdiction in the case, the matter was ended. If the Circuit Court had no jurisdiction, then there had been no trial, and no decision. There was nothing judicially done to be reviewed by the appellate court. What is extra-judicial, is judicially nothing. If this is so, then all that the six judges said about the Missouri compromise act was said extra-judicially, and remains as though it never had been said. It has no authority whatever, further than the same

views would have, if published anonymously in a pamphlet. This is the view of the matter taken by Judge McLean. He says the majority of the court uttered "many things which are of no authority. Nothing that was said by them, which has not a direct bearing on the jurisdiction of the court, against which they decided, can be considered as authority. I shall certainly not regard it as such. The question of jurisdiction being before the court, was decided by them authoritatively, but nothing beyond that question."* Judge Curtis takes the same ground. He says, "I dissent both from what I deem their assumption of authority to examine the constitutionality of an act of Congress, commonly called the Missouri compromise act, and the grounds and conclusions announced in their opinion." "Having decided that this plea showed that the Circuit Court had not jurisdiction, . . . they have gone on to examine the merits of the case, as they appeared on the trial before the court and jury, on the issues joined on the pleas in bar, and so have reached the question of the power of Congress to pass the act of 1820. On so grave a subject as this, I feel obliged to say that, in my opinion, such an exertion of judicial power transcends the limits of the power of the court, as described by its repeated decisions, and, as I understand, acknowledged in this opinion of the majority of the court."†

We are far from presuming to say that the court had no right to pronounce upon the constitutionality of the Compromise act; but it is certainly a great misfortune to the country that there should be any doubt on the subject. In a matter which, as Judge Daniel said, "had never been surpassed in importance by any question submitted to the court since the establishment of the government," it is deeply to be deplored that the authority of the court to pronounce an opinion should be denied by some of its own members. If Judge McLean could say that he would not regard the judgment as any authority, what will others say? It remains, therefore, a matter of doubt, whether any judicial decision was legitimately given on that subject. But admitting that the court had a right to pronounce a judgment, and that their judgment was that Congress

* Howard, vol. xix., p. 549. † Ib., p. 588.

has no right to prohibit slavery in the territories, what are the legitimate effects of that decision? Or, to state the question more generally, what authority is due to the decisions of the Supreme Court? On this vital subject there are extreme opinions. On the one side, it has often been asserted that those decisions were not binding, even as to the particular case decided. We have sovereign States refusing obedience to such decisions. On the other hand, it is asserted that the judgments of the Supreme Court bind the conscience and reason of the people, so that it is a sin even to dissent from them. The "Pennsylvania Elder" rebukes us for expressing such dissent. This is simply absurd. No human authority can bind the reason or conscience. Such tyranny over the thoughts and utterance of men is never claimed, except in favour of one's own opinions. Had the decision of the court not coincided with the Elder's own convictions, he would not have thought dissent a sin. It is the right and duty of every man to protest against every unrighteous act of the executive power, and every unjust decision of the judiciary. The six or seven judges who pronounced the act of 1820 unconstitutional, stand before the country as able, learned, and upright men. We bow to their authority. We acknowledge their integrity. But we do not see why their judgment should have more weight over our interior convictions, than that of the seventy times seven men of equal learning, ability, and worth, who have given an opposite judgment. We do not see that Chief Justice Marshall's opinion, uttered as the judgment of the Supreme Court, that "in legislating for the territories, Congress exercises the combined powers of the general and state governments,"* is not entitled to as much deference as the opposite opinion of any subsequent Chief Justice. But if the judgments of the Supreme court have no authority to control the reason, or to seal the lips of the people, what is the authority legitimately due to them? As this is a question which affects the conscience and determines the duties of men, we take the liberty to say to the "Pennsylvania Elder," and to all others who have repeated or sanctioned his rebuke, that we as clergymen and

* Howard, vol. xix., p. 541.

as Christian men claim, and mean always to exercise the right of publicly discussing such questions to the best of our ability. Lawyers and judges have not the prerogative of thinking for the people, or of deciding without appeal, questions which touch the public conscience.

