Vol. V.] [No. 3.

# BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

## NEW SERIES.

VOL. I.] JULY, 1829. [No. 3.

## Contents.



PRINCETON, N. J.

BERNARD CONNOLLY, PRINTER

1829.

# JAHN'S HEBREW COMMONWEALTH.

---

Jahn's *History of the Hebrew Commonwealth; translated from the German, by* Calvin E. Stowe, A. M. of the Theological Seminary, Andover. *Andover.* 8vo. pp. 692. 1828.

We have long thought a good history of the Old Testament one of the greatest *desiderata* in theological literature. All the works relating to this subject, which, heretofore, have come to our knowledge, appear to us to be essentially defective. Dr. Shuckford's "Sacred and Profane History of the World Connected," is no doubt, the work of a learned man, and entitled to considerable praise: but it is heavy and disproportioned, manifesting little judgment and less taste; and by no means fitted to throw a strong and satisfactory light on those earlier parts of the sacred history which it is designed to elucidate. It was the intention of this writer to fill up the whole space from the Creation to the time at which Dr. *Prideaux* commenced his elaborate and useful work. But he followed his predecessor *haud passibus aequis*, and did not live to execute his plan, even as well as he might have done.

On Dr. Prideaux's work higher commendation may be bestowed. It is an invaluable monument of learned labor; comprehensive in its plan, rich in matter, and minutely instructive, in all cases in which the author had materials for making it so. It would be difficult to mention a work of greater value in these respects. But Dr. *Prideaux* is a dull writer; he is, in many cases, unnecessarily and unrea-

sonably tedious; and in a great measure destitute of the art of beguiling the labor of study by the charms of either spirited narrative, or masterly diction. Hence his work, however solid, can never be a favourite with the mass of youthful readers;—not even with theological students.

STACKHOUSE'S "History of the Bible" is a learned and instructive work; but complex and ill judged in its structure; abounding in matter which might very well have been spared; and, in some of its positions and defences of truth, so injudicious, that even his *sincerity* has been sometimes questioned. The truth is, *Stackhouse* was a bookmaker by profession. No wonder, then, that he often wrote in haste, and took more care to multiply volumes, than to digest their contents in the best manner.

The chasm left between *Shuckford and Prideaux*, in consequence of the premature decease of the former, has been well filled by several writers since their time, and perhaps by none more satisfactorily than the learned *Arthur Bedford*, in a part of his "Scripture Chronology." Still the trouble and expense incurred by the student, in being obliged to resort to a third writer, in order to complete his course through the Old Testament, amounts to no small inconvenience, and has long rendered some new and more finished work desirable.

Among the single and complete works on the Old Testament, which former times have produced, the *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, of JOHN FRANCIS BUDDÆUS, in two volumes, quarto, is, in our opinion, by far the best. Judgment, learning, comprehensiveness, and lucid order, characterize it throughout. If it were as rich and finished in profane history, as that of *Prideaux*, and some others, it would scarcely leave any thing to be desired. But here lies its main defect. To which may be added, that since the time of *Buddæus*, such large and very rich additions have been made to every department of Biblical knowledge,

that materials for a more satisfactory work are abundant and easily accessible. Besides all this, the work is scarce, and can never be procured with sufficient ease to be made a class-book, in a large institution; and to crown all, it is in a language which even some theological students do not read with entire familiarity.

When we have fancied to our own minds such a work as we should like to see on this subject, we have sketched the character of it thus—Let it be substantially on the plan of *Buddæus*, with, however, more *text*, and lesss extended *annotations*. Let it contain all that his work contains, with a more ample collateral exhibition of profane history. Let it take up, and discuss all the principal difficulties and questions which occur, in reference to every portion of the Old Testament history; giving, in a dense and clear manner, the most valuable opinions, of different writers, on every point; and closing with the author's own, with a suggestion of the principal reasons in its support. Let the *Creation;* the *Paradisiacal State;* the *fall* of man; the *Deluge;* the rise of *Idolatry;* the origin of *language*, and *alphabetical writing;* the *dispersion* of mankind; the origin of *Sacrifices;* the *Abrahamic Covenant;* the institution of *Circumcision;* the departure out of *Egypt;* the Miracles of the *Magicians;* the passage of the *Red Sea*, and through the *wilderness;* the introduction of the *Ceremonial* economy; the *Theocracy;* and a multitude of other points, which will immediately occur to a student of the Bible, all pass in review, and each receive that brief, condensed, lucid discussion, which its relative importance demands. And to every chapter and section let a distinct reference be subjoined, to the best authors, ancient and modern, who have treated of the several points, respectively, which may come under review.

Such a work would be an interesting present to thousands; but to theological students, it would be a treasure of

inestimable value. What a *Gnomon* is to a *dial*, a well executed history on this plan would be in the liberal pursuit of Old Testament studies. At the same time, it cannot be disguised, that it would be extremely difficult of execution. To do it well, would put in requisition the very best talents and erudition in any country, for a number of years. In a comparatively short time, indeed, a judicious well informed divine might prepare a work in some measure on the plan proposed, if he would consent to swell it into seven or eight octavo volumes: for there can be no doubt, that, *cæteris paribus,* the *longer* the work, the greater the *ease* with which it might be executed. But to comprise it in two, or at most three volumes of convenient size, beyond which no one ought to think of extending it,—would require a power of arrangement, of digestion, and of comprehension, as uncommon as it is enviable. For our part, such is our impression of the arduousness of the task, that we do not expect very soon to see a work corresponding with the model which we have imagined, and attempted to describe.

From our knowledge of some of the other publications of *Jahn*, we expected to find in his "*History of the Hebrew Commonwealth*," what we *have* found—a learned and valuable work, sustaining his former reputