THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1868.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Synopsis of the Books of the Bible.* By J. N. DARBY. Four vols. London: G. Morrish. 1862.

The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament. By THOMAS DEHANY BARNARD, M. A. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1867.

Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. With Historical and Explanatory Notes. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, M. A., etc. With an Introduction, by HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D., etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1866.

THE history of the Bible is one continued record of marvels. Sometimes an accident, often a trifle, has, in the ordainings of Providence, and through coöperation with some prevailing tendency of human thought or drift of human events, decided the way in which the great mass of men were to regard the Divine word for centuries to come. The mechanical division of its separate books into chapters and verses may be looked upon as one of these apparently trifling incidents, which has nevertheless exerted a vast influence upon the views which have been taken of the connections of the Scriptures, from the time that the printed Bible first began to find a place in the Christian home until the present day. The work was done in a way and at a time to give it the greatest possible influence in hiding the structural harmony and unity of the Sacred

Word. Prepared by a purely mechanical process, as one would be led to conclude, without even the trouble of an examination, by the fact that Robert Stephens completed the division of the New Testament into verses during a *journey on horseback* from Paris to Lyons, in the troublous times of the middle of the 16th century; given to the church ten years before the birth of Lord Bacon, while the mechanical philosophy still held undisputed sway in the world of thought; it was exactly fitted to meet the intellectual wants of the times. Commending itself as a convenient arrangement in favour of which much may yet be said; completed in time to be attached to even the earlier English editions of the Bible, (the earliest had been issued only sixteen years before, and King James' translation was not issued till sixty years after,) it was equally fitted to take advantage of the drift of events in extending and perpetuating its influence among the English-speaking nations. What may have been the design of God in ordering such a thing at such a time, and how it has turned the attention to the great doctrines which everywhere lie upon the surface of Scripture, and reserved the development of the great argument for the rhetorical unity of the various books of the Bible until this age when the attack comes from that side, does not fall within the scope of the present article, which has to do rather with the actual results of a thing apparently so unimportant. It can scarcely be denied that its tendency has been to lead the multitudes to read the word of God very much as if made up of detached portions, having little or no logical or rhetorical connection with one another, and each composed of ten or twenty words, more or less; and that the *popular* commentaries are constructed very much in accordance with that view.

Perhaps the influence of this mechanical chopping up of the Scriptures, in preventing the recognition of a beautiful structural harmony, and in concealing most obvious and characteristic differences in aim and structure, is nowhere more positive than in that portion so much read and commented upon, the Gospels. The common theory among the masses, if we have interpreted it correctly, accepts them as so many lives of Christ, more or less complete, but assigns no peculiar sphere

and attributes no special design to any one of them. It recognizes no reason why there should be more than one Gospel, or since there are more than one, why there should not be three or five instead of four. It follows naturally from this failure to recognize a specific aim in each Gospel, that they all come to be looked upon as being without coherent plan or inherent harmony and unity of structure. From the special Commentaries most used among us, in the family and Sabbath-school, one could never even infer that the Holy Ghost had any distinct aim in inspiring the four Evangelists to write their respective accounts of the life of Christ. There are explanations of single words or verses, or, at best, of separate and detached incidents. Nor could one infer from them that Matthew or Mark, or Luke or John, whether consciously or unconsciously, each gave to the world a book with a definite plan possessed of both harmony and unity, and entirely different from that which Cardinal Hugo and Robert Stephens together discovered so long ago, when the one divided the New Testament into chapters and the other into verses. Where the need of something higher and more rational has been felt by these writers, they have aimed to supply it by trying to construct out of the material of all the Evangelists one complete and harmonious life of Christ after a merely human pattern, instead of seeking, by a patient examination and analysis, to bring out from each separate Gospel the plan, at once Divine and human, which the Spirit has wrought into it. And we do not hesitate to go further and affirm that this mistaken use of a harmony of the Gospels, for other than its legitimate objects, has exerted an influence in concealing the real Divine harmony in the rhetorical structure of these portions of Scriptures only less than that exerted by the mechanical division into chapters and verses.

There are clear indications that we are coming upon a new era in the study of the Bible and the exposition of the articulation of its various parts. The old mechanical philosophy is passing away. A new philosophy, the Baconian, is taking its place and changing the tenor of the entire thought of the civilized world, leading us to seek for and expect order, design, and plan in everything that has come from the hand of God. Mere mechanical arrangement in anything no longer

satisfies the thinking mind. Such modes of viewing the Bible no longer commend themselves to men. The theory, which has so greatly concealed the relations and harmonies of Scripture from the masses, is no longer tenable. Men begin to feel, if not to see, that it is contrary to all analogy. God is a God of order. We see this world, with its vast and complicated array of mechanism, growing in grandeur with our increasing knowledge of science, with all its parts adjusted and directed to the accomplishment of wise designs. We have seen order everywhere rising out of its seeming disorder, and design being evoked where aimlessness once thrust itself upon us at every turn, until we have come to take it for granted that the Divine wisdom and skill are as truly manifested in the full energy of their operation "on every lonely bank and mouldering stone, as in the lifting of the pillars of heaven and settling the foundations of the earth." We apply the same reasoning to God's word, the Bible. If it be a production of the Divine mind for a specific end, then it is not a mere jumble of facts and doctrines. Accepting it as God's own book, we do not hesitate to affirm that there must be in it the same Divine harmony and adaptation that we find in God's world; that every book in it from Genesis to Revelation must have its own definite character and its own distinct part in one great and consistent plan.

That all this has not as yet been clearly ascertained and fully exhibited, has no force as an objection to this view: for that later and common-sense mode of investigation, which is characteristic of the Baconian philosophy, and which sends men first to search for facts on which to base their theories, was at the outset applied to external nature chiefly, then to general literature, and, owing perhaps, at once to the nature of the subjects treated in the Divine word and the groundless fears of its friends, came later to be extended to the Bible. The books placed at the head of this paper are specimens of what is being done in this new direction. The work of Darby aims to present in the form of a synopsis, the general drift of all the books of Scripture. It is to be commended for the comprehensiveness of its plan, but, while eminently spiritual in its views, is wanting sometimes in that historical and criti-

cal knowledge, often in that keen analytic power, without which such a work is apt to become too loose and general in the execution of its details. The Bampton Lectures by Barnard embrace within their scope only the New Testament. The aim of the lecturer is to show that in the books of the New Testament, in the order in which they appear in our English Bible, there is a constant progress of doctrine from the Gospels, in which we have the manifestation of Christ in his conflict in the flesh, to the Apocalypse, in which the full effects of redemption are manifested, after the last conflict is over, in the city of God. Such a series of lectures, from their nature and limits, cannot enter much into detail in treating so comprehensive a theme; indeed, the author tells us in his preface, that "it will be seen that the importance ascribed to the order of the books is ascribed strongly to its chief divisions, and more faintly to its details;" but, on the whole, we regard the book as one of the very best of the Bampton series, less acute and metaphysical than those of Mansel and Farrar, but not less suggestive and valuable. For the thoughtful student of the Gospels we know of no book equal to Mr. Westcott's Introduction to the Four Gospels. The Commentary of Dr. Lange is also doing a good work in this line, in the analyses contained in the special introduction to each of the books of Scripture.

In the pages of this review work has been done in the same direction, in such articles as that in April 1865, on "The Structure of the Old Testament," and those published from time to time on the different prophetic books. There are abundant and cheering indications on every hand, that the attention of the church is now being turned in a remarkable degree to this important subject, and that to this age is given the mission of ascertaining and setting forth the structural harmony of the Bible and its parts.

With these preparatory remarks upon the great general principle involved in all investigations like that now before us, and the circumstances which have combined to render such investigations timely at this late day in the history of the church, we are now ready to address ourselves to the precise object of the present paper, which is to present, so far as we

have been able to ascertain it, *the Divine aim and plan of the Gospel according to Matthew.*

1. It will be necessary first to define clearly the place of each of the four Gospels, that the contrast may aid us in securing a correct principle of division in our analysis of the one under consideration.

It is evident that the common design of the Gospels must be to commend Jesus the Nazarene to mankind as the great deliverer from sin and its consequences of evil. It is matter of history that at the time of the appearance of Jesus among men, there had been awakened in all the nations the expectation of such a deliverer, who was to be born of the Jewish race. The old civilizations had run their course, the old religions were effete, and the race was anxiously waiting for God to interpose in its behalf. The Magi who sought and worshipped the new-born king of the Jews in Bethlehem were but the representatives of the anxious and longing world. The Gospels present Jesus of Nazareth as this expected deliverer.

It was necessary and only necessary that the gospel of Christ should be made according to the song of the angels of the annunciation, "good tidings of great joy which shall be *to all people.*" There were three great races in that world with which Christianity first came in contact; the Jew, the Roman, and the Greek. There was in addition the new kingdom set up by Christ, the church, made up of those lifted out of the three races of natural men and made spiritual. To all these Jesus was to be commended.

It is in accordance with all that we know of the ways of God, that the presentation of Jesus to each of these classes should be such as was best suited to attain the end in view, of leading them to submit to Him. The same presentation would not equally commend him to all the races. Each of them had its peculiarities which must be taken into account; each of them its side to be reached; each of them its own view of the evils of the world and of the deliverer, of which, so far as it was right, the gospel must take advantage.

A general view of the Four Gospels will show that they meet the various conditions requisite to present the claims of the Saviour to lordship over the whole world. Matthew—as

we gather from tradition* as well as from its own character—was written for *the Jew*. The Jew acknowledged the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures as the word of God. Brought down through a history of twenty centuries of fulfilment of types and prophecies, and educated to read such things as familiarly as his alphabet, Jesus could be commended to the descendant of Abraham only by showing him to be the Messiah foretold by the Prophets, and for whose coming and deliverance the Jew waited. We call Matthew therefore, the *Gospel of Prophecy*. It commends Jesus to the Jew from the side of authority, setting Him forth as the fulfilment of the law and the prophets,—holding up the historic life and character of Jesus over against the prophetic life and character of Messiah. Mark—as we learn from like sources†—was written for *the Roman*. The grand idea of the Roman was *power*, ordered and organized, or appearing in the form of law and government, represented by an emperor who was a god at the head of an empire which was divine, contending triumphantly with all other and opposing power, and establishing universal rule. The deliverer to whom the Roman would most readily submit in his hour of failure and longing, must answer in some measure to this his ideal of power. We call Mark, therefore, the *Gospel of Power*. It commends Jesus to the Roman by exhibiting Him as the manifestation of the Divine power, as the Son of God setting up the kingdom of God, coming into collision with, and triumphing over, all other forms of power that oppose and work evil, and establishing a universal empire. Luke—as we gather in the same way‡—was written for *the*

* Irenæus says, "The Gospel of Matthew was written for the Jews, who specially desired that it should be shown that the Christ was of the seed of David." *Iren.* Caten. in Matth. Massuet, p. 347, and c. Hæres, iii. 9. 1. To the same purport, *Origen* in Joann. tom. iv. p. 4.—and *Jerome*, Proem. in Matth. tom. iv. p. 3.

† Clement of Alexandria tells us that Mark was requested by some Roman knights to commit to writing the gospel which had been preached to them by Peter, and that in this request his Gospel had its origin. *Clem. Alex.* ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 25. Of like purport, *Hieronymus de Viris Illustribus*, c. 8.

‡ Antioch became the great centre of Gentile Christianity, and from it Paul and Luke preached the gospel to the Gentile world. From the ancient authorities we learn that Luke recorded in a book the Gospel preached by Paul, for the benefit of the Gentiles, particularly of those who inhabited Greece. *Iren.* iii. 1; also, iii. 14. 1–4.—*Euseb.* iii. 4.—*Hieron.* Cat. Eccl. Ser. 7., &c.—*Origen* ap. Euseb. vi. 25.—*Greg. Nazian.* Orat. xxv. &c.

Greek, the representative of the gentile world. The Greek deified *humanity*, preëminently exalting intellect and the sense of the beautiful in that apotheosis. He was labouring, and longing, and waiting for the perfect man, the Divine man. The deliverer to whom the Greek would most readily submit in the hour of his failure must realize this Greek ideal. We call Luke, therefore, *the Gospel of Universal Humanity.* It commends Jesus to the Greek, the universal man, from the side of reason and manhood, by unfolding His development as the perfect man in whom Deity works to relieve the suffering and remove the sorrow and exalt the destiny of the race. John, by the consent of Christian antiquity, was written for *the Christian, the Church.* The Christian was the man who had been lifted up by God out of the three great races of unspiritual men,—the Jews, the Romans, and the Greeks,—and made spiritual by the gift of a new life, which brought him into sympathy with God, and enabled him, by a certain Divine intuition, an inner light called faith, to discern directly and appreciate those diviner qualities in Jesus, which were to the Jew a stumbling-block, and to the Greek foolishness. We call John, therefore, *the Gospel for the Christian.* It commends Jesus to the faith of the Christian as the eternal Word, as the Divine Son, revealing the Father in his relation in redemption to a fallen world, loving it and saving and glorifying all believers in Jesus,—as *the light and life* for the world in its darkness and death.

There are Four Gospels then, because Jesus was to be commended to four classes or races of men, or to men of four different temperaments or characters, or to four different sides of the nature of man. Had not these exhausted the classes, or essential temperaments, or sides of access to human nature, there might have been more gospels; and had there not been so many needed to meet and exhaust these essential differences, there might have been less. It will be observed that the Four Gospels do thus exhaust the races of men to be reached, which races are representative ones for all time. It might readily be shown that they exhaust the demands of the representative temperaments or characters to which the Saviour must be commended,—one needing for conviction to hear a word of

God in type or prophecy, and to be assured of its fulfilment as proclaiming the Divine mission of Jesus; a second, needing to see him as the Divine power in his living activity, confirming his own claim; a third, requiring a manifestation of God addressed to reason through the perfect manhood of Jesus; a fourth, demanding only the spiritual presence and teachings of Jesus to recognize in him the light and life. So, likewise, it might be shown that this exhausts the sides of man's nature from which he may best be reached and led to submission to the Saviour, since these Gospels appeal respectively to the instincts which lead men to bow down to Divine authority, power, perfection, and spirituality. The Gospels in their contrasts are thus seen to be suited to meet a fourfold want of the race and of the individual man.

Did our present design and the space at our command permit it, we think it might, without difficulty, be demonstrated that all the Gospels, both in their general drift and in their special peculiarities, fall in with and confirm the theory which we have sketched, while the theory itself explains or renders significant much in their structure that is otherwise inexplicable or without significance. The part which the chronological order of events plays in the work of the Evangelists, is at the same time determined, for it appears at once that there is a higher law of unity and arrangement than mere succession in time. Out of the vast array of facts and events which were crowded into the life of Jesus, the Holy Ghost leads each writer to select those which will best serve his own purpose, and to arrange them in accordance with his own design, now following the order of time and now departing from it. No one of them attempts a complete life of Christ after the pattern of the biographers. All of them together can scarcely be said to furnish the materials for such a life. It is evident, moreover, that any attempt at an analysis of the Gospels, which is to be successful, must bear in mind the contrasts between them, and the higher principle of arrangement and unity upon which they are constructed. The present essay aims to take both into account.

2. Having secured our general principle of division, we are

now ready to clear the way for its application to the Gospel according to Matthew.

Jesus, the Nazarene, is to be presented to the Jew in that way which is calculated to gain the submission of the Jew to his authority. How must it be done?

(1.) Taking our sketch of the ideal Jew, we must first see what are the credentials with which Jesus must be brought before this representative race. Whatever would commend him to the Jew would evidently go so far toward commending him to that class of men in all lands and ages constituted like him, and to the corresponding side of man's complex nature.

The Jew acknowledged the Divine authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. He was expecting the Messiah foretold by the prophets. The credentials of Jesus to the Jew must therefore be those of the Messiah.

The Jew read in his Scriptures of a coming Deliverer, promised and prophesied, the revelation growing clearer all down the ages. He was to be the seed of the woman, the seed of Abraham, a prophet like unto Moses, the royal son of David, the child of a virgin. All the types found their explanation in him, all the sacrifices pointed to him, all prophecy centered in him, all the experience and history of Israel shadowed his coming and work. In person He was to be God and man, Emmanuel, the everlasting Father and the man of sorrows in one. Officially he was to be Messiah, or, as the Greek has it, Christ, the anointed of God; and as the anointing of the old dispensation was used in inducting into the three offices of prophet, king, and priest, he was to be a prophet like the greatest of the prophets, was to be the legal heir to the throne of David, and was to bear the sins of his people. This great outline was filled in with a multitude of details, made up of circumstances and incidents connected with his birth, his life, and his death, and serving to mark his character and his work for the world. The Jew had daily access to these prophecies, and the time of the advent of Messiah had been so definitely fixed by the prophet Daniel, that he was hourly expecting that advent when Jesus the Nazarene appeared among men. The only credentials by which he could claim the homage of the Jew would therefore

be a general correspondence in his origin and in the nature and scope of his life-work with this great outline of the Messiah, as found in Moses and the prophets, sustained and confirmed by the many minute coincidences rendered possible by the details with which that outline was filled in.

Setting this Jewish people apart from all others, the Holy Ghost, choosing Matthew, a man eminently fitted by his birth and training for the work, as His instrument, proposes to commend Jesus to them as the Messiah, and to do it in the way best suited to their character and antecedents. Clearly it would have availed less to set Him forth as Mark does for the Roman, chiefly as the Son of God, wielding divine power in establishing a universal empire, for the Jew bowed to *prophesy* and not to power. Equally vain would it have been to bring him forward as Luke does, for the Jew was not looking for a Divine man of perfect development and bound to all the race, but for a son of Abraham, a king descended from David by the royal line. Still more fruitless would it have been to exhibit Him as John does, for the veil was before the eyes of the Jew, and he could not discern the spiritual God as manifested in the "Word,"—the light shone into his darkness, and that darkness comprehended it not. His credentials must be drawn from Moses and the prophets. In his origin human and divine, in the capital facts of his life, in his character private and official, he must be shown to meet the requirements of the Scriptures. This work clearly and completely done, there could be no escape for the ideal Jew from the conclusion, *Jesus is the Messiah.*

(2.) But we need now to modify our sketch of the ideal Jew to make it correspond with the *Jew actual* as he existed in the times of Jesus, in order to ascertain the precise form in which these credentials must be presented in order to correct his errors while they leave him without excuse or win his homage. The Jew was not what he ought to be. Both in life and faith he had departed from the standard of his Scriptures, so that the method of reaching him and securing his submission to Jesus involved a problem more complicated in its conditions than that above considered. These changes must all be taken into the account in presenting Jesus to him

as the Messiah. The truth in his view must be made available, and the errors in his life and doctrine must be unmasked.

Religiously the masses had departed from the Law and the Prophets. The great council, the Sanhedrim, the head of the Jewish system, had been brought, in great measure, under the influence of the heathen rulers of the nation and secularized. There had sprung up a party, the Herodians, doubtless numerous, who had cut loose from Jewish hopes and aspirations as well as Jewish worship, and who "saw in the power of the Herodian family the pledge of the preservation of their national existence in the face of Roman ambition,"—a party so entirely worldly that a Herod could meet all their longings for a deliverer. The remainder of the nation were divided into the two great religious sects, the Pharisees and Sadducees, the traditionalists and the skeptics. The former class, embracing by far the greater number and reaching down among the common people, had added to the teaching of the Scriptures a mass of traditions which had completely overlaid it and taken its place, making their religion mere form and ceremony, mere theatrical show. The latter class, comprising the more scholarly and cultivated of the people, had not only discarded all tradition, and rejected every doctrine which was not plainly taught in the Scriptures, but had made free with the Scriptures themselves—very much after the style of the modern rationalist—receiving or rejecting as best suited them, and giving little or no attention to practical religion. Matthew, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, in presenting Jesus to the Jew, must needs take account of all these departures from a right life. We may accordingly expect to find him setting his face against this tide of secularity, showing up the corruption and worldliness of the chief authorities in the Jewish church, stripping the mask from the formality, hypocrisy, and malignity of Phariseeism, and revealing the nature and danger of the infidelity of Sadduceeism,—so as to hold up in connection with Jesus, and through his words and conduct as its representative, the picture of a life and a religion such as the Law and the Prophets sketched for the chosen people—at once spiritual and hearty and reverent—the life and religion of the ideal Jew.

Doctrinally the masses had departed from the correct teachings concerning the Messiah. The Jew had not read the prophets aright. He had started out from the prophecy of Christ as the son and heir of David, or as king, and had warped all his reading and interpretation to accord with his notions of what was demanded by that. David had conquered and imposed tribute on the surrounding nations, had led their armies and decided their great civil questions for them. The Jew overlooked or explained away everything that did not agree with the temporal splendour of a King and Kingdom after this model. He had therefore lost sight of the Prophet and Priest in the Messianic character and work. In commending Jesus to the Jew it was accordingly needful that Matthew should present His credentials in such a way as to take advantage of all that was right in his doctrine, and at the same time correct what was erroneous and supplement what was incomplete in it; so leading him back to the scriptural idea of the Messiah, while he led him to bow to Jesus as that Messiah. He must bring out the spiritual side of Messiah's kingship, must carry the Jew back to the ideas, almost lost, of Messiah as Prophet and Priest. He must bring the truth on these points into manifest prominence, showing its foundation in the Law and the Prophets, so marking and rendering emphatic the Messianic doctrine of the ideal Jew. This fully done, there would be no alternative left the degenerate Jew but open apostasy or submission to Jesus as the Messiah.

(3.) Having ascertained the central idea of the first Gospel, and taken note of the circumstances which must have modified Matthew's presentation of the credentials of Jesus if he aimed to secure the submission of the Jew to his claims as Messiah, we are now prepared to put everything to the crucial test of an analysis of the Gospel itself.

The Gospel according to Matthew may be divided into five parts; or rather, into three Principal Parts with an appropriate Introduction and Conclusion. Making use of the latter mode of the statement, we have an outline analysis as follows:

Introduction.—The origin of Jesus and his preparation for

his mission as Messiah in founding the Kingdom of Heaven. Chap. i.—iv. 11.

Part 1st.—Jesus proclaiming the Coming Kingdom of Heaven. Chap. iv. 12.—xvi. 12.

Part 2d.—Jesus casting himself upon the faith awakened in him as Messiah by this proclamation. Chap. xvi. 13.—xxiv. 1, (a).

Part 3d.—Jesus laying the foundation of his Kingdom in his Sacrificial Death. Chap. xxiv. 1, (b)—xxvii. 66.

Conclusion.—Jesus rising from the dead and assuming Royal Authority. Chap. xxviii.

It will be observed that Jesus appears throughout in the character of the Messiah, laying the foundation of the Kingdom of Heaven among men. In tracing the progress of the Coming Kingdom as Matthew unfolds it, it will be convenient to follow our outline analysis and consider the structure and aim of each of the divisions in its proper order.

Introduction.—The origin of Jesus and his preparation for his Mission as Messiah in founding the Kingdom of Heaven. Chap. i.—iv. 11.

1st Section.—The Origin of Jesus as the Divine-man—the Person of the Messiah. Chap. i.

A.—Human Descent of Jesus. Credentials as descendant of Abraham and Judah, and as legal descendant and heir to the throne of David. (Verses 1—17.)

B.—Divine Origin of Jesus exhibited in the Incarnation. Credentials as Emmanuel, God with us—in Jesus—Jah-Hoshea. (Verses 18—25.)

2d Section.—The Preparation of Jesus in Person and Office for his mission. Chap. ii.—iv. 11.

A.—Remote Preparation, or Preparation in Person, for the Messianic Office. Chap. ii.

a.—Divine manifestation as the King of the Jews to all the world as represented in the Magi, Herod, and the Sanhedrim. Credentials as born heir to the position of universal King and Deliverer, the desire of all nations. (Verses 1—11.)

b.—Divine concealment of the new-born King from all the world in Nazareth, till He shall develope into full manhood. Credentials as the Nazarene of Prophecy. (Verses 12—23).

B.—Immediate or Official Preparation for the Messianic work. Chap. iii.—iv. 11.

a.—External Preparation or Induction into his Office. (Chap. iii.)

(a).—The ministry of John, preparing the way for bringing Jesus out of the obscurity of Nazareth. Credentials in the Forerunner. (Verses 1—12.)

(b.)—The Baptism of Jesus, or the actual bringing out of obscurity and induction into the office of Messiah. Credentials from God, before all the nation. (Verses 13—17.)

b.—Internal Preparation, or the Temptation. The testing of His Person by the Devil. Credentials as man's representative, the Second Adam. (Chap. iv. 1—11.)

The Jew would not listen to the claims of any one, until he was shown to have the origin of the Messiah. It was accordingly the first task of Matthew to show that Jesus in his origin met the requirements of the Law and the Prophets. The genealogical roll which gives the *official pedigree* of Jesus traces his descent from Abraham to David through Judah,—from David to the captivity by the royal line,—and from the captivity through Joseph—legally the father by virtue of his relation to Mary—by what would have been the royal line had the monarchy continued. It is all of the nature of documentary proof, the first two portions drawn from the records of the Old Testament, and the third doubtless from data found in the public archives of the tribe of Judah, or in the private genealogy of the family of Joseph. The Jew could thus examine it for himself. It demonstrates that Jesus the Nazarene has the human and royal descent of Messiah. But there is another side to the Messianic prophecies; the Anointed of God is to be "God with us"—Divine as well as human. Matthew accordingly brings forward, in connection with the account of the espousal of Mary and Joseph, the Divine origin of Jesus by the power of the Holy Ghost, and his actual human birth of the virgin, holding Him up to the Jew as named by God himself, "Jesus," Jah-Hoshea, the Jehovah-Saviour, in fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah that Messiah should be "Emmanuel." Of the facts connected with his birth and naming, Joseph and his household were

competent witnesses for the Jew. It is thus demonstrated for the Jew that Jesus has the Divine-human person requisite in the Messiah.

The *unofficial life* of Jesus—the remote preparation or the thirty years given to the development of his personality in accordance with the laws of human nature—must now be shown to fulfil the requirements made of Messiah in prophecy in order to commend him to the Jew. In connection with the Divine manifestation of the infant Jesus to the world, a decree of the Sanhedrim, called out by the demand of Herod in consequence of the inquiry of the Magi, fixes upon Bethlehem, the actual birth-place of Jesus, as the place where Messiah should be born; while in connection with the Divine concealment from the world which follows, of which the warning of the wise men and of Joseph, the night-flight into Egypt, the murder of the innocents and the final settlement in remote and obscure Nazareth are but successive parts,—the experience of Messiah is traced in that of Jesus till the prophetic character of the Nazarene, in which He is to go forth on his mission, finally and firmly attaches to him. The array of facts here brought forward had its witnesses in Jerusalem and in Nazareth, and in both the Jewish and Gentile worlds.

The immediate, or official preparation of Jesus, needed next to be demonstrated that of the Messiah. The prophesied forerunner appears in John the Baptist, announces His speedy appearance and prepares the nation for it; and, when Jesus comes out of the obscurity of Nazareth, solemnly inducts Him into the office of Messiah in the presence of the nation, and with His claims as the Son acknowledged by God the Father. The Spirit then bears Him away into the wilderness where, *as man*—the second Adam—in the temptation, He overcomes the devil, and so begins the bruising of the serpent's head. The multitudes, to whom His Messiahship was thus attested by God from heaven, and by his forerunner on earth, were the witnesses to whom the Jew could refer in testing his claims.

Contrasting this introduction with the opening portions of the other Gospels, its Jewish features become still more conspicuous. It differs from them as we would expect it to differ. Mark hastens at once to the opening of that public ministry

of Jesus in which are found the works of power fitted to command the attention of the Roman: Luke, keeping the Greek in view, begins with declaring his purpose to write a connected and consistent account of the career of Jesus as the Divine man, and then proceeds to record the wonders by which his life was heralded, commenced, and developed into its strength and completeness; John, with eminent adaptation to the Christian, beginning with the Word in eternity as God, holds him up as the Divine agent in creation and providence, and then proceeds to his manifestation in the incarnation as the life and light of men. The prophetic origin of Jesus, human and divine, would have no special force with the Roman, the Greek, or the Christian; it is accordingly omitted by the other three Gospels. Luke's genealogy appears in a different connection; is intended to demonstrate to *the universal man* that Jesus is bound to all the race from Adam, and descended from God; and gives us accordingly *the actual descent* of Jesus by the line of Mary, instead of *the royal lineage* through Joseph. The manifestation and concealment could have force only with the man of prophecy. The mission of John is recorded by each of the Evangelists with a different aim. In Matthew, the Baptist heralds Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews, coming in fulfilment of prophecy. He is to appear as the Lord Jehovah in person, to set up the kingdom of heaven among men, and the Jews are called to repentance as a preparation for his appearance. In Mark, the work of the Baptist is introduced to exhibit by contrast the mightier power of the Son of God, who comes to set up the kingdom of God. In Luke, the Baptist brings Jesus forward as the one perfect man, in whom all flesh shall see the salvation of God, placing himself on a level with all men by coming to be baptized, "when all the people were baptized." In John, the Baptist witnesses to Jesus before the church and the world, as the divine, eternal, only-begotten Son of God, the Lamb of God sacrificed to take away the sin of the world, the life and light of men. With these other differences, Matthew dwells especially on the relation of Jesus to the Jews *under the law and covenant.* The internal preparation, the temptation, appears only in the first three Gospels, and with difference in each.

Matthew, commending Jesus as *king* to the Jew, presents the temptations in the order of his relations to human wants, to dependence on God, and to the sovereignty of the world; closing thus, by showing that *the king* would win the kingdom by obedience to the law given to man:—Luke, commending Jesus to the world as *the man and Saviour*, presents them in the order of his relations to human wants, to the sovereignty of the world, and to his human dependence on God;—closing thus with the preservation of the just relation of *the Saviour* to God:—Mark, commending Jesus to the Romans as *the mighty God*, gathers all up into a single sentence, and adds to the victory over Satan, that over the terrors of the wilderness, so aiming to increase the impression of *the power* of the Son of God. Matthew's introduction is therefore evidently a most complete and telling argument directed to the Jew.

The introduction of Matthew paves the way for the first of the three great stages in the progress of the earthly ministry of Jesus,—the proclamation of the coming kingdom or reign of Heaven in its law and relations. The direct claim to Messiahship is not put forward, nor is the title of Messiah acknowledged by Jesus in this portion of the Gospel, for that belongs to a future period, for which the particular object of Part 1st is to prepare.

Part 1st.—Jesus proclaiming the coming kingdom of heaven in its law and relations, present and future. The King as lawgiver and prophet. Chap. iv. 12—xvi. 12.

1st Section.—Proclamation of his coming kingdom and its constitution, by the King in person. The King as lawgiver. Chap. iv. 12—ix. 35.

A.—Preliminary proclamation—rousing the attention of all Syria, and preparing for the unfolding of the constitution of the kingdom. Credentials from the place of his opening mission. Chap. iv. 12—25.

B.—The Constitution of the kingdom of heaven, commonly called the Sermon on the Mount. Credentials in the *authority* of his teaching. Chaps. v.—vii.

a.—The citizens of the kingdom, in their character and influence in the world. (Vers. 3—16.

b.—The law of the kingdom, in its relations to Old Tes-

tament Scriptures in themselves considered in their purity and as perverted in the teaching and observance of the Scribes and Pharisees, to the aim and work of common life, in contrast with heathenish worldliness, and to the estimate and treatment of brethren in contrast with the censoriousness of the false disciple. (Chap. v. 17—vii. 6.)

c.—Directions for securing a place in the kingdom. (Vers. 7—27.)

C.—The establishment of the authority of Jesus to proclaim such a constitution, by three series of miracles. Credentials as King and lawgiver. Chap. viii. 1—ix. 35.

1st Series.—The lawgiver in relation to the old law.* Credentials as Healer, from Isaiah. Chap. viii. 1—17.

a.—The spirit before the letter. (v. 3.) The leper cleansed. b.—Faith before descent. (v. 10.) The healing of the centurion's servant. c.—The service of love before ritual observance. (v. 14.) The healing of Peter's wife's mother. (Many healed, as Esaias prophesied.)

2d series.—The Lawgiver in himself as all-powerful. Credentials as "the Son of God," (viii. 29) and as "the Son of man, (ix. 6.) Chap. viii. 18—ix. 8.

(Following the declaration to one disciple that no earthly advantages could be expected in the kingdom, and the demand for immediate and undivided service upon another.) a.—All-powerful over the material world. The stilling of the storm. b.—Over the spiritual world. The Gadarene demoniacs healed. c.—Over the power of sin. The paralytic healed.

3d series.—The Lawgiver in relation to man, as requiring faith. Credentials as "the Son of David." (v. 27.) Chap. ix. 9—35.

(Prepared for by two incidents at a feast at Matthew's house, which lead Jesus to teach that neither church-position nor fasting could give title to a place in the kingdom of heaven.) Requiring faith. a.—Actively, to seize the blessing. The woman with issue healed. b.—Passively, to receive it. Jairus' daughter raised. c.—As a measure of the blessing. The two blind men. d.—As the means of understanding it. The dumb devil cast out. (Many healed.)

* See Westcott's *Introduction to the Gospels*, p. 353, note 2.

2d Section.—Proclamation of the coming kingdom, associated with twelve chosen Apostles. The work for Israel from the dawning of opposition to the withdrawal of Jesus from public teaching. Chap. ix. 36—xvi. 12.

A.—The choice and preliminary instruction of the men by whom the kingdom was to be set up. The law of associated effort in preparing for and in the kingdom. Chap. ix. 36—xi. 1.

B.—The dawning opposition. The King as prophet defining his relations to the various classes of the people. Chap. xi. 2—xii. 50.

a.—The relation of Jesus to his forerunner John, calling out the denunciation of woe and the gracious invitation into the kingdom. Credentials in his miracles. (Vers. 2—30.)

b.—The relation of Jesus to the Pharisees, the religionists of the day. Charges and answers. Credentials of the prophet, in the withered hand healed on the Sabbath, and in the blind and dumb demoniac healed. (Ch. xii. 1—45.)

c.—The relation of Jesus to the earthly family. (Vers. 46—50.)

C.—The unfolding of the nature and future development of the kingdom in seven parables. The King as prophet in the narrow sense. Ch. xiii. 1—53.

D.—Jesus as Messianic King at open variance with the representatives of the leading classes. Credentials as King renewed, followed by his withdrawal from public. Ch. xiii. 54—xvi. 12.

a.—The synagogue of Nazareth acknowledging his wisdom and mighty works, rejects His claims. Credentials as Son of man. (Vers. 54—58.)

b.—Herod, the earthly king, acknowledges his mighty works, and fears but does not recognize his Messiahship. Credentials of the King in contrast with Herod, as "the Son of God" (v. 33) in healing many, in his withdrawal from Herod into the desert, in feeding the 5000, in walking on the sea, and in the miracles in Gennesaret. (Ch. xiv.)

c.—The Scribes and Pharisees, the theological authorities reject his claims. Their formality and hypocrisy in contrast with his hearty, world-wide mercy. Credentials of

the King as the Son of David (v. 22) in curing the daughter of the woman of Canaan in his withdrawal, in feeding the 4000, and in healing the multitudes. (Ch. xv.)

d.—The Pharisees and Sadducees, the theocratical authorities, reject his claims. Credentials in the sign of Jonas. Sincerity and hypocrisy in contrast, and withdrawal from public. (Ch. xvi. 1—12.)