As to the authority, then, of the decisions of the Supreme Court we say, 1. That they finally determine the case to which they refer. Dred Scott applied to the court to be declared a free man. The court decided that he was not entitled to such a declaration. That determined the matter. No one questions the effect of that decision so far as Dred Scott is concerned. He remains a slave. Everybody submits so to regard and treat him. 2. It necessarily settles all similar cases so long as the construction of the constitution on which the decision was made, continues to be held by the court. No other man of African descent would think of claiming his freedom on the grounds on which Dred Scott claimed his. No slaveholder would hesitate to take his slave into any territory of the United States, for fear of his constitutional right to do so being called into question. That decision opens all the territories now possessed, or hereafter to be acquired, to the introduction of slavery. It declares that the constitution, *proprio vigore*, carries slavery wherever it goes, until slaveholding is forbidden by the action of a sovereign State. Should we, therefore, hereafter annex a part or the whole of Mexico, or should we extend our possessions to Patagonia, slavery would everywhere attend our progress. The constitution is a great organic power for the extension of slavery. This, indeed, is not the constitution our fathers intended to frame. It is not the constitution which the people understood themselves to adopt. It is not the constitution in which, as Judge McLean says, the whole country acquiesced for sixty years; but it is, nevertheless, our present constitution, to which we are all bound to submit, until it is constitutionally altered by the people, or until the Dred Scott decision, supposing it to be what it is claimed to be, is legitimately reversed. Why the Gulf States should revolt against such a constitution it is hard to see. Judge Campbell, of the Supreme Court, therefore, was fully justified in saying, as he does say in his letters to the people of Alabama, that the

South now had all they could require or could demand. 3d. The decisions of the Supreme Court necessarily determine all future decisions of the lower courts. No such court would now presume to pronounce a slave free, because taken into any of the territories of the United States, because it knows that its decision would certainly be reversed. 4th. The decisions of the Supreme Court in effect control the action both of the executive and legislative departments of the government. Should Congress pass any new compromise act, forbidding slavery on one side of a given line, and permitting it upon another, it would be a dead letter. It could only be enforced through the courts, and the courts must declare it unconstitutional. The only way in which the Missouri compromise, or anything of a like nature, can be restored, is by altering the constitution, or reversing the Dred Scott decision. While that decision remains in force, it effectually prevents Congress from prohibiting the introduction of slavery into any of the common territories of the Union. General Jackson took the ground, that the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the government are co-ordinate, and that the two former are not bound to subordinate their action to the judgments of the latter. He therefore said that he was bound to execute the constitution as he understood it, and not as the Supreme Court chose to interpret it. This may be so. But the executive and legislative departments must act, in many cases at least, through the judicial. Suppose the court pronounced a United States bank unconstitutional. Such decision might not prevent Congress, with the sanction of the president, creating such a bank. But as soon as the bank applies to the United States courts to enforce its contracts in the collection of debts, it is arrested in its operations, and must come to an end. So Congress and the president may pass laws prohibiting slavery in the territories. What good will it do? If the court pronounces such laws null and void, they cannot be executed. 5th. The above statement carries the authority of the Supreme Court as far as can be reasonably demanded. We have only to say further, that no man is bound, as already intimated, to think its decisions in all cases just and wise, nor is he precluded from the right of

expressing his convictions, be they favourable or unfavourable. 6th. As the decisions of the Supreme Court do not bind the internal judgments of the people, so neither do they bind their successors. The judges for the time being are bound to interpret the constitution and laws according to their own conscientious convictions of their meaning. Courts have always acted on this principle. Although they give great weight to the decisions of their predecessors, and are disposed to exercise great caution in dissenting from them, and thus rendering the law uncertain and unsteady, they nevertheless have not failed to exercise their own right of independent judgment. If this were not so, the first half dozen men who happen to be appointed judges of the Supreme Court, could fix the law for all generations. What would have become of the liberties of England, if the decisions of Jeffreys could never have been reversed? This is the way this matter lies in the minds of unsophisticated men; and these are the principles by which such must be allowed to govern themselves until convinced of their unsoundness.

Our readers must not suppose that we have forgotten our subject. We have not travelled out of the record. The question which we proposed to discuss is, Can our church be held together in the existing state of the country? We could not intelligently answer this question without bringing distinctly before our minds what the state of the country is. We are in the midst of a civil revolution. Alienation of feeling, mutual want of confidence, and great diversity of opinion on vitally important subjects, undoubtedly exist. It was necessary, therefore, to present the true state of the case, and to exhibit the points about which we are divided. Having done this, we are prepared to say, that notwithstanding this deplorable state of things, we are bound to hold together as a church, because the grounds of difference, important as they are, do not relate to the divinely appointed terms of Christian or ministerial communion. A man who holds with the extreme South can conscientiously answer in the affirmative every question which a church session or a Presbytery has a right to ask a minister or member. A man who holds with the extreme Northern section of the church can do the same. If this is true, what

right has either side to demand more? If these are the terms of church fellowship which Christ has prescribed, who will assume the responsibility of altering them?

But if our church is bound to remain united, how is the imminent danger of division to which we are exposed, to be avoided? In answer to this question, we have only two things to say. First, all our ministers and elders, and especially those of their number who may be sent as delegates to the next General Assembly, should have their minds settled on the nature of schism, and the causes which justify secession from the Church to which we belong. It is generally agreed that unfriendly separation or disruption of a church, is of the nature of schism, unless, 1. we are called upon to profess what we do not believe; or, 2. are forbidden to profess and preach what we do believe; or, 3. are required to do something which our consciences forbid; or, 4. are forbidden to do what conscience and the word of God demand. If these are the only conditions under which we are authorized to dismember the church, if our brethren will adhere to these principles, there need be no division.

Secondly, there should be a settled purpose to let the slavery question remain just as it is. Both parties have acquiesced in the decisions of the church already made. Should any new deliverance be called for, in the present state of the public mind, division is inevitable. If the North requires the extreme Southern views on this subject to be formally condemned; or if the South requires them to be formally sanctioned, we cannot continue one body. Neither side has the moral or ecclesiastical right to make such a demand; because these diversities of opinion, great as they are, fall within the divinely prescribed conditions of ecclesiastical union. We cannot but hope that, with the blessing of God, our church may survive this conflict, and present to the world the edifying spectacle of Christian brotherhood unbroken by political convulsions.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Christian Element in Plato and the Platonic Philosophy; unfolded and set forth by Dr. C. Ackermann, Archdeacon at Jena. Translated from the German by Samuel Ralph Asbury, B. A. With an Introductory Note by William G. T. Shedd, D. D., Brown Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1861.

The title-page of this work evinces its claim to the respectful attention of Christian scholars. The subject, the author, and the sanction of Professor Shedd's name, not, of course, for all the contents of the book, but for its general style of execution, all conspire to prove it worthy of examination by scholars, philosophers, and theologians. In the cursory glance which we have been able to bestow upon the book, we observe the merits and faults of the German mode of treating theological and philosophical subjects. There is the exhaustive and relentless search into the minutest points and most subtle analogies which show the most remote and shadowy connection between Plato and the Bible. It therefore affords most valuable helps to those who are seeking to detect the Christian truth which lies latent or palpable in Plato's writings. It also displays German modes of thought in setting forth Christianity. This is so obvious in regard to Divine justice, sin, and atonement, that the translator has signalized it in a preliminary note. Of course, it is the impulse of the author to find as much coincidence as possible between Plato and Christianity. This involves the temptation to magnify the Christian element in the former, and the Platonic element in the latter. With these things in mind, all may find the book a great assistance in learning the degree of truth, in regard to the soul, God, and immortality, attained by the loftiest and purest of heathen philosophers. Great and marvellous as it was—even if we were to admit, as some maintain, it to be the prophetic dawn of Christianity—it is less than is now known by the babes and sucklings out of whose mouths God has ordained praise.