It may be said in general of Part 1st, which comprises the whole of the public and official proclamation of the kingdom, that it is preëminently Jewish in its aspect. The proclamation by Jesus in person has constant reference to the Jew; the proclamation in conjunction with the Twelve was begun in consequence of the needs of the Jew. The Law is constantly exhibited in its relations to the Jewish life and notions; the conflicts are with the representatives and leaders of the Jewish race; the credentials are those of Messiah—the Son of man, the Son of God, the Son of David, the King as lawgiver and prophet —drawn from the Jewish Scriptures and directed to the Jew.

Descending to details, the Jewish complexion of Part 1st is no less marked. The public official work of Jesus begins when that of his forerunner is done and he has disappeared from public view. This commended itself to the Jew's sense of propriety. In its beginnings it meets the prophetic requirements made of Messiah, in its place, Galilee, and in its character, attracting the attention of all Syria. The constitution of the kingdom is throughout a most emphatic condemnation of the perverted Judaism of Christ's day. The Jews expected a magnificent temporal kingdom with blessings confined to themselves. In contrast with this notion, Jesus, in describing the blessed citizens of the kingdom, points out the way into that kingdom through the successive stages in the sinner's experience in conversion, (sense of utter spiritual need, godly sorrow, submission to God, intense longing for and appropriation of righteousness); and marks out the life in the kingdom, through the successive stages in the Christian's experience, (blessing men with mercy, growing into holiness, making peace in the world, enduring persecution); and then shows that the benign influence of that kingdom must be world-wide in their reach. The Scribes and Pharisees had perverted the whole law and

life, and the people burdened with their traditional exactions had come to look forward to the abrogation of all law by the Messiah. In laying down the law of his kingdom, Jesus therefore declares that he has only come to carry out and complete the old law, which is eternal in all, even the least, of its underlying principles. He demands a higher righteousness than that of the Scribes and Pharisees in order to admittance into this kingdom, and then tears off the disguises from the Pharisee, in examining the teaching of the Scribes, in showing up the righteousness wrought to be seen of men, in exhibiting the heathenish worldliness of his common work in life, and in their true light his uncharitable judgments. The miracles by which the authority of the King as lawgiver is established, as well as the incidents which introduce them, have a Jewish cast and aim, presenting the credentials of Jesus as "the Son of man," "the Son of God," and "the Son of David," on the ground of which the submission of the Jews to him as Messiah is claimed. The same adaptation to the Jewish character and wants might be traced through all the details of the second section of Part 1st.

A view of Part 1st in contrast with the corresponding portions of the other Gospels will give a conception even more striking of its Jewish design. Each of the Evangelists sets out from the Baptist in introducing us to the ministry of Jesus. The differences in procedure are characteristic:—Mark, keeping in view the Roman, merely makes the imprisonment of the Baptist the starting point of a wonder-working ministry of Jesus in Galilee, into the marvels of which he hurries us at once, without even hinting at its prophetic relations; Luke, in tracing the orderly development of the life and work of Jesus for the reasoning Greek, opens with the ministry in Galilee, as the natural sequence of that of the Baptist, but does not emphasize the connection; John, writing for the Christian, sets out with that private ministry of Jesus in Judea which preceded the public ministry in Galilee, and which, as being directed to the true Israel and dealing with high spiritual themes, is passed over in silence by the other Evangelists, but brought forward in the Gospel for the Christian, the spiritual

man, as eminently fitted to further its peculiar aim;* Matthew, with his eye on the Jew, starts with the public ministry of Jesus in Galilee, which, strictly speaking, could begin only when that of the Baptist closed, and presents Jesus at once and most prominently in his Messianic character fulfilling prophecy. The Constitution of the kingdom of Heaven, or the Sermon on the Mount, which occupies so marked a place in Matthew, appears in Luke only in a form so modified as to render the identity of the two doubtful, and is entirely omitted by both Mark and John. Power in action, and not connected discourse, was what the Roman needed and appreciated, and Mark therefore omits this, as also he either omits or abridges the other discourses of Jesus. The Christian, who has already been brought into the kingdom through the other Gospels, and has acquired an experimental knowledge of its law and life, has been carried in his experience far beyond the need of a first revelation so rudimentary, and John therefore makes no record of the sermon. Luke† must provide for the Greek, with his speculative tendencies and his many philosophies, the principles of this new system, which claims to be better than all the philosophies as an aid in attaining to that perfect manhood which was the end of all Greek thought and work. It matters not, for our present purpose, whether in Luke and Matthew we have separate abridgments of the same discourse or the outlines of two discourses differing in occasion but alike in aim, the variations are such as fall in with the requirements of our general theory. In Luke we have the beatitudes, in their starting point and essence, and illustrated by a corresponding series of contrasted woes; but the world-wide influence of the citizens of the kingdom, so needed in Matthew to correct the narrowness of the Jew, would be out of place with the Greek,

* We do not yet remember to have ever seen this explanation anywhere suggested by any of the writers on this Gospel. While it falls in with our general theory of John's Gospel, and illustrates that theory, it seems in itself more satisfactory than the one usually offered: viz., that John is merely aiming to supplement the narratives of the other Evangelists, and so records what they omit. The latter explanation does not sufficiently take into the account *the spiritual character* of the matter here and elsewhere supplied by John, and which renders his Gospel so different from the others.

† See Luke vi. 20—49.

the man of universal sympathies, and is omitted. The relation of the law of the kingdom to the law and the prophets, and to the perverse teachings and practice of the Pharisees, finds no place in Luke, for the Greek knew nothing of the law and prophets, and therefore nothing of the peculiar sins of the Pharisees; but the great law of love to enemies and of likeness in universal benevolence to the Father is given with tolerable fulness, as is also the condemnation of censorious judgments with the main idea expanded. In the conclusion of the sermon, which gives directions for securing a place in the kingdom, Luke has no full record of the requirement to enter into the kingdom by prayer, and the strait gate, because these are to appear later in the carrying out of his plan, (ch. xi. and xiii.), and no trace either of the golden rule, which was aimed at Jewish selfishness and exclusiveness, or of the caution against false prophets, designed to guard against Jewish teachers of error. The omissions as well as the variations are thus throughout characteristic. The series of miracles by which the authority of Jesus as lawgiver of the kingdom is established, exhibit, in contrast with the scattered records of them found in Mark and Luke, the same adaptation to Jewish needs. This is seen in the *internal arrangement*, which in Matthew follows chiefly the order of time, and presents Jesus (as will be seen by our analysis) in three successive phases of the Messianic character, and in the manifest unity of the *design*, following immediately after the laying down of the law of the kingdom and authenticating it; no trace of which arrangement and design is to be detected in either Mark or Luke. It is seen in *the recognition*, expressed or implied throughout, by Matthew, *of the fulfilment in Jesus of prophecy concerning Messiah;* of which recognition nothing is found in this connection in Mark and Luke. It is seen in *the variations* in the narratives of the same events by the different Evangelists: *e. g.*, in Matthew's record of the healing of the centurion's servant, we find prominent at once, the demonstration of the authority of Jesus as lawgiver, and the lesson of warning aimed at the Jewish error that descent from the fathers of the covenant is more important than personal faith, and obviates the need of such faith;

while in Luke* we have a more minute delineation of the exalted character of the centurion, with the omission of the reference to Abraham and the rejection of the covenant race,† intended for Jewish ears and chiefly significant to them. The last two miracles in the third series—the healing of the two blind men and of the dumb demoniac—which are recorded only by Matthew, bring Jesus forward in his Messianic character as "the Son of David," and show at once the wondering recognition of the people and the malignant opposition of the Pharisees. With the merest glance at the 2d section of Part 1st, we must leave it to the reader who is interested in the work to trace the Jewish aim of Matthew in the contrasts with the other Gospels furnished by its details. It will be found in general that what Matthew alone records has peculiar value to the Jew as having reference to his needs or errors. In Mark and Luke we find no hint of the exclusively Jewish mission of the Twelve, which is so emphasized by Matthew in their commission;‡ and we accordingly find the former Evangelists omitting in their Gospels whatever of the commission has not a wider reference both present and future. The defining by Jesus of his relation to the Baptist as his forerunner, is found in Matthew and Luke, but is omitted by Mark and John as not partaking of the character of striking fact or of the highest spiritual lesson. The intimate official connection of the Baptist with Jesus as Messiah makes it indispensable in a Gospel for the Jew; and the intimate actual connection between the development and missions of the two, demands a place for it in the Gospel for the philosophical Greek. Luke however omits the accompanying condemnation of the incomprehensible unbelief of the cities in which Jesus had done most of his mighty works for the Jews, and the concluding gracious invitation of all the weary and burdened to the King for rest. The connected series of parables (chap. xiii.) is too rudimentary to be needed in John; so aimed at Jewish errors that Mark‖ only finds place for the two striking ones—the sower and the mustard seed, which exhibit the small beginnings and extraordi-

* Luke vii. 1—10.
† Matt. viii. 11, 12.
‡ Matt. x. 5—6.
‖ Mark iv.

nary results in the kingdom, and between which he inserts that of the growing corn; while Luke* records only that of the sower, as embracing in germ the entire philosophy of the kingdom. The antagonism on the part of the authorities is presented in Matthew as from the Jewish side; and while Mark introduces it for its striking exhibition of the conflict and triumph of the King, Luke omits the greater part of it, as giving to the universal man no new insight into the inner life of the Divine-man.

Part 1st prepares the way for part 2d. Public proclamation of the kingdom is no longer safe; the King has withdrawn from public; the immediate circle of the disciples believe in him as the Messiah, as also do the masses who follow him in his retirement into the desert. He is now to cast himself upon that faith, strengthening and correcting it, as he moves forward to his final rejection by all the leading classes and authorities of the Jewish nation, and his final farewell to the whole Jewish dispensation,† preparatory to laying the foundations of the kingdom in his high-priestly death. In Part 1st, Jesus comes forward in the characters of Messianic king and prophet, in Part 2d, that of the suffering Messiah is added to these.

Part 2d.—The King giving himself up to the faith awakened in him as the Messiah by his proclamation of the kingdom. Credentials of the Messiah as priest and king. Chap. xvi. 13—xxiv. 1 (a.)

1st Section.—Jesus as the King casting himself on the faith awakened in him on the part of his disciples, and teaching that his mission is one of death for the redemption of men. Credentials as priest. Ch. xvi. 13—xx. 28.

A.—First stage in the lesson of the suffering Messiah—its announcement. Ch. xvi. 13—xvii. 21.

a.—The confession of Peter and the acknowledgment by

* Luke viii. 4—15.

† See Matt. xxiv. 1 (a.) The words, "And Jesus went out and departed (withdrew) from the temple," have been most unfortunately severed from their proper connection with Chap. xxiii., and united with Chap. xxiv. Their real force, as recording the final withdrawal of Jesus from the temple and the Jewish system which it represented, is thus obscured.

Jesus, (vers. 13—20); first announcement of sufferings and death, (vers. 21—23); the demand upon the followers of Jesus for self-denial and suffering with him in his kingdom, (vers. 24—28.)

b.—The Credentials. The transfiguration, or the vision of glory, confirming the faith of the inner circle of disciples in him as the suffering Messiah, (ch. xvii. 1—13); the healing of the epileptic demoniac, confirming the faith of the Twelve, and pointing to the secret source of strength, (vers. 14—21.)

B.—Second stage in the lesson of the suffering Messiah. The period of residence in Galilee devoted to it, and to making plain the new duties in the kingdom growing out of it. Ch. xvii. 22—xviii. 35. Relation of the citizens to the temple service, (vers. 24—27); true greatness in the kingdom, (xviii. 1—14); the discipline of the kingdom, (vers. 15—35.)

C.—Third stage in the lesson of the suffering Messiah. Jesus setting out toward Jerusalem, and giving instruction to the disciples and the gathering multitudes by the way, on the social relations of the citizens in the kingdom. Ch. xix. 1—xx. 16. The family in the kingdom, (vers. 3—12); children in the kingdom, (vers. 13—15); riches in the kingdom, (vers. 16—26); sacrifice for Christ's sake in the kingdom, rewarded, but of grace, (xix. 27—xx. 16.)

D.—Fourth and final stage in the lesson of the suffering Saviour. Jesus approaching Jerusalem and privately announcing to the disciples that this journey will end in his death as a ransom for many. Ch. xx. 17—28. The announcement, (vers. 17—19); rank in the kingdom, (vers. 20—28.)

2d Section.—Jesus as the King giving himself up to the faith awakened in him as the Messiah on the part of the masses. Credentials as the royal Son of David. Chap. xx. 29—xxiv. 1 (a.)

A.—The claiming of the royal place before the people. Confession of the blind men, first public acknowledgment by Jesus of his Messiahship, and confirmation of his claims by their healing; triumphal entry of the King into the royal city and temple; cleansing the temple, and miraculous credentials. Ch. xx. 29—xxi. 17.

B.—The King in conflict, triumphing, rejected and rejecting. Ch. xxi. 18—xxiv. 1 (a.)

a.—The sign.—The barren fig-tree cursed, (vers. 18—22.)

b.—Final conflict with the Jewish officials. (Ch. xxi. 23—xxii. 14.) (a.) Jesus on the defensive. Formal demand for his authority, and his answer. (Vers. 23—27.)—(b.) Jesus taking the offensive—in three parables. (Ch. xxi. 28—xxii. 14.)

c.—Final conflict with the leading classes of the people. (Ch. xxii. 15—xxiv. 1 (a.)).—(a.) Jesus on the defensive. The Pharisees and the Herodians; the Sadducees; the lawyer of the Pharisees (Vers. 15—40.)—(b.) Jesus taking the offensive. The enemies put to silence, or Christ the Son and Lord of David; official position of Scribes and Pharisees defined; judgment pronounced upon them; lamentation over Jerusalem and final farewell of the Jewish system—(Ch. xxii. 41—xxiv. 1 (a.)).

A glance at the analysis will serve to show the general adaptation of Part 2d to the Jewish minds and wants. Jesus appears throughout as the Messiah of the Jew; in the 1st section bringing into prominence the lost idea of the suffering Messiah, and in the 2d, putting forward his royal claims as the heir to the throne of David. The credentials are at once those of the Priest and the King.

The Jewish reference is no less evident in the details of this whole passage than in its general drift. Peter confesses him, and Jesus acknowledges himself to Peter, as the Messiah of the Jews; in the transfiguration, Moses and Elijah the representatives of the old dispensation, and God the Father, acknowledge him as Messiah. The teachings which accompany his progressive revelation of himself in the character of a sufferer, are those evidently rendered necessary by the introduction of a new phase of the Messianic kingdom. The 2d section opens with the public claiming by Jesus, established by miracle, of the position of royal Son of David. The multitudes who have gathered round him acknowledge his claim, and escort him triumphantly into the royal city, in fulfilment of prophecy concerning Messiah. In the temple he assumed the prerogatives of Messiah, removing the abominations of his Father's

house, and, amid the hosannas of the children and the murmurs of the Sanhedrim, demonstrating his right by miracle. Throughout his final conflict with the officials and the leading classes of the people, Jesus is everywhere brought forward in the character of Messiah of the Jew. Symbolically, in the barren fig-tree, he curses the unfruitful Jewish race. The Jewish officials in the Sanhedrim, who had charge of the temple, make a formal demand for his credentials as Messiah, and Jesus, while apparently refusing, virtually gives them, in pointing to his forerunner, the Baptist, and silences those who make the demand. As the Messiah, he then openly attacks them, obliging them, in the parable of the two sons, to declare their own guilt; forcing them in the parable of the vineyard let out to husbandmen, to fix their own punishment; and in the marriage of the king's son, foreshadowing the rejection of the Jews for their treatment of himself, and the setting up of the new theocracy of the kingdom. The leading classes successively attack him as Messiah, and are discomfited; and then he attacks and puts to confusion the Pharisees with his question, "What think ye of the Messiah?" In defining the official position of the Scribes and Pharisees before the disciples and the multitudes, he claims for himself as the Messiah the place of the only teacher, master,* and Lord; and then with Messianic authority denounces judgment against these hypocrites. His farewell wail over Jerusalem, which had now rejected him as Messiah, and his final withdrawal from the temple, symbolizing his rejection as Messiah of the apostate leaders of the old dispensation, complete the second stage of his Messianic work, the account of which ends at the middle of the first verse of ch. xxiv.

A glance at Part 2d in comparison with corresponding portions of the other Gospels will confirm our general view of the design of Matthew. John records only a single event of all that appears in this part of Matthew; the triumphal entry into Jerusalem;† and he gives us this incidentally, in compendious form, connected with the Jewish designs against Lazarus, and as in measure accounting for the increasing jealousy and enmity of the Pharisees to Jesus. The rudimentary character

* Matt. xxiii. 8, 10. † John xii. 12—19.

of the remainder of the teachings of this portion of Matthew, as well as their polemic aspect, as directed against Jewish errorists and errors, may account for their omission in the Gospel for the spiritual man, who has already, through this lower revelation, acknowledged Jesus as Messiah, and who is waiting for his higher revelations of himself to faith. Mark and Luke contain almost everything found in this division of Matthew, with the exception of some things of exclusive Jewish aim, as the marriage feast. (Ch. xxii.) The Roman did not recognize suffering as an element commanding respect, unless some great triumph went with it, or was wrought through it: Mark needed, therefore, to take up the King with his lesson of suffering and justify it to those for whom he wrote. We accordingly find him giving vividness and picturesqueness to the events: *e. g.*, he loses sight of one of the blind men at Jericho, brings forward only Bartimeus the more prominent of the two, portrays the scene most graphically, and treats it as an occasion for the extraordinary exercise of the power of Jesus rather than as the acknowledgment of his royalty;—omitting wholly or abridging greatly that which in Matthew has the form of connected discourse;—and in dwelling upon the triumph of Jesus in the conflict dropping out the idea of his rejection. For the Greek, the suffering of Jesus was no bar to his reception as the Divine Saviour; it prepared him with that broader, deeper sympathy for which the Greek had been made to long: Luke must, therefore, avail himself of the lesson of the suffering Saviour to commend Jesus to his readers with their more catholic natures. In his record of the same events, we accordingly find less of the Jewish, and more of the human and universal: *e. g.*, he tells not of Bartimeus, nor of two blind men, but of "a certain blind man," and notes in connection with it, not only the recognition of the royal claim of Jesus, but also the faith of the man, and the effect of the miracle in developing the enthusiasm which is so soon to bear the Son of David in triumph into the city of his fathers; he pauses by the way to rehearse the story of Zaccheus and the tender compassion to sinners of "the Son of man," who "is come to seek and to save that which was lost;" he gives us the parable of the ten pounds delivered to correct the error and to repress

the impatience of those who supposed that the kingdom would be immediately established by some miraculous display of power; he exhibits Jesus stopping in the midst of his triumph, when the multitudes proclaim "peace in heaven, and glory in the highest," and, as he looks down upon the devoted city and thinks of past sin and future obduracy and retribution, weeping uncontrollable human tears over it. In his design likewise, Luke differs from Matthew: we find in his Gospel nothing of that Jewish reference which is so patent in that of the other Evangelist: rather we should say that with Luke the whole design of the portion under consideration is emphatically anti-Jewish,—so anti-Jewish and catholic in fact, that this feature has always attracted marked attention, and the chief aim of it may be concisely stated to be, to exhibit the introduction of the Gentile into the place of the apostate and rejected Jew. It is into the midst of these events, which he records in common with Matthew and Mark, that Luke throws those wonderful parables, found nowhere else—the good Samaritan, the unfortunate friend, the rich fool, the great supper, the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, the prodigal son, the politic steward, the rich man and Lazarus, the unjust judge and the poor widow, and the Pharisee and publican—the parables which give us such views of the infinite benevolence of God, of the world-wide mercy of the gospel, and of the infinite Divine tenderness and the matchless human sympathy of the Son of man,—parables so rich for the thinking Greek, and without which there would be a great blank in the Gospel for the Gentile world. Everywhere we find confirmation of our general theory of the design of Matthew.

With the close of Part 2d ends the second stage in the work of Jesus, as that work is presented by Matthew. The coming kingdom has been proclaimed, and the King has been rejected by those to whom he surrendered himself up and who should have been ready to bear him to the throne. That the throne of Messiah is to be reached only through death, has now been clearly taught and demonstrated, and the causes which are to bring about the death of Jesus are already working. He is now to be brought before us in his work of laying the foundations of his kingdom by his high-priestly death.

Part 3d.—Jesus, as the King, rejected and rejecting, making ready and laying the foundation for his kingdom through his high-priestly death. Chap. xxiv. 1, (b)—xxvii. 66.

A. 1st Section.—The special prophetic preparation of his disciples for his departure and second coming. Ch. xxiv. 1,(b.) —xxvi. 2.

A.—Coming of the King in the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the present order of things. (Verse 1 (b).—41.)

a.—Signs preceding and attending the King's coming, (4—31); b.—The time of coming, (32—41.)

B.—The posture of the disciples in waiting for the King's coming. (Chap. xxiv. 42—xxv. 46.)

a.—Watching. *b.*—Watching and prepared; parable of the ten virgins. *c.*—With watchfulness laborious and productive in proportion to their several capacities and opportunities; parable of the talents. *d.*—Testifying their love to the King in his absence by acts of kindness to his suffering people; the judgment scene.

C.—The exact date of his death revealed. Prophetic credentials. Chap. xxvi. 1, 2.

2d Section.—Jesus, the Messianic King, laying the foundation of his kingdom in his death. Chap. xxvi. 3—xxvii. 66.

A.—The preliminaries. (Verses 3—46.)

a.—External and immediate preparation for the sacrifice; the conspiracy of the Jewish authorities; the anointing for the burial, leading Judas to the compact with the Sanhedrim. (Verses 3—16.) b.—The economical preparation, or the King as Priest putting himself in the place of the Paschal Lamb in instituting the sacrament of the Supper. Credentials in the prophetic announcement of his betrayal and desertion. (Verses 17—35.) c.—The personal preparation of the King as Priest in the struggle with the weakness of the flesh in Gethsemane. (Verses 36—46.)

B.—The King as Priest delivered to his enemies. Chap. xxxvi. 47—56. Betrayal, arrest, and desertion. Credentials in the restoration of the high priest's servant.

C.—The trial. The King as Priest judged and condemned of men. Chap. xxvi. 57—xxvii. 26.

a.—The trial before the religious authority—the Sanhedrim.

The charge, blasphemy; the sentence, death. Peter's denial. (Verses 57—75.)

b.—The trial before the civil authority—Pilate. Charge, sedition; declared innocent, yet sentenced to death by the cross. Credentials in the confession and suicide of Judas, the efforts of Pilate, and the dream of his wife. Chap. xxvii. 1—26.

D.—The King as Priest in the hands of the executioners. Credentials from the prophets, and from heaven in the darkness at mid-day. (Verses 7—49.)

E.—The death and burial. Credentials in the earthquake, the resurrection of the saints, and the witnesses. (Verses 50—66.)

It cannot but be manifest, in following Matthew through Part 3d of his Gospel, that he never even for a moment loses sight of the Jewish reader for whom he is wielding his pen. Jesus is everywhere held up, along with his appropriate credentials, as the promised Messiah of the Jews.

We leave the tracing of this Jewish aim in the details of this portion of the Gospel to the reader, and direct our attention to the contrasts with Matthew's Gospel furnished by the records of the other three Evangelists. The discourse concerning his future advent appears in Mark and Luke as well as in Matthew. John omits it, as the great events immediately predicted in it were already long since passed when he wrote his Gospel. Mark passes by the series of parables in which Jesus teaches the disciples how to wait for his coming, but narrates the other events found in Matthew as essential parts in the career of his King. Luke omits the parables; points, in his version of the prophetic discourse, beyond the destruction of Jerusalem to the times of the retribution of the Gentiles;* introduces after it the strife for the chief place that occurred just before the Passover meal, (in connection with the washing of feet, John xiii.); and records the tenderness of Jesus toward the easily tempted Simon, in his promise to save him from Satan. John, in marked contrast with all the synoptists, brings forward the comforting discourses, the grand doctrines, the loving spiritual communion, the precious consola-

* Luke xxi. 24.

tions and the Divine tenderness of Jesus, which marked the closing hours with his disciples, and which, while above the reach of the unspiritual Jew and Roman and Greek, have furnished the theme of the sweetest meditations of the Christian, the spiritual man, in all ages and circumstances. The contrast between Matthew's account of the Passion and the events attending, and the accounts of the other Evangelists, is very clear in the minor details. Mark portrays this great closing event of the Gospel history with the vividness of an eye-witness;* fitting the whole picture for the Roman mind by fixing upon the more striking features and then adding such details as that concerning the young man who fled naked, the disagreement in the testimony of the false witness, and Pilate's investigation of the reality of the death of Jesus.† Luke presents the Passion in its gleams of "human sympathy, its points of contact with common life, its evidences of a perfect manhood."‡ This is seen quite as much in the general drift of his narrative as in its separate incidents, sometimes even more in what he omits than in what he inserts. Luke alone has recorded the question which showed the devotion of the disciples to their Lord when the sword was unsheathed in the garden, the thrice-repeated declaration of Pilate, that "he found no fault in Him," the accusation for civil crime, and the examination before Herod.‖ He alone tells us of the strengthening angel in Gethsemane, in the struggle with the weakness of human nature; of his sweat like great drops of blood; of an hour of his enemies, and of the powers of darkness; of that look which recalled Peter to the consciousness of his fearful fall; of the words with which he resigned his spirit into the hands of his Father.§ Luke alone has preserved the last word of mercy, in which he removed the injury which had been wrought by mistaken zeal; the last word of warning, in which he turned the thoughts of mourners to the consequences which should follow the deed which moved their compassion, to themselves and the Jewish nation; the last prayer of infinite love, in which he

* See Westcott, pp. 323, 324.
† Mark xiv. 51, 52, 59; xv. 44, 45.
‡ See Westcott, pp. 324, 325.
‖ Luke xxii. 49; xxiii. 2, 4, 14, 22.
§ Luke xxii. 43, 44, 53, 61; xxiii. 46.

pleaded for those who reviled and slew him; the last act of sovereign grace, in which he spoke a blessing from the cross to the dying malefactor.* It is Luke who tells us that all the multitudes that came together and saw the things which were done, returned beating their breasts for sorrow.† He makes his aim, to reach the universal man, everywhere apparent. John gives the main facts in an abridged form, and as if to prepare for what he is to add by way of supplementing and bringing out the mutual harmony of the accounts of the other Gospels, and infuses into the whole narrative of the events which centre in the cross the spirit of "the disciple who leaned on Jesus' breast." He alone gives us all the details of the betrayal; the record of the hearing before Annas, which clears up the difficulties in the accounts of Peter's denial of Jesus; the explanation to Pilate of the spiritual nature of his kingdom; the committing of the mother of Jesus to the care of John; that the legs of Jesus were not broken as were those of the malefactors; that his side was pierced with a lance and forthwith blood and water came out.‡ Everywhere we find in his Gospel, even where he records the same facts with the other Evangelists, those touches which always affect the Christian heart. Matthew wields a different pen. He is not writing for the Roman, nor for the Greek, nor yet for the Christian, but for the Jew not yet become a believer in Jesus, and whom he is seeking, under God's guidance and in a way which takes into account his essential character and peculiar history and development, to lead up to the higher spiritual level of the truth of John's Gospel. *Jesus is the Messiah*, is the thought that everywhere gives unity to his narrative of the Passion.‖ His record has therefore an Old Testament cast. Out of the events that shook the faith of men in Jesus he brings singularly significant fulfilments of prophecy. He alone gives the final testimony to the Messiahship of Jesus by himself and his enemies. He alone makes prominent the Messianic majesty of Jesus, in his arrest, when he declares to his disciples that a word could bring legions of angels to his rescue; in his trial

* Luke xxii. 51; xxiii. 27—31, 34, 43. † Luke xxiii. 48.
‡ John xviii. 1—11, 12—24, 33—38; xix. 26, 27, 33, 34.
‖ See Westcott, pp. 322, 323.

before the religious authorities, when, under solemn oath, he claims the title and glory of the Messiah; in his death, when the earth quakes and the dead come forth to do homage to the crucified.*

Matthew has now recorded the proclamation of the coming kingdom, the testing of the faith of men in the Messiahship of Jesus, and the laying of the foundation of the kingdom in the high-priestly death. The King is in the sepulchre—and that sepulchre sealed and guarded. It remains for him to record that event on which his claims before the Jewish nation finally hinge, and which prepares for his assumption of his royal authority.

Conclusion.—Resurrection and assumption of kingly authority. Credentials for the Jew. Chap. xxviii.

The concluding chapter, with its brief record of events subsequent to the death of Jesus, and centring in his resurrection, was manifestly written for the Jew. The facts connected with the sealing of the sepulchre and the setting of the Roman guard to keep it, furnish irrefragable evidence to the Jew that Jesus is risen from the dead,—and this, whether we regard the array of witnesses of the event, in the enemies as well as the friends of Jesus, to whom appeal could be made, or the utter insufficiency of the explanation of the Sanhedrim to account for the marvellous power and progress of the kingdom. As compared with the other Gospels, that of Matthew retains to the close those distinctive features, the presence of which we have traced from its beginning. Matthew presents to the Jew the outward glory of the resurrection, in the supernatural accompaniments, and in the majesty of the risen and triumphant Messiah to whom the disciples bow as God;† Mark confirms for the Roman the reality of the resurrection by the evidence so addressed to the senses as successively to dissipate the doubts of the women, the two disciples, and the eleven; Luke demonstrates for the Greek the spiritual *necessity* by which suffering and victory were united in the close of the earthly career of Jesus; John portrays the effect of the resurrection on those individuals who by long companionship had

* Matt. xxvi. 53, 64; xxvii. 51, 53.

† See Westcott, pp. 329—333.

been lifted up into spiritual communion with Jesus, and shows the risen Son of God in his relations to the frailties of the Christian. In Matthew we behold the risen Jesus as the Messianic King, invested with "all authority in heaven and on earth;" sending out all his royal subjects,—not from Jerusalem from which he had before withdrawn, and which was henceforth to be no more the seat and centre of the true religion, but from the mountain in Galilee,—to subdue all the nations to his spiritual sway; and promising to be present with them to the end:—in Mark we see the risen Jesus, as the universal King, who, after infusing a divine energy into those who are to be his representatives on earth, and clothing them with miraculous power for the conquest of that world to which he gives law, is seated "at the right hand of God" in heaven, as Lord of all, while they push that conquest to the furthest limits of the globe:—in Luke we witness in the risen Jesus the Divine Saviour, in whom everything that belongs to the perfection of our human nature remains still, and through whose name repentance and remission of sins is to be preached among all nations beginning at Jerusalem:—in John we perceive in the risen Jesus, Christ, the Son of God, among his own, dispensing comfort to the weeping, peace to the troubled, faith to the doubting, pardon and restoration to the tempted, and fallen, and penitent, in order that, believing in him they might have life through his name.* The aspects in which the risen Jesus comes forward in these Gospels,—as Almighty Sovereign in heaven with a conquered world beneath, as Divine Saviour of the suffering and sorrowing sinner, of whatever race, and as Son of God the life of men,—serve to make more conspicuous the character of that Messiah of prophecy who, in the view given in the first of the Gospels, assumes the sceptre of universal and eternal King;—while the four portraitures together exhibit the perfect character of that Divine-man and mediator between God and man, which meets and satisfies the needs of the great races of the Gospel time, and of the representative men and our complex nature in all ages.

To one casting a final glance back from the point which we

* Matt. xxviii. 16—20; Mark xvi. 15—20; Luke xxiv. 36—49; John xx. 11 to the end; John xx. 31.

have reached over this entire Gospel, its adaptation in its spirit and aim, and plan, to the wants of the Jew *ideal*, and in its polemic aspects, to the needs of the Jew *actual*, in the time of our Lord, must, we think, be evident. We find the three sides of the Messianic office realized in Jesus as he is held up by Matthew. He is born King of the Jews, and addresses himself to the mission of founding the kingdom of heaven. In the prosecution of that mission we see that he appears as Prophet proclaiming the coming and law of that kingdom; that surrendering himself up as king to the faith awakened in him by his proclamation of the coming kingdom, and as prophet correcting the false notions of the kingdom held by his disciples and the masses, he is rejected by the leaders of the nation; that as Priest he lays the foundation for his dominion in his sacrificial death; and he rises from the dead and assumes the place of royal authority which he has won by his prophetic and priestly work. We find the corruptions and hypocrisies of Jewish religious life everywhere unmasked, and the errors of Jewish doctrine exhibited and corrected, until religion and truth stand out so clearly in contrast with their counterfeits, that there is no mistaking them, and the character of the Messiah shines with all the lustre of its scriptural beauty and spirituality. Here that Messiah is realized in Jesus. The life of Jesus as it was lived on earth, and his character as it actually appeared, are placed alongside the life and character of the Messiah as sketched in the prophets,—the historic by the side of the prophetic; the greatness of the Prophet like unto Moses is seen in the Nazarene as he speaks for God the fundamental truths of the kingdom and foretells its future; the grandeur of the suffering servant of Jehovah, "despised and rejected of men," "wounded for our transgressions," shines through all his words and acts which culminate in his vicarious death on Calvary; and the sublimity of him of whom Jehovah said, "I have set my king on my holy hill of Zion," appears in Jesus the Son of David, as he forms and gives law to a world-wide spiritual society, an everlasting state, the kingdom of heaven;—*Jesus and the Messiah are demonstrated to be the one and the same.* At the same time, by the marked contrasts everywhere to be seen, as well in the general scope

as in the details,—in distinction from Mark, the Gospel for the Roman, Luke, the Gospel for the Greek, and John, the Gospel for the Christian,—the claim of Matthew is established as *the Gospel for the Jew.*

ART. II.—*The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament;* considered in eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, on the Bampton Foundation. By THOMAS DEHANY BERNARD, M. A., of Exeter College, and Rector of Walcot. From the second London edition, with improvements. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard & Co. 1867. Pp. 258.

WE have been led to undertake the preparation of the present article, by an earnest desire to call the attention of our readers to this admirable treatise, of which we have seen no extended notice in any of the religious periodicals of this country. What reputation Mr. Bernard had gained in England before the delivery of these lectures we do not know, but we cannot doubt that he will henceforth be regarded by the church to which he belongs, as one of the ablest of her sons. Some of his co-labourers in that church may surpass him in learning, but few of them by any one book which they have produced, have rendered greater service than he has done in this volume to the cause of truth.

The freshness of the matter, the thoroughness with which the subject is thought out, and the clearness and vigour of the style evince a gifted and highly cultivated mind, while in every part it breathes the spirit of genuine evangelical piety. The book, moreover, has all the merits of an able controversial work without being really such, for while not much notice is taken of the errors of those who dishonour the Scriptures, the truth is exhibited in the most lucid manner. It is eminently readable, and there is a remarkable absence of that undigested mass of reference and authority, so common among English scholars.