Evenings with the Doctrines. By Nehemiah Adams, D. D., author of "Friends of Christ," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1861.

Dr. Adams is one of the few pastors who have the happy art of so constructing discourses, and reproducing the substance of

them in print, that they are widely and permanently read after their original delivery. His clear and chaste diction is the apt drapery of his pure and racy thought. He sets forth Christian truth without abatement or compromise, in a manner intelligible to the humble and ignorant, and yet attractive to the cultivated and polished. We deem it quite fortunate that the orthodox system can be articulated in such a manner, amidst the fastidious refinement and erratic culture of our Eastern metropolis. Although some statements in the volume come short of the strict accuracy of theological science, there are but slight deviations from the Westminster standards. The doctrines of grace are presented without any perceptible toning down, but divested of those technicalities and caricatures which so often expose them to gratuitous odium. Few men have been privileged to do more for truth, in quarters ungenial to it, than Dr. Adams. Few have been more bitterly or persistently assailed by the radical press. Few have more patiently or successfully repelled malignant vituperation with the benignity of the gospel, and thus overcome evil with good.

The Life of Trust; being a Narrative of the Lord's dealings with George Müller. Written by himself. Edited and condensed by H. Lincoln Wayland, Pastor of the Third Baptist Church, Worcester, Massachusetts. With an Introduction by Francis Wayland. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1861.

Dr. Wayland tells us that this narrative furnishes the most remarkable instance of the efficacy of prayer with which he is acquainted. "A single man, wholly destitute of funds, is supporting and educating several hundred orphans, providing every thing needful for their education; is in himself an extensive Bible and Tract and Missionary Society; the work is daily increasing in magnitude, and the means for carrying it on are abundantly supplied, while he is connected with no particular denomination, is aided by no voluntary association, and has asked the assistance of not a single individual. He has asked no one but God, and all his wants have been regularly supplied. In these labours of love he has, up to the present time, expended nearly a million of dollars. It is thus that he has endeavoured to show to an unbelieving world that God is a living God, and that He means what He has said in every one of his promises."

It is obvious that such a narrative must be highly interesting and instructive. As to the views advanced in regard to the prayer of faith, they require a more extended consideration than we are now able to bestow upon them.

Sinai and Sion; or, a Pilgrimage through the Wilderness to the Land of Promise. By Benjamin Bausman. With Illustrations. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1861.

The books of travels in the Holy Land with which the press teems, of course present little that is new, either in statistics, history, or geography, yet they are not stolid reproductions or servile copies of previous works. Each new traveller sees the same old objects with new eyes. He will exhibit it with surroundings and associations overlooked by others. He may have personal or official advantages for commanding a circle of readers, to whom other similar works have no access. The author of this work looks for the "larger number of readers in the German Reformed Church, of which he is a member." We see no reason why they should be restricted to this communion. The narrative is copious, fresh, and vigorous. The author's observations are often independent and forcible. The pictorial illustrations are instructive and interesting. The table of Scripture texts illustrated, and of contents at the close, enhance the value of the work.

Life Pictures from the Bible; or, Illustrations of Scripture Character. By Le Roy J. Halsey, D. D., author of The Literary Attractions of the Bible, &c. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Since this book reached us (too late for notice in our last number) it has been so generally and favourably spoken of by the religious journals, as to render further comment on our part superfluous. We heartily concur in the general estimate which has been expressed of its literary, religious, and readable merit.

Blessings in Disguise; being a sequel to "The Valley of Achor." By the Rev. S. S. Sheddan. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This little volume gives out the aroma of devout feeling and spiritual unction, while it exhibits a rhetorical force and elegance which we are prepared to look for in the author's productions.

Marion Leslie; or, the Light at Home. With an Introduction, by the Rev. H. A. Boardman, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This interesting volume was written by a lady of Dr. Boardman's church during her last sickness. His testimony, which is better than any judgment founded on a hurried inspection can be, is as follows: "The story is well arranged. The incidents are precisely such as have frequently occurred. And

the judicious manner in which embarrassing questions of conscience are resolved, cannot fail to make the book, by God's blessing, useful to many youthful Christians who are surrounded by gay relatives and friends."

Remarkable Escapes from Peril, Illustrative of Divine Providence.

Cares and Comforts. By the Author of "Lame Letty," &c.

Whispers from Dreamland. By Nellie Graham, Author of "Little Annie's First Thoughts about God."

These are further additions to the excellent "Series for Youth," issued by our Board of Publication. They fully sustain the character which this "Series" has thus far earned, for fitness to please, instruct, and profit the young.

Notes on New Testament Literature and Ecclesiastical History. By Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D. New York: C. Scribner, 124 Grand Street. London: Sampson Low, Son & Co. 1861. Pp. 319.

The Gospel according to Matthew. Explained by Joseph Addison Alexander. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. 1861. Pp. 450.

The first of these volumes contains a general survey of the subjects included under the head of New Testament Literature; and a similar preliminary view of the department of ecclesiastical history. Both evince the thorough mastery of the topics, and the compass, and clearness of arrangement and view for which Dr. Alexander was remarkable. The second volume contains his commentary on Matthew, as prepared for the press, to the close of the sixteenth chapter, with a general view of the contents of the remaining chapters. No intimate friend of their author can read these volumes without tears. They bring him so distinctly to view, and they exhibit such evidence of the magnitude of the loss involved in his death, that those who knew and loved him, find it hard to gather up these remnants of his greatness. To others these books, notwithstanding their incompleteness, have great intrinsic value. They are replete with important knowledge, and they open for the student an extended view of the field to be examined.

Thoughts on Preaching, being Contributions to Homiletics. By James W. Alexander, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner. 1861, pp. 514.

This also is a posthumous fragmentary work. But it contains the fragments from a richly furnished table. The preeminence which his gifted brother attained as a scholar and professor, Dr. James Alexander attained as a preacher and pastor. The volume contains detached paragraphs gathered from his journals. Letters to Young Ministers, first published in the *Presbyterian*, and some of the author's contributions to

the *Princeton Review.* Together they constitute a characteristic, interesting, and instructive volume, for which the grateful acknowledgments of the church are due to the faithful and assiduous brother of the author.

A Text-Book of the History of Doctrines. By Dr. R. R. Hagenbach of the University of Basle. The Edinburgh Translation of C. W. Buch, revised with large additions from the fourth German edition, and other sources. By Henry B. Smith, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary of the City of New York. New York: Sheldon & Co., 115 Nassau street. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1861. 8vo. pp. 478.

The history of doctrines has been singularly neglected by English scholars, and assiduously cultivated by the Germans. In no department of either history or theology is the literature of modern Germany more abundant and rich. Of the numerous works on this subject, perhaps no one has met with such general acceptance as that of Dr. Hagenbach. This is no doubt in a measure due to its conciseness. He divides the history of the church into periods, the third of which closes with 1517, which is the extent to which this volume reaches. The second volume brings down the history to the present time. A concise view is given of the state of opinion during each period, on the several leading doctrines in their order. The author presents in a short paragraph a statement of the opinions held, which is followed by a long array of citations in illustration and support of that statement. The reader, therefore, has the satisfaction of seeing for himself what the fathers and their successors have written on the points presented. This method, although it precludes discussion or extended exhibition of any subject, has many and obvious advantages. The work will prove a valuable accession to the libraries of ministers and theological students. It is rare that translations of German books are satisfactory. In the scholarship, diligence, and skill of Dr. H. B. Smith, the editor of this volume, the public have a guaranty such as is not often enjoyed.