He entitles his book *Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament*, but the word *progress* applies rather to the writings of the New Testament as teaching the doctrines, than to the doctrines themselves. But even when the phrase progressive teaching is used, the subject of the lectures is not stated; it is the *plan* on which the New Testament teaches progressively, which the lecturer discusses. The idea of plan is much more prominent throughout the lectures than that of progress. His design is to show that the progress in teaching, so discernible in the several stages or parts of the New Testament, is of such a character as to prove "*the unity of a divine plan*, and, therefore, the continuity of a divine authority." For the teaching of the New Testament is not only progressive, but it was matured on a plan, a plan which lay completely in the mind of the Divine Author before any part was written. This plan discovers itself in the relations which all the component parts of the book sustain to each other. We consider it a very important remark of our author, that the relations constituted by the several parts of the Bible "enter as really into the scheme of Scriptures as do the several parts themselves; and must be rightly understood and duly appreciated, if the doctrine which the book yields upon the whole, is to be firmly grasped by the student or fairly presented by the preacher." To this we will add another of his sentences equally worthy of attention. "In regard to any subject, the observation of successive stages of design must be expected ultimately to conduce to a more thorough comprehension of the thing designed, and will also naturally tend to place the observer in closer contact with the mind of the designer. So will it be with the written word."

A desire to assist the student of the Bible thus to understand and appreciate the relations constituted by its several parts, and to aid him thus to place his mind "in conscious contact with the mind of God," would have been inducement enough for selecting the theme chosen by the author for the subject of his lectures. He informs us, however, that the present labour had its origin in the solicitude with which he observed the fact, that many eminent writers and preachers refuse to regard the apostolic writings as the teaching of Christ, considering them as simply specimens of human appre-

hensions of Divine truth, mere Pauline, Petrine, or Alexandrian versions of the Christian doctrine. For he says, "the subject was in fact originally suggested by the strong disposition evinced by some eminent writers and preachers to make a broad separation between the words of the Lord and the teaching of his Apostles, and to treat the definite statements of doctrine in the Epistles, rather as individual varieties of opinion on the revelation recorded in the Gospels, than as the form in which the Lord Jesus has perfected for us the one revelation of himself." This is almost the only notice which Mr. Bernard takes in his book of the strong disposition to which he alludes manifested by some English writers, and much more freely indulged by many of the German. As already remarked, he says but little about the erroneous views which he is desirous to overthrow. Dr. Newman's doctrine of Development is referred to, but it is not made prominent. His plan seems to be to counteract the influence of error rather by the strong presentation of truth than by arguing with heretics.

We think it unfortunate that language is often employed in this instructive volume which seems to convey the idea that the author is speaking of the development of doctrine, when he does not mean the thing itself, either in a good or bad sense, but simply progressive teaching. The two things should be kept distinct, for they are different. For progress varies in its nature according to the nature of the thing which progresses. When we speak of a doctrine progressing we mean *its evolution.* But when we speak of the progress of a course of teaching, we mean the gradual, systematic unfolding *by the teacher* of the truths which it is his object to place before us. Perhaps also the idea is included, that as the course of teaching goes on, such changes, new methods, &c., are from time to time introduced as may be required to meet the exigences of the particular stage of instruction reached by the learner.

In the discussion of his subject he proceeds on the assumption that a course of teaching is involved in that particular arrangement of the books of the New Testament which is familiar to us. For he treats the four Gospels, the Book of Acts, the collection of Epistles, and the Apocalypse, as severally exhibiting

stages in the course of Divine teaching which have a natural fitness to succeed each other. Here an unwarrantable stress may seem to be laid on an accidental order. The answer to this idea is, that a careful study and comparison of the parts of the New Testament, show that "the several documents are in their right places according to the highest kind of relation which they can bear to each other;" and that if they had come into our hands differently arranged from what they are, one who would study them as a whole, would be led to place them in the same order as that which they have actually assumed.

It does not enter into the design of the lectures, Mr. Bernard informs us, to treat of the custom of the church in regard to the order of the canon. A short summary of the testimony derived from extant manuscripts, from catalogues of the sacred books given by ancient writers, and from the habitual arrangement of the oldest versions, is given in a note in the Appendix. To this he refers us, with the remark: "From that review of the case, it will be apparent that the order in which we now read the books of the New Testament is that which on the whole they have tended to assume; and that the general internal arrangement, by which the entire collection forms for us a consecutive course of teaching, has been sufficiently recognized by the instinct, and fixed by the habit of the church."

It shall be our aim in the remainder of this article to give our readers, with but little comment, the substance of these eight lectures, quoting as frequently as may suit our purpose the author's own words.

The first lecture is introductory; the second and third lectures are devoted to the Gospel collection; the fourth and fifth, to the book of Acts; the sixth and seventh to the Epistles, and the eighth to the Apocalypse.

In order to fix the point of view from which the subject will be regarded, our author in the introductory lecture lays down three positions. The first is, that the teaching of the New Testament is truly Divine, it being nothing less than truth communicated by God. The second position assumes that "the course of Divine teaching under the Christian dispensation coincides in extent with the New Testament Scriptures,"

—it extends to the close of the New Testament, and reaches its completion within those limits.

In regard to the communications contained in the four Gospels there is no room for doubt. That they are from God the Saviour asserts when just before his departure addressing the Father, he said, "I have given them the words which thou gavest me." The saying, however, is not only true of those words. We may be sure that it applies to the teaching which was continued by the apostles after the voice of Jesus ceased to be heard, and he had ascended to the Father. The distinctive character of the discourse of our Saviour contained in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of St. John, "is that of transition, closing the past but opening the future, representing a later stage of teaching as the predestined completion of the earlier, and cementing both into one, by asserting for both the same source, and diffusing over both the same authority."

The course of Divine instruction then extends to the close of the New Testament. Here however it reaches its completion. The presumption might seem to be otherwise. For the revealed truth presented to us in the Epistles is not simply in the form of rehearsals to us of certain definite revelations which the writers alleged that they had received. Were this the case, their testimony to these revelations would be on the same footing with the testimony of the Evangelists as to the discourses of our Lord. "But we have the revealed truth presented to us in the second part of the New Testament, not only as a communication from God, but also as an apprehension by man." "We have the Gospel as it existed in the mind of Peter and of Paul, of James and of John. It is thus presented to us in combination with the processes of human thought, and the variations of human feelings, in association with the peculiarities of individual character, and in the course of its more perfect elaboration through the exigencies of events and controversies." But this is "also the account of the whole subsequent history of doctrine in the world, that is, of church history in its essential and inward character. Therefore the Acts and the Epistles stand to the ecclesiastical historian as the first chapters of his work, for there he already finds the aspects which the revealed truth

bears to human minds and assumes in human hands, and the manner in which its parts and proportions come to be distinctly exhibited through the agency of men and the instrumentality of facts. And this is a process which goes on through descending ages and in which every generation bears its part." But if the history of the apprehension of Christian truth by man, which commences within the New Testament, is continued in the history of the Church to the end of time, what is it which draws the line of separation between the apostolic period and all the subsequent periods of this history? It is this—that the apostolic period is *not only* a part of the history *of the apprehension of truth by man;* it is *also* a part of the history of *the communication of truth by God.*" In the writings of the apostles the Gospel bears this aspect, viz., that of a revelation of what he intended that it should be in the minds of men for ever. And while the church has from the beginning acknowledged this character of the apostolic writings, this acknowledgment has been confined to these writings, and has never been extended to subsequent expositions or decrees.

The third position is that the relative character of the parts of the New Testament adequately represent the plan on which the Divine teaching was progressively matured. Here the author explains the method of teaching which characterizes the New Testament as a whole. It does not exhibit the growth of Christian doctrine as a matter of history. Its progressive teaching is not on the historical, but the constructive method. Its representation of progress is not regulated by the order of fact but by the order of thought. For instance, in the development of the manifestation of Christ in the flesh, had the exhibition given of it in the Gospel of John been on the historic principle, the words and deeds of our Lord would have been presented in the actual order of their occurrence. The representation, however, is constructive, and therefore we see them "coalescing into a separate whole, as bringing out a view of that manifestation, which is an advance in the order of thought upon the view which the synoptic Gospels present." The New Testament being completed, the plan on which the Lord perfected his promised teaching can now be seen. The relative order of the successive contributions of that teaching can be discerned.

This collection of writings is upon the face of them independent and occasional, yet taken as a whole the impression which it makes upon the mind is that of unity and design. "The several parts grow out of, and into each other, with mutual support and correlative functions," and the delighted believer recognizes in the whole book a plan of teaching conceived by one presiding mind. The introductory lecture closes with a rapid sketch of the outlines of the subject to be discussed, marking off the stages of teaching in the New Testament, viz., the Gospels, the book of Acts, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, and pointing out four principles by which the progressive system of teaching is determined.

The second and third lectures are devoted to the examination of the first stage in the course of Divine teaching in the New Testament. It is represented by the writings of the four Evangelists. In it we have the visible manifestation of Christ, including with an account of his words and deeds and sufferings, all that sets before our minds the glories of his person, the superhuman loveliness of his character, and the Divine power and majesty which belonged to him. And also his personal ministry and teaching, whereby he partially interpreted the facts relating to his visible manifestation, and partially answered the questions which it suggested. Representing thus the whole of the manifestation of Christ in the flesh, the Gospel collection "*is fitted to its place, and fulfils its function as the commencement of the Christian doctrine in the New Testament.*" It sustains to the succeeding parts of the New Testament the relation of a commencement of a course of teaching, of which they are the continuance. For "the Christian doctrine is a doctrine concerning facts which have occurred, and *a person* who has been manifested within the sphere of human observation. The foundations of all that is to be known of the word of life are laid in 'that which was seen with the eyes, and heard with the ears, and handled with the hands' of men. Then it is necessary for every learner that, before all inferences or applications, the facts themselves as mere phenomena should first be rendered in the clearest light. Hence our elementary lessons are narratives of the simplest form." In pursuance of their object, the writers have nothing to say as from them-

selves. "Their narratives place us without preface, and keep us without comment, among external scenes, in full view of facts, and in contact with the living person whom they teach us to know." This purpose is still more effectually secured by the fourfold repetition of the history. "We do not go forward to further disclosures, till the historical facts have been insured to us by testimony upon testimony, and the portrait has grown familiar to us by line upon line." And we are placed as nearly as possible in the position of those who were present with Jesus when he was upon earth. We have fellowship with them in their remembrances of him. For us it is all real.

The impression is deeper from the repetition of many passages of the story under slightly varying lights, and in different relative connections. "Lively attention, minute observation, careful comparison, and inquiry which is never fully satisfied, are awakened at every step by that singular combination of resemblances, and differences; and the mind is thus engaged to dwell longer on the scenes, conversing among them in a more animated spirit, and with an interest which is perpetually refreshed." "The four discriminated aspects of their common subject which the several Gospels present, are those of the Royal Lawgiver, the Mighty Worker, the Friend of man, and the Son of God, four aspects, but one portrait." "In placing *the statement of the person of Christ* as the first work of the Gospel histories, and as the beginning of the gospel itself, I speak in accordance with the spirit of those books, and of the whole ensuing system of doctrine." It is when we have first known himself, that we are ready for the Spirit to take of the things which are his, and show them to us.

But with the visible manifestation of Christ is interwoven his personal teaching. Before however showing that it also partakes of an initiatory character, the author invites us to look at the Gospel collection as separated from the other parts of the New Testament, in order to notice that it fulfils its work within its own limits on a plan of progress.

(1.) The first three Gospels may be considered as one of the two parts of the Gospel collection, the Gospel of John constituting the other part. Thus considered, it fulfils a function in relation to John. It prepares us for the higher disclosures,

for the "concentrated revelations of glory" of the fourth Gospel, by dwelling on events occurring in time, and by presenting the external aspects of our Saviour's life. (2.) Again, if the synoptic Gospels are taken by themselves, we perceive that even within the limits of this division the three books in combination, constitute a progressive course. Here our author condenses in a few sentences some of the results of recent investigations into the internal characters and historical associations of these Gospels, whereby each makes its proper contribution to the complete portrait of the Lord, and represents a separate stage in his presentation to the world. He then remarks: "As the book of Acts shows us three stages in the outward progress of the Gospel, first within the bounds of Judaism, then in the work of St. Peter spreading beyond those limits in the Roman direction, and finally in the ministry of St. Paul, delivered freely and fully to the world; so do the synoptic Gospels as they stand in the canon, correspond with a singular fitness to those three periods." (3.) The Gospel of John fulfils a function in relation to the other three Gospels. That function is to dwell fully upon, and interpret what the other three Gospels imply, concerning the glory of Christ. At the same time it is connected with historical conditions subsequent in time to those under which the preceding books originated. When the gospel had "completed the conflicts through which it established its relations to Judaism and to the world," it entered on controversies which turned on the person of Christ. John was chosen "as the chief instrument for settling human thought in regard to this point. There was but one moment in which the conditions for such a production could exist. Such a moment was secured by the providence which ordained that John should live till the first heresies had shaped themselves."

It is to be observed that these stages of progress are constituted only by differences of degree. "There is nothing expanded in one book which has not been asserted in another. 'The Johannean conception of Christ,' as it has been termed by some, who would place it in opposition to preceding representations, is in fact their explication and confirmation. The exposition is continuous; the picture is one." But though the

Gospel collection in thus seen to be a scheme characterized by unity and progress, yet even when viewed separately, it has the appearance of being not a whole scheme ending in itself, but a part of a larger scheme. Further disclosures are almost necessitated.

If the Gospel collection in its relation to the whole New Testament forms the initiatory stage of a progressive plan, then the personal ministry of the Lord Jesus must be an initiatory stage of "the word of salvation." But it is not a finished word; "*it does not bear the character of finality*," notwithstanding that "it includes the substance of all Christian doctrine." And while it is visibly progressive, yet "*on reaching its highest point it announces its own incompleteness, and opens another stage of instruction.*" It is admitted that we have in our Lord's teaching the substance of every doctrine afterwards opened out to the church. "Every truth expounded in the Epistles roots itself in some pregnant saying in the Gospels." Nevertheless our Lord's instructions do not bear the character of finality. His ministry is introductory in its form, its method, and its substance. In regard to its form it is cast into the mould of parable or proverb. This form of teaching belongs to the introduction of knowledge. "It seems intended to set the mind working, and to rouse the spirit of inquiry by partial or disguised discoveries of truth." Even to the disciples through all their time of training, "we see that this mode of speech is largely used, and when the personal intercourse is about to close, they receive the assurance that the teaching of the future will herein differ from that of the past." Not only however when we observe the form and method, but when we consider the *substance* of the doctrine in the Gospels, we conclude that we are only in an initiatory stage of Divine teaching. The teaching contained in the Gospels is much more full in the clearing, restoring, and perfecting of truth already known, than in the revealing of a mysterious economy which had not yet been divulged, in the revealing of the central truths of Christ's redeeming work. "In passing through the synoptic Gospels, we meet with few express and definite assertions of the real nature and effects of the mediatorial work of Christ." And even in that of John, as our Lord's great testimonies concern-

ing himself fall on our ears, we are made to feel in regard to every one of them, "that the intimations given at the time are beyond the comprehension of his hearers, and this not only on account of the dulness of the particular persons, but because the testimonies imply events which have not yet happened, and are fragments of a revelation for which the hour is not yet come. Glance through a few of these sayings: The heavens open, and the angels ascending and descending on the Son of man; the temple destroyed, and raised up again in three days; the birth of water and the Spirit; the Son of man who came from heaven, who goes to heaven, and who is in heaven; the lifting up like the serpent in the wilderness that men may not perish; the water which he will give springing up into everlasting life; the eating the flesh and drinking the blood as the means of everlasting life and of being raised up at the last day. These sayings, and many others like them, are uttered to hearers whose perplexity is made apparent, and are at the time left unexplained, to await the light which they are to receive from future events and later discoveries." "And if this account of one part of his teaching be true, an evident consequence follows in regard to the other part. Grant that the discoveries of the redeeming work of Christ are in any measure restricted and deferred, and it follows that a large part of the teaching on human duty must be restricted and deferred in proportion." "In illustration of these assertions I will instance the treatment of the two doctrines of *the forgiveness of sins and the success of prayer*. We know how intimately in the evangelical system, these two doctrines are associated with the personal agency of our Redeemer, the one with his atoning sacrifice, the other with his priestly mediation. But it is certain that in his own teaching on earth they are not so treated. Other truths concerning them are brought forward when these are absent."

The doctrine of the Gospels then looks as if it were to be followed by another stage of teaching. It not only however has this appearance; it declares that such is the fact. "*On reaching its highest point, it declares its own incompleteness, and refers us to another stage of instruction.*" That the personal teaching of the Lord is a visibly progressive system,

must be apparent to every reader. Place side by side the first discourse in St. Matthew and the last in St. John, and how evident it is that "as we pass from one to the other, we leave behind us the language and associations of the Old Testament, and enter a new world of thought, and hear a new language which is being created for its exigencies." But though there is progress in the teaching of Christ, yet one main purpose of this very discourse is to give assurance of the fact that the instructions of its author are incomplete. "Our Lord would have it understood to what point in the progress of his teaching we have come, and what is the relation between that which is now ending, and that which is about to begin." The discourse announces a *change* not an *end;* while closing one course of teaching, it at the same time opens another; its character is distinctly *transitional.* "The presence of Christ with his disciples had been a help to what they had already learned; it was a hindrance to what they had now to learn. While he sat before them in the body, it was hard to understand the mystery of a spiritual union. That hindrance is to be removed; 'it is expedient for you that I go away.'" The teaching which he had given them must close, but another teaching is to be substituted, which shall be also his. If I depart I will send the Comforter unto you. "Then follow precious promises of the coming, and office, and work of the Holy Ghost." It was to be the office of that Spirit which had been promised them, to recall to their minds the truths which they had heard, as the text and substance of their future knowledge. He was moreover to add that which had not been delivered, as well as to recall that which had been already spoken. "'When he the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth.' He shall guide you, as by successive steps and continuous direction into the whole of that truth into which the commencements have now been given; and especially into the highest and central part of it. For it is also made plain on what *subject* this light shall be poured. 'He shall testify of *me;*' 'he shall glorify *me,*' 'he shall take of *mine* and show it unto you;' 'at that day ye shall know that *I am in the Father, and ye in me, and I in you.*'"

Thus do we perceive upon reviewing the teaching of our

Lord in the flesh, that the revelation of the great salvation given to us in that teaching, is far from final and complete. "It *explicitly declares* that it is not complete. When it was ended, it was to be followed by a new testimony from God."

The fourth and fifth lectures are devoted to the consideration of the book of Acts as being the second stage in the course of Divine teaching in the New Testament.

The office which the Gospel collection fulfils in the evolution of doctrine in the New Testament has been pointed out. The same question is now to be considered with reference to the second stage. Another question however is first to be answered, and the second stage in answering it clearly evinces a plan of progress in teaching. That question is this, Is the teaching which the Acts and the Epistles furnish us, also the teaching of Christ? It is the purpose of the book of Acts to assure us that it is.

I. One part of the office then which this book fulfils is to place in a clear light, the Divine authority of the doctrine given during the period which it covers—to show that that authority which was self-evident in the first stage of teaching, is continued also in the second. It is indeed implied that this is the case in the manner in which the Acts opens. The former treatise delivered to us not all that Jesus did and taught, but "all that Jesus *began* both to do and teach *until* the day when he was taken up." Then the following writings appear intended to give us that which Jesus *continued* to do and teach *after* the day in which he was taken up.

The authority then is continued in the second stage, and how does that stage furnish evidence of this? By exhibiting "*the personal action or administration of the Lord Jesus Christ in the first evolution of his Gospel and formation of his church.*" This adminstration was manifested by special interventions on the part of our Lord. It was also manifested when he filled the apostles with the Holy Ghost to fit them to deliver the doctrine.

This book, it was said, is a record of the personal administration of the Lord Jesus:—it exhibits him to us as commanding and guiding his apostles in all they did to extend his gospel. If this is so, as will now be shown, then we have a

pledge that in the doctrine which they delivered to the world, whether by preaching or writing, it was Jesus who continued to teach. "*If the introductory historical book manifests the direction of the Lord in the acts of these men, then in the subsequent doctrinal books we must own his direction in their teaching.*" The method of this action on the part of Jesus as presented in the Acts was, in the first place, as already intimated, by special interventions. An instance of such intervention is seen in his selecting to give testimony to the truth, Stephen, Philip, Peter, and above all the great apostle under whose hand the doctrines and the destinies of the gospel receive so extensive a development. "This man's conversion, education, commission, direction the Lord Jesus undertakes himself. His whole history is marked by continual testimonies of Divine intervention given at every step which might involve the doubt whether it were of Paul or of Christ." In proof of this the author refers to passages in the Acts which cannot here be presented. "And these appearances, voices, and visions are not merely incidental favours; they are, as we have seen, apportioned to the moments when they are wanted, moments which determine the course which the gospel takes. Thus does he who at the commencement of the history was seen to pass into the heavens, continue to appear in person on the scene. His apostles act not only on his past commission, but under his present direction.

In the facts recorded in the book of Acts, we not only see a pledge of the Divine authority of the doctrine in the Epistles, but we recognize in them the *means* through which that doctrine was perfected. "As the gospel was guided through its conflict with the contemporaneous Judaism; as it spread from the Hebrews to the Grecians, to the dispersion, to the devout persons, to the heathen beyond; as it passed from Jerusalem to Antioch, to Corinth, to Rome; as it was presented to men first through Peter, and then through Paul,—its doctrines were gaining at every step in definiteness and fulness. Under these circumstances, a Divine guidance of events was only a means for the Divine guidance of doctrine. Not only the steps, but the doctrinal results of them, are visibly included in the purpose of God, and marked with the seal of heaven."

In this way does the history in the Acts afford proof that our teacher in the first, is our teacher in the subsequent stages, and that the voice of Paul speaking in the Scriptures is to be taken as the voice of Jesus. But Paul's own words contained in his Epistles supply proof still more direct. "In his writings in general he is careful to assert the reality of his apostleship, as conferred by immediate appointment and bearing the seal of God. He even goes further, and affirms that those instructions themselves were no less immediately received from the Lord Jesus, than was the commission under which they were delivered." Here the author argues that the apostle in 1 Cor. xi. 23—25 and 1 Cor. xv. 1—7, as compared with Gal. i. 2, 12, and Eph. iii. 2, 3, intends to say that he received the gospel on its historical side,—as a body of historic fact, precisely as Luke did, viz., from those who were the appointed witnesses of Christ's visible manifestation. On its doctrinal side, however, he received it in the way of direct revelation from the Lord. Even in personal visits, and by immediate personal communication, did the Lord Jesus explain to him the doctrines which it was given to *him* especially to develope and defend. His reasoning cannot be spread out in a review. No reader can deny that his presentation of the subject is forcible and interesting. A part of the argument will be found in a note in the appendix. So that we have evidence given us in the Epistles no less than in the Acts, of the personal administration of the Lord Jesus in perfecting his word.

But secondly, we not only have our Lord's special interventions, in order that they might be fully prepared and fitted to deliver the gospel to the world, He filled them with the Holy Ghost. We recall the Saviour's promises respecting the gift which was to follow his departure. "In that day ye shall know;" "he shall bring all things to your remembrance;" "he shall guide you into all truth." That the apostles had the habitual guidance of the Holy Spirit, that he abode in them to enlighten and fit them for their work, is evident from their express declarations. They declared that they "preached the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven;" that they "had received not the spirit which is of the world, but the Spirit which is of God;" that they "spoke these things

not in words which man's wisdom taught, but which the Holy Ghost taught; and that they "could be judged of no man," because "none knew the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him, and they had the mind of Christ."

We describe the nature of the gift bestowed upon the apostles in this communicating to them of the Holy Spirit, when we call it the gospel itself. Much, however, pertaining to its doctrinal element had not yet been fully made known to them. But the Spirit on his coming fully revealed to them the salvation which only began to be spoken by the Lord. If the Saviour's promise had not been fulfilled, and the Spirit been sent to complete that revelation, "the gospel which the apostles preached would have been in some of its most important features partly a word of God, and partly a word of man. Their witness of the death, and resurrection, and ascension of Jesus would have demanded an unqualified acceptance, but their representation of the sacrificial character and atoning merits of the death, of the life-giving power of the resurrection, and of the mediatorial office in heaven, would have been the result of their own inferences from the words which they had gleaned from their Lord."

Thus Jesus by bestowing this gift upon his apostles in order that they might become the teachers of his church continued to be himself her teacher. The teacher is not changed; the only change is in the *method* of instruction; the method by which we are taught when we reach the apostolic writings, is different from that by which we are instructed when we read the Gospels. For the writers of the Gospels have nothing to say as from themselves, while the authors of the Epistles give us their own apprehensions of the truth formed under the Divine agency. The change was indeed rendered necessary by the departure of Him who had spoken with his lips, but it was also expedient. The new method was best suited to meet the wants of the learners in the new position which they occupied as learners. The thing now to be done is to "sum up the whole bearing of the manifestation of Christ, throw full light on its spiritual effects, and guide the minds of men in their application of it to themselves.

And the method adopted by the ascended Saviour in order

to accomplish this, consisted in his giving to the church in the form of Epistles written by men expositions of their own convictions and feelings, and of the processes of their own thoughts concerning the things of Christ. "Who does not see that this kind of teaching exceeds the other in completeness and effectiveness? It is more complete; for we thus have the word presented to us in the final form which it was meant to take, that, namely, of a word dwelling in us—a Divine announcement changed already into a human experience. It is more effective; inasmuch as example is more so than precept, and the same voice being to us both the voice of God and the voice of man, affects our hearts with the double power of certainty and sympathy." In order to fit the apostles to be channels for conveying the Saviour's instructions to men, he bestowed upon them, as founders of the church, higher gifts than the mere members of the church received, on the principle that gifts are bestowed according to the work which the Holy Spirit calls men to perform.

II. But there is another function which the book of Acts fulfils, viz., that of exhibiting the doctrines *as to their general character* delivered by the apostles to the world, and drawn out from the facts relating to the manifestation of Christ. These doctrines are the truths relating to Christ as the Saviour of souls, in contrast to the "things concerning the kingdom of God," which were presented so prominently in the preaching spoken of in the Gospels. The parables and the common teaching of our Lord are not mainly about himself, but about the kingdom of heaven." So also his disciples are sent out "to preach the kingdom of God," and are even charged to "tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ," and are forbidden to publish the manifestation of the fact, "until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." But after our Lord's ascension, "they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." We have constantly such expressions in the Acts, as, "he preached unto him Jesus;" "he preached Christ in the synagogues." Here is progress; here is a change in the character of the doctrine. A change sufficient, as the author thinks, to explain the difference in the effect of the preaching as seen in the Gospels, and in the Acts. But what more particularly

are the doctrines drawn out from the facts relating to the manifestation of Christ, which the book of Acts exhibits? The answer is, that in this book is presented to us the preaching of Christ as having died, risen, and ascended, which three facts carry with them the implication of the three blessings of the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. "Him hath God exalted," says Peter, "to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." And from one end of the book to the other, the apostles with great power, "give witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus," which event is presented as the cause and the commencement of that eternal life which was the hope of Israel.

By presenting the *general character* of the doctrine delivered by the apostles to the world, that is by exhibiting the doctrines of Christianity on their *objective* side, the book of Acts becomes an introductory book to the Epistles. And if we see it sustaining this relation to the Epistles, we discern in the New Testament a *plan* of teaching. It is however by fulfilling its third function that the book more especially performs the work of a preface to the doctrinal books which follow.

III. The book of Acts in the third place fulfils a part of its office by tracing the steps of external history through which the doctrine was matured, in other words by letting us see how the doctrines of the gospel were gradually matured through events which occurred during the time which this book covers.

It has been shown, our author intimates, that the book of Acts is a record of the personal administration of the Lord Jesus, of his guidance given to the steps of his apostles, and of his attestations to their words and works. It thus prepares us for the study of the apostolic writings with a sufficient acquaintance with the persons, scenes, and facts with which they are connected, carrying us "straight from the Gospels to the Epistles, as the span of some great bridge continues the road between dissevered regions." But during this intervening time the doctrine was not only spreading, but through a certain line of events and through the agency of particular persons, it was *clearing* and *forming* itself. We cannot follow

the author in noting particulars of the narrative. We can see how the events minister progressively to fixing for ever the relations of the gospel to Jew and Gentile, how the persecutions, labours, journeyings, oppositions, and in connection with them, the preaching, consultations, and debates of the apostles were the means of clearing the gospel of those elements which Judaism would have infused into it, and of forming it of those elements which it was intended that the law or the old covenant should prepare for its use. For example, the fact was brought to light that the gospel and not the law must be depended on, to provide the means of justification, and the title to eternal life. This is one of the great principles which were fought for and secured. It "may be expressed (though not with strict accuracy) by saying that the gospel is the substitute for the law. Not that it is so, as doing what the law had done before it came, nor yet as doing what the law had been meant, but had failed to do; but only as doing what the law had been *supposed* to do." Prophets and Psalmists had asserted that the law could not give life, nevertheless the Scribes taught distinctly, and the people were possessed with the contrary idea. No sooner did the apostles begin to preach than the antagonism of the two doctrines appeared. "In the Acts we are carried through the period of this contest in the outward course of events, and when the history ceases in the hired house at Rome, the gospel had fought itself free, and severed itself from Judaism, not merely in its form, but in its essence, proclaiming salvation by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and not by the works of the law."

"The other principle which is contended for and secured is, that *the Gospel is the heir of the Law.*" The fact was brought to light that the ideas (together with their form) of the law or of the preceding dispensation belong to the Gospel. Included in, and connected with the law were the ideas of "an elect nation, a special covenant, a worldly sanctuary, a perpetual service, an anointed priesthood, a ceremonial sanctity, a scheme of sacrifice and atonement, a purchased possession, a holy city, a throne of David, a destiny of dominion." The gospel claimed these riches, and developed in them a value unknown before, "presenting the same ideas which had been

before embodied in the narrow but distinct limits of carnal forms, in their spiritual, universal, and eternal character." Not only the ideas, but the very form of the law, even the very words of the Old Testament belong to the gospel, unchanged and unchangeable.

"These two principles, what the gospel does without the Law, and what the Gospel derives from the Law, contain the main substance of apostolic teaching. Their expansion fills, and forms all the Epistles, and each is distinctly wrought out by itself, the one in the Epistle to the Romans at the beginning, the other in the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end of the course of the Pauline writings."

In the sixth and seventh lectures, the Epistles, considered as constituting the third stage in the course of Divine teaching, are examined. Some of the most striking thoughts in this volume are to be found in the remarks introductory to some of the lectures. We especially refer to the observations at the beginning of the fourth and sixth lectures, and to what the author says concerning the links of Scripture as he calls them, uniting one part to another, and assisting our sense of the continuity of the whole. The opening sentences of the Acts of the Apostles, and also the first words of the Epistle to the Romans constitute such links.

The author would, in our opinion, have done well had he called attention to the importance, in order to our understanding more clearly the plan on which the New Testament was written, of going back in our thoughts to the time when the several books were given to the churches. In some parts of the New Testament we can discern this plan by simply examining the volume itself, without also thinking of the first period of the church's history when the several books were sent forth to the society of believers. But in other portions of the New Testament, in order to see the plan on which the Divine teaching is communicated, we must take into consideration while examining its pages, the time when the books were written and given to the people of God to be read and studied. The Epistles everywhere assume that spiritual life exists in those who read them, and they are intended for such in all ages, but they were in the first instance addressed to the churches con-

stituted by the labours of the apostles, and which in the circumstances surrounding them seemed peculiarly to need the "continued action of the living word of God." If we bear this in mind we shall be assisted to see the plan of instruction which characterizes this collection of writings. The titles repeated in the successive superscriptions, "called of Christ Jesus"—"beloved of God"—"called saints," show that they are addressed, as remarked, to those who are already Christians. And as they who received the truth by revelation through the apostolic writings were believers before they received those writings; as it was spiritually discerned by them; and as spiritual life was promoted in them by its contemplation; the doctrine now has relation to the spiritual life of souls, and even if inspired men do not exhibit the truth in writing, it will make progress, it will be intellectually thought out, it will have a subjective progress, it will advance working in the consciousness of men.

Now God might have permitted this progress to go on without any Divine exhibitions of truth, but such were needed by the church. Believers were agitated by "new principles of thought, new standards of character, new grounds of duty, new motives, new powers, new bonds between man and man, new forms of human society, new language for human lips. . . . At the same time they carried into this world of thought, all the tendencies, infirmities, and perversities of our nature, and revealed truth had to settle itself into lasting forms, to find its adequate expression, and to have its moral and social consequences deduced under a variety of influences uncongenial to itself." Divine exhibitions then were needed, and so God caused the doctrine to be thought out and exhibited to the church by his servants whom he endowed with apostolic gifts. And he caused it to be infallibly exhibited by them in their Epistles as a matter of *their* experience, and as worked out in *their* consciousness.

The Epistles are "the voice of the Spirit speaking within the church to those who are themselves within it, certifying to them the true interpretations and applications of the principles of thought and life which as believers in Jesus they had received." They clear, and settle, and develope, and combine the

doctrines of the gospel in correspondence with the ascertained capacities and necessities of believers. They show the revelation of God as wrought into its ultimate and subjective form, thereby assisting the same processes in other hearts by sympathy and ratifying the same processes by example. This is their function, and the author first proceeds to point out some of their characteristic features which fit them for its fulfilment, reserving the examination of their actual doctrine as compared with the preceding parts of the New Testament, for the seventh lecture. And he notes four aspects in which we perceive the adaptation of the Epistles to their work. Though in considering them he occupies more than eighteen pages of the sixth lecture, yet our limited space requires us (we say it with regret) to be satisfied with the most meagre statement of their contents. First, the *epistolary form* as indicating fellowship and as addressing itself to actual life and to various conditions of mind, fit the apostolic instructions to be a course of teaching of the kind described. Secondly, they are adapted by their *method*, which is one of reasoning, and interpretation of Old Testament Scriptures, and of the utterance of personal feelings and convictions. Thirdly, the place occupied by Paul as the principal author of the Epistles, fits them for the fulfilment of their peculiar function. "The office of working out the principles of Christian faith into full proportions and clearly defined forms, was assigned to Paul," not *although* but precisely *because* he had not been a witness of the Lord's life on earth, and had nothing to tell of things which he had seen and heard. The inference is that the Epistles form a stage of teaching in advance of that in the Gospels as showing the *results* of the manifestation of Christ. "If the others were the apostles of the manifestation of Christ, he was the apostle of its results; and in the fact of passing under his teaching we have sufficient warning that we are advancing from the lessons which the life, and the character, and the words of Jesus gave, into the distinct exposition of the redemption, the reconciliation, the salvation which result from his appearing. In this way it was provided that the two correlative kinds of teaching which the church received at the first, should be left to the church for ever in the distinctness of their respective develop-

ments; for this distinctness of development in the second kind of teaching is both announced and secured by its being confided to St. Paul." But lest it should appear "that the Gospel which he preached was not so much a stage of progress as an individual variety, and that in following it out we had diverged from the track of the original doctrine, and were no longer sustained by the authority of the Twelve," they are joined with Paul as authors, in their representatives, Peter, John, James, and Jude.

Fourthly, an adaptation is found in the *relative characters* of the several Epistles, as complementary one to another, and constituent parts of one body of teaching. The author gives first the characteristics of the Pauline Epistles, exclusively of that to the Hebrews, showing how "they fall naturally into three groups which stand relatively to each other, in the places which they ought to occupy for purposes of progressive instruction." Then the Epistle to the Hebrews is considered in its relation to the other Pauline Epistles; and finally, the catholic Epistles are shown to be confirmatory to, and to supplement the teaching of Paul. In this way do the *relative characters* of the apostolic writings meet and provide for the exigencies of the spiritual life at every point.

But what is the actual doctrine of the Epistles as compared with the preceding parts of the New Testament? An idea of it in the statement that they recognized those to whom they are addressed as possessing a spiritual life, the nature of which is determined by their union to Christ, and that all their instructions are directed to educate and develope it. The words, "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus," says the author, appears to me to contain the fundamental idea which underlies the whole range of the Epistles, and gives the specific character to their doctrine. Our Saviour foretold a state of consciousness to be enjoyed by his disciples under the succeeding dispensation. "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." "The language of the Epistles is the echo of this promise. It is the voice of those who have entered on the predicted knowledge, and who view all subjects in the light of it. . . . As the sense of the fact that believers are in Christ, breathes in every page, so

also does the sense of the correlative fact that Christ is in those who believe; associating his own presence with their whole inward and outward life. They know that Jesus Christ is *in them,* except they be reprobates. They live, yet not they, but Christ liveth in them, and he is their strength and their song. This indwelling of Christ is by the Holy Ghost, so that the same passages speak interchangeably of the Spirit being in us, and of Christ being in us; or of the Holy Ghost being in us, and our members being the members of Christ. . . Thus through the different but correlative relations represented by the words, 'Ye in me, and I in you,' human life is constituted *a life in Christ;* and through the still higher mystery of the union of the Father and the Son, is thereby revealed a life in God. . . This idea underlies all that is said, gives the point of view from which every subject is regarded, and supplies the standard of character and the rules of conduct. . . . The churches are 'in Christ;' the persons are 'in Christ.' They are 'found in Christ,' and 'preserved in Christ.' They are 'saved,' and 'sanctified in Christ;' are 'rooted, built up' and 'made perfect in Christ.' Their ways are 'ways that be in Christ;' their conversation is 'a good conversation' in Christ; their faith, hope, love, joy, their whole life is 'in Christ.' They think, they speak, they walk 'in Christ.' They labour, and suffer, they sorrow and rejoice, they conquer and triumph 'in the Lord.' They receive each other and love each other 'in the Lord.' The fundamental relations, the primal duties of life, have been drawn within the same circle."

Having shown that the nature of the advance made by the Epistles may be described in general by saying that they recognize a spiritual state which has been attained, and that they educate the spiritual life pertaining to it, he proceeds to point out that this fundamental character of the apostolic writings itself constitutes a visible advance in the *several parts* of doctrine. He selects the doctrine concerning the way of salvation, the doctrine of adoption, the doctrine concerning prayer, and the ethical doctrine, all of which are presented both in the Gospels and the Epistles, and shows how their exhibition in the Epistles is modified and affected by this per-

vading characteristic of those writings, and that it greatly changes their aspect and enlarges their bounds.

As it regards the way of salvation in the Gospels, we do indeed meet with words which suggest the method in which it is wrought, but in the Epistles "the grounds of this salvation in the work of Christ, and the means of it, *i. e.*, faith, are brought clearly and vividly into view, and the attention is fixed upon the *way* in which men, being sinful, are made the righteousness of God." As it regards the sonship of believers, it appears in a fuller form in the Epistles than in the Gospels, and with plainer statement of its ground in the work of Christ. "But the substantive addition to the doctrine lies in the region of consciousness, and in the experience of the inward life. Believers are in Christ, and so are the sons of God, but having become his sons, they find that Christ is also in them giving them the *mind* of sons and the *sense* of their sonship." In regard to prayer, there is a plainer revelation in the Epistles than in the Gospels, of access through Christ. "To those who are in Christ the Holy Ghost is given as the consequence of their union with him, and thus there is the Divine presence in the soul of the worshipper; and so in the highest and most perfect sense, he worships the Father in spirit and in truth, and prays in the Holy Ghost." Finally, in regard to ethical doctrine, though there can be no advance on the code as given by the lips of Christ, yet in the Epistles we nevertheless see a change. That change, however, is found in the position of those who are to use the code, in the relations of which they are now conscious, and therefore, in the motives by which they are to be influenced. "If there is this visible progress of doctrine in the department of Christian ethics; if in respect of distinct exhibitions of principles and motives, the teaching of the apostles surpasses that of their Lord; it is plain that this fact is a necessity from the nature of the case. Till Jesus was glorified, his spiritual relations with believers could not be fully unfolded; and till those relations were apprehended, the motives arising out of them could not be called into action." These are a few of the subjects on which we have the teaching of God in the New Testament, and which may be referred to as illustrations of the change which that teaching exhibits in

the latter part of the volume. And we perceive that in the Epistles as standing among those who are in Christ, there is given us a fuller interpretation of the things which he spoke with his lips.

In the eighth and last lecture the Apocalypse, as constituting the last stage of teaching in the New Testament, is examined. It is founded on the text Rev. xxi. 2: "I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." Our author, as already intimated, regards the Epistles as sustaining a peculiar relation to "the great transitional discourse" contained in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of John. The Apocalypse bears a similar relation to the last discourse in Matthew, in which our Lord gave the outlines of a prophetic history which contained the substance of this later and larger revelation. This larger revelation treats of the destinies of the church, as the body of Christ, possessing an organic life, and endued with a corporate personality. The perfection and glory of this church, "its full response to the work of Christ, its realization of the purposes of God, constitute the end to which the existence of each member ministers. This line of thought runs through the Epistles, and forms a distinct advance upon that which works out the development of personal salvation. I have now to point out that it is not perfected in the Epistles, but demands such a continuance and such a close as it received in the Apocalypse."

After some remarks designed to show that he is not called in this lecture to go into any detailed apocalyptic interpretation, he first considers the doctrinal bearing of the book, as supposing and recognizing a want of information concerning the final state of the church felt by every reader of the preceding books of the New Testament. The expectations which were formed in the morning of the church of her future history, were not realized. "Even while the apostles wrote, the actual state and the visible tendencies of things showed too plainly what church history would be. . . . In their writings we seem as it were to feel the whole atmosphere charged with the elements of future tempest and death. . . . And after the doctrines of the gospel have been fully wrought out, and the ful-

ness of personal salvation, and the ideal character of the church have been placed in the clearest light, the shadows gather, and deepen on the external history." "Prophetic intimations made the prospect still more dark. . . . The mystery of lawlessness was already working, and as Antichrist should come, even then were there many antichrists, men 'denying the Father and the Son,' 'denying the Lord that bought them,' 'turning the grace of God into lasciviousness,' and 'bringing on themselves swift destruction.'" "For the perfection and glory of the church we wait in vain, among the confusions of the world and the ever-active, ever-changing forms of evil. What is the meaning of this wild scene? what is to be its issue? and what prospect is there of the realization of that which we desire? To such a state of mind as this, and to the wants which it involves, this last part of the teaching of God is addressed, in accordance with that system of progressive doctrine which I have endeavoured to illustrate, wherein each stage of advance ensues in the way of natural sequence from the effect of that which preceded it."

The author next proceeds to point out some particulars in which the Apocalypse gives us clear and satisfying information concerning the church's future. And its instructions on this subject are to be regarded as additions made in the last book of the New Testament, to the doctrines exhibited in its earlier writings. The general character of these additions can be seen without difficulty. All the instructions of the book partake of a character which may be expressed by one word—*consummation*. "The doctrine of the book is a doctrine of consummation." He notes the instruction given on, 1. The cause of the consummation. 2. The history of the consummation. 3. On the coming of the Lord. 4. The victory of the church. 5. The judgment, or overthrow and condemnation of her enemies. 6. The final and complete restoration. The last four—the coming of the Lord, the victory, the judgment, and the restoration, are constituent parts of the consummation.

The most important instructions given in the last book, bear on the final restoration. This itself is by preëminence the consummation. "I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the

first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." Here at the last step, we have a definite and satisfactory completion of the former doctrine of the future. There is to be a perfect humanity; not only perfect individually but perfect in society. There is to be a city of God. The Holy City! New Jerusalem! This society or city is presented "not as a mere name for the congregation of individuals, but as having a being, and life of its own, in which the Lord finds his satisfaction and man his perfection. . . In its appearance the revealed course of redemption culminates, and the history of man is closed; and thus the last chapters of the Bible declare the unity of the whole book, by completing the design which has been developed in its pages, and disclosing the result to which all preceding steps have tended. . . The perfect society is to be founded on men's relations to God, and is to be compacted by their relations to each other." And in those who receive Christ Jesus the Lord, are already "established those relations with God in Christ, which shall hereafter glorify the community of the saints." Men's relations to each other will also be reconstituted, and thus their happiness and perfection will be secured in that city, where the people shall be all righteous, and where love shall never fail. "Its fabric and scenery are described in symbolic language, glowing with all precious and glorious things, nor do we desire an interpreter who will tell us what the symbols severally represent, in the future details of the glorified society. Perhaps such an effect would impair, rather than enhance the effect of the vision, which now kindles the imagination of expectant faith by the entire assemblage of its glories. I only dwell upon the fact that it is *a city* which stands before us as the final home of mankind. If we think only of our individual portion, we miss the completeness of Scripture in its completeness for the provisions of man."

As already stated, the coming of our Lord, the church's victory, and the judgment of her enemies, are regarded and treated by our author as forming the three other constituent parts of the consummation in regard to which the Apocalypse instructs us. It likewise informs us of the cause, and the his-

tory of the consummation. But we have no space left for presenting to our readers his remarks on these points. As we have omitted so much belonging to the preceding lectures, we had hoped to be able to give more of the substance of the concluding one, but we console ourselves with the hope that our article may lead some to have recourse to Mr. Bernard's book. And we think that the impression will be deepened on their minds that the New Testament is a unit, and that their views will be in perfect accord with those which he expresses in his closing paragraph: "When it is felt that these narratives, letters, and visions do in fact fulfil the several functions, and sustain the mutual relations, which would belong to the parts of one design, coalescing into a doctrinal scheme, which is orderly, progressive, and complete, then is the mind of the reader in conscious contact with the mind of God; then the superficial diversity of the parts is lost in the essential unity of the whole: the many writings have become one Book; the many writers have become one Author."

Art. III.—*Christian Work in Egypt.*

Egypt is the Phœnix of history. Its origin lies in the hoariest regions of antiquity, and though often crushed down to the grave it has always to a certain extent risen upon its dead self to higher and better things. And now, while other kingdoms and empires, born long after its attainment to manhood, have sunk into oblivion or been actually blotted out of existence, Egypt still occupies a prominent place in the eyes of the world. True, there has been an abundant fulfilment of the prophetic denunciation: "Egypt shall be the basest of kingdoms, neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations,"—but the fulfilment of prophecy has only tended to add to the individuality of its history. For nearly two and a half millenniums it has been under the sway of foreign powers. The Persian, the Greek, the Roman, the Turk, have in turn lorded it over its people, but notwithstanding all, Egypt still lives; and though there be

little hope of her restoration to independence, but on the contrary almost a certainty of the opposite, there are yet signs within her borders of reviving vitality and renewed vigour. For half a century now, the work of regeneration has been going on, always slowly, often sternly, and with much severity, —latterly somewhat more rapidly and with increasing hopefulness. The Christian missionary has taken his place side by side with the political reformer, and there is much in the history of his labour, not excepting even the collisions with the civil power and opposing sectaries, and in the present state of the country to cheer the heart and stimulate the efforts of the Christian and the philanthropist. The story is indeed not all brightness. Some parts of it are sad and dismal enough, but even these have their interest and the brighter tints of other portions appear all the more pleasing from their shade.

The interest of America in the revival of the East in general, and of Egypt in particular, must require little demonstration. Politically there may be little prospect and just as little desire of acquiring new dominion there, and yet far more unlikely things have happened than that a great neutral power should come in to hold the balance between two such rivals as England and France, neither of whom will suffer the other to gain or hold possession. There are however higher and more disinterested grounds on which the claims of Egypt to American sympathy and help may be based. To her the New World in common with the rest of Christendom, owes some of the brightest names in the history of the church, and some of the most splendid acquisitions in the domain of religious truth; and now that the light of those other days has so deplorably faded in the East, it is little more than duty that the far West should aid in its re-illumination. And that America is neither blind to, nor forgetful of her duty, is abundantly shown by the history of missions. The labours of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in Turkey and Syria, would of themselves vindicate her from any charge of ingratitude or want of interest; and the less pretentious but no less energetic efforts of the United Presbyterian Church prove that the claims of Egypt have neither been baseless nor made in vain. America has already given of her sons to the work of Egyptian regen-

eration, and yearly gives thirty thousand dollars of her money. But the time seems to have come when she must give more or be contented to take a second place in the field—not more men, except to replace the disabled and retiring, nor, at least much more money, but greater interest and more lively sympathy as a nation. An American church is in possession of the field, and so long as it does its work with due vigour and energy it will be left by other churches with all the advantages which unity of organization, sympathy, and training afford. But the history of 1867, and the attempt which it witnessed on the part of the Egyptian government and a hostile church to damage, and indeed, if possible, to exterminate the mission-work, fully proves that if the work is to be carried on with anything like the activity and to anything like the extent, which the exigencies of the field demand, the missionary must be backed with the influence of the people by whom he is sent. There can be no doubt that the life of the mission enterprize in Egypt was saved last year by the timely and energetic interference of Her Britannic Majesty's consular representative; why should the name of America not be as potent in the cause of truth and right as that of Great Britain? *Verbum sapientibus satis.*

Interest to be powerful must be intelligent; and it is the desire of the writer, so far as in him lies, to stir up new interest or sustain that already awakened in the cause of Egyptian civilization, by laying before American readers some account of the condition and character of the people, with a short narrative of the Christian work now being carried on for their improvement. Made up almost, if not wholly, from personal observation and intercourse with the people, the statements made are believed to be accurate, and the views expressed warranted by facts; and although addressed specially to those interested in the cause of missions abroad, there are many others to whom the information advanced may not be without advantage. The number of travellers who visit Egypt from the far West is increasing every year, and whether excusably or not, a great proportion of them know next to nothing either about the country or its people, and many are not even aware that an American church is there represented. Before proceeding however to the people, it may be that a pre-

liminary sketch of the extent and nature of the country will not be uninteresting in itself, while it may help to the formation of a fuller and juster realization of the character of its inhabitants. This then will be the first subject of the present article.

The geographical situation and limits of Egypt are known to every schoolboy, and most readers are acquainted with the general character of the country; but in the matter of details there exists not a little vagueness and confusion, while with regard to the last additions to the pashalic few books on geography give much information. It may not be without its use, therefore, to remind the reader, generally, that Egypt proper extends from the Mediterranean Sea, its northern boundary, to the first cataract on the Nile, at Asswan, the ancient Syene, or in round numbers from N. lat. 31° to 26°, a distance of about 800 miles, while if regard be had to the territory actually under Egyptian rule the southern limit must be looked for away down in the Soudan, in the centre of the continent. The actual boundaries on the east are the Isthmus of Suez and the Red Sea, and on the west the Lybian deserts, but the real country is of much more limited width than these confines would represent. The Delta at the seashore, say from Alexandria to the Gulf of Pelusium, where the Suez Canal is to run into the sea, is a distance of about 130 miles, while from the sea to the bifurcation of the river is a length of about 90 miles, and the area of the triangle thus formed gives an approximate idea of the cultivable surface in this part of the country. South of the Delta, however, a wonderful change takes place. A range of hills rising to a height of over 400 feet above the sea level, and called, for sake of distinction, "The Arabian range," makes its appearance behind Cairo, and thence stretches away southwards on the east side of the Nile. A short distance to the south, the Lybian hills appear on the west side of the river, and from this point these two ranges run almost parallel through the whole length of the land, varying only in their height and their distances from the river, rising in some places to an altitude of some 1500 feet, and coming down again to little more than 100 feet, running sometimes to the water's edge and anon stretching away back till the valley

is left a width of several miles. Seldom do the two ranges approach the river at the same point, although at a place called Silsilis, south of Thebes, their appearance is compared by Dean Stanley to the Drachenfels and Rolandsdeck on the Rhine, the width from mountain to mountain being only a few hundred feet. In Nubia and southward the uniformity in their relative positions ceases, and now the hills run not in contiguous chains, but east and west, and north and south.

In the valley thus formed, and protected by these natural barriers from the all-destructive sands of the desert beyond, runs the Nile, one of the most wonderful water-courses on the earth's surface. From even prehistoric times its sources were the subject of continual conjecture and endless search, and it is only in our own day that they have been assigned a local habitation and a name, and that the proverb—"*Caput Nili quærere*"—to seek the head of the Nile, has ceased to be a designation of fruitless undertakings. Rising in the centre of the continent, it first reaches Egyptian territory at Kordofan, the capital of the Egyptian Soudan, and from this point till it reaches the sea, the same body of water rushes onward unincreased by any tributary, branchless like the trunk of one of its own palms, and even casting a less volume of water into the sea than it brings into the country, forming, in the words of Humboldt, "a unique example in the hydrographic history of the globe."

Another of the peculiarities of the river is its annual rise and fall, at periods which come round with almost the rigid precision of law. As regularly as the month of June comes round, the volume of water begins to increase and its colour to change,—a process which goes on with varying degrees of regularity—sometimes with exceeding rapidity, at other times slowly and gradually—till it reaches its maximum at the end of September or beginning of October. Its width at Boolak, the port of Cairo, is said to be nearly two and a half English miles, and in some parts of Southern Nubia it is considerably wider. Between these two points are all possible widths, down to a few hundred feet, the depth, of course, varying in a corresponding ratio; and the volume of water poured into the sea was calculated by the engineers of the French commission to

have been 750,000 million cubic metres in a day. Its velocity is almost surprisingly slow, reminding one too, that still waters run deep. Its colour continually suggests the yellow Tiber of the Latins much more than usual descriptions, which talk of the *red* waters of the Nile, would lead one to expect. From October the fall begins, and for a few weeks goes on with almost perceptible rapidity, while thereafter the decrease is little noticeable except at considerable intervals. The lowest level is not reached till April or May, at which time the southern part of the river has already begun to swell.

It is to this phenomenon doubtless, that the river owes its Homeric epithet—*διϊπετέος*, or its Arabic designation by the phrase—"the water sent by God." Search as men might the fountains of the flood could not be found; no rain fell in the country by which its waters might be increased, and therefore the only course left for a religious people was to attribute it as a gift directly to Divine beneficence. Attempts were indeed made by Greek travellers to explain it by natural causes, but the explanations were most of them incomparably more absurd, and less destitute of truth. One writer, for example, referred the increased volume of water in the summer months to the blowing of the Etesian winds, which coming from the north prevented the river from emptying itself into the sea—damming it in fact; while Herodotus himself authoritatively, and as if putting the matter beyond all dispute, declares that "the whole secret in the fewest possible words" is that "during the winter the sun is driven out of his usual course by the storms and removes to the upper parts of Libya!" In its absence it draws its moisture equally from all rivers, and then the Nile runs at its normal height, in flood, where as upon his solar majesty's return, and on account of his much greater proximity, much heavier contributions are levied upon the river of Egypt, and thus its waters are abnormally reduced! One or two ancient writers are mentioned as having hit upon the true cause, and assigned the annual rise to the tropical rains of the south. These begin to fall in the lower latitudes in March or the beginning of April, and thus early do the southern branches of the river give indications of the increase, which

is kept up by still more southerly rains which are later in falling.

But even the peculiarity of this annual rise would not be half so noticeable were it not for the life which the swollen waters bring with them. Their moisture serves to vivify what would otherwise be a barren desert; and even this is not all, for the water brings with it the very soil which it moistens. The priests used to say in the time of Herodotus that the Delta was the gift of the river, but they might have applied the remark with even greater truth to the whole country. From Khartoom to the Mediterranean, a virgin soil of most fertile properties is deposited from year to year—the contribution of Abyssinia to the life of Egypt. The White Nile which comes from the centre of the continent is a clear water, hence its name—and has none of the fertilizing elements of the Egyptian river; while the Blue Nile which comes through Abyssinia holds the same black alluvium in suspension. The following analysis of the soil, though by no means new, may not be without its interest to some readers, and will explain several of the features of Egyptian fertility. There is in every hundred parts 11 of water, 48 of alumen, 18 carbonate of lime, 9 carbon, 6 oxide of iron, and 4 parts each of silica and carbonate of magnesia, to which elements may plainly be traced its clayey tenacious quality when moist, its great friability when dried, and above all its extreme fertility. Herodotus describes the soil as black and crumbly, and the ancient name of the country, Misr—in the Hebrew Misrayim, the two Misrs—is derived from the same quality of blackness.

But how is this soil distributed over the land? By the river overflowing its banks and deluging the adjacent fields. Such, at least, would be the answer of nine-tenths of ordinarily informed people in this country,—but there could scarcely be a greater delusion. Swollen immensely, though it be, the river follows the peaceful tenor of its way, and so much is the overflowing an exception—for it sometimes does occur—that when it does happen, it is in fact a national calamity. Whole villages are swept away, cattle are drowned in large numbers, and human lives are not unfrequently lost. It is indeed true, that every year almost the whole cultivable land is flooded

with water, in some districts to the depth of several feet, but this is entirely by artificial means and by contrivances which are entirely under control—contrivances, the preservation and general supervision of which forms one of the most important duties of the provincial governors. The whole land is cut up with canals, some of them of great size, one commencing as high up as Girgeh, and running away north parallel to the river, till it empties itself in the Lake Mareotis in the Delta—a distance of several hundred miles. From these large arteries, outlets are made into the plains where practicable, or into smaller canals where that is more expedient, the fields in the latter case being irrigated by means of the shadoof, a bucket suspended from a long lever weighted at its short end by an immense lump of clay, by which one man is able to raise several gallons per minute a height of seven or eight feet, or the sakkiah, an endless rope hung with earthenware jars raised and lowered by a wheel turned by oxen or camels. These machines are of the rudest possible construction, the work of the fellaheen themselves, and correspond exactly to those employed three thousand years ago, as represented in the pictures of the tombs. They are used not in the heart of the country alone, but the fields immediately adjacent to the river are irrigated by their means, and there is perhaps nothing strikes the attention of the traveller more than the numerous shadoofs which line the banks, and in low Nile rise one above the other to as many as four and five tiers, the lowest raising the water into a pool, the next into a second pool, and so on till the life-giving liquid flows into the prepared channels in the fields above. They seem a hearty set, the workers of these machines, and it certainly requires all the enlivening influence of their endless songs to counteract the painful effect produced upon the spectator's mind by the dreadful monotony of the labour, and the want of civilization which rightly or wrongly their almost primitive nakedness suggests, or to mollify his nerves under the everlasting creaking of the oilless wheels. Dean Stanley says, the people use so much oil upon their skins that they have none left for their sakkiahs—an explanation which, had Artemus Ward made it, would surely have been followed by—"that's a goak."

The formation of the canals and the whole system of irrigation is considerably simplified by the formation of the valley of the Nile. Like the Mississippi, and other great water basins, the bed of the river is the lowest part of the valley, but the ground, generally speaking, falls by a gradual declination from the banks of the river backwards, towards the mountains.

Nature has in fact done almost everything for Egypt. It has raised mighty barriers for keeping out the sands of the deserts, it has provided a river which yields a soil and the water to moisten it, and it has so placed the river that the distribution of its precious gifts may be the easiest possible. And there is little left for man to do, save to cast in the seed and cut down the crops. In some cases too, nothing more of agricultural labour is expended, and it is no uncommon sight to see the sower following the retiring flood, casting his bread beside the waters. Generally speaking, however, considerable care is given to ploughing and otherwise preparing the soil, and the greater labour is rewarded by a better, though perhaps a somewhat later crop.

Allusion has been made more than once to the fertility of the soil. To the stranger it is simply astounding. To walk or ride out to-day along an embankment, on both sides of which water to the depth of some feet stretches over the fields, and to find on returning three or four weeks afterwards, that not only is a way through the fields possible, but that it is skirted by growing crops in some instances a foot or eighteen inches high, is enough to suggest with some force that "the thousand and one nights" are yet running. The Muslim general wrote no more than the truth when he told his chief that the land which his arms had just subjugated "presented in succession the appearance of an arid and sandy desert, of a liquid and silvery plain, a marsh covered with a black and cracking alluvium, a green and undulating prairie, a parterre adorned with flowers the most varied, and finally a vast field covered with yellowing crops. Ever blessed be the name of the Creator of so many wonders." The picture may be left to the reader's imagination, with the mention of the additional fact, that in those lands which can be regularly watered when occasion demands, three successive

crops can be taken in one year. Well may we say Amen to the Muslim's exclamation.

The principal crops are wheat, doorah—a coarse grain preferred by the natives to wheat, and forming their great means of subsistence,—barley, beans, rice, and lentiles—same as that of which Jacob sod his pottage which he sold to Esau, and which is largely used by all classes, European no less than native, somewhat resembling in appearance the split peas of our own markets. Sugar is cultivated to a considerable extent and manufactured in the country. Cotton was introduced as early as 1821 and has always received attention since. During the years of the American war it was raised wherever the land gave the smallest promise of bearing it, and large fortunes were made and lost in the speculations to which its commerce gave rise. Now it is not nearly so extensively grown, although it still holds a prominent place in the export trade of the country. There are yet other products, but these are the most important.

In regard to climate Egypt is as highly favoured as she is in the respects which have just been mentioned. For seven months, from April to October, the sun reigns supreme, for the remainder of the year the temperature is exceedingly agreeable, and in some parts of the country perfectly exquisite to western feelings. The maximum heat at the sea-board averages about 80° Fah., in Upper Egypt, as at Osiout, the average maximum is 104°, at Luxor it is yet higher, but all these figures are very much increased during the prevalence of the hot winds from the south and south-west. It is these last indeed which are so trying to foreign residents and they are even felt by the natives themselves. In the Delta the atmosphere is all the year round more or less impregnated with moisture, and for three months rain falls in very great abundance, pouring down in torrents for several days together.

In Cairo the air is palpably drier, and showers are usually few and far between; while in the Upper country rain is almost wholly unknown, many of the people scarcely knowing the meaning of the word. Indeed could perfect happiness be extracted from the weather, winter in the Sa'eed, as Upper

Egypt is called, *i. e.*, "the happy land"—would be as near an approximation to Paradise as need be desired on earth. The sun is always there, but his dreadful rigour is lessened by his distance and modified by silvery clouds, and the breezes which come from the north—the famous Etesian winds which the philosopher imagined had such potent effect on the river—are full of vitality and vigor.

With regard to Nubia and the Soudan, it may be said that while there are large districts of pure desert land, yet generally speaking the ground is fertile and productive. The heat is there however excessive, and the exhalations during the rainy season are surcharged with sickness and fevers, so that residence in this region must always be trying upon foreigners. Still men have spent their long periods of active service and returned to their homes in the lower country to die in a good old age.

Several other points yet suggest themselves for notice, but sufficient has been said to show the immense capabilities of the country, and at the same time to give some insight into the character of its inhabitants. With such a soil and such a climate Egypt might become in itself—and not by virtue of its relative position merely—one of the most important countries of the world. Formerly it used to help feed both Greece and Rome, and it might still perform the same service to their successors, and with the paucity of wants felt by the people the country might soon become as wealthy as it is productive. At the same time such a country could not be a world-power, except, as it actually was, in the infancy of history. At the first it took the lead of all other nations, and rose to an eminence which now fills with wonder and some degree of admiration; but so soon as the mountainous regions and rougher temperature of the north had exerted their influences upon branches of the human family, the supremacy of Egypt ceased, and it became what it must ever remain, the tributary of a foreign power. The monotony of such plains and such weather, the relaxing influence of such a climate, the exuberance of nature leaving little to develope the resources of the cultivator, can never produce the vigour and energy necessary for the maintenance of national freedom, while, if oppression

be superadded, the people once down might be kept down for ever.

While, however, it may not be possible in the nature of things, or in the state of political relations, that Egypt should again be in itself one of the powers in the world, there is nothing either in reason or nature why the people should be allowed to sink, or having sunk, should be left in the degradation of semi-babarism. That the country has been very low and that there is yet great room for the elevating influences of education and Christianity, the succeeding sketches of the people will show, while the restrictions and disadvantages under which the work of regeneration still labours, will appear as the narrative proceeds. As it is, there is much reason for gratitude and ground for exertion in the fact that the field is as open as it is, and that religious liberty is at least proclaimed from the Mediterranean to Kordofan, and only a very slight touch of the talisman of hope is necessary to picture the day, surely not far distant, when this freedom shall have become a reality, when the curses and excommunications of irate hierarchs, and the machinations of a government professedly friendly, but inimical at heart, will be equally powerless—when, notwithstanding all opposition, even "princes shall come out of Egypt, and Ethiopia shall stretch out her hands to God."

Greek writers represent the population of Egypt at seven or eight millions, while the Arabic historians declare with characteristic exaggeration, that at the time of the Moslem conquest there were at least twenty million inhabitants in the country. In 1845 Mr. Lane writes the total at about two and a half millions, and his reputation for conscientiousness and accuracy leaves little ground to question the truth of his estimate. At the same time the numbers first mentioned are within the capabilities of the country, and there are many things in the national history and in existing antiquities which plainly indicate that in very early times the land was very thickly peopled, while on the other hand there are not wanting causes abundantly sufficient to explain the decrease which must have since taken place. Centuries of oppression and misrule during which the inhabitants existed in a state of serfdom, treated by their masters as so many machines for

the produce of food and the providing of money, machines too which were left to the rough usage of irresponsible servants; and some conception may be formed from scenes in the present century of comparative enlightenment, of what must have been the condition of the people before European opinion and civilization had begun to exert any influence in its government. Take for instance the matter of taxation. Imports were entirely arbitrary, regulated only by the wants of the viceroy. When money was required, the amounts were allocated in the first instance by the government to the provinces, then by the provincial governors to the towns and villages, and finally the individual contributions were fixed by the sheyks or head-men. It need hardly be said that in each subdivision, considerable additions were made to the original sum, so that when the viceroy asked and received say 10,000 dollars, the country actually contributed perhaps tenfold that sum. And the injustice of the actual collection was nothing less. The sheykh had to answer for the village of which he was head,—the village was responsible for its component individuals. If a man could not, or would not pay, his share simply fell on others, and if the resources of the many were exhausted so much the worse for the few. In this way the villagers, their means drained and their patience exhausted, the subjects of daily increasing threats, and the victims of abuse and ill treatment from functionaries of every order, successively decamped and sought in the deserts and the mountains, a place of subsistence in quietness, if not in comfort or plenty, till at length the sheykh was left at the head of a motley collection of infirm and weak women and children. An order for more money brought the climax, in which the sheykh made short work of his responsibility and avoided disgrace and punishment—otherwise inevitable—by a moonlight flitting! Now if all this—and much worse—happened in the time of Muhammed Ali, what scenes of depopulation must have occurred under the reckless and self-aggrandizing domination of the Mamlooks and their predecessors? And that oppression and misrule have had to do with the decrease of the population is further evident from the fact that in recent years, when an approach to system has been made in the government, and civilization

has begun to revive, the number of inhabitants has palpably increased. In the census taken in 1862, under the auspices of the governmental sanitary commissioners, a total of 4,306,691 was reached, while according to some authorities there is reason to believe a further increase has since been made.

As to the ethnology of the people a great deal of interesting matter might be written, and there is considerable opportunity for the speculation that profiteth not. That they were originally of the same branch of the Noetic family which spread itself to the northwest is suggested by the eminence attained by the ancient nation, and by the strong resemblance to the Caucasian type to be traced in many of the present inhabitants, although there have been investigators who believed that they had found many features of likeness to the negro race, while others again have assigned to them a Chinese origin. Be this as it may, the Egyptian seems at an early period to have attained considerable individuality, and notwithstanding the extensive immigration of which the land has been the scene, he has maintained it with very little modification till the present day, so that it was no mere freak of imagination which suggested the remark, that to look at some of the fellaheen, or peasantry of Upper Egypt, one would suppose that the figures of its monuments had become detached from the walls and descended into the fields, or that the mummies of three thousand years had been unveiled and revivified for the special edification of modern ethnologists! The immigration has been extensive, but it has also been gradual; and even after the establishment of Islam, when Arabians in large numbers sought in the land of the Ibis a wealth which their native country could little yield, the original inhabitants always predominated, and it would almost seem as if the new-comers, instead of producing any change upon the existing stock, had themselves yielded to the influences of country and climate, and gradually become moulded after the primal type. Still it is true, that in Egypt one may find specimens of almost every type of feature, from the Negro to the Caucasian, the Habishy to the European —a walk in the streets of Alexandria or simply through the Moosky, the Broadway of Cairo, being sufficient to introduce

the traveller who has eyes to see, to a greater variety of human feature than is possible to be had in any other city of the world.

There is one thing however in which the vast majority of the inhabitants agree, viz., their religion, and this binds them together with bands stronger even than those of blood itself. With the exception of 300,000 who profess the Christian name, the whole population are followers of Mohammed. *Salām aleikum* is the password to native society, and though peculiarities of speech or of dress may raise suspicions, or draw forth the sarcastic response—*allikum aslām*, (upon you be a stone)—instead of the orthodox reply which it closely enough resembles, *aleikum essalām*, (peace to you), yet the further enunciation of the simple but talismanic symbol of the faith—"There is no deity but God, and Mohammed is the apostle of God," introduces the speaker to a mighty circle, practically irrefragable, of which the earthly centre is the Sultan, but which actually radiates from God himself.

For the religion of the Muslim is that of a theocracy. The Sultan is the head of the state and *Pontifex maximus* as well, the successor of the prophet, the vicar of God. The laws of society are the laws of the church—both drawn from the Koran and the traditions of the fathers—and the officers of the law are ecclesiastical authorities. There may be wazeers, and wakeels, ministers of state, and provincial governors, *et hoc genus omne*, but all from the lowest to the highest are amenable to the ulema, the wise men, learned in the law,—"the high priests, scribes, and elders." "The law and the prophet" is the standard to which every appeal must be made, although there is sufficient pliability and contradiction in both, and abundant ingenuity on the part of the interpreters to find a vindication for almost any possible course of action, or justification of almost any crime.

This theocratic character of the government may go some way in explaining the patience and endurance of the people under oppressions which in any other land would inevitably have set in full blaze the flames of universal rebellion. Here the rebel against the Sultan raises his hand against the God of whom he is the substitute on earth; so that it takes either

an infidel or a lunatic to show any resistance—the one by setting religion aside altogether, the other by introducing the superseding influence of a new revelation. The great part of Muhammed Ali's life was spent in open antagonism to the Porte, and he was in his own day, as he is still, regarded and even spoken of as an unbeliever; while the most recent attempt at rebellion in Egypt—which occurred in March, 1865, in the province of Osiout—was led by a man whose madness, real or pretended, commended him to his followers, of whom he gathered some two thousand, as a divinely commissioned and specially endowed liberator of his country. The reader is of course aware that lunacy is regarded in the East as a sign of a special relation to and communion with the Deity.