Annals of the American Pulpit; or Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of various Denominations, from the early settlement of the country to the close of the year 1855. With Historical Introductions. By William B. Sprague, D. D. Vol. VII. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 530 Broadway. Pp. 844.

This volume is devoted to the American Methodist church in its several divisions. The rise and progress of Methodism in this country is one of the most important and interesting features of its religious history. The remarkable body of men produced by that church well deserve commemoration, in view

of their varied excellences of character, and of the great work which they performed. Of Dr. Sprague's singular fitness for the work of an annalist, and of the astonishing perseverance and diligence, as well as the tact and skill with which he has performed his herculean task, we have already spoken. The public has borne abundant and cheerful testimony to the author's fidelity and success.

Biblical Commentary on the Epistles of St. John; in continuation of the work of Olshausen. With an Appendix on the Catholic Epistles, and an Introductory Essay on the Life and Writings of St. John. By Dr. John H. A. Ebrard. Translated by the Rev. W. B. Pope, Manchester. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1859. 8vo. pp. 423.

This is the eighth volume of the third series of Clark's Foreign Theological Library, which we have so often had occasion to notice in our pages. Messrs. Smith & English, of Philadelphia, are the agents of the Messrs. Clark in this country, and from them the works constituting their Foreign Theological Library can be procured. Ebrard belongs to the Reformed Church, and to the class of the more orthodox of the theologians of Germany. His elaborate Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, as well as the present volume, is in continuation of the work of Olshausen, is already extensively known in this country. His exegetical works are among the most valuable of the present day. This Commentary on the Epistles of St. John is of special interest and importance, not only from the peculiar value of those Epistles, but also from the fact that we have so few scholarly commentaries on that portion of the New Testament.

Works of Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam, &c. Collected and edited by James Spedding, M. A., Robert Leslie Ellis, M. A., Douglas Denon Heath, Barrister-at-law, all of the University of Cambridge. Vol. XIV. Being Vol. IV. of the Literary and Professional Works. Boston: Published by Brown & Taggart. 1861. Pp. 432.

The same. Vol. XV. Being Vol. V. of the Literary and Professional Works. Boston: Brown & Taggart. 1861. Pp. 449.

The enterprising Boston house, engaged in the publication of this beautiful and convenient edition of Bacon's works, continue to fulfil their engagements to the public with laudable punctuality, and we are happy to learn, with encouraging success. It is gratifying to know, that works of the grade of Lord Bacon's can command such an extensive sale in this country. All that it is necessary for us to do, is to keep our readers in mind that this work is in the regular course of publication, in an attractive form and at a moderate price.

Brick Church Memorial, containing the Discourses delivered by Dr. Spring on the closing of the old church in Beekman street, and the opening of the new church on Murray Hill; the Discourse delivered on the Fiftieth Anniversary of his Installation as Pastor of the Brick Church; with the Proceedings of the Memorial Meeting, and the Discourse delivered on Mrs. Spring's decease. New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway. 1861. Pp. 248.

The Rev. Dr. Spring is now the patriarch of the Presbyterian church. His pastorate of more than fifty years of a large and influential church in the city of New York, during which he has seen nearly two generations pass away, is almost without a parallel in our history. To have filled such a position so long, without in any degree losing his hold on the affections of his own people, or on the reverence and confidence of the public, is a rare felicity and honour. This volume, designed to be a memorial of his ministerial life and services, is of great value, not only as a memento of affection, but as an historical document. It is a more lasting monument than any mausoleum.

Annual of Scientific Discovery: or Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1861, &c., &c. Edited by David A. Wells, M. A. Author of Principles of Natural Philosophy, &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. London: Trübner & Co. 1861. Pp. 424.