But the one doctrine, which of all other abstract principles has exerted the most depressing influence on the votaries of Islam, and still presents the greatest obstacle in the way of their elevation, is the all-prevailing one of Fate. One of the most striking instances of the pernicious influence of half-truths, this doctrine of Predestination—true in itself—has crushed out of the people all vigour or energy, not certainly by its truth, but by the undue attention which it has received to the exclusion of its other and complementary half, which teaches, with equally unmistakable force, the responsibility of man. When the belief that "to flee the evils which God sends is to pretend to immortality," has become engrained in the life of a nation, its activity in social emergencies or under political grievances is simply nullified, and the pestilence is allowed to run its rapid course with the same listless apathy, and exclamations of "God has so willed it,"—"It is the will of God"—with which a tyranny worse than slavery is endured for generations. At the same time it is gratifying to be able to state, that although the "stupid immobility" which is the legitimate fruit of fatalism, is still everywhere observable in Egypt, yet the Western influences of the last half century have not been without their effect, and the experience of the last visit of cholera in 1865, and the practice of universal vaccination—not to mention other instances—have indicated a growing tendency to give some weight to the dictates of human wisdom.

But, alas for human wisdom with the present system of training and education. Knowledge of a kind has come to large numbers of the Muslim community, but wisdom lingers long. And it cannot in the nature of things be otherwise. With few exceptions every child in the towns and large villages is sent to school, but his education is exclusively confined to instruction in reading and writing, and in the majority of instances the same book in which he receives his first lessons serves him for life. The Koran is the only text-book, and the highest aim of a teacher is to turn out the greatest possible number of boys who can repeat from memory the largest portion of its contents. If the desire for reading remains till years of maturity, the only materials for its satisfaction are romances, of one of the best of which, the Anglified "Arabian Nights' Entertainments," gives some idea, legends of saints and prophets of the most absurdly marvellous and mythical character, or if he be yet more scholarly, commentaries on the Koran, and books of Mohammedan law. In the event of higher education being desiderated, the boy is transferred from the fakee, or elementary teacher, directly to some higher college, of which the chief for almost all the East is the Mosque el Azhar in Cairo—an institution attended by several thousand students, drawn not from Egypt alone, but from India, Syria, Turkey, and all parts of Africa. Here the student continues two or three years at least, or it may be as many as six or seven, his studies during the whole period being made to circle round the one essential subject—"The Science of the Unity"—the Godhead and its attributes, although most of the attention is devoted to the intricacies—in the hands of its teachers perfectly labyrinthine—of the Arabic grammar, and at length he comes forth a full-fledged Sheykh, it may be thoroughly versed in all the mysteries of etymology and syntax, *au fait* in the order and details of religious duties and ceremonies, accomplished in all the sayings of the prophet and the interpretations of his successors, but withal really ignorant, narrow-minded, self-satisfied, in his every thought, word, and deed, a veritable Pharisee.

In some such way as this it comes about that the inhabitants of the towns—those who have received more or less edu-

cation—are as a rule more superstitious and bigotted than the peasantry of the country districts, whose instruction has been confined to a few words, and the ordinary attitudes, of prayer. Among the former all the exclusiveness of the religion, all the enmity which it engenders towards those outside its pale, all the superstitions which its legendary tales produce, have their full influence, and it is not a surprising thing at the present day to hear the protestation of a passing bigot against the liberality of his neighbour, who returns the salutation of, and enters into conversation with a Christian acquaintance, in the words—"God will diminish by a third the years of him who stands with a Christian." Lying and deceit are universal characteristics countenanced and even in some cases inculcated by the Koran itself, and abundantly fostered by the general system of trading; openness of character and conduct is as rare as water in the neighbouring deserts.

Of the fellah, on the other hand, the most striking characteristic is his animality. From early youth engaged in the fields from morning till night, he developes a robust and hardy frame, upon which the rigors of a summer sun, or the severities of winter cold are equally ineffectual. His wants are amazingly few, his food mainly consisting of coarse bread, spiced with raw onions; his dress a simple rough loose shirt of homespun wool, his bed the ground, and pillow anything that answers, or it may be nothing at all. He has a house, limited in accommodation, and rough in construction, its walls made of sun-dried bricks and roof of reeds—but it is principally used by the women, or by himself as a sleeping apartment during winter, the summer nights being spent on the roof or on the street. He has a wife, but like himself she is a labourer, and if there be children their assistance is made available at the earliest possible moment. He is ignorant to a degree, his knowledge of the present being limited to the narrow sphere of his existence, and his ideas of the future being of the vaguest kind, and indeed seldom rising to the surface. If he have plenty of food he is cheerful, and the field or the shadoof continually resounds with his song. Roused by hunger he will commit any outrage, even murder itself,—and at any time honesty is little to be expected among those who have been so persistently

plundered. He is superstitious, but his beliefs are those born of ignorance, not of false education; he may be fanatical when roused by extraneous influences, but generally he is polite and tractable. In short, his stomach is the guiding power in his relations with his fellows, just as it is in the first instance the controller of his own comfort and happiness.

There is one important respect in which the peasantry have the advantage over their fellow-countrymen of the towns. With them the state of social morality is much higher. They are too poor to be intemperate, and breaches of the seventh commandment are almost unknown. The crimes that are found are more those inspired by sudden passion or suggested by the pressure of want. In the towns, on the other hand, there is immensely more immorality than the casual visitor would suppose. Strong drink is prohibited by religious law, and in the cafes to which the men betake themselves immediately after supper—that is, shortly after sunset—only coffee and tobacco are supplied, yet there are many who drink spirituous liquors, and perhaps more who indulge in smoking a kind of hemp, very similar in its effects to opium. Prostitution is not now, as it used to be, a legally authorized profession, but it is scarcely the less practised, while the restraint which has been put on it has served to increase the almost unmentionable crime of sodomy. These vices to be sure are more characteristic of the large towns of Alexandria and Cairo, and much of the responsibility for their extensive prevalence there lies at the door of Europeans, but they are also found in towns far removed from these centres. And it is not surprising that it should be so. Climate is powerful in developing the lower part of the nature, the religion instead of restraining, fosters sensuality both by example and practice, the lascivious character of much of the popular literature acts as fuel to the tinder, while the utter want of family life leaves a man an open and easy prey to influences in themselves so sufficiently powerful.

And this leads to one of the most saddening and painful features in eastern life—the state of the female sex. It has often been dwelt upon and its details are known to most readers, so that it need not here detain us. Yet the remark

demands insertion, that the thought of two million human beings growing up from year to year, in a state worse than slavery, regarded as inferior beings, almost soulless, used as hewers of wood and drawers of water, or cooped up in a hareem, guarded and watched with lynx-eyed jealousy, ought to be one of the most solemn and powerful influences in stirring up the sympathies of more favoured nations, and nerving the arms of those who have set themselves to the work of human regeneration. Comparatively little has yet been done for the women of Egypt, and so long as this is so—so long as they are left uncared for, the political liberation of the country, or its reconversion to Christianity will be equally hopeless. For the poet was inspired by truth when he wrote,

> **Can man be free if woman be a slave?**
> **Chain one who lives, and breathes this boundless air**
> **To the corruption of a closed grave!**
> **Can they whose mates are beasts, condemned to bear**
> **Scorn, heavier than toil or anguish, dare**
> **To trample their oppressors?**

And the theory is confirmed by the experience of every missionary, that the strongest enemies to a man's embracing the religion of Christ have over and over again been found to be the women of his family or family connections—a remark which is true even of the Copts, to whom the adoption of Protestantism is by no means the vital thing which the reception of Christianity is to the Muslim.

With all that has been said it is yet true that the Muslims are a decidedly religious people—that is, they are most faithful in the discharge of the devotions prescribed by their religion. To be sure these are of a kind to suit all parties—numerous and extensive enough to please the devotee, and at the same time loose enough to suit the libertine. To attain to the highest places in Paradise is motive sufficient with many to give even an earnestness to their performance of all the prescriptions of the prophet and his successors in authority. While on the other hand the commission of a heinous sin, or even great crime, is made up by a more than usually faithful attention to the times of prayer. An alms covers a multitude of sins, and a pilgrimage to Mecca is an almost certain passport to heaven. It is said that Muslims are not

idolaters, and certainly Mohammed himself was an Iconoclast, yet the adoration now paid to their saints lays his followers of the present day almost as much under the charge as the church of Rome, while the indulgences of Popery find considerable correspondence in the Muslim practice referred to.

The reader will now be able to form some estimate of the influences operating upon the large mass of the inhabitants of this land, and to represent to himself the character which these influences combine to produce. The country and climate predispose them to inactivity, and make them contented with a dreary monotony, fatalism extracts any little vigour which ambition or oppression might generate, and reconciles them to the most unhappy conditions; religion fosters deceit, sensuality, and superstition, and permits license by the abundance of self-justifying means which it affords; the relations of the sexes degrade and enslave, and even education itself heightens the power of these influences in proportion to the extent to which it is carried. There is work here surely for those who

> Struggle to relume
> The lamp of Hope o'er man's bewildered lot—

a work truly Herculean, yea, which seems at times almost hopeless. The appearance of the Son of God himself, the mighty works which he wrought, and the mightier words which he spake, and the labours of his apostles, miraculously endowed though they were, did not succeed in entirely breaking down the Jewish theocracy, and the nineteenth century of the history of Christianity still finds it in existence, its members scattered through the nations it is true, but yet many in number and strong in their traditions, clinging to the hope of restoration, and to the appearance of the Messiah, who they will not be persuaded has come. And thus were it not for the promises of God, and the consciousness of his Almighty power, the declarations of reason on the subject of Muslim evangelization would almost extinguish hope itself. For after all, the theocratic element is the secret of their inaccessibility.

But can nothing good be said of this people, and is it not true that much improvement has of late years taken place in their condition and character? Happily, both questions can

be answered in the affirmative. With all their faults the people are industrious and steady in application; they are easily impressed, and though simple in character, are yet when roused capable of great exertion and wondrous endurance. Their worse defects are those of corrupt human nature, not restrained, but rather developed, by a false religion. And their condition has considerably improved. In towns they are not subjected to the oppressions which characterized former dynasties, while in the country very important reforms have been wrought, even since the days of Muhammed Ali. The relation of the cultivators to the land has been altered from a state of virtual serfdom, in which the whole produce, save the little necessary for their subsistence, was exacted by the government, to a condition of quasi-proprietorship in which every farmer has his own piece of land, upon which he pays at regular intervals a stipulated tax, varying in amount according to the value of the ground, and is left to make the most he can of its produce. The number of intermediate officers between the head of the government and the people has been reduced, and with the opportunities for its perpetration the amount of undue exaction has not a little diminished. The system of forced labour, according to which the government calls forth the peasantry by tens and hundreds of thousands for the performance of its public works, such as the construction of railways and canals, and which has been the cause of immense suffering and loss of life in past years, no fewer than 12,000 lives having been sacrificed in a space of ten months in making the canal between Alexandria and the Nile, has not indeed been abolished, but is practised with less inhumanity and with more appearance of consideration and equality than before, although it is still a great blot on the administration, and hangs as a perpetual source of terror over the heads of the country people. And here it may not be uninteresting to the reader to hear what the people themselves think of their present condition. In view of the present article, the writer addressed an inquiry on the subject to one of the most intelligent men whom he met in Egypt, a man of the people himself, whose powers of observation are as great as his opportunities have been extensive, and who can speak of an experience of at least forty

years, and the following is a translation of part of his answer. After describing the state of matters in the early years of Muhammed Ali, which have been already sufficiently characterized, he states that towards the close of his reign and during that of his successor, considerable improvement had been introduced, and then proceeds: "And in the time of our lord Sa'eed Pasha, the rest [tranquillity] of the people was increased still more, and also justice and happiness, and the tribute upon Christians was abolished; and improvements increased, and people obtained riches and property, and advanced very much, and the land became quiet and happy. And all [the inhabitants] were on an equality with reference to the public works,* and the result was that the population increased, and men exerted themselves in sowing, and in their livelihood with all their might; and even to the inhabitants of the Benders† and to tradesmen sowing [agriculture] became valued, and there was no distinction among men on account of their religion, and the thoughts of men were continually [engaged] upon their means of livelihood, and there happened to some a little reviving in their religion, on account of the goodness of God, and the rest of conscience, and the comfort and justice.

"Then in the reign of the most noble Khidawey‡—the present viceroy—men were found upon the advancements before mentioned, and continued in that condition about two years, and after that appeared the pens‖ in the demand for the increase of moneys; and the tax upon date-palms was increased upon what it was formerly; and the impost on the lands was increased, and the impost of the poll-tax was increased; and the impost upon oil-mills, and fishing, and salt, and articles sold in the markets, was increased; and the services in making

* Previously the greatest partiality had been shown by the heads of the villages in the selection of the men who should be sent to supply the demands of the government.

† The market towns.

‡ The new title of the viceroy, for which he paid to the Porte an enormous sum. It is a Persian word, and was originally used as a title of Deity, but latterly applied to majesty. On the strength of it, the newspapers speak of H. R. H., and some of the sovereign of Egypt, but the connection of dependence upon the Porte still subsists—indeed the chief difference is the name itself.

‖ *i. e.* The pens of the Scribes were called into requisition.

canals, and embankments, and railroads, and the services at the steam-works of the viceroy, were increased; but with all that the cultivable lands are very much sought after, and though men complain of the multitude of services and demands for money, yet they do not cease to have a comfortable living, and those who are very poor, or in actual want are few. But with regard to the desire for education the children of the farmers are always busy in the employment of their parents, some of them tending the flocks and herds, and some in the service of the sowing; but the people of the Benders desire education in religion and trades."

And the reforms have not been confined to the peasantry and the country districts, but attempts—varying in different reigns in degrees of vigour—but all of them deserving more or less praise—have been made for the last forty years to introduce western arts and even western science. Schools on a very large scale were established by Muhammed Ali, but the main object of their establishment was to provide a supply of educated officers and disciplined men for the army, and thus when the necessity for large forces ceased, by the curtailment of the viceroy's schemes and power in 1827, the schools were allowed almost to die a natural death, and though revived by Sa'eed Pasha, they now exist on a much diminished scale. The institution of hospitals and medical schools, taught by French and Italian professors, was a later work, but has been attended with very considerable success; and although the licentiates in actual practice are looked upon with so much suspicion and dislike as government servants, that the prescription of an English or French layman—little matter who—would be faithfully followed, while the drugs of the government doctor would be given to the dust, yet this feeling must in time disappear as greater accomplishment and experience on the part of the doctors, and increased familiarity on the side of the people give confidence to both. Again, the system of sending young men to France and Britain to be there educated in the science and art of particular professions has been tried for many years, but with very questionable results—the young men returning from the gaiety and dissipation of the French capital, or with English notions of social and home life, being in no good state to

settle down to the old ways of their fathers, while the want of judgment in the selection of the trades to which they were appointed, or the most ordinary consideration in setting a man to the profession for which he had been trained, was of itself sufficient to deprive the system of any good, which, notwithstanding the drawbacks just mentioned, it may have possessed. The process is still going on, but on a much diminished scale. And still another sphere in which the government has yielded to western influence, and shown a desire to improve its subjects, has been the establishment of a printing-press under its own auspices. Books in considerable numbers have been issued in Arabic, Turkish, and Persian, of which the most part has consisted of works of military and medical science, standard classics of Arabic literature, such as "The Thousand and one Nights," large dictionaries of the language, and although there have been a few historical works from original MSS., or as translations from the French, History of Charles XII, Charles V, &c.,—yet whether from the character of the books, their high prices, or the deep-rooted prejudice of the Muslim to anything having even the appearance of Christianity, the products of the press have not found their way to any great extent among the people; and a healthy popular literature which shall take the place of the silly, morbid, licentious, filthy stuff at present current, is yet much desiderated.

All these things, together with the actual contact with Europeans, which has so much increased in these twenty years —although they may not have produced all the fruit which might have been desired, have not been without their influence, as now and again comes out in individual cases. Even ten or twelve years ago conversation with a Christian, other than that involved in actual trading, would have been universally regarded as it was by the bigot mentioned in a previous page; but now there are found sheykhs who not only do not refuse to have intercourse with "Infidels," but will even engage in discussion upon the doctrines of Christianity. During the writer's residence in the country, at least one such instance came under his own observation, in which a sheykh, noted for his controversial proclivities, entered into a discussion on their favourite objection—the doctrine of the Trinity—with one of the Ame-

rican missionaries, and although he fought entirely from the side of logic and reason, and fought too more for the sake of fighting, or perhaps of victory, yet the occasion was notable for the patience and attention with which the large audience, who had gradually assembled, listened to the Christian advocate's earnest and forcible exposition of the aspect in which this mystery comes home to the human heart—"God in Christ reconciling the world to himself." The eyes of not a few have been opened to the absurdity and falsity of their own religion, but rather than receive anything at the hands of Christians, or swayed, it may be, by French reading or French intercourse, they settle down into a Voltairean ridicule of all religion, while others again intellectually convinced, and even to some extent spiritually impressed, are kept within the pale of Islam by the barriers which it presents to their egress, and which their feeble resolution is unable to break down. And the obstacles, political and social, are really formidable. To become a Christian is to put off the allegiance of the Sultan and the Prophet, and death is the only punishment for such treason. Much has indeed been said in these days of the liberality of the modern Turkish rulers; His Majesty the Sultan is quoted as having declared his intention of protecting not only Christians, but even Christianity; and the famous *Hátti Hammayún* has often been instanced in proof of the sincerity of these and such professions. In point of fact, however, little change has taken place. The firman so much talked of, brings no increase of freedom to the Muslim—its object being only to give the protection of law to Christians, or to those who being already Christians turn from one sect to another; and the readiness with which the Egyptian government lent its countenance and aid last year to the persecuting measures of the Coptic Patriarch, is plain enough evidence that the old aversion to Christianity is unchanged, and even indicates the existence of apprehensions as to its progress. The rulers are as sensible now as ever they were, that their only hope on the one hand, of retaining power, is by conserving all the old religious fences; and on the other, of saving the religion, is by keeping it bound up in the state. They know that were education made as broad and general as Western ideas would dictate, or perfect freedom of

conscience and religious action granted to those thus educated, the result would soon appear in the thinned ranks of Islam. But though the rulers yet "set themselves against the Lord and his Anointed," hope whispers that the end has begun. For more than twenty years a large amount of intellectual vigour and liberality has been manifested by the Muslims of India, and every year is bringing intelligence of the greater spread and study of the Bible amongst them—the perusal of "the Holy Books" of the Christians being now not only permitted but even inculcated as a duty laid upon every good Mussulman by his own prophet—Muhammed. The publication of such works as are constantly appearing in India from the pens of both Christian and Muslim writers on the subject of Christianity is scarcely yet possible under a purely Muslim rule, but the time of such possibility, and of greater things than these, is surely not far distant.

Meanwhile there is abundant room for evangelistic effort amongst the inhabitants who already profess the name of Christ. In 1847, Dr. Wilson of Bombay, wrote of the western Mohammedans—"The native Christianity of the lands in which they dwell, as exhibited by the Greek and Roman churches, presents itself to their view as essentially polytheistic and idolatrous; and it is consequently an object of their contempt and abhorrence. The Europeans sojourning among them are in general viewed by them as having no religion of any kind. They see neither the practice nor persuasion of a living Christianity."* How sadly true this is even of Egypt and of the Coptic, and other so-called Christian churches within its borders!

* Lands of the Bible, vol. ii. p. 704.

Art. IV.—*Antiquity of Man.*

This question has been discussed chiefly by

1. The Linguists, from the number of languages:
2. The Ethnologists, from the forms of ancient skulls:
3. The Geologists, from the position of human fossils:
4. The Archæologists, from the relics of non-historic races:
5. The Sociologists, from the statistics of population:
6. The Egyptologists, from the existing monuments of Egypt.

A mere statement of the argument on either side, with an illustrative fact under each head, is all that can be attempted in the limits of this article.

1. The argument from language will not bear logical analysis. It is thus stated by Mr. Crawford, before the British Association, 1861:—"Language was not innate, but adventitious. Infants were without language, and those born deaf were always dumb, for without the sense of hearing there would be no language at all. Among the unquestionable proofs that language was not innate, was the prodigious number of languages which existed, some being of a very simple, others of a very complex character. If additional evidence were wanted that language was an adventitious acquirement, it was found in this, that a whole nation might lose its original tongue, and in its stead adopt any foreign one. The language which had been the vernacular of the Jews for three thousand years, had ceased to be so for two thousand years, and the descendants of those who spake it were now speaking an infinity of foreign languages, European and Asiatic." "It necessarily followed from this argument, that when man first appeared on the earth he was destitute of language, and each separate tribe of men framed a separate one; hence the multitude of tongues. That the framers were arrant savages was proved by the fact that the rudest tribes ever discovered had already completed the task of forming a perfect language. The languages spoken by the grovelling savages of Australia were so, and were even more artificial and complex in structure than those of many people more advanced. The first rudi-

ments of language would consist of a few articulate sounds, by which to make known their wants and wishes; and between that time and their obtaining completeness, probably countless centuries had passed, even among the rudest tribes."

Now how does it necessarily follow from the premises, that if man came into the world destitute of language, he must have invented it for himself? No fact is alleged showing the invention of language by any individual or tribe. Every nation which has any tradition on the subject, alleges that man was taught language by the gods. The Bible indicates it as a Divine gift. One can hardly believe that Mr. Crawford solemnly read before the British Association that extraordinary burlesque of logic in which he argues the savage character of the inventors of philosophical language, from the barbarism of some of the tribes who still use it—the barbarism of the inventors and makers of the calico, hatchets, and guns of the Feejee islanders, from the state of the savages who now use these manufactures. The argument which proves the original dignity of a nation from the copiousness and elegance of its language, notwithstanding the present degradation of the people who use it, is the very same by which we are compelled to recognize in the convict, or the street beggar, the fallen lady or gentleman, by the same infallible sign. Language is the expression of thought. Civilized language never was invented by savages, no more than pianos could be manufactured by monkeys. All the authorities in philology—Humboldt, Max Müller, and Whitney—are agreed upon a philosophy of language in direct antagonism to Mr. Crawford's theory. Indeed he found it necessary, in defence of his theory, to make a formal direct attack on the Aryan or Indo-Germanic theory of language, accepted by all scholars.

The absurdity of the argument to prove the human invention of language from the change of languages by the Jews and negroes, is apparent, the moment we remember that these are not instances of invention at all, but of educational imitation. No man, no nation, ever invented a language. Let those who assert the fact as the basis of their argument show an instance, or cease their unproved assertions. They argue that the human race must be of great antiquity, because four thousand

years ago they had invented a great many very complicated languages. Now we ask them, How do you know that they *invented* these languages?. How do you know they were not taught them? The only answer is, "They must have invented them; there was no one to teach them?" Thus the whole thing rests on the baldest Atheism,—the denial that man ever had a heavenly Father who cared enough for his child to teach him to speak;—or that the God who gave man a tongue could not teach him to use it. Yet this illogical, self-contradictory, and unsupported notion of the human invention of language is gravely and confidently cited, in our reviews and cyclopedias, as one of the latest discoveries of science. Not a single fact, analogy, or even tradition, is alleged in support of the assumption that man invented language. The whole reasoning is based on an unproved assertion.

2. The ethnological argument is based on the Darwinian theory of the development of the present races of Europe from ancestral nations of a lower grade of physical structure, as these were in their turn developed from apes and monkeys, by the process of gradual self-education, and natural selection. This is not the place for any examination of this theory. The facts to which it is applied in this discussion are the discovery of two skulls of the supposed inferior progenitors of the Germans at Engis and Neanderthal. But in the very same paper the writer asserts, that skulls precisely similar have been found in a collection of Australian heads, and that the Engis skull can be paralleled by English skulls.* If that is the case, the whole argument falls to the ground; and no argument, either of paternity or of chronology, is deducible from the skulls. Like skulls found in the same grave-yard may not be of kin. The negro may not have been the grandfather of the Virginian, nor the Wallah Wallahs the ancestors of the Scotch settlers of Melbourne, and the queer skull of Neanderthal may have had no more claim to the paternity of Bismark and Napoleon, than it had to affiliation with the bones of the beasts which lay beside it, or to the brains of the philosophers who

* Prof. Huxley in *Manual of Scientific Discovery*, 1863, p. 281.

are now extracting systems of ethnology from it. As a mere matter of observed fact, it may be noted, that there is no perceptible difference between the oldest obtainable skulls of American Indians, Germans, Britons, Hindoos, Negroes, or Egyptians, and those of the existing races of the same people. The ethnological question of the antiquity of skulls will therefore stand thus, If the result of progress for 3000 years=0, what will be the amount for 3,000,000 years? We do not despair of seeing a solution of the problem; though it is rather an inversion of the question with which we began; after the manner of these gentlemen, who on one page will argue the immense antiquity of a long-headed skull from its shape, and on the next will tell you that the existing races south of a given line are all of that same long-headed type of skulls to this day!

3. The geological facts adduced in support of the indefinite antiquity of mankind are spread over a volume published by Lyell, in 1863; to which some more recent discoveries in France are to be added. The archæological evidence is also presented in the same documents. Indeed, the two species of evidence are so mingled as to render their strict separation impossible. Of course, a review of the mass of matter in these reports and volumes is impossible within the limits of a single essay. We can only note the heads of the argument, give an illustrative instance under each head, and indicate the mode of discussion and answer. The geologists argue the antiquity of man from the presence of his bones in company with those of extinct animals, from the alleged antiquity of the strata in which they have been found, and from the great geological changes which have occurred in the human period; from none of which, nor from them all combined, is any chronology logically deducible.

Lyell seems to lay the greatest stress upon the discovery of human bones, and of flint implements in certain cases, in fluviatile deposits, in Europe and America, in company with those of extinct races of animals; this association proving to him that they were contemporary. Some of the bones of these extinct animals, it is alleged, were split lengthwise to extract the marrow, as our Indians do with marrow bones to this day.

Of the extinct animals, the bones of the cave-bear, the reindeer in Southern Europe, the mammoth, the mastodon, and the woolly rhinoceros, are thus found associated with human fossils in Europe and America. Lyell argues, that if he is right in calculating a hundred thousand years for the growth of the Delta of the Mississippi, and if it be admitted that the Natchez man was contemporary with the mastodon, North America must have been peopled a hundred thousand years ago.*

Colonel Foster, in a lecture reported to the Chicago daily papers informs us that "in excavating the ground for the foundations of the gas-works at New Orleans, the labourers discovered at the depth of sixteen feet a human skeleton, which scientific men have pronounced to be 50,000 years old, basing their assertion upon the known deposits in the Delta of the Mississippi."† But a more accurate investigation exposes the blunder as follows: "In New Orleans, while digging a pit for the gas works, the workmen came upon the skeleton of a red Indian sixteen feet beneath the surface, and overlaid by earth in which stood the stumps of four successive cypress forests. Dr. Dowler, who investigated the matter, concluded that it required 50,000 years to accumulate the sixteen feet of material above the skeleton, and Lyell quotes and partly approves the calculation. Dr. Dowler is well known in the medical profession as an enthusiastic but unsound investigator, who is very prone to come to startling, but erroneous conclusions, but that Lyell should be led astray by such enormous blunders may well excite astonishment. The accretion both of vegetable matter and of river mud in the region of the lower Mississippi is very rapid, and the United States Army engineers have calculated that the whole ground on which New Orleans stands, down to the depth of forty feet has been deposited within the period of 4,400 years. Lyell himself states that he has seen many stumps of trees standing erect in the banks of the river, a fact which should have shown him that the accretion was rapid enough to cover these stumps to their summits before they had time to decay. I have myself seen in that region

* Lyell, *Antiquity of Man*, p. 204.

† Chicago *Republican's* Report of Meeting of the Academy of Sciences, February 2, 1868.

young cottonwood saplings only seven years old, around whose trunks the annual overflow of the river had deposited two or three feet of earth above their original roots. It is possible that the New Orleans man may be one or two thousand years of age, but to claim fifty thousand years for him is provocative of laughter."* This is a fair illustration of the astonishing credulity of scientific men.

Lyell's characteristic blunder, of demanding a thousand centuries for the formation of the delta of the Mississippi, which the United States surveyors demonstrate could have been formed in forty-four, at the present rate of growth, will be exposed in another place. We only notice here the illogical argument from man's contemporaneous existence with the mammoths and mastodons. How does that prove that they lived a hundred thousand years ago? They lie in the same graveyard, but there is no date on the tombstones to tell when they died. It may be that man is very ancient, but it may just as logically be that mammoths are comparatively modern. The actual date of their contemporaneous existence must be ascertained from some other records. Principal Forbes examines a burial cave at Aurignac, described by Lyell, (p. 190) containing the bodies and weapons of seventeen persons, buried as our Indians still inter their dead, and presenting at its entrance the remains of the funeral feast;—the bones of the elephantine animals, and the undisturbed ashes and cinders of the fire, covered with a slight coat of vegetable mould;—bearing evidence that no disturbance of any kind, geological or superficial, had taken place since the Celts roasted the mammoth and rhinoceros there; and he comes to the following conclusion: "It seems very improbable that such a tomb transcends in antiquity the limits usually assigned to historic records. Clearly no considerable geological change has happened in the valley where it occurs; for the entrance to the cave was covered over only by turf, a little gravel through which a rabbit had worked a passage which led to the discovery of the tomb. Outside of the stone portal were lying beds of ashes, burned and gnawed bones, and other transportable relics, which a moving force of

* Chicago *Advance*. E. Andrews, M. D., May 28, 1868.

the slightest kind must at once have dislodged. As an argument of mere general probability, no one would be disposed to assign to such a place of aboriginal sepulture an antiquity of more than two or three thousand years. It appears to us to afford an argument altogether in favour of the comparatively modern date of the disappearance of the mammoth."*

The result of this discovery, then, is not to establish the remote antiquity of man, but rather to reduce some of the extravagant calculations of geologists about mammoths. It may not be so many centuries since these animals flourished. The discovery of the bones of the megatherium on the surface soil of South America, where the natives use them for fire-places, startled the remote antiquarians. Bones will not last many millenniums in such a climate. The discovery of the *Mastodon Giganteus* in Orange County, New York, now in Dr. Warren's museum in Boston, with five or six bushels of pine and maple twigs in excellent preservation in the cavity of its belly,† and with the vegetable fibre still undecayed in the hollows of its teeth, settled the question of the remote antiquity of that mastodon's last meal. Any man of common sense who goes to that museum, and sees the chewed fibres taken from the teeth of the skeleton, will need no scientific calculation to assure him that these fibres, and those twigs, have not retained their form for a hundred centuries. The tradition of the

* *Good Words*, 1864, p. 436.

† "The mass of broken twigs, &c., above alluded to as lying beneath the pelvic bones, was in quantity about five or six bushels, differed from the surrounding mass; towards the posterior portions presented traces of convolutions, passed in a straight column of four inches diameter through the pelvic orifice, and behind the ischium terminated in a homogeneous mass evidently of fæcal character. Three or four similar masses were found in different parts of the pit. The constituents of this mass, significantly called by Professor Hitchcock 'his last supper,' were twigs, grass, and earthy matter. The largest twigs, in their wet and swollen state, were from one fourth to three-eighths of an inch in diameter, and from an inch to an inch and a half in length. They presented no appearance of being ground during mastication, but rather as though crushed in a vice. Some pieces of twigs were entire; those which separated parted in the direction of their longitudinal fibres. Their botanical characters have not been accurately ascertained, but are supposed to belong to the willow, linden, and maple-trees."—*Mastodon Giganteus*, Boston, 1855, p. 199. *American Cyclopedia*, 1—392.

Indians is explained, who report that their fathers had seen in the forests large deer, never lying down, but leaning against a tree whilst they slept, tree-eaters with a hand on their faces. In the milder climates of Europe the mammoth might have existed even later than in the Siberian winters of New York. In fact, the Siberian hunters fed their dogs on the bloody flesh of the celebrated mammoth of the Lena, whose skin, bristles, and wool are now in the Museum of St. Petersburgh. Professor Brandt has pine leaves, and seeds half chewed, found in the molar tooth of a rhinoceros. The skeleton of one of our American mammoths was found on the roadside trench of the old Tescuco road, into which it had doubtless fallen, pursued by the children of the Sun, no great while before the Spanish conquest. There is every reason to believe, that the extinction of the mammoth, the European rhinoceros, and their contemporaries, dates no further back than that elevation of Scandinavia and Greenland, less than three centuries ago, which closed the Polar Sea, and changed the climate of all northern Europe and America, rendering Greenland uninhabitable. At any rate, it is a most preposterous demand, upon even scientific credulity, to ask men to believe that pine leaves and twigs and grass have been preserved in shape and substance for one hundred thousand years.

The latest geological excitement is the discovery of a human jaw-bone buried in several feet of gravel, said to be of the glacial or diluvial period, at Abbeville in France, in company with a multitude of chipped flints, alleged to be tools and weapons of man. The immense antiquity of this diluvial drift, which is found all over Europe and America, was formerly argued from the absence of human remains: now that they have been found in it, their immense antiquity is argued from their position in the drift. This is a good specimen of geological reasoning, which always rests one leg on an assumption. M. Elie de Beaumont, who is one of the highest authority in mountains and valleys and general cosmogony, alleges however that this gravel of the valley of the Somme does not belong to the diluvial period at all, but to the modern or existing period. Probably the same may be said of most of the flints, which are now made to order, and sold in thousands at two pence a piece;

which is the most satisfactory reason yet adduced for the original splinters to be of human workmanship; since certain trades seem indigenous to certain localities. The bone however was not manufactured to order, and its actual discovery in the gravel pit seems to have been established to the satisfaction of a scientific jury, who made the journey from London to Paris expressly to investigate this interesting jaw-bone and its belongings. The result has been the very opposite of that expected and claimed from its discovery. For an examination of human bones from the battle-fields of Marathon, Philippi, Tours, and Hastings, discovers certain changes of structure as the result of age, by which the age of a bone may be approximately calculated. One of the first changes, in the process of decay, is the loss of the organic matter which gives the peculiar smell emitted by fresh bones when burnt or sawn. The commission had the bone, and a tooth found in it, sawed open. It emitted distinctly the odour of bone, the section was fresh-looking, and so was that of the tooth, and the dental canal was found lined with a grey sand, showing that it had been washed from a former bed of a different material. Messrs. Falconer and Busk therefore declare that it cannot be of any great antiquity.* Thus ends the celebrated Abbeville flint-hatchet controversy. The hatchets, it is generally supposed, are no older than their manufacturers. The case moreover enables us to settle the antiquity of any fresh bone presented to us as a hundred thousand years old. If it contains animal matter, and emits the bone odour in the fire, the alleged pre-Adamite bone should at once be forwarded to the museum where are preserved the jaw-bone of the ass wherewith Samson smote the Philistines, and the nest and eggs of the dove which Noah sent from the ark.

Another geological argument is drawn from the discovery of human bones in the loess, a bed of gravel and loam which forms the river bluffs of a great many rivers. But as no probable account of the origin of this stratum can be given, nor any agreement come to among geologists, whether it was

* *Annual of Scientific Discovery*, 1864, p. 234. *American Cyclopedia*, 1863, p. 377.

deposited by glacier action, river inundations, the bursting of primeval lakes, or half a dozen other possibilities, the dates assigned to any remains found in it must be purely imaginary.

One of Lyell's principal arguments is drawn from the great physical changes which have taken place in the human period. His theory of geology is, that only such agencies operated in the past as we now see at work in the elevation and subsidence of continents, the excavation of water-courses, &c.; and that all these agencies operate very slowly. Certain pieces of pottery have been discovered in a beach elevated 300 feet above the existing sea-level, in the south of Sardinia; and human bones, associated with those of hyenas, in caverns whose present openings are inaccessible to these animals. He calculates that the Cagliari pottery must be 12,000 years old, if we assume the rate of elevation to be that now observed in Sweden, two and a half feet in a century. But why should we assume any such rate? Does he not know that the very best geologists deny his principle of the uniformity of geological movements, and give conclusive demonstration of the past operation of vastly greater forces than any we now observe? In that case we could have no rate at all—the elevation of Sardinia might not have occupied twelve hours, instead of twelve millenniums. In fact, Humboldt shows that the mountain of Jorullo, in South America, was seen to rise from a level plain, on the 14th September, 1759, to a height of 1681 feet.* According to Lyell, it should have taken a hundred thousand years. We know that the whole basin of the Mediterranean is also a focus of volcanic activity. But if he wished to compare this elevation with more gradual movements, why overlook the well-attested elevation of the northern coast of Asia, still in progress; which has advanced the coast line seven degrees of latitude, leaving ships and whales seven hundred miles inland, in half as many centuries as he demands millenniums; viz., since A. D. 1266?†

But the truth is, we have no data for calculating geological chronology. We cannot transform elevation or subsidence in space into time, because there is no possibility of our ever knowing the causes of these changes, and we do know that

* Humboldt, *Cosmos*, 5. 280, 313.

† Hamilton Smith, *cit. Arago in Natural History of the Human Species*, 119.

there is no approach to uniformity in the rate of those now in progress. For the same reason we cannot infer the length of geological periods from the deposits of sedimentary formations, inasmuch as we can never know the causes of the floods which deposited the diluvium, nor the depth of any single deposit. Nor can we even guess periods from the extinction of animals, since we know not the period of the natural life of a species, nor the causes of those changes of climate by which some species have been exterminated. Accordingly, truly scientific Rationalists, like Herbert Spencer, in his essay on *Illogical Geology*,* throw overboard the whole Uniformitarian theory of Lyell, and with it all possibility of constructing any geological chronology. If any geological date can be given, or the period of any formation ascertained, it can only be fixed historically, as other dates are. We can in this way ascertain the dates of geological events occurring in the historical period. Fortunately the connecting link has been found which enables us positively to fix the date of the latest geological period, variously known as the drift or glacial era. In 1853, Lyell reasoned, that if human remains should be found in the raised beaches of this era, we would be compelled to ascribe a much higher antiquity to our species than even the boldest speculations of the ethnologist require—viz., from sixty to one hundred thousand years. He instances especially the beaches of Great Britain.† Well, the human remains have been found, and they are perfectly undeniable, not like the rude flints of Abbeville. And what kind of pre-Adamite curiosities think you have the geologists discovered? "In a raised beach at Leith, fragments of Roman pottery, along with bones apparently of deer, and littoral shells have been discovered, at a height of twenty-five feet above the sea. This is an important fact; for it shows that since the time when the Roman legions marched along the shores of the Frith of Forth, and their galleys sailed into its harbours, the land has actually been upheaved, slowly and imperceptibly, to a height of twenty-five feet. So great a change within so recent a period tempts us to pause before we give assent to the enormous intervals of time which some

* *Illustrations of Progress*, ch. viii.
† *Principles of Geology*, p. 184.

geologists demand for the accomplishment of other changes that have elapsed since the advent of man. It may be that man appeared on earth at a much earlier period than is generally supposed, but such a discovery as that of the raised beach at Leith seems to teach us, that we cannot be too cautious in sifting the evidence on which his antiquity is sought to be established."* It is certainly rather a comical anachronism to represent the pre-Adamite ancestors of mankind, sixty thousand years ago supping their broth out of Roman pottery.

The very latest deliverance on the subject is the result of a three days discussion of a number of papers read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at its recent meeting in Chicago, August 6—10, 1868, by the most eminent American geologists. The most important of these documents was one by Prof. J. D. Whitney, of California, on "The Fossil Skull of Calaveras county, California." He claims that it was found 300 feet below the surface of Bald's Mountain, below the lava, and close to petrified oak and rhinoceros teeth; and that it is consequently of the Post-pliocene age. But Professor Silliman, and other geologists of like standing, deny the consequence, even supposing the genuineness of the skull; while gentlemen familiar with the locality, and with the alleged discovery, deny the authenticity of the finding. The result of the discussion of the whole subject is thus given by Prof. Hungerford, as the verdict in the case.

"Prof. Hungerford thought that the evidence in this matter is of the class known as cumulative. He believed the only true method of investigation was to examine the isolated facts, and he thought that a great deal of all that had been written and said upon the subject of the antiquity of man would go for zero. It was curious to follow this discussion and see how much of it should go for nothing as evidence of an antiquity dated beyond the usual accepted creation. Granting the existence of human remains contemporaneously with the remains of extinct mammals, it is to be remembered that it is to be considered, do the extinct mammals actually come down nearer to the present epoch than we have supposed,

* *North British Review*, No. lxix., p. 77.

or does the existence of the human race extend further back than we have hitherto supposed?"*

4. The archæologists present us with the remains of the buildings, and implements of non-historic races, and assurances that these are of vast antiquity. The relics consist of remains of villages built upon piles, in certain drained lakes in Switzerland, somewhat after the fashion of the existing villages of the South American and Australian fishers and hunters; and of the bones of the animals on which they fed, the flint arrow-heads and hatchets with which they killed them, and sundry other relics; all, it is alleged, of vast antiquity. The antiquaries are not exactly agreed how old they are. M. Morlat and M. Gillieron differing a hundred thousand years or so in their calculations; the latter makes the lake dwellings of Neufchatel about six or seven thousand years old, while the former, from the same data, but with more liberal views, calculates the existence of man at a hundred thousand years before the present geological period.†

If you should feel a little hesitation in accepting these assurances of the hundreds of thousands of years which have elapsed since these piles were driven into the mud, you are invited to contemplate the scraped bones from which these primeval savages dined, and the flint hatchets and knives with which they did their carving long before the era of Birmingham and Sheffield cutlery; and which, it is believed, as plainly assert their pre-Adamite origin by the rudeness of their workmanship, as the frogs of the Connecticut sandstone, whose tracks Hitchcock expounded as those of birds with legs five yards long, showed a bulk capable of gobbling up little Cain and Abel, and so of preventing a deal of human slaughter. Unluckily, however, our antiquaries have not confined their discoveries to flints and bones. Quite a number of other relics of a more perishable nature have been recovered from the mud; so many indeed that our Swiss antiquaries have reproduced the dwellings of the Lakemen, and actually have given us a wood-cut of a restored village. We shall no doubt soon have

* *Chicago Tribune*, August 10, 1868.

† *Annual of Scientific Discovery*, 1863, p. 282. Lyell's *Antiquity of Man*, p. 18.

photographs of their divines and statesmen, furnished by scientific clairvoyance, as plentifully as the portraits of the Glyptodon and Pterodactyle which now astonish the students of *Chambers' Geology*. In the mean time we have discussions of their religion, politics, and domestic policy; illustrated by specimens of their bread and corn, pieces of the bark and twigs with which they constructed their huts, some pieces of the linen of the chemisettes of their ladies, specimens of the bone needles with which they were sewed, and an endless variety of other venerable relics, altogether too sacred for vulgar handling. We suggest the formation of a court of canonization of scientific relics, after the example of that of Rome. It is too great a responsibility to throw each fledgling savan back on his own individual encyclopediac infallibility in fixing the age of these super-human antiquities. Indeed we have no data to guide us in such remote researches. Ordinary analogies fail us. Even religious faith gives us little aid: its line of belief is altogether too short for the demands of science. The wood of the holy cross, a good deal worm eaten, is not yet two thousand years old, but here is an oak axe handle of eleven thousand years age "in excellent preservation." St. Veronica's sacred handkerchief only dates from the Christian era, and the feather of Michael the archangel, preserved in Padua, only claims the age of Moses, but here we have the linen and needles of saints who cultivated dress-making a hundred thousand years before Eve's primitive experiment with the fig-leaves; and we are compelled to veil our faces lest we should fail to treat these holy relics with becoming reverence.

The learning of the controversy however centres on the sinners, their wars and invasions and weapons of war; in discussions around the stone, bronze, and iron ages of man. The old traditions of the progressive degeneracy of mankind in the gold, silver, and iron ages, are reversed, and this iron age is now discovered to be the highest epoch, to which man, at first a savage, having only some rude clipped flints for weapons and tools, advanced through the discovery of bronze. How these savages in the interior of Europe made the discovery of the tin, needful to make bronze, in the British isles, or in India, and conveyed it to Switzerland, does not clearly appear:

for at present the manufacture of bronze is by no means an operation for a savage. The evidence of the relative antiquity of the three eras is however given in this way. In the bogs of Ireland and Denmark, some of which are thirty or forty feet deep, are found existing forests of growing trees, generally beech; several feet beneath the surface the fallen trunks of oak trees; still lower the remains of pines. In this latter stratum are found stone implements; in the oak stratum bronze; while iron implements are found only in the upper layer. The argument is, that as no people who could have bronze would use stone, and none who could get iron would use bronze, the stone age was inferior to the bronze age in skill, and preceded it in time, as it in like manner preceded, and was superseded by, a race using iron. A similar argument is based upon certain shell heaps, the refuse of ancient camps of the coast-dwellers of Denmark, containing similar relics. It is further alleged, that it is not possible "to make any calculation of the years that have elapsed between the stone period and the present day; the consideration of the immense length of time which must have been occupied in the formation of these bogs can alone furnish us with any idea on the subject." It is assumed that the forests of pine, oak, and beech were successive, and the bogs of very slow growth. The same assumption is made for the four tiers of cypress stumps found in the Mississippi bottom. It is imagined that one forest grew, and fell, and rotted, and was succeeded by another after a vast interval of ages.

But we are by no means compelled to trust the exuberant imaginations of geologists for calculations either of the immense periods demanded for the growth of bogs, or by the succession of metals. The whole question is fortunately capable of direct historical solution. In the first place, the assumption that the stone, bronze, and iron ages were successive, is refuted by the facts that the Persians, Greeks, and Egyptians used implements of stone, bronze, and iron contemporaneously.* So did the British army in America. We have now lying before us a stone arrow-head of the Revolutionary war, picked up on the banks of the James River. From the pine stratum

* Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, 1. 354, 2. 163.

of the bogs of Ireland skeletons of warriors with gold epaulets and clasps, bronze battle-axes, and stone arrow-heads have been frequently raised in the process of cutting out peat for fuel. We have seen the three kinds of weapons and ornaments, which were found together. The absence of iron is sufficiently accounted for by its perishable nature when exposed to moisture. But that this Celtic race used iron also, as well as bronze and stone, is established beyond question by the discovery, in 1863, at Linhope, in Northumberland, of iron slag, among a number of flint weapons and Celtic skulls; the iron itself having perished by rust.* The pottery, glass, and handmills found beside these skulls show that these flint-workers were by no means degraded savages.

The actual antiquity also of these bogs is capable of tolerably certain decision. There is, fortunately, a piece of primeval bog and forest, not yet cleared off, on the Earl of Arran's estate in Scotland, which demonstrates that the pine, oak, and beech were not successive, but contemporaneous at different levels; the bog growing as well as the trees. Holes from which peat has been cut, have been observed to fill up at the rate of a foot in four years. And finally the frequent discovery of similar Danish remains in the Danish forts of Ireland determines the stone and bronze ages to the era of the Danish invasion, A. D. 827.

An argument of a similar character has been raised upon some burnt brick and pottery, raised by Mr. Horner, in 1854, from the depth of sixty feet, and by others from a depth of seventy-two feet, in the valley of the Nile.† It was at once assumed that they were found where they were made, and that the mud had been deposited over them by the annual deposit of the Nile in its inundations. Accordingly learned men went to work to calculate the rate of this deposition, and to find out how many centuries had elapsed since the brick-bats were made. Lyell seriously discusses the question, and it has been solemnly expounded before various learned societies, by several distinguished scholars, whose estimates present a slight differ-

* *American Cyclopedia*, 1863, p. 374. *Annual of Scientific Discovery*, 1861, p. 351.

† Lyell's *Antiquity of Man*, p. 36.

ence of results, ranging from twelve thousand to sixty thousand years. Either of these numbers however would do very well to confute the Bible; and Horner's Nile pottery was quite famous, until some unlucky urchin, of frog-pelting propensities, proposed a different statement of the question, namely, "How long would a brick require to sink sixty feet into a quagmire?" All Egypt is simply a vast quagmire of soluble mud during the inundation which covers it with water for half the year. The brickbats could be deposited in a single inundation.*

On a review of the whole field of geological and archæological discovery, Principal Forbes gives the following deliverance: "While on the one hand the revelations of geology undoubtedly tend to expand our ideas more and more as to the periods over which the successive phases of animal life, and the deposition of the strata of the globe, must be held to have extended, it does not appear by any means equally clear, that the space of time which separates us from the age of the mammoth and of primeval man, is to be equally extended. Many persons will doubt whether under the influence of existing causes alone, even had they endured for tens, or hundreds of thousands of years, the observed phenomena of the drift of Picardy, or Kent, or Sussex, could have been produced. The chronology based on uniformity is therefore at fault. It does not appear that a chronological date can be assigned with any probability to a single step in the succession of the pre-historic relics of man, which we have enumerated."†

5. Leaving these geological improbabilities tossing upon the uncertainties, we step ashore upon a fixed principle—the statistics of population. The Creator has decreed the increase of the human family, has appointed the ordinance of marriage for that purpose, has bestowed his blessing upon it, a blessing recognized in the festivities of all nations in connection with

* "The late Sir Robert Stephenson found in the Delta, (in the neighbourhood of Damietta,) at a greater depth than was ever reached by Mr. Horner's deepest diggings, a brick bearing upon it the stamp of Mohammed Ali." *London Quarterly Review.* In a notice of *Wilson's Prehistoric Man;* cited in *Theological Eclectic*, iv. 307.

† *Good Words*, 1864, p, 440.

marriage and birth, and has denounced, and continues to execute his curse upon all who, in any way, prevent or destroy the life of man. Accordingly there is no law of nature more certain than that of the increase of population in a geometrical progression, doubling its numbers in ascertainable periods. These periods vary in different countries, but the actual doubling of the population of our own and other western states assures us of the truth of Stuart Mill's assertion,* that "It is a very low estimate of the capacity of increase, if we only assume that in a good sanitary condition of the people, each generation may be double the number of the generation which preceded it. Twenty or thirty years ago these propositions might still have required considerable enforcement and illustration; but the evidence of them is so ample and incontestable that they have made their way against all kinds of opposition, and may now be regarded as axiomatic."

The actual ratio of increase varies in different countries and ages; the possible ratio of increase being checked by disease, war, vice, starvation, emigration, and the habits of the people. Thus the population of Scotland doubles only every forty-six years, that of Austria in one hundred and eighty-seven years, and France has made such demands for her armies that her people double their numbers only once in two centuries. Many statisticians accept this lowest rate as the average ratio for mankind. The ravages of famine and pestilence, of war and emigration, are much sooner repaired by the inexhaustible fecundity of nature than is generally supposed. During the last two centuries Ireland has experienced two civil wars, three famines, and four pestilences, and yet her resident population has trebled in that period, and there are now a larger number of Irish people alive in other countries than the whole population of Ireland at the Revolution. The recorded emigration to foreign countries from 1847 to 1867 was 2,650,000;† and the unrecorded emigration to the manufacturing towns of England and Scotland, at least an equal number. It thus appears that, notwithstanding these terrible calamities, and in

* *Political Economy*, 1. 207.

† *Reports of the Commissioners of Emigration.* London.

the depth of poverty, a nation may double its numbers every century. Some of the best sociologists accordingly accept this ratio as the average rate of the increase of the world's population.

Our own country, however, furnishes us, on a grand scale, an appropriate illustration of the law of the increase of population in new settlements, such as all the world was to the primeval colonists. The United States have struggled with all the difficulties of new nations;—two wars of invasion, a continual hostility of aborigines, a civil war of unprecedented magnitude, mustering armies outnumbering the combined forces of allied Europe in the war of the French Revolution, cities ravaged by the attacks of yellow-fever, and the whole country twice swept by cholera;—yet, after deducting the total number of immigrants landed, the population has doubled four times in the last century and four millions over.* The Mosaic statistics show us, that the same ratio prevailed in Egypt thirty-three centuries ago. The seventy families of Israel increased to 22,263† male first born, representing twice as many families, doubling ten and one-fourth times in 216 years; which is nearly the American rate of progress.

This is very far below the possibilities of increase where God's blessing is enjoyed by a family for successive generations. The celebrated Jonathan Edwards was born in 1703; and when his descendants were contemplating a family festival in 1852, less than a century after his death, it was found that they numbered about two thousand persons.‡ But leaving out of sight all such extraordinary fertility of families, and of certain climates, as those of the Pacific coast, and taking broad fields of calculation extending over ages, it is well established as one of the foundations of all social science, that the human race increases in a geometrical progression, doubling its numbers every two centuries at the least, and much more rapidly under favourable circumstances. This is not a theory, it is one of the universal laws, like those of competition and mortality, which become fixed principles of science.

* *American Cyclopedia.*—Art. *United States* and *Emigration.*

† Numbers iii. 43.

‡ Hamilton—*The Friend of Moses*, p. 282.

Now the result of this principle is evident; its existence utterly exorcises the Darwinian dogma of an indefinite antiquity of the race, by a very simple arithmetical calculation. No matter how low you fix the ratio of the geometrical progression, the numbers in the hundred millenniums demanded by the geologists become inexpressible; and even the twelve thousand years asserted by the Egyptologists would, at the lowest actual rate of increase, produce unutterable hundreds of thousands of millions, unable to find standing room upon the face of the earth. Even the addition of twenty centuries, at the lowest actual rate of increase, would have crowded every acre of arable land with its tenants: and long ere this the solitudes of the steppes of Russia, and South America, the fertile valleys of the Volga and the Amoor, of the Mississippi, the Williamette, and the Red River of the North, and of the Amazon, the Orinoco, and the La Plata, would have been as densely peopled as the banks of the Hoang Ho, or as the Curragh of Kildare. The actual population of 1,200,000,000 corresponds only to a growth of some forty centuries.

This demonstration of the impossibility of the great antiquity of the existing race of mankind, which is as near to a mathematical demonstration as the case permits, applies with equal force to past generations. Geologists cannot show that the human race ever existed in any such numbers as this law required, on their theory; nor in any such numbers as those of other animals, with thom they allege man was contemporary. On the contrary, they acknowledge the extreme rarity of human remains in all, save the most superficial, layers of our soil; while the remains of the lower animals have been found in great abundance. The great abundance of the human fossils, stone implements, pottery, and ruins of buildings, where they are found, shows what we might expect were all the world once covered with pre-Adamite Ninevehs or Herculaneums. Every river valley would be as monumental as that of the Nile, and the tombs of the dead would far outnumber the houses of the living. Instead of any such abundance of human remains, geologists present us with a dozen equivocal specimens from the most recent strata, and as many bigoted assumptions of their remote

antiquity; which, as conflicting with a well established law of nature, are inherently, and on their very face, improbable.

This law of the increase of population also, we may remark in passing, very summarily disposes of Agassiz' notion, that "Men must have originated in nations, as bees have originated in swarms."* If they were created in swarms under the same laws of fecundity under which man and animals now multiply, man, with his proved superiority to the lower animals, should by this time have so occupied the earth during the thousand centuries claimed for him, as to leave no room for them; human bones should far outnumber those of the bears and hyænas; and the existing population of the globe, it is mathematically demonstrable, in even the 12,000 years claimed by the most moderate antiquaries, must have increased to thousands of thousands of millions.

The attention of all thinking men must be arrested by the irreconcileable antagonism between the theories of Darwin, who developes all men, and all animals also, from one primeval germ, and that of Agassiz, who demands a separate creation of each species and variety. Spencer and Lyell in like manner are at open war in the geological field, the one asserting, the other denying, that geological changes proceed with uniformity. Yet these diametrically opposite schools of anti-biblical science draw their contradictory theories from the self-same facts. How can men of plain common sense place confidence in the scientific certainty of investigations which give such contradictory results? For neither Agassiz nor Darwin, nor Lyell nor Spencer, contradict Moses more directly than they contradict each other on the contested dogma of the origin of man. As we have seen in other sciences, so in anthropology, like the host of Midian in the dark, each successive theory falls by the sword of his neighbour; but expires shouting, Science! science! with a great cry.

6. The monumental evidence of man's antiquity is found chiefly in Egypt. It is of two kinds, direct, and inferential. The direct evidence consists of certain hieroglyphic inscriptions, which, compared with the fragments of ancient historians, are

* *Christian Examiner*, 1850, pp. 135, 138.

said to denote a vast antiquity. The science of Egyptology demands a separate chapter for its proper consideration. It is sufficient for our present purpose to say that no three Egyptologists can agree on any common principles of interpreting the hieroglyphics, that they all demand large allowances of imaginative power to fill gaps in the documents, and that, with all this good guessing, they do not agree on any date by some thousands of years; Lepsius, for instance, placing the reign of Menes, the first Pharaoh, B. C. 3893, while Boekh alleges he flourished B. C. 5867, and Bunsen and other hieroglyphists spread him out over all the two millenniums between.* We must therefore be excused from expressing any opinion on a subject so disputed by the learned in Egyptology, and for dismissing the whole subject of hieroglyphic testimony, until its prophets can agree in presenting us with an anti-bible chronology.

A much more plausible argument however is derived from the general state of high civilization pictured on the monuments of Egypt, and evidenced in the construction and embellishments of these famous structures. Recent investigations have made the world familiar with the fact, that many inventions and discoveries supposed to be comparatively recent were well-known to the ancient Egyptians. They were acquainted with steam, electricity, magnetism, mesmerism, and astronomy; which were not revealed to the vulgar. Their geographical discoveries however could not be thus kept secret. They doubled the Cape of Good Hope in the reign of Pharaoh Necho, some twenty centuries before Bartholomew Diaz and Vasco de Gama; procured tin from India and Britain for their bronze tools, and carried on a commerce with China, the traces of which remain in the Chinese bottles frequently found in their tombs. Well executed pictures of glass-blowing and cutting, in tombs of the reign of Osirtasen, assure us of the fabulous character of Pliny's account of its discovery by Phœnician sailors. Indeed the headings of the chapters in "*Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians*," assure us that they were a highly civilized people; acquainted with navigation, agricul-

* G. R. Gliddon—*Types of Mankind*, p. 675.

ture, war, architecture, sculpture, painting, music, cookery, brewing, distilling, milling, spinning, weaving, dyeing, sewing, dressing, working of all kinds of metals, the use of acids and alkalies, geometry and arithmetic, and the common use of letters and literature; as Moses declares in all his biblical allusions to them. The inference drawn from this however by Bunsen, and other distinguished scholars, is, that since man began life as a savage, and entered on life under a universal law of progressive development, and gradually raised himself from one discovery to another, learning first to kindle a fire, then to wield a club, after a long interval to use a stone hammer, then to chip flint knives, and after many millenniums to melt and forge metals, and build houses, it must have taken a long time to reach that state of civilization displayed in the erection of the First Pyramid; which is on all hands admitted to be the oldest existing human building, and generally believed to be about 4000 years old. Sixty-seven centuries of previous education is the least time claimed for Egypt's apprenticeship.

This argument however is lame on both legs. This law of universal development, if a law of nature, as is alleged, must be necessary, inevitable, and operative in all ages, and among all nations—and so its advocates allege. But neither the present state, nor the past history of Egypt, nor of the rest of the world, so far as we know it, corresponds to this theory of a necessary, natural, and geometrically increasing progress towards civilization; nor indeed exhibits any necessary progress at all in that direction. The progress is often the other way.

In the first place, how does it happen, that if the human race existed ten thousand, or twenty thousand years before the pyramids, all over the world, all under the same universal law of developement, none of them should have developed pyramids but the Egyptians; nor left us any pre-Adamite monuments or temples whatever, or any intelligible traces of their architecture during all that time? The histories of India and China have been reduced to a moderate chronology. The Greeks expressly assert the modern origin of their nation. No pre-Adamite fortresses, tombs, or temples, rear their heads in any other part of the world. Egypt then, so far from being

an illustration of a universal law of human developement, is an exception to the other nations, a perfect historical anomaly.

Nor does the present state of Egypt present us with any reason to believe in a necessary law of the progress of nations to perfection. All these monuments are ancient; there can be no doubt of that, however the learned may differ about their exact date. It is at least twenty or thirty centuries since the Egyptians ceased to build pyramids. Now how is this? According to the theory, or law, as it is called, they ought to have not only gone on building pyramids, and should have been building them to-day, but they ought to have gone on improving during the millenniums which have elapsed since they built the pyramids, erecting in each succeeding century buildings superior to those of their fathers, and presenting to the heavens erections as far exceeding the Great Pyramid in grandeur of design and magnificence of architecture, as the Great Pyramid exceeds the reed hovels of the modern Egyptian. Now why is this? Did the developement dogma go to sleep after the building of the pyramids? Has it been asleep for thirty centuries, and only now, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, is it rubbing its eyes, and ascending the car of progress? But a law of nature has no business to go to sleep, or intermit its activity for any reason whatever. That is the very ground of scientific objection against the Bible, that it represents the laws of nature as controlled by superior forces, and denies the invariability of natural law. It is of no use for our developement men to give us any explanations of the causes of this arrest of progress, such as war, civil discord, superior races, and all the rest. The philosophy of the matter concerns us not, but the fact. But this philosophy is equally fatal to the law of progress. Whether you say that the old Pharaohs contended with the same difficulties as the moderns, and vanquished them, and so proved themselves superior to their successors; or allege that these evils are peculiar to the later ages, and so confess that the human race is growing worse; either explanation is fatal to the theory of progress toward perfection. But it is the fact, the fatal fact, that since the building of the pyramids, Egypt has not gone upwards, but has gone downwards, which now arrests

our consideration, and refutes the so-called necessary, natural, universal law of progress. If that law did apply in all the world beside, it has, undeniably, been repealed in Egypt. Civilization has retrograded there since the building of the pyramids.

It does not meet the requirements of the case at all to allege, that our modern Christian civilization is the developement of that of Ancient Egypt. If the allegation were true, it would still be fatal to the theory of necessary Egyptian progress. A natural law has no right to leave a land where it has been operating for sixty-seven centuries, and skip over continents, and plant itself in new places, to the neglect of its old homes. That is the doctrine of election which makes the Bible so offensive. Of all countries in the world, why should the universal law of progress be excommunicated from Egypt, where it prospered so well for so many millenniums? Why should not the Egyptians, with such models as the tombs, and temples, and obelisks, and pyramids of their ancestors, before their faces, on their own soil, make as much progress during the last thirty centuries, as the barbarous Gauls, and the savage Britons clad in raw hides? What is the matter with the law of progress, universal progress, necessary progress towards perfection, that the sons of Egypt, the cradle of arts and sciences, need Frenchmen now to teach them to dig canals, Americans to show them how to plant cotton, missionaries to teach them to read, and have no ambition higher than to keep themselves from starvation, by obtaining from the passing traveller a few coppers for the bones of their fathers, of the Pharaohs who were in their day the monarchs of the world? What comfort is it to these starving beggars to tell them, that their luck has left them, and that other people across the ocean are reaping the harvest of civilization their fathers sowed? The allegation, however, is not true, that our Christian civilization is the developement of that of Ancient Egypt. It is the developement of a system of religion, politics, and social life, as antagonistic to that of Egypt as Moses was to Pharaoh. We come back then to the broad indisputable fact, that Egypt has not progressed upwards, but downwards, since the erection of the pyramids. The irre-

sistible inference is that her previous progress was in the same direction.

Egypt, however, is not a solitary instance of national degradation. The law of the progress of nations is very different from that assumed by our anti-Bible sociologists. It has been observed and noted, by the infidel author of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, and by the no less anti-Christian Volney, in his *Ruins of Empires*, in the very title-pages of their famous works. A modern Rationalist, who will not be suspected of any biblical superstition, Draper, in his *Intellectual Developement of Europe*, finds the fact of degradation so universal, that he lays down the law, that nations, like individuals, must pass through a process of decay and dotage to death.

Egypt then, is no solitary instance of degradation in a world of universal progress toward perfection. There is not now, nor ever was, upon the earth an instance of self-educating people making progress toward a higher civilization, without the stimulus of the influence, direct or indirect, of a revelation from God. The alleged law of necessary universal progress is not merely a myth, unfounded in fact, it is a falsehood, contrary to all the existing facts of social science, and to all the lessons of history.

The past history of Egypt gives no more countenance to the gradual perpetual progress theory, than does its present state. The early monuments present not the first trace of any infancy of civilization. In this so-called cradle of the sciences, we look in vain for their swaddling bands. In fact, civilization lands in Egypt full grown. We behold no self-nursing, self-developing baby there; but a giant form of majestic proportions rises before us on the very first dawn of history. We have no child-houses built when the Egyptian Adam was a boy, but at once, and without any apprentice failures, we meet the oldest, grandest structure upon the face of the earth—the Great Pyramid—the mere sight of which has taken the breath from astonished armies, and extorted shouts of admiration from the legions of France.

Yet, in the face of this grand and acknowledged fact, dreaming philosophers set themselves to argue, that this full-grown

Egyptian civilization must have had a long infancy and childhood, because their theory requires it. All facts of human history must retire before the necessities of their theories. A startling illustration of the extent and power of the illusions to which materialists subject themselves when they attempt to carry their crude astronomical and geological theories into the domains of actual human life, was given before the British Association of 1866, by no less a person than its President, Mr. Grove, in his attempt to show that in spite of the fact of its absence, Egypt must have had long millenniums of an infancy of civilization. Hear him: "Can it be supposed that the inhabitants of Central America, or of Egypt, suddenly, or what is called instinctively, built their cities, and carved, and ornamented their monuments? If not, if they must have learned to construct such erections, did it not take time to acquire such learning—to invent tools as the occasion required, contrivances to raise weights, rules and laws by which men acted in concert to effect the design? Did not all this require time? And if, as the evidences of historical periods show, invention marches with a geometrical progression, how slow must have been the earlier steps?" And Bunsen argues that not less than sixty-seven centuries of civilized society were required as an apprenticeship before the Egyptians could have learned to build their earliest monuments. Others demand periods of as many millenniums. All alike postulate the savage infancy of man, and all silently ignore the possibility of his receiving any Divine instruction. The basis of the whole business is the assumption that the supernatural is impossible, for there is no God, no Creator, no Father of mankind. Hence, if these premises be admitted, man must have spent a long apprenticeship to nature before he could conceive and build the pyramids, and the other monuments of Egypt.

When we come to examine these remarkable structures minutely, however, in search of traces of this apprenticeship and progress, we are assured by all observers, that the most ancient of them all, the Great Pyramid, is beyond all comparison the grandest in its conception, and the most perfect in its execution. Bunsen alleges that the skill and science of an apprenticeship of sixty-seven centuries were expended in that

remarkable structure. But where are the experimental edifices erected during all that long apprenticeship? The Egyptians were monument makers. They had a mania for monuments. They preserved pictures, and records, and sculptures of every thing. Other nations erected monuments of the doings of their gods and heroes, and of the great events of their national history; but the Egyptians covered every inch of everybody's tomb, and of his winding-sheet, with pictures and records of every event of his life. The shoemaker, the weaver, the fisherman, and the farmer, are as prominently portrayed as the soldier and the statesman; and the cooking of a pancake is as accurately sketched as the erection of an obelisk. The grave, which to all other people was the land of oblivion, was the Egyptian's hall of history, in which he being dead, yet speaketh the tale of his life, from the inscribed shroud and pictured and sculptured wall. Even his very dreams and superstitions, and his faith in the invisible, stand out as plainly pictured before us as those of the Greeks and Romans in the pages of their poets. The half of his life was spent in securing a monument to preserve his mummy and his memory.

Now the inexplicable thing about this is, that this passion for monuments did not grow gradually, but has a well-defined beginning, and bursts upon us full blown at the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty. Before that time Egypt is absolutely dumb, blank, and unrecorded. There is no contemporary monument of any person or thing, of any event, great or small, of all those sixty-seven centuries of civilization which Bunsen alleges, and Grove argues, must have preceded these earliest monuments. If no people bursts at once into civilization, as these gentlemen allege,—if a desire for posthumous fame, and a passion for history and monument building, and the ability to indulge it, be a gradual growth,—then the Egyptians must have excavated tombs, and sculptured and painted them, and must have built pyramids, and hewed obelisks, long before the Fourth Dynasty; and the question is, What has become of them? They could not perish by the action of the elements in Egypt. Bunsen himself tells us, "In Egypt nothing of the sort decays. It is not there as it would be in Europe, or in

India, where in the former cold and snow, in the latter, heat and rain destroy, for Egypt is the monumental land of the earth, adapted not only for saving its monuments from great dilapidations, but for preserving them as perfect as the day they were erected." And so the puzzling question recurs, Where are the monuments before the Fourth Dynasty? What has become of them? Where are all the edifices attesting the gradual growth of Egyptian art previous to its culmination in the Great Pyramid? They could not have been destroyed by invaders so utterly as to leave no ruins. Even the Turks, during centuries of persistent and fanatical spoliation, have been unable to destroy, or even materially to obliterate or injure these gigantic edifices. Nor can we answer the question by referring the phenomenon to the emigration of an already civilized people to the banks of the Nile; for in that case we should find pyramids, obelisks, and sphinxes, in the fatherland of the Egyptians. All Egyptologists however indignantly repudiate the idea of Egypt being indebted to any other land, and now agree that the Ethiopian monuments, the only structures which can claim kindred with the Egyptian, are not the parents, but the children, of Egyptian art in its dotage. In fact, no other country possesses any such pyramids and obelisks. And they are equally enthusiastic in asserting the priority of the Egyptian, to all other monuments in the world. Bunsen expressly asserts that, "these monuments of the Fourth Dynasty are the oldest in the world." Lepsius, too, declares that, "the builders of the Great Pyramid seem to assert their right to form the commencement of monumental history;" and that, "not only for Egyptian, but also for universal history." The Great Pyramid then has no ancestors on the face of the earth.

Again, therefore, we demand, "Why so?" Surely the people who built the Great Pyramid could have built some lesser structures earlier. Surely the tomb painters of the Fourth Dynasty must have inherited the tastes, and received the instructions of the fathers of the Third Dynasty. But Lepsius declares that he has not found a single cartouche which can with safety be assigned to a period preceding the Fourth Dynasty. By what deluge then were the monuments

of the preceding dynasties so utterly swept away that not a single vestige of the ruins can be discerned on the face of the whole earth?