This valuable manual has acquired an established reputation. A continued series of these volumes would of themselves form an excellent philosophical library.

Dying Legacy to the People of his beloved Charge. By Nicholas Murray, D. D. February 4th, 1861. Things Unseen and Eternal. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861.

This volume contains five sermons, on a Future World, a Personal God, the Soul, the Intermediate State, and the Resurrection. They have a peculiar, and, as his faithful widow, by whose energy they were so soon passed through the press, and placed in the hands of his sorrowing people, says, "a sacred interest." They were prepared for his own pulpit, but never delivered. They constitute, therefore, in a strict sense, a message from the grave. Dr. Murray's unexpected death in the midst of perfect health, and in the prime of his life, produced a very deep and widely extended impression on the church. He was one of our most public-spirited, distinguished, and useful ministers. We do not believe that his value was duly estimated, even by those who were his most intimate friends. It is only by seeing what a space he filled in his own congregation, what a work he there accomplished, and by stopping to consider how much he effected in other spheres, and by his pen, that we gain a proper idea of his real

value to the church. His death will be felt as a real and heavy loss, not only by personal friends, but by the friends of truth and of true religion throughout our whole land.

Kritisch-praktischer Commentar über das Neue Testament. Von Wilhelm Nast, Doktor der Theologie, 1—4 Lieferungen, pp. 256. Cincinnati. 1860.

[Critical and Practical Commentary on the New Testament, by William Nast, D. D.]

This promises to be a valuable and important work. Its author is a Methodist clergyman, who studied at Tübingen, and who, so far as we can judge from a hasty inspection of these opening pages, possesses an extensive acquaintance with both English and German theology and exegesis, though his philosophy bears a tinge from the school at which he received his training. His aim is to bring the results of Biblical learning within reach of the ordinary German readers of this country, and to meet those forms of unbelief to which they are particularly exposed. The preliminary discussions of the canon, the genuineness of the writings of the New Testament, the credibility of the Gospels, the person and work of Christ, and the inspiration of the New Testament, occupy 152 pages. The Commentary is issued in numbers, and is to consist of 30 to 36 numbers of 64 pages each.

Plants of the Holy Land with their Fruits and Flowers, beautifully illustrated by original drawings coloured from nature, by the Rev. Henry S. Osborn, author of "Palestine Past and Present." 8vo. pp. 174.

The author is already sufficiently known from his previous publication, and from the lectures which he has delivered in various parts of the country upon subjects connected with Palestine. The object of this volume, as stated in the Preface, is "to identify scriptural plants with the existing plants of Syria, or with those mentioned and described in the writings of early Greek and Latin physicians, botanists, and naturalists, together with such historical and botanical notices as may be of special interest." It is executed in a style of rare beauty, and forms an exceedingly ornamental volume.

Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb. By W. W. Goodwin, Ph. D., Eliot Professor of Greek Literature in Harvard University. Cambridge, 1860. Pp. 311.

The syntax of the Greek language is the most ingenious of all devices for expression of delicate shades of thought. We are glad to see original effort put forth among us, toward the further elucidation of the subject. In the present instance we find the region of its nicest distinctions treated with order, clearness and simplicity. And it may not be amiss to add, that in beauty of mechanical execution the volume recommends itself to the eye of the scholar.

REV. DR. BOARDMAN'S BOOK OF HYMNS.

FIRST EDITION EXHAUSTED IN TWO WEEKS.

SECOND EDITION NOW READY.

A SELECTION OF HYMNS,

Designed as a Supplement to the "Psalms and Hymns" of the Presbyterian Church. Prepared by the Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D. D. 1 vol. 16mo.