The confusion of the Egyptologist increases when the fact is forced upon his notice, that these first monuments stand out in bold distinction above all the rest in character and construction, in royal grandeur of conception, severe simplicity of style, and accurate perfection of workmanship, the wonder and admiration of the world; while to the eye of the astonished astronomer and mathematician, they present the records of the most recondite truths of physical science, such as only within the present century have begun to be discovered among us, and allusions to others, such as the earth's density, yet unsolved problems. The monuments of the succeeding dynasties are those of the decline and fall of Egyptian architecture. On this point there is no dispute. The progressive moral degradation of the people, their progress in sensual vice, and their multiplication of beastly idols, are not more plainly pictured on the inside of their tombs and temples, than their industrial and scientific deterioration in their external architecture. Pharaoh Necho could no more have built the Great Pyramid than Mohammed Ali. And all this is in direct contradiction to the theory of a gradual advance in civilization, arts, and architecture. No wonder they begin to be awe-struck as they stand on the verge of this great oblivion of *what must have existed.* Indeed the feeling of awe with which they have inspired all beholders, deepens as the man of science studies these primeval monuments, and though he cannot read the riddle, he is compelled to own the presence of a science superior to his greatest discoveries, built imperishably into this oldest monument of the human race. No inscriptions of the names or deeds of mortals deface this venerable pile. No idolatrous figures desecrate its walls or chambers. Nor do any dubious hieroglyphics exercise the imagination of the explorer. But certain fundamental scientific truths concerning the shape and size of our globe, and its astronomical position, and the application of these scientific facts to the business of life, are imperishably and accurately recorded in this structure, and after lying hidden from the ignorance which trampled over them for millen-

niums, are now revealing themselves to the scientific investigator. The Astronomer Royal of Scotland, J. Piazzi Smith, has published an account* of these investigations; and has given a remarkably readable and interesting account of their results, in *Good Words* for June and July, 1867. The character of the man, the nature of the investigation, which is purely mechanical and mathematical, and the repetition and accuracy of his measurements, combine to inspire us with a confidence in his conclusions utterly unattainable in the translation of hieroglyphics, and at the very opposite pole to the credulity which accepts for facts the visions of Egyptologists amidst the darkness of the unrecorded past.

The Astronomer Royal, after months of the most assiduous measurements, repeated again and again with the best instruments, by himself and his wife, and their assistants, alleges, that the following facts are patent and demonstrable to-day to any scientific investigator:

(1.) That the Great Pyramid, which the traditions of eastern nations connect with Seth, is perfectly plain and devoid of all those carvings and ornaments with which the Egyptians delighted to decorate their tombs; that it is provided with a thorough system of ventilation, quite unnecessary on the common supposition that it was simply the tomb of a king; that the passages leading to the Great Chamber, are lined with white stone, as if to lead to the discovery of its contents; that it is of a different construction from all other tombs, having the smallest door, 41 by 47 inches, to the largest building in the world; and that these facts show that it was not built merely for a burying place, as Egyptologists allege.

(2.) That while the mass of the Pyramid is built with pretty good stone, and excellent masonry, laid in horizontal courses, the entrance passage is laid with stone much harder and finer, cemented with finer cement, and with joints ground so truly, and fitted so closely along an axial line, that the point of a penknife cannot be inserted between them; and that this entrance passage has been laid, not horizontally, but at such a vertical angle, and such an azimuth, as to point ex-

* *Life and Work at the Great Pyramid.*

actly to the star *a Draconis*, when it was at the lowest point of its daily circle around the Pole, in the year when that star's distance from the Pole amounted to only 3° 42′; that the Great Gallery of the Pyramid rises again with an angle, and with its seven overlappings points southward, to the precise spot in the heavens in which the constellation of the Pleiades —called in the Bible "the pivot," and supposed by modern astronomers to be the centre of the revolution of our sun and the other stars of our firmament—stood at midnight of the autumnal equinox in the year B. C. 2170, the same year in which *a Draconis* was 3° 42′ distant from the Pole; that neither of these stars have been in the same positions since, nor will *a Draconis* again be in line with the Pyramid passage until a cycle of over 25,000 years repeats itself; and that these Pyramid builders understood accurately the Precession of the Equinoxes—one of the most difficult problems of astronomy.

(3.) That the vertical height of the Great Pyramid is to the length of the four sides, as the radius to the circumference of the circle; and that the size has been so proportioned as to indicate the annual number of the earth's rotations on its axis, in terms of a certain unit of linear measure whereof the precise round number of 10,000,000 measures the semi-axis of rotation;* this unit of length was the sacred cubit of the Hebrews, different from the cubit of the Egyptians and all other nations, but identical upon division by the square of the Pyramid number, 5 by 5, with the inches of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, and with the present inch to within one-thousandth part. It is unnecessary to indicate to the scientific reader the significance of this discovery, or to contrast it with the attempt of the French Academy to establish a metric system on an arc of the earth's circumference, erroneously measured.

(4.) That a certain hollow, empty, lidless stone, in the central chamber of the Great Pyramid, well adapted from its box-like shape to be a standard measure of capacity, measures precisely the contents of one laver, or four homers of the Hebrews, and also of one chalder, or four quarters of the Anglo-Saxon, to such a nicety, that the present *quarters* by

* Sir John F. W. Herschell—*Celestial Measurings and Weighings*, p. 493.

which the British farmer sells his wheat in Mark Lane, and which have nothing corresponding to them in existing British metrology, are accurate fourth parts or quarters of the contents of the sacred coffer in the pyramid, and also of the Ark of the Covenant, which was precisely of the same size.

Other scientific mysteries half-developed await our progress in science to comprehend them, such as the relation of the earth's density to its measurement; but the above are patent, demonstrable, undeniable, and imperishable. Again we ask, Are such architecture, and mathematics, and scientific astronomy, and physical geography, and applied metrology, the playthings of the infant human race? For, let it not be forgotten, this is confessedly the oldest monument of mankind's history, which thus silently displays to the astonished scholars of this proud nineteenth century a science in advance of their own. No wonder that the reflecting part of the development philosophers stand astonished before this dumb witness for God; which for forty centuries has hidden from the degraded children of its builders the most sublime truths of natural science, imperishably built into its indestructible masonry, to reveal them, in the fulness of time, to the strangers from a far land, at the precise time that revelation would be needed to silence the atheistic folly of a boastful mushroom science, denying the heavenly Father of mankind, asserting our self-education without a revelation from God, and denying the Bible account of God's dealings with the world before the flood. It confounds even Renan, and wrings from him this remarkable confession: "When one thinks of this civilization of the Fourth Dynasty, which had no known infancy; that this art, of which there remain innumerable monuments, had no archaic period; that the Egypt of Cheops and Chephren is superior, in a sense, to all which followed, *one is seized with dizziness!*"

Aye! Must it ever come to that? Must the deniers of God be ever put to confusion, in whatever field they urge their war against him? No wonder the infidel is seized with dizziness as he stands beside this ample evidence of the scientific culture of a buried world! Must he at length, after a life of scoffing, turn back to that old narrative, so humbling to proud godless man, of God-created, God-instructed men, who lived a millen-

nium, and so learned more in one lifetime than many generations of modern two-century-old universities, men who built monster ships, and giant cities, and pyramidal observatories, and measured the heavens, and weighed the solid globe, and grew proud of this fruit of the tree of knowledge, and would be as gods, refusing the restraints of moral law—of men of renown whose vices equalled their talents, and ripened with their ungodly civilization, until humanity groaned under their heartless oppression, and the God whom they had despised caused a convulsion of the nature which they worshipped instead of Him, in which their memorial perished with them, and they and their monuments sunk into the depths of the sea? And must we in this Pyramid read another chapter in continuance of this sad awful story—of the survivors of this dread destruction again multiplying in the earth, scattered by some Divine impulse to remote shores, carrying with them the wrecks of antediluvian science and skill, and that instinct for gigantic buildings which never could have originated with a short-lived race, and those godless habits which centuries of sensual civilization and refinement had produced? As these patriarchs sadly viewed the increasing vices, and enfeebled minds, and puny bodies of their sickly short-lived sons and grandsons, whom they followed to their untimely graves, did they resolve, before death's inexorable summons consigned them also to oblivion, to erect one imperishable monument of that earthly wisdom they had learned from their God-instructed fathers? A monument which bears no man's name, a memorial of the collective physical science of the human race!

Yes! there it lifts its majestic head amidst the ruins of the cities of its sons, and casts its shades of proud contempt upon the ignorant, dirty, degraded, vicious beggars, and thieves, and cut-throats, their offspring! There it stands an imperishable memorial of the value of ungodly science; its very stones crying out, that materialism, so far from making a necessary progress towards civilization, cannot even preserve the civilization it has inherited; but that generation after generation growing baser and viler under its influence, will at length lose all remembrance of the design of their noblest monuments, will use the most sacred cathedral of art as a quarry for materials

for their stables, until growing even too vicious and indolent for energetic sacrilege, they will earn a precarious livelihood by the plunder of their tombs, and shed each other's blood for the privilege of peddling their forefathers' bones. As he stands, awe-stricken and confounded, in the presence of these desolations of nations, over which the Great Pyramid rears its mournful majesty, a solemn voice thrills his soul, saying: "Choose thy portion, sceptic! The Pyramid or the Pentateuch! The desolate tomb of mummied Egypt, or the life-giving church of the living God!"

ART. V.—*The Men and Times of the Reunion of* 1758. By Rev. E. H. GILLETT, D. D. An article in the *American Presbyterian and Theological Review*, for July 1868, p. 414.

THE design of Dr. Gillett's article is to show that in the Adopting Act of 1729, and the reunion of 1758, the fathers of our church planted themselves on the "liberal principles," as to subscription of the doctrinal standards, for which our New-school brethren so strenuously contend.

By these Acts, he says, the Synod "gave permanent shaping to the policy and spirit of the American Presbyterian Church, and entitled it, at the same time, to the epithets, Calvinistic, and liberal. Equally removed from bigotry on the one hand, and laxity on the other, it has left behind it a history which we need not blush to record."

If this be true, in the sense intended, we of the Old-school must confess our position to be an innovation on the established principles of our church; and recognize in the latitudinarian policy which is now so earnestly pressed upon us, a title to respect which we have not heretofore accorded.

When the General Presbytery, from which our General Assembly has grown, was organized in Philadelphia, about the

year 1705, no formal constitution was adopted by the body, the members, in fact, regarding themselves as belonging to the Church of Scotland, and bound by its standards. After some years, as the body grew, the necessity of a formally recognized standard of doctrine and order became evident. All the members held the doctrines of the Westminster Confession, to which they had been respectively pledged at their ordination. An overture was therefore introduced by the Rev. John Thomson, in 1727, for the adoption of those standards as the public constitution of the church. In the meantime, the Presbytery had subdivided itself into subordinate Presbyteries, and taken the name of Synod. Of this body, the Presbyteries of Philadelphia and New Castle were located in Pennsylvania, and the region southward, and, with rare exceptions, were all Scotch-Irish. The Presbytery of New York, including the churches in New Jersey and northward, was largely made up of English, Welsh, and New England people, and ministers from New England and Wales. The mutual intercourse of these two sections was comparatively limited, and their personal knowledge of each other, slight. When, therefore, the proposal for the adoption of the Confession was made and urged by the Scotch-Irish, it excited apprehensions on the part of the others, that the object might be to get rid of them, or to accomplish some other covert design. The overture was, therefore, postponed. In 1728, it was again introduced, and was referred to the next Synod, which was appointed to be "a full Synod." It sometimes met by delegation. Notice of the question then to be decided was directed to be given to all absentees.

In the spring of the next year, Dickinson published "Remarks on a Discourse entitled 'An Overture,'" &c. In this paper, which was evidently a hasty and ill-considered production, the doctrines of which he soon and entirely abandoned, Dickinson opposed himself strenuously against enforcing subscription to any human composure as a test of orthodoxy; as this was making it a standard of faith, an honour due only to the word of God; and as an invasion of the royalty of Christ. His position has been confounded with that of the Irish non-subscribers. But, while some of his arguments were identical, the difference was fundamental, in the fact that their

arguments were urged in the interest of a false theology; whilst Dickinson pursued what he thought to be the best means to maintain the purity of the church. To his "Remarks" no reply seems to have been made.

Thomson's overture presented the following specific propositions to the Synod. 1. That the Westminster Confession, Catechisms, &c., be adopted "for the public confession of our faith, as we are a particular organized church." 2. That every candidate and incoming minister be required to subscribe the said Confession, &c., and promise not to teach or preach contrary thereto. 3. That "if any minister within our bounds shall take upon him to teach or preach anything contrary to any of the said Articles [of the Confession] unless, first, he propose the said point to the Presbytery or Synod, to be by them discussed, he shall be censured, so and so."

When the Synod met, in 1729, the Overture was referred to a committee, a majority of which were of the Scotch-Irish, and of which Thomson the author, and Dickinson the opposer of the overture, were members.

This committee, although in the mean time occupied with other business referred to it, was prepared, at the opening of the sessions the next morning, to report a paper, which was unanimously adopted by the Synod, "after long discussion," says the record. But the discussion closed and the vote was taken before the noon adjournment. The paper thus adopted was afterward, by the Synod, designated as the "First or Preliminary Act," and was cited by that name in subsequent discussions by the members. From the promptitude with which it was reported, its perfect congruity in style and matter with the overture, and the propriety of the thing itself, we would infer the Act to have been prepared by Mr. Thomson, with a view to conciliate the opposition, as far as was possible in consistency with maintaining the principles and duty involved. That it was admirably adapted to this purpose a glance at its contents will show.* After repudiating the claim to any authority to impose their faith on other men's consciences, and declaring their willingness to admit to fellowship in sacred

* See the Act in Baird's *Digest*, p. 30; Moore's *New Digest*, p. 18.

ordinances all true believers, the authors of the Preliminary Act assert the duty of the church to transmit the faith pure and uncorrupt to posterity. To this purpose it was therefore agreed that all the ministers of the Synod, and that should afterward be admitted, "shall declare their agreement in, and approbation of, the Confession of Faith," &c., "as being, in all the essential and necessary articles, good forms of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine; and do also adopt the said Confession and Catechisms as the confession of our faith." It also provided that if any minister or candidate "shall have any scruple with respect to any article or articles of said Confession or Catechisms, he shall, at the time of his making the said declaration, declare his sentiments to the Presbytery or Synod, who shall, notwithstanding, admit him to the exercise of the ministry within our bounds, and to ministerial communion, if the Synod or Presbytery shall judge his scruple or mistake to be about articles not essential and necessary in doctrine, worship, or government." Otherwise, he was to be rejected.

In the provisions thus adopted, the Preliminary Act, in one respect, exceeded the strictness of the Overture itself. The latter only proposed to apply its requirements to new members; but the Act laid hold of those who were already on the roll of the Synod, and required them all to "declare" their adoption of the Confession. This rule was carried into effect on the afternoon of the same day, by a proceeding which was distinctively designated by the Synod as the Adopting Act. The roll was called, that each member might declare his sentiments respecting the Confession. Record was thereupon made that the members by name, except one, who afterward complied, "after proposing all the scruples that any of them had to make against any articles and expressions in the Confession of Faith," &c., "have unanimously agreed in the solution of these scruples, and in declaring the said Confession and Catechisms to be the confession of their faith; excepting only some clauses in the twentieth and twenty-third chapters; concerning which clauses the Synod do unanimously declare, that they do not receive those articles in any such sense as to suppose the civil magistrate hath a controlling power over Synods, with

respect to the exercise of their ministerial authority; or power to persecute any for their religion; or in any sense contrary to the Protestant succession to the throne of Great Britain." The clauses to which exception was thus taken have since been altered by our church.

Having thus individually and as a body erected the Westminster Confession as the standard of their faith, the Synod unanimously declared the Directory "to be agreeable *in substance* to the word of God, and founded thereupon," and therefore recommended its observance to the members.

In these transactions one point was left unexpressed. It came up next year, and was unanimously decided, that the design of the Acts of 1729, was to oblige intrants and candidates "to receive and adopt the Confession and Catechisms at their admission, in the same manner and as fully as the members of Synod did that were then present."

Such was the history of the Adopting Act, the interpretation of which would seem to be very plain. In fact, for more than a century the church rested in calm unconsciousness of the possibility of question on the subject. It was not until the case of Mr. Barnes was pending under Dr. Junkin's charges, that the Rev. Dr. Luther Halsey announced it as a great discovery, that "we differ from other Presbyterian churches, in so adopting these formulas that only *the essential or fundamental doctrines* shall be the test of ministerial and Christian fellowship. This was formally avowed in the Adopting Act of 1729." This discovery Dr. Halsey published for the purpose, as he declared, of correcting "a practical mistake" on the subject, and of influencing the General Assembly in its action on Mr. Barnes's case. From the date of this publication appeal has been constantly made by our New-school brethren to the Adopting Act for the purpose of vindicating the position so clearly stated by Dr. Halsey. The latest and the most specious publication of this kind is the article of Dr. Gillett, now under consideration. We will examine the Adopting Act, in connection with his arguments, and see whether it admits of the conclusions which he deduces.

It is a minor matter, but not unimportant to our author's conclusions, that he asserts that in the transactions connected

with the Adopting Act, Dickinson maintained his consistency throughout. "We may be sure," says he, "that his carefully considered and well-matured views had not changed. *He had given them in print to the world, and he never recalled them.*" This is a very remarkable statement for a writer familiar with the history.

What are the facts? In April, Dickinson published his "Remarks," in which he took the ground that "a subscription to any human composure, as the test of orthodoxy," gives it "the honour due only to the word of God;" and that imposing subscription on others, is an invasion of the royalty of Christ. Yet, within five months, in September, Dickinson joined in declaring the necessity of taking care "that the faith once delivered to the saints be kept pure and incorrupt;" and in, "*therefore*," enforcing on "all the ministers of this Synod, or that shall hereafter be admitted into this Synod," a declaration of their "agreement in opinion with all the essential and necessary articles of said Confession," &c. He further joined in asserting the right of the church-courts to decide in every case, which were, and which were not, essential and necessary articles, and in personally adopting the Confession and Catechisms, every article and clause of them, as the confession of his faith; excepting only the repudiated sense of the articles in chapters twenty and twenty-three. And yet, says Dr. Gillett, Dickinson's "well-matured" views had not changed. "He never recalled them." We may surely dismiss, without further remark, any inference deduced from these assertions of Dickinson's consistency.

There is, however, another, and much more important point, upon which our author is equally unfaithful to the facts of the history. In common with all the writers of the New-school, with whom we are conversant, he constantly, we will not say, studiously, confounds the distinction between the Preliminary and the Adopting Act, and ignores the latter altogether. The distinction between these two acts is very clear in itself. The distinctive appellations were given them by the Synod. They are familiarly used by Blair, in 1741, as recognized designations of discrimination, respecting which he complains of Craighead for the very same error of which the New-school are now

guilty. In his "Animadversions," he says, "Mr. Craighead, to prove what he supposes, [the charge of laxity in the faith,] dwells much on what is called the Synod's Preliminary Act about the Confession of Faith, made in 1729. But let that Act be thought insufficient as it can possibly admit, . . . that is no argument, but the Confession of Faith has been sufficiently received by other Acts. And so, indeed, it has been in the Synod's Act for the purpose;" and he proceeds to recite the Adopting Act.

The manner in which our New-school brethren are in the habit of dealing with this subject, deserves here particular notice. Of this, Moore's "*New Digest*," is an illustration. This work, prepared under the direction of the Committee of Publication, has been compiled from Baird's *Digest*, by striking out a large amount of matter of a date subsequent to the division, together with the editorial notes, rearranging, to some extent, the chapters, occasionally transferring a section from one chapter to another, modifying the phraseology of the headings, and adding the materials found in the New-school *Minutes* since the division. With these modifications, and such as we are about to illustrate, the work is a transcript of Baird's *Digest*.* This is evident at a glance with respect to the first chapter of the former work, which has been copied from the first edition of the latter. In it, however, is contained the Adopting Act, which, in the two works, receives very different treatment. In Baird, the two documents are presented separately, with their proper titles. "§ 7. Act Preliminary to the Adopting Act." "§ 8. The Adopting Act." In Moore, they are run together as one section, under the title,—"2. The Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly adopted." It is evident that this confounding of these two Acts is, under the circumstances, not inadvertent, but designed and deliberate.

Precisely similar is the course adopted by the New-school Assembly of 1839 and Dr. Gillett on this subject. The Assem-

* The latter may be regarded as having stood the *experimentum crucis*, in the fact that from the records of one hundred and thirty-two years, which preceded the division, not a citation is found in the *New Digest*, which is not referred to in Baird.

bly in a solemn "Declaration setting forth the Present Position of our beloved Zion, and the Causes which have brought us into our peculiar position," (*Moore*, p. 549,) recites the Preliminary Act, of which it speaks as "the Adopting Act of 1729, which was a return to the liberal principles of 1691, upon which the Presbyterian church in America was based." But the Adopting Act itself is not alluded to in the most distant manner. Dr. Gillett, also, in his *History*, spreads before us the entire Preliminary Act, and ever afterwards designates it as the Adopting Act, while the Adopting Act itself is *concealed* under a statement without quotations, that "the ministers of the Synod then present, with the exception of Mr. Elmer, who declared himself not prepared, after proposing all the scruples that any of them had against any articles and expressions in the Confession and Catechisms, unanimously agreed in the solution of those scruples, and in declaring the Confession and Catechisms to be their confession of faith. The only exception made was those articles of the Form of Government which related to the civil magistrate."

By such a statement as this is the Adopting Act slurred over, its formal character and documentary record ignored, and the nature and extent of the obligations taken misapprehended and concealed. The language of this statement, "declaring the Confession and Catechisms to be their confession of faith," with what follows, is anything but a correct rendering of the words of the record, "declaring the said Confession and Catechisms to be the *confession of their faith, excepting only* some clauses," &c. In this statement it is a comparatively trivial blunder which represents the excepted clauses as found in the Form of Government. But such is the account with which the historian finally dismisses the genuine Adopting Act from his own and the reader's thoughts ever after, appropriating its name on the pages of his History to the Preliminary Act. The same is the course taken in the *Review* article now under consideration. In its pages the reader will search in vain for a trace of the consciousness of knowledge that such a transaction as was the real Adopting Act ever took place, or was to be found of record. We do not attempt to account for these phenomena. But it is necessary to emphasize the fact,

that writers who thus deal with history cannot be trusted as safe guides, whether as to facts or inferences. Whether they be blinded by prejudice, or mistaken through inadvertence or negligence, or incapable of making the necessary discriminations, or however else the facts be explained, the effect is the same.

In another respect these writers, and especially our author, misconceive the Act of which they make so much account in their writings. They assume that the Act indicates a discrimination between "necessary and essential *doctrines*" of the Confession and those which are not so. Nothing of the kind is there to be found. In Thomson's overture it was proposed that if any minister teach "contrary to any of said *Articles*," without first submitting the question to the proper judicatory, he shall be censured. The Act shows its paternity by the use of the same phraseology. "The essential and necessary *Articles*" of the Confession are the subjects of its distinctions; the phrase unvaried in form occurring no less than five times in the Act; and it is not until the last sentence, which has every appearance of being an extemporaneous addition to the document, that we find the phraseology slide into "these extra essential and not-necessary points of doctrine."

In the Adopting Act itself the consistency of the style is in this respect maintained. The members agreed in solving all scruples "against any *Articles* or expressions in the Confession," and in the exception made as to "certain *clauses* in the twentieth and twenty-third chapters."

The significance of the phraseology thus employed is manifest. Evidently, the authors of these papers had in their minds something more specific and more worthy than to make indefinite provision for liberty of departure from the doctrines of the standards. Had this been their object they would have talked of essential and necessary *doctrines*, and not *Articles*. They had in view the fact that among the one hundred and seventy-two Articles of the Confession there were certain of them, treating of the relations of church and state, in which were ambiguous statements susceptible of an interpretation which the Synod would have repudiated unanimously. With a view to these Articles of the doctrinal standards, especially,

were the cautionary provisions of the Preliminary Act adopted, whilst, in making them, the same principle was extended to the Directory for Worship and Government, in which were some things never strictly followed by our church. Such is the interpretation of the Preliminary Act, which grows out of a simple inspection of its own terms, taken in connection with the language of the Overture and the Adopting Act.

But apart from the evidently specific design of the distinction made in the Preliminary Act, a moment's candid reflection will satisfy the reader that the use to which the Act is applied by our New-school brethren is unjustifiable upon any sound principles of interpretation. The Act makes no provision for the allowance of mistake or error, great or small, upon the essential Articles. It does not take any concern as to the *extent of the error*, but is *wholly occupied with the subject* of it. Presbytery may admit an errorist, if it "shall judge his scruple or mistake to be only about Articles not essential or necessary." But will any one pretend that those Articles, for example, which treat of sin and the atonement, are to be counted unessential in the Confession; or that they would have been so classified by the Synod? Let us suppose, then, a party found to differ from the Confession, no matter to what extent, on the atonement. How, then, would operate the requirement,—"if erroneous in essential and necessary Articles of faith, the Synod or Presbytery shall declare them uncapable of communion with us." In a word, the fathers were no bigots as to matters not involved in the doctrines of faith. But they cherished a just and irrepressible repugnance to tampering with any of those doctrines, and would give place to it,—no, not for a moment, as the history of both Old-side and New most unequivocally illustrates. The Articles respecting the civil government, and the Directory for the details of Divine worship, and the organization and government of the church might admit of innocent difference of opinion—as we shall hereafter see Witherspoon and a committee of Synod explain; but the Articles of faith were sacred in their eyes, and guarded with jealous vigilance against the first beginnings of error.

In the Westminster standards, as adopted in 1729, besides the doctrinal Articles and the Catechisms, there were "The

humble Advice of the Assembly, concerning Church Government," and "a Directory for the Public Worship of God." Respecting them all, the Preliminary Act determined four points:—1st. That neither "in doctrine, worship, nor government," were all the articles essential and necessary. 2d. That in every case, parties must bring their scruples, in the first place, to the proper judicatory, and abide by its judgment respecting them. 3d. That divergence from the teachings of the book in the "not-necessary" articles, would not, of necessity forfeit ministerial communion. 4th. That error, in essential and necessary articles of faith, involved the exclusion of the party.

In the Adopting Act itself, these principles were strictly applied. The members were individually called upon, and each one—the non-subscriber Dickinson not excepted—stated his scruples as to any articles and expressions in the Confession and Catechisms, and declared them to be the confession of his faith; excepting only the specified clauses. Every article and expression, with these exceptions, was by the members thus unreservedly adopted, no man scrupling one word to anything in the doctrinal statements. Says the Rev. Samuel Blair, "There never was any scruple that ever I heard of, made by any member of the Synod, about any part of the Confession of Faith; but only about some particular clauses in the twentieth and twenty-third chapters; and these clauses were excepted against in the Synod's Act receiving the Confession of Faith, only in such a sense; which, for my part, I believe the reverend composers never intended in them, but which might, notwithstanding, be readily put upon them."

The Directory for worship and government was treated in a different manner. To it,—but to it alone,—was applied the "substance of doctrine" principle. It was pronounced "agreeable *in substance* to the word of God," and as such commended to prudent and discriminating use.

Such was the mode and extent of the adoption of the Confession by the members of the Synod, in 1729. Needing no indulgence for themselves, and adopting the book, man by man, in the full and unreserved manner here shown, it would certainly have been very extraordinary had they designed or pro-

vided for giving to others greater liberty than they claimed for themselves. Nor did they. At the time of making the Adopting Act, this point was left to implication. But the next year, report coming up of apprehensions caused in the churches respecting it, the Synod unanimously declared, as already stated, that the design of the Acts of 1729, was to enforce on intrants the adoption of the standards "in the same manner, and as fully as the members of Synod did, that were then present."

This minute of 1730 has been utterly ignored by New-school writers, and for a very manifest reason. If the minute be true, all their statements as to the design of the Adopting Act, and arguments thence deduced, must go by the board. And yet this minute was unanimously passed, at a "full meeting" of the Synod. Of the eighteen members present in 1729, twelve were now present; and of the seventeen who were unanimous in the adoption of this minute, but seven could be classified with the Scotch.

These men certainly knew what they meant in the proceedings of 1729. They declare them to have been designed to enforce adoption upon intrants, "in the same manner, and as fully as the members of Synod did." Those members adopted without reservation, every article and expression, except the repudiated sense of the articles on the magistrate. The whole issue, therefore, between us and our New-school brethren is palpably one as to the veracity of the Synod in this unanimous action. If the position of our New-school brethren be correct, the fathers in this Synod deliberately conspired to utter and place on permanent record a wilful untruth. If the Synod told the truth, our brethren are inexcusable for the account which they insist upon giving of the matter. That the question is one involving the truth of our fathers, Dr. Gillett distinctly admits, as we shall presently see.

In 1734, the solicitude of the Synod on this subject was indicated by a rule requiring that, at each annual meeting, inquiry should be made as to the adoption of the Confession by intrants, "according to the Acts of the Synod, made some years since, for that purpose,"—the Acts of 1729 and 1730.

In 1736, the Synod passed an explanatory Act, which has been the occasion of no little displeasure to Dr. Gillett and others. By some means, probably through the agency of an enemy, the Preliminary Act had been published, without the Adopting Act. To obviate the misconceptions and uneasiness thus induced, the Synod formally and without a dissenting voice, declared that it had adopted, and still adhered to the Westminster standards, "without the least variation or alteration, and without regard to the said distinctions" of the Preliminary Act. "And we do further declare that this was our meaning and true intent, in our first adopting of said Confession, as may particularly appear by our Adopting Act," which they then recite in full, as evidence to the people "of our firm attachment to our good old received doctrines contained in our Confession, without the least variation or alteration."

The reader will bear in mind the statement of Blair, as to the clauses in the Confession which were excepted to in the Adopting Act, "only in such a sense; *which, for my part I believe the reverend composers never intended* in them." Here is the key to the harmony between the exceptions made in the Adopting Act, and the unreserved terms of this explanatory minute and of many subsequent documents.

This minute entirely exhausts the patience of Dr. Gillett. In his *History*, he exclaims,—"As a matter of fact, this was not true; as a matter of right, it was a gross injustice, to attempt to change the constitutional basis," &c. In the *Review* article now before us, he is rather more modest in his language; but the matter is left in the same predicament. If we admit Dr. Gillett's assumptions, we must believe that the explanatory Act of 1736 was a deliberate falsehood, concocted by the wicked Scotch, to the injury of the rest, and unanimously adopted by the Synod; English and Welsh, Irish, Scotch, and New Englanders, all concurring; whilst not a man was found then, or afterward, until our historian arose, to impeach it of falsehood, or charge it with injustice.

The New-school "Declaration," of 1839, treats this matter in a somewhat different, but equally remarkable manner. Having, in its account of the Synod of 1729, given the Preliminary Act in full, under the name of the Adopting Act, and

suppressed all allusion to the latter, it not only pursues the same policy in its account of the minute of 1736, by ignoring the Act, as transcribed therein, but actually asserts of the minute, that by its adoption the Synod "established the power of the civil magistrate to control synods and persecute the church," although that was the point so expressly and carefully guarded by the Adopting Act, which was transcribed into the minute, as a part of it.

That the declaration of 1736 did truly represent the Adopting Act is manifest. Every member then present had, as a matter of fact, adopted the entire Confession, repudiating only what they considered an illegitimate interpretation of certain clauses. Every member, subsequently admitted, had been required by the rule of 1730 to do the same. All the action on the subject, from first to last, was consistent and unanimous; and, at least down to the schism of 1741, no man was admitted as a member of the ministry without the fact of his adoption in accordance with these Acts, being made the subject of formal inquiry and record, on the minutes of Synod.

The schism of 1741 was immediately consequent upon the extreme and irregular action of the signers of the Protestation of that year. Its ultimate cause was the disorderly and fanatical course of the New-side revivalists intruding into Presbyteries and churches, denouncing their opposers as unconverted men, treating with contempt their ministerial and pastoral rights, and disregarding and trampling upon every regulation of the Synod which tended to restrain their irregularities. They were also charged by the Old-side with propagating grievous doctrinal errors. The principal errors thus charged were such as, "that every true Christian is sure of his own conversion; every adult person, when he is converted, must be able to tell the time, place, and manner of his conversion; that no adult person is converted without first undergoing an high degree of legal, ungracious, preparatory convictions and terrors," and such like.

It was in view of these "points of doctrine," and the connected disorders, that the Old-side, in 1741, protested, among other things, that no person "should be allowed to sit and vote in this Synod who hath not received, adopted, or sub-

scribed the Confession, &c., as our Presbyteries respectively do, according to our last explication of the Adopting Act; or who is either accused or convicted, or may be convicted, before this Synod or any of our Presbyteries, of holding or maintaining any doctrine, or who act and persist in any practice contrary to any of those doctrines, or the rules contained in said Directory, or contrary to any known rights of Presbytery, or orders made or agreed to by this Synod."

It will be noticed that whilst the protesters here assert the obligation of the Acts of 1729, they also testify that the Presbyteries respectively were faithful in enforcing subscription "according to our last explication of the Adopting Act." The point of the protestation is aimed at the doctrinal aberrations and the disorders before mentioned. Touching the meaning of the Act and the truth of the explanatory declaration, there appears, as yet, no diversity of sentiment. Respecting this matter, however, Dr. Gillett in his *History* thus speaks:

"It will be observed, that 'the last explication of' the Adopting Act was that of 1736. The majority of the Synod, therefore, demanded as a condition of membership a principle fundamentally different from that of the Adopting Act. They demanded, in short, an *ipsissima verba* subscription. And because of the refusal to yield to this demand, among others, they proceeded to what was a virtual excision, and what they did not hesitate to characterize as such, in their subsequent documents. . . . The *systematic*, in contradistinction from the *ipsissima verba* subscription, was reëstablished at the reunion of 1758."

Of these statements as to the Acts of 1729 and 1736, the reader is now competent to judge. If anything more had been necessary to show how much this writer relies upon his fancy for his facts, it would be found in the assertion that one cause of the excision was the refusal of the New-side to consent to the explication of 1736. Let us hear them on the subject.

The Protestation was a formal impeachment of them. Their reply was immediate. No sooner did the division take place than they met and adopted the following minute: "Inasmuch as the ministers who have protested against our being of their communion, do at least insinuate false reflections against us,

endeavouring to make people suspect that we are receding from Presbyterian principles, . . . we think it fit unanimously to declare that we do adhere as closely and fully to the Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Directory, *as ever the Synod of Philadelphia did*, in *any* of their public acts or statements about it."

Shortly afterward they issued a "Declaration" of their views and principles. In it they proceed, in the first place, to declare their adoption of the standards, in the precise manner of the Adopting Act, and with its exception to the obnoxious interpretation as to the civil government. (See Baird's *Digest*, p. 32.) Neither of these papers is held entitled to a place in the *New Digest*. Nor does Dr. Gillett think them worthy of recognition. Their significance the reader will appreciate, and their bearing upon the Doctor's assertion as to the reasons for the proto-excision.

But our author finds new evidence of "liberal" sentiments in the New York Synod's constitution, when organized in 1745. The first article declared their agreement "that the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, be the public confession of their faith, in such manner as was agreed unto by the Synod of Philadelphia in the year 1729. "This language," says Dr. Gillett, "is as distinct a repudiation" of the position taken by the signers of the Protestation, on subscription, "as anything can be by means of implication." This assertion might possibly be sustained were the Adopting Act blotted out of existence and the Preliminary Act surrendered to Dr. Gillett's interpretation. But, as the facts stand,—the language of the Preliminary Act applying its distinctions, not to the doctrines but to the Articles of the Confession; its perfect congruity with Thomson's overture, on the one hand, and the Adopting Act on the other; the full and comprehensive terms of the latter; the interpretations of 1730 and 1736; the absence of all dissent, complaint, or dissatisfaction with these measures; the unanimous enforcement given them by Old-side and New, both before and after the division; in a word, the active concurrence of all parties for fourteen years, which had now elapsed since the passage of the Adopting Act, forbid us to accept the forced interpretation put by

Dr. Gillett upon the basis of 1743; or to admit that thus suddenly and silently, without motive or warning, the New-side stultified themselves and repudiated the ground so firmly taken by them immediately after the division.