Arabesque,	60
Arabesque, gilt,	75
Morocco, plain,	1 25
Morocco, gilt,	1 50
Turkey, plain,	1 75
Turkey, gilt or antique,	2 00
Turkey, flexible,	2 25
Turkey flexible, ribbon edges (new style)	2 25

Nearly twenty years have elapsed since the publication of the Book of "Psalms and Hymns," now in general use in our Church. Within this period, the Hymnology of the Church has been enriched by numerous original contributions of great merit, and by copious translations from the devotional poetry of other languages. Many of the old Greek and Latin Hymns are now for the first time made accessible to the English reader; and he is admitted into that great storehouse of German Hymnology, the warmth of which is, perhaps, without a parallel. The feeling has come to be very prevalent, that these treasures should be brought within the reach of the American churches. Of this we have decisive evidence in the new Collections of Hymns prepared for the Congregational, the Protestant Episcopal, the Lutheran, and other denominations. The same demand exists in our own Communion; and is more likely to increase than diminish, since it has the sympathy of many prominent pastors and laymen in various parts of the Church.

In the feeling here referred to the present volume had its origin. After much deliberation it was decided to arrange the work as a "Supplement" to our "Church Book." The Hymns in our Book, therefore, are excluded, with a single exception.

FOR FAMILY WORSHIP.—In the present volume a large space has been allotted to hymns suited to *Family Worship;* not larger, however, it is believed, than is demanded by the growing disposition to combine praise with the reading of the Scriptures and prayer, at the domestic altar.

FOR SCHOOLS—These Hymns, it will be seen on examination, are also appropriate to *Boarding and Day Schools*, which open or close the day with sacred song.

FOR PRIVATE DEVOTION.—Under the head of *Private Devotion* there will be found a choice variety of Hymns adapted to the closet—many of which, as being of irregular or unusual metres, are designed for reading only.

SOURCES OF THIS COLLECTION.—Of the sources which have supplied the materials for the present collection, it is proper to say, that these Five Hundred Hymns have been winnowed out of several thousand scattered through an indefinite variety of Hymn-Books and other publications. Several of them appear now in a Hymn-Book for the first time.

DESIGN OF THE WORK.—In the preparation of the volume, the compiler has had a special eye to the wants of his own pulpit and people. He is not without the hope that it may prove an acceptable offering to some other congregations, and to private Christians.

*** Copies will be sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of the price.

AN ABLE WORK.—JUST PUBLISHED—

NOTES ON SCRIPTURE.

By Joel Jones, LL.D. With an Introduction by the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, D. D., and a Memoir by the Rev. C. W. Shields. 8vo. $2.50.

These *Notes on Scripture* are, in effect, an exposition of the Gospel doctrine concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, as this diligent student of the Scriptures understood it. They are Notes upon those portions of the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, embracing, rather incidentally, parallel and illustrative passages from all the other inspired books, which appeared to him to contain the Gospel doctrine concerning the Saviour of the world. In some respects they are critical—in some respects they are historical; but it is their expository character which chiefly distinguishes them—expository in the sense of being carefully and continually directed towards the precise understanding of the entire meaning of the particular inspired statements as contained in themselves, and as illustrated, enforced, or limited by other inspired statements, and by the great ideas, and aim, and end of all inspired Scripture. The aspect of the work is not devotional, nor is it controversial; nor is it, properly speaking, dogmatical; but it is of the nature of a judicial analysis, and determination of the true meaning of a record, the particular portions of which that bear specially upon certain vast topics, have been submitted to a most rigorous scrutiny. And the candid reader will observe, everywhere, the studious diligence with which every conclusion is made to rest on special Scriptures, which are constantly cited; the judicial fairness with which conclusions differing from his own are stated; the modesty with which new interpretations, and peculiar opinions are announced; and the blended calmness and directness with which his own interpretations and judgments are given.

*** A copy of the above will be sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of the price.

Published by

WILLIAM S. & ALFRED MARTIEN,

No. 606 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

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 auy 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; aud 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 $31 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.*