On this subject it is significant that, while we hear not a word of the Old-side having impeached them of adopting lax principles of subscription, we do hear of complaints from their own members, on account of their strictness on the subject. To these complaints the Synod replied with a touch of indignant sternness, that "by adopting the Westminster Confession, we only intend receiving it as a test of orthodoxy in our church; and it is the order of this Synod, that all who are licensed to preach the gospel, or become members of any Presbytery in our bounds, shall receive the same as the confession of their faith, according to our constituting Act, which we see no reason to repeal." (Baird's *Digest*, p. 33.) The reader will look in vain to find this minute in the *New Digest*, or in the pages of Dr. Gillett. But here is no appeal to the much-abused distinctions of the Preliminary Act; no intimation that the memorialists, to whom this is a reply, misconceived as to the strictness of the subscription enforced upon intrants; no talk of liberality, or exposition of the difference between the essential and the unessential doctrines of the Confession; not one word in the line which our New-school brethren would so promptly have followed. On the contrary, the Synod replied to the cavils of its dissatisfied members, that, in condescension to their weakness, it will inform them that by adopting the Confession, they "*only* intend receiving it as a test of orthodoxy;" and that they see no occasion to rescind the rule enforcing it upon intrants! To see the full significance of this reply, it is to be remembered that it was this very idea of receiving the standards "as a test of orthodoxy," which excited the opposition of Dickinson and the New England members, when Thomson brought in his overture at first. "Our countrymen," said Andrews, "are willing to join in a vote to make it the Confession of our church; but to agree to making it a test of orthodoxy and term of ministerial communion, they will not."

The conclusion is inevitable. The liberal sentiments which Dr. Gillett accredits to the Synod of New York, were alto-

gether foreign to the principles of that body. It received the standards in the same manner, and as fully as did the Synod of Philadelphia. Of this, in addition to all the other evidence, one fact is conclusive; the entire silence of the latter Synod on that point. Our historian attempts to create a different impression. But, how unjustly, we shall presently see. In fact, the Church of Scotland itself was the proclaimed model of the New York Synod in this respect. "Her young daughter," the Synod claimed to be; and for the information of her Reformed Dutch neighbours, she declared that she enjoyed the sympathy and confidence of that church; and that the Westminster standards adopted by it "are, in like manner adopted by us." (Baird's *Digest*, p. 33.) Of all this, however, the reader will learn nothing from the pages of Dr. Gillett, or the *New Digest*.

The Reunion of 1758 is represented by our historian as the final and permanent establishment of the liberal policy which he so much admires. In his *History*, he represents the progress of events in the growth of the two Synods, as having reduced the obstacles to reunion "to the mode of subscription, and the Protest itself," of 1741. In his present essay, he does not assert this in express terms. But it is implied and assumed in all his statements and arguments. And yet, in the correspondence for reunion, there is not a trace of one word of discussion or difficulty, with respect to the mode of subscription. There was no diversity of sentiment, nor of practice, on the subject, and therefore, no room for discussion. As our writer brings an array of quotations from the records, which, as he presents them, seem to sustain his assertion, it is necessary to examine their real meaning, and the question touching which they were in fact written.

One article of the Protestation of 1741, was in these words: —"We protest that all our protesting brethren have at present no right to sit and vote as members of this Synod, having forfeited their right of being accounted members of it for many reasons, a few of which we shall mention afterwards." Here "our protesting brethren," were the New-side, who had protested against and disregarded the Synod's acts respecting intrusions and education. The grounds of the forfeiture thus

charged upon them, were in general, the errors of doctrine which have been already illustrated, and the disorders and disregard of Synodical authority and rules of which they were guilty. The signers of the Protestation took the ground that by these things the New-side men had, *ipso facto*, separated themselves from the Synod and forfeited all rights therein; and it was by the Synod's acquiescence in this assumption that their actual exclusion was effected, without any vote or formal act of exclusion.

Upon the propriety of this course of procedure, the New York brethren joined issue with the Old-side. They admitted that no person could rightfully remain in connection with the Synod, whilst rejecting its authority, and violating its decisions. But they denied that it was consistent with Presbyterian principles to attempt the exclusion of such persons without judicial process, by mere protest, and removal of their names. In accordance with these views, they proposed in the overture for reunion, that, in the united church, all the members should be required to actively concur, or passively submit to all decisions of the courts of the church; or, if they can do neither, then to withdraw, peaceably, without attempting to excite controversy or create division. Here arose the point made use of by Dr. Gillett. Shall this rule to submit to the decisions of the courts or withdraw, apply to all cases, without exception; or only to those which may concern essential questions. If, for example, Mr. Andrews cannot consent to comply with the rule of the Synod in favour of a morning expository discourse, after the Scotch method, must he withdraw? The Synod of New York insisted that the obligation be limited to necessary cases; whilst that of Philadelphia, at first, urged that it be universal.

The first overture of the New York Synod for reunion proposed an article in these terms: "That every member promise, that after any question has been determined by the major vote, he will actively concur or passively submit to the judgment of the body; but if his conscience permit him to do neither of these, that then he shall be obliged peaceably to withdraw from our Synodical communion, without any attempt to make a division among us. Yet *this is not intended to*

extend to any cases but those which the Synod judges essential in matters of doctrine and discipline."

This is that famous "paragraph about essentials," which Dr. Gillett constantly treats as if it had respect to the mode of subscription to the Confession, and to the distinctions of the Preliminary Act, with which it has nothing in common, except the fact that the word "essential" occurs in both. The sole question here debated was, whether the members might with impunity trample on the authority of the supreme court of the church, as the New Brunswick brethren had done in their proceedings prior to the division. On this point, the seeming difference between the two Synods was, in fact, a mere question of words; for, a decision which the Synod should pronounce to be not essential, would be thereby stripped of the authority of a Synodical ordinance, and become a mere recommendation, appealing to the discretion of the members. Practically, the result would have been the same, whether the New York or Philadelphia phraseology were adopted. The latter proposed to insert, instead of the clause above italicised, the following: "always reserving him a liberty to sue for a review, and to lay his grievances before the body, in a Christian manner."

When all other points of difference had been removed out of the way, it was evident that the "paragraph about essentials" could create no embarrassment. Without pausing to decide this point, therefore, the Synod of Philadelphia proposed, and the New York Synod consented to the appointment of a joint committee, to digest details for reunion. The result was a report of Articles of Union. These were unanimously accepted by the two Synods, which thereupon coalesced as one body in 1758. The first and second articles of this basis were as follows:

"I. Both Synods having always approved and received the Westminster Confession of Faith and Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine, founded on the word of God, we do still receive the same as the confession of our faith, and also adhere to the plan of worship, government, and discipline, contained in the Westminster Directory, *strictly enjoining it* on all our mem-

bers and probationers for the ministry, that they preach and teach according to the form of sound words in said Confession and Catechisms, and *avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereto.*"

"II. That when any matter is determined by a major vote, every member shall, either actively concur with, or passively submit to such determination; or, if his conscience permit him to do neither, he shall, after sufficient liberty modestly to reason and remonstrate, peaceably withdraw from our communion, without attempting to make any schism. Provided, always, that this shall be understood to extend only to such determinations as the body shall judge indispensable, in doctrine and Presbyterian government."

Here, it will be perceived that the whole question of subscription is decided by the first Article; and decided in a way which utterly ignores the Preliminary Act as interpreted by Dr. Gillett, and harmonizes perfectly with the Adopting Act and the whole subsequent tenor of action on the subject. It will also be noticed that the second Article has reference, wholly, to the question of the authority of determinations of every kind, made by church courts; and that, in it, the Philadelphia and New York propositions are combined in perfect and recognized harmony. The former allows that dissentients shall first have "sufficient liberty modestly to reason and remonstrate," before withdrawing; and the latter provides that unless, thereupon, the court shall allow the determination in question to be dispensed with, the party must withdraw.

What then shall we say to the commentary of our historian upon this transaction. In his essay he omits any allusion to the first of the above articles, recites the second, and proceeds in the following style:

"Thus the New-side had secured the *thing*, while less scrupulous about the form. They had acted in consistency with themselves throughout. They made the Adopting Act, *as received in* 1729," (the reader will remember that Dr. Gillett refers to the Preliminary Act,) "the fundamental position which they resolved to occupy. They allowed a latitude in what they accounted non-essentials. . . . . His [Gellatly's] charges of laxity were based on inference, and not on facts, and

may therefore readily be set aside; but he was not mistaken in his view of the importance the New-side attached to the paragraph about essentials. With them it was a vital matter; it was a point which, even for union's sake, they would not and did not surrender."

He goes on through several pages to descant upon this idea; leading his readers, all the time, to suppose that the question involved in the second article was that of subscription for substance, and leaving them in utter ignorance of the fact that, already and unequivocally, that question had been concluded by the first article; and that the only subject handled in the second article, was the authority of church courts to bind the members by decisions, whether doctrinal or administrative.

Davies is appealed to by our author as attempting to conciliate English non-subscribers by telling them of the liberty allowed in the Preliminary Act. Davies truly stated the distinctions of that Act. But he did not give his English friends the key to those distinctions, in the terms of the Adopting Act, and the subsequent deliverances and practice of the church. The statement of Davies appears, indeed, on the face of it, to have been a weak concession to the latitudinarian spirit by which he was surrounded, and of which, in his account of the matter, he so bitterly complains. In fact, the association of ideas on this subject, in connection with the English churches, is not flattering to the friends of "liberal principles."

Twenty-one years after the reunion of 1758, the Rev. Jacob Green, the father of the Rev. Dr. Ashbel Green, claimed the privilege of withdrawing from the Synod. His reasons were found in the two Articles of the basis of union above cited. He complained, that the Confession, "without any liberty of explanation in any Article, was enjoined upon all the ministers, who are to teach and preach accordingly;" and that the Synod assumed authority, after the Scotch method, to enact regulations and enforce them on inferior courts and ministers.

We might have supposed that such a practical exposition of the reunion basis, founded as it was upon the very words of that document, would stagger our author as to the correctness of his theory of the transaction. But he is entirely proof against the force of the argument. He tells us in his *History*

that a large amount of Mr. Green's repugnance "might have been overcome, if he had known or remembered that provision had been made for the 'scruples' of the candidate, and that he was to be admitted by the Synod or Presbytery, unless his scruple or mistake concerned some essential and necessary doctrine." (Gillett's *History*, vol. i. p. 209.) He had all the liberty he wanted, if he had but known it!

The *simplicity* of this remark disarms all criticism. The reader, however, will reflect, that Mr. Green was a member of the New York Presbytery, which, in the Synod of New York, led that whole movement for reunion, in which, we are told, the principles of the Preliminary Act had been held so vital, and, therefore, carefully incorporated into the basis of reunion. Yet, it seems, neither that Presbytery in the kind expostulations which the historian tells us it urged upon him, nor Mr. Green himself, who had been for thirty-four years connected with the Presbytery and Synod, and familiar with their history and policy through all that time, "knew or remembered" how liberal in fact were the principles of subscription maintained by them! This much, at least, results from the suggestion of our author, that in the time of Mr. Green, the distinctions of the Preliminary Act had become obsolete and forgotten. That generation was as ignorant on the subject as was that of 1836, till informed by Dr. Halsey.

One additional fact will close this review. In 1786, a committee of the General Synod met in convention with similar committees of the Reformed Dutch and Associate Reformed Churches. The committee consisted of the Rev. Drs. Witherspoon, Rodgers, McWhorter, Smith, Kerr, and Woodhull. To the convention this committee communicated the following statement:

"The Synod of New York and Philadelphia adopt, according to the known and established meaning of the terms, the Westminster Confession of Faith, as the confession of their faith; save that every candidate for the gospel ministry is permitted to except against so much of the twenty-third chapter as gives authority to civil magistrates in matters of religion. . . . The Synod also receives the Directory for public worship and the Form of Church Government, recommended by the Westmin-

ster Assembly, as, *in substance*, agreeable to the institutions of the New Testament. This mode of adoption we use, because we believe the general platform of our government to be agreeable to the sacred Scriptures; but we do not believe that God has been pleased so to reveal and enjoin every minute circumstance of ecclesiastical government and discipline, as not to leave room for orthodox churches of Christ, in these minutiæ, to differ, with charity from one another."

Thus, fifty-seven years after the first passage of the Adopting Act, it remained in all its original comprehensiveness and strictness, whilst the exposition here given, of the reason of adopting the Directory, *for substance*, is most significant as to the different principle applied to the doctrinal standards.

We will not annoy the reader by tracing the mode in which, in his *History*, Dr. Gillett tries to evade the force of this conclusive fact. It is enough that we have the testimony of these witnesses, as to the mode of subscription then actually in use; that their report, including this statement, was expressly approved by the Synod; and that in its deliberations and decisions on the questions which came before it from the convention, it passes this subject by as being already concluded; and the action of the Synod, which Dr. Gillett cites as an implied censure of the committee, is altogether misapprehended by him, and had reference wholly to the questions which were still pending in the deliberations of the convention. In a word, the Synod's committee in the above cited paper, under circumstances of peculiar solemnity and responsibility, made a formal and explicit statement of facts. That statement was false, or else the historian's exceptions to it are worthless.

We confess that in this discussion, we have continually realized a feeling akin to that with which we should labour to prove that the sun shines in the heavens. The conclusions to which the facts bring us, are, that the general distinction between the Articles of the Confession, which was recognized in the Preliminary Act, was made in view of the precise Articles excepted to in the Adopting Act; that the latter defined and determined the meaning of that distinction, and that thenceforward, the Adopting Act, proper, with all its comprehensive strictness, and its specific exceptions, became, and was

always recognized as the model and rule of subscription enforced upon all who entered the ministry, until the revision of the standards in 1788 rendered the exceptions of 1729 inapplicable.

The "liberal principles" of Dr. Gillett find no shadow of countenance in the Adopting Act of 1729, nor the reunion of 1758, nor anywhere else in the history of our fathers.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Doctrine of the Atonement, as taught by Christ himself; or, The Sayings of Jesus on the Atonement exegetically expounded and classified. By Rev. George Smeaton, Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Hamilton & Co. Dublin: John Robertson & Co. 1868. pp. 460.

The idea has often occurred to us that a distinct work on the Theology of Jesus would be of great value to the Church. It would surprise any one whose attention had not been specially directed to the subject, how fully the doctrines of the Trinity; the Incarnation, or the true Divinity and humanity of our Lord; of the atonement; of salvation by faith; of regeneration; of the mystical union and indwelling of the Holy Ghost; of original sin and inability; of the future judgment; of the everlasting punishment of the finally impenitent, and especially the doctrine of God's sovereignty in the selection of the subjects of salvation, are taught by Christ himself. One part of this scheme has been admirably carried out by Prof. Smeaton in the work before us. He tells his readers, "The present volume is intended to be the first portion of a larger whole, which, if completed, will exhibit the entire New Testament-teaching on the subject." The work is not a discussion of ethical and doctrinal principles involved in the controversies on the great doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ. It is biblical and exegetical. This gives additional weight to the results obtained. The author well says, "The one-sided views on this great theme, held not by scoffers at vital religion, but by earnest men, actually, though not willingly, deviating from biblical truth, are not to be corrected by human authority, nor even by appeal to the Church's past, which yet, as the voice of our mother, is entitled to some amount of deference. They can be effectually confronted and silenced only by the explicit testimony of the Church's Lord." We regard this book as a very valuable contribution to the theological literature of our day.

The Works of President Edwards, in Four Volumes, with valuable additions and a copious General Index, and a complete Index of Scripture Texts. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1868.

The annunciation of this publication is all that can be here expected or needed. Every one knows that the works of President Edwards are a treasury of scriptural truth, of sound philosophy, and spiritual nourishment. That they are constantly in demand, is a healthful indication. We trust the Messrs. Carter will be abundantly rewarded for their publication.

The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, and that of the Lamentations. Translated from the original Hebrew. With a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical. By E. Henderson, D. D. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Boston: W. H. Halliday & Co. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1868. Pp. 315.

This volume contains an instructive Introductory Dissertation, the new translation arranged according to the parallelism of the Hebrew text. The commentary consists of notes appended at the foot of the page. These notes are mainly critical and philological; the limits which the author assigns this part of his work precluding extended exposition. The volume is printed in the clear and handsome style for which the Andover Press is distinguished. The work is thoroughly scholarly, and is written in the spirit of a devout believer.

The Word of God Opened. Its Inspiration, Canon, and Interpretation considered and illustrated. By Rev. Bradford K. Peirce. New York: Published by Carlton & Porter, Sunday-school Union, 800 Mulberry street. 12mo. pp. 223.

The design of this little work is to present in a popular form the information on the important topics of which it treats, to be found in larger and less accessible publications. It contains much valuable matter, presented in an attractive form. Ten pages only are devoted to the subject of inspiration, and these are made up largely of quotations from distinguished writers. The author while asserting the Divine origin and authority of the Bible, and claiming that it is free from error, yet objects to the doctrine of verbal inspiration. This is to be regretted, for the phrase "verbal inspiration" is commonly employed to express an important truth—a truth the author himself seems to admit, as he quotes with approbation the language of Dr. Schaff, who says, "that the Bible is thoroughly divine, both in its thoughts and words." The book is handsomely printed on tinted paper.

The Age-Question: A Plea for Christian Union. By Alfred Nevin, D. D. Philadelphia: William Flint, 28 South Seventh street. 1868. Pp. 204.

The union for which the author pleads, is first, that all Christians should regard and treat their fellow-believers as Christians, especially by uniting with them at the Lord's table; and secondly, that all Christian ministers should recognize each other as ministers of Christ. This Christian and ministerial communion is indeed a consummation devoutly to be wished. It is a duty, and would be a great blessing. A third element of Christian union on which Dr. Nevin insists, "is a representative Assembly, clerical and lay, to meet at stated periods for consultation, supervision, and direction in regard to the interests of religion in the various denominations represented." This also, when the churches are ripe for it, would, we doubt not, be a great good. This kind of union we may all pray for and labour to accomplish. But this is very different from the organic union for which many are now contending; a union which cannot fail to be a source of alienation and strife, when the parties to it are uncongenial.

Lange's Commentary. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. By Christian Friedrich Kling, Doctor of Theology, and late Dean of Marbach on the Neckar. Translated from the second revised German edition, with additions. By Daniel W. Poor, D. D., Pastor of the High street Presbyterian Church, Newark, New Jersey.

The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Translated by Conway P. Wing, D. D. Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pa. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1868.

This learned and comprehensive work has already secured a wide circulation and established reputation. Dr. Schaff and his co-labourers are conducting their arduous enterprise with assiduity and success. Dr. Poor's translation of the difficult German original strikes us as unusually felicitous, and the numerous additions which he has made greatly enhances the value of Dr. Kling's Commentary. This volume also contains the Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, by the same author, translated with additions by Conway P. Wing, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pa. Dr. Wing has enriched his portion of the work with numerous citations of the early Greek commentators. As this Commentary is not only critical and exegetical, but doctrinal and homiletical, it is peculiarly adapted to the wants of pastors, furnishing them with a valuable and varied help in a short compass.

The Presbyterian Historical Almanac, and Annual Remembrancer of the Church for 1867. By Joseph M. Wilson. Volume nine. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, 123 South Fourth street. Pp. 550.

This valuable work comes replete with its usual amount of important matter, arranged under the heads of "Meetings of General Assemblies and Synods," "Biographies of Presbyterian Ministers," "Manses, or Homes for Presbyterian Ministers," "Advertisements," &c. Mr. Wilson is preparing, in the preparation of these successive volumes, a store-house of information which must become of increasing value to the church.

A History of the New-School, and of the Questions involved in the Disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1838. By Samuel J. Baird, D.D. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Heffelfinger, Nos. 819 and 821 Market street. 1868. Pp. 564.

This volume has just come to hand. We cannot speak of its merits from actual knowledge of its contents. The subject is one of great importance; and the publication is most opportune. No man in our church is better furnished for the preparation of such a work than Dr. Baird; no one has probably devoted so much time and labour to our documentary history. His Digest is a monument not only of research, but of skill. And we refer to the article in our present number in answer to Dr. Gillett as proof of his ability as a disputant, and his power of clear, calm, and conclusive argument.

The Hebraist's Vade Mecum; a first attempt at a complete verbal Index to the contents of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures. London. 1867. 8vo. Pp. 582 and 43.

This is not a compilation from preëxisting works, repeating their deficiencies or mistakes, but a fresh contribution to Old Testament studies, laboriously wrought out *ab initio*. All the words in the Hebrew Bible have by a most careful and painstaking process been assorted and arranged in alphabetical order, all the grammatical forms of each being distinctly noted, and every separate passage or instance registered in which it occurs. A completeness and accuracy have thus been attained, which are truly astonishing, the best existing concordances being corrected in a number of particulars. In Fürst's great work, which is the fullest and most reliable hitherto produced, and which has been reckoned the standard Hebrew Concordance, not a few slips and omissions were discovered, "Seven *corrigenda*, and at least ten omissions" it is claimed, "in the course of its first eight pages." Even the monosyllabic particles which ordinary Concordances neglect on

account of the frequency of their occurrence, are here indexed with the same fidelity and fulness as the rest of the vocabulary.

The Vade Mecum was originally projected and executed not with a view to its separate publication, but as one of a series of measures adopted in order to ensure the most rigorous accuracy in the Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance, then in a course of preparation, but which has now been several years before the public, and has passed into a second edition. This latter we have little hesitation in commending as the prince of Concordances. No pains or expense have been spared in attaining the *ne plus ultra* of correctness and completeness. And the citation of all passages in the familiar words of the ordinary English version, while it embraces the facility of consultation, also enables the student to see at a glance the various renderings which our translators have adopted for any given word of the original. This comparison is still further facilitated by the ample and exhaustive Hebrew-English and English-Hebrew indexes, attached to the work, in which the various Hebrew equivalents of every word used in the common version, and the various English equivalents of every word in the Hebrew Bible are tabulated.

The Vade Mecum after lying in manuscript for many years, is now independently issued as a partial and less costly substitute for a concordance, and will doubtless be welcomed by many who are deterred by the expense of the larger publication. Both these valuable works are offered by John Boyd, 1193 Broadway, New York, at a great reduction from the prices hitherto charged by importers generally.

A Practical Grammar of the Hebrew Language for Schools and Colleges. By B. Felsenthal, Ph. D. 8vo. Pp. 99. New York. 1868.

A New Practical Hebrew Grammar, with Hebrew-English and English-Hebrew Exercises, and a Hebrew Chrestomathy. By Solanar Deutsch, A. M., Ph. D. 8vo. Pp. 268. New York. 1868.

The multiplication of text books for the study of Hebrew, affords a pleasing evidence of the increased attention paid to this sacred and venerable tongue. Of the two grammars named above, and which have appeared during the present year, that of Dr. Felsenthal of Chicago, is more elementary and meagre, devoting a large share of attention to the correct reading and pronunciation of the Hebrew text, and seems to have been chiefly intended for, and adapted to the earlier stages of instruction in Jewish schools. That of Dr. Deutsch, of Baltimore, without ceasing to be elementary, is more advanced in its character, and adapted to a wider range of

pupils. It is a valuable compendium of Hebrew Grammar, illustrated throughout by exercises in translation and composition, and followed by a brief Chrestomathy. It will be especially serviceable to beginners, and to those who wish to prosecute the study of the language without the aid of a teacher.

In the Schoolroom: Chapters in the Philosophy of Education. By John S. Hart, LL.D., Principal of the New Jersey State Normal School. Pp. 376. 12mo. Philadelphia: Elderidge & Brother.

The long experience of Dr. Hart entitles him to speak with authority on the subject of teaching. Few have ever given it more earnest, judicious, and patient study, and few have enjoyed so wide a field, and so varied, for observation. His previous books prepared us to expect instruction given in an easy, polished style. The present volume fully meets that expectation. The teacher will find it valuable to him in his profession; and the general reader can scarcely fail to enjoy almost any page he may turn up. Without the formidable appearance of a connected treatise, it is possessed of real unity and progressiveness of subject. Its thirty brief chapters on different topics are all connected steps of discussion. Beginning with the question, "What is teaching?" the author proceeds to treat of methods of communicating instruction and of training, the order of development and cultivation of the several faculties, the attainment of breadth and symmetry of character, the attainment of power, of clearness and command of attention, together with various miscellaneous counsels, the benefits of common schools to the commonwealth and to society, and closes with a reasonable account of what an education should be when complete. The whole is marked by a sober, but penetrating good sense, and agreeably enlivened with example and narrative.

The Progress of Philosophy in the Past and in the Future. By Samuel Tyler, LL.D. Second edition, enlarged. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1868. Pp. 244.

This volume is handsomely printed on tinted paper. It contains three Review articles. The first originally published in the *Southern Quarterly Review* for November, 1856; the second in the *Princeton Review* for October, 1855, on the Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton; and the third, in the *Princeton Review* for January, 1862, on Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought. All these articles commanded general attention not only in this country but in England. They prove Mr. Tyler to be a clear and able metaphysician, the peer of the most distinguished authors in that department.

The Dutchman's Fire-side. A Tale. By James K. Paulding. "Somewhere about the time of the old French War." Edited by William J. Paulding. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Pp. 376.

A Book of Vagaries; comprising the New Mirror for Travellers, and other Whim-Whams: being selections from the Papers of a Retired Common Councilman, erewhile known as Launcelot Langstaff, and in the Public Records, as James K. Paulding. Edited by William J. Paulding. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Pp. 417.

Great popularity attended the writings of that coterie of men of talents in New York in the early part of this century. Mr. Paulding was one of the most admired of this set of humourists. The reproduction of his principal works will no doubt be acceptable to a large class of readers to whom they will have all the attraction of novelty.

Annual of Scientific Discovery: or, Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1868, exhibiting the most important discoveries and improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Botany, &c. &c., together with Notes on the Progress of Science during the year 1867; a list of recent Scientific Publications; obituaries of eminent scientific men, &c. Edited by Samuel Kneeland, A. M., M. D., Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, &c. &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington street. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1868. Pp. 331.

To the majority of educated persons, not specially addicted to science, such a summary as that contained in this volume is a desideratum. It gives them what is necessary in short compass, and refers them to sources of more detailed information. The reader must make up his mind in taking up this, and most other scientific works of the day, to find the Scriptures set aside as of no authority.

Norwood; or, Village Life in New England. By Henry Ward Beecher. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Pp. 549.

An interesting and instructive presentation of a phase of New England character and life, which is rapidly passing way. The work has already an established reputation, due not more to the celebrity of its author, than to its own merits.

The Speech of Mr. John Checkley upon his Trial at Boston in 1724. With an Introduction, by the Rev. E. H. Gillett, D. D., of Harlem, New York. Morrisania, N. Y. 1868.

This is a reprint in quaint style of a speech once famous in New England, but of which hardly more than a solitary copy in the hands of an antiquary was known to be extant. The author was arraigned, tried, and convicted of publishing an offensive article in favour of Episcopacy, and against Deists

and Dissenters. This article was published in a volume entitled *Leslie's Short Method with Deists*, and as an Appendix to that celebrated Tract, the latter reaching some forty pages, the former extending over a hundred, and making the bulk of the volume. It was in the highest degree contemptuous, abusive, and provoking to the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, by whose toleration its author had residence and citizenship among them—a privilege which he abused to vituperate them and their religion. Consequently they did, what a generation later they would not have done, arraigned him before the civil courts, and, after hearing his defence, found him guilty, fined fined him fifty pounds, and bound him in the sum of one hundred pounds to keep the peace for six months. The speech here published is that made by him in self-defence before the court. It of course has some historical and antiquarian value, which is increased by Dr. Gillett's explanatory introduction. The following burlesque catechism contained in it, is a good illustration of its teasing and insulting character.

"A Specimen of a True Dissenting Catechism upon Right True Dissenting Principles with Learned* Notes, by way of Explication.

Question. Why don't the *Dissenters* in their Publick Worship make use of Creeds?

Answer. Why?—Because they are not set down *Word for Word* in the Bible.

Question. Well,—But why don't the *Dissenters* in their Publick Worship make use of the *Lord's Prayer?*

Answer. Oh!—Because that is set down *Word for Word* in the Bible."

Light and Truth: or, Bible Thoughts and Themes: Old Testament. By Horatius Bonar, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brother. 1868.

This book consists of brief meditations on passages of Scripture in the author's usual happy vein.

Memories of Olivet. By J. R. Macduff, D. D., author of "Morning and Night Watches," "The Shepherd and his Flock," "Sunsets on the Hebrew Mountains," etc etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1868.

As the title suggests, this book is a series of expositions of those passages of Scripture which recount things said and done on the Mount Olivet. It is rich in doctrinal, practical, and devotional matter.

* They're so perverse and opposite
As if they worshipped God for spite.

Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. By C. F. Keil, D. D., and F. Delitzsch, D. D., Professors of Theology. *The Twelve Minor Prophets.* Translated from the German by Rev. James Martin, B. A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1868. Vol. I. 615. Vol. II. 475.

The Christian Doctrine of Sin. By D. Julius Müller, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. Translated from the German of the Fifth Edition. By the Rev. William Urwick, M. A. Edinburgh: T. &. T. Clark. 1868. Vol. I. p. 417. Vol. II. pp. 431.

These volumes form a part of the valuable Foreign Theological Library, with which our readers are already familiar. Keil and Delitzsch are among the most decided of the evangelical theologians of Germany, and second to none in their reputation for learning and ability. Dr. Müller's work on Sin has assumed the position of a standard, which for years has been generally conceded to it.

The Works of the Rev. John Howe, M. A. With Memoirs of his Life. By Edmund Calamy, D. D. Complete in two volumes. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1869. Royal 8vo. Vol. I. and Vol. II. pp. 1276.

John Howe, author of the *Living Temple*, stands in the first rank of the English theologians of the seventeenth century. His works have never lost their hold upon the public mind. They continue to make an important part of the library of the ministers of the present generation. These condensed volumes, printed in double columns, contain the matter spread over the folios with which our older ministers are familiar. The type is legible, and the whole getting up of the work is highly creditable to the enterprising publishers; who richly deserve the thanks of the friends of sound doctrine for bringing these time-honoured writings anew before the public.

A Manual of Mythology, in the Form of Questions and Answers. By Rev. George W. Cox, M. A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. First American, from the Second London edition. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1868. Pp. 290.

"The researches of Comparative Mythologists during the present century have effected a complete revolution in the treatment and classification of the various systems of Mythology." The design of this volume is to give the results of those researches in a form suitable for the young.

The Word. The Star out of Jacob. By the author of "Dollars and Cents." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1868.

The Culdee Church. By Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Richmond. Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

The romantic interest which attaches to the Culdees, renders this little volume by Dr. Moore specially attractive. It will, we hope, tend to call attention to the faithful witnesses for truth, who have been too much forgotten, and to strengthen genuine Protestant feeling.

The following publications of the Board of Publication have been received for notice.

Oak-Mot. By the Rev. William M. Baker, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church at Zanesville, O.

Ulrich Zwingli, the Patriotic Reformer. A History. By the Rev. William M. Blackburn.

The Promises of God, considered in their Nature, Source, Certainty, Freeness, Preciousness, and Sanctifying Power. By E. C. Wines, D.D.

The Translated Prophet. By the late John M. Lowrie, D. D.

Three additional numbers of the excellent abridgment of Dr. William Smith's Biographical Dictionary, by the Rev. Samuel W. Barnum, published by D. Appleton & Co., noticed in our last number, have reached us, carrying it forward far into the letter M. This edition is not a mere abridgment. It contains also many valuable additions, suggested by J. A. Alexander's Commentaries, Fairbairn's Imperial Dictionary, &c.

We have also received additional numbers reaching down to the letter P. of the excellent edition of Smith's *Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible,* edited by Rev. Samuel W. Barnum, and published by D. Appleton & Co., New York, which we have before noticed.

STANDARD TEXT-BOOKS

FOR

COLLEGES, ACADEMIES AND HIGH-SCHOOLS,

PUBLISHED BY

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.,

654 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

PORTER.—The Human Intellect: with an Introduction upon Psychology and the Human Soul. By Professor Noah Porter, D. D., of Yale College. 1 vol. 8vo. . . $5 00

HOPKINS.—Love as a Law. A Treatise on Moral Science. By Mark Hopkins, D. D., LL.D., President of Williams College. 1 vol. 12mo. $1 50

DAY.—An Introduction to the Study of English Literature. By Prof. H. N. Day, of New Haven. One volume 12mo, uniform with Day's "Logic," "Art of Discourse," and "Art of Composition." $2 25

COOLEY.—A Text-Book of Natural Philosophy. An accurate, modern, and systematic explanation of the Elementary Principles of the Science adapted to use in High Schools and Academies. By Le Roy C. Cooley, A. M., Professor of Natural Science in the New York State Normal School. One volume 12mo, with numerous illustrations. $1 50

WORKS UPON THE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE,

PUBLISHED BY

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.

CRAIK.—A Compendious History of English Literature, and of the English Language from the Norman Conquest. With numerous Specimens. By George L. Craik, LL.D., Professor of History and English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast. Two volumes 8vo. . . Half calf, $12 00; cloth, $7 50

COLLIER.—A Bibliographical and Critical Account of the Rarest Books in the English Language (alphabetically arranged) which during the last fifty years have come under the observation of J. Payne Collier, F. S. A. In four volumes, cloth . $12 00

CLARK (N. G.)—An Outline of the Elements of the English Language, for the Use of Students. By N. G. Clark, Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in Union College. One volume 12mo, cloth. $1 25

DE VERE (PROF. M. SCHELE.)—Studies in English; or, Glimpses into the Inner Life of our Language. By M. Schele De Vere, LL.D., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Virginia. One volume 8vo, cloth . $2 50

DWIGHT.—Modern Philology: Its Discoveries, History, and Influence. With Maps, Tabular Views, and an Index. By Benjamin W. Dwight, Author of "The Higher Christian Education." Two volumes 8vo, cloth . . . $6 00

MARSH (G. P)—Lectures on the English Language. By George P. Marsh. First Series, fourth edition, revised and enlarged. One volume crown 8vo, half calf, large paper, $6 00; half calf, $5 00; cloth $3 00

———— The Origin and History of the English Language, and of the Early Literature it Embodies. By George P. Marsh, author of "Lectures on the English Language." One volume crown 8vo, large paper, $6 00; half calf, 5 00; cloth, $3 00

MULLER (MAX, M. A.)—Lectures on the Science of Language. Delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, in April, May, and June, 1861. By Max Muller, M. A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford; Corresponding Member of the Imperial Institute of France. First Series. One volume, half calf, $4 50; cloth, crown 8vo, ... $2 50

———— Second Series. By the same. With thirty-one Illustrations. One vol. crown 8vo, half calf, $5 50; cloth, . $3 50

TRENCH.—A select Glossary of English Words used formerly in Senses different from their Present. By Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., Dean of Westminster. One volume 12mo. $1 25

———— English, Past and Present. By the same. One volume 12mo. $2 00

WHITNEY.—Language, and the Study of Language. Twelve Lectures on the Principles of Linguistic Science. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanscrit and Instructor in Modern Languages in Yale College. One volume crown 8vo, cloth, ... $2 50

☞ These books sent post-paid upon receipt of the price.

Full descriptive Catalogues of the publications of Charles Scribner & Co. sent to any address upon application.

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.,
654 *Broadway, New York.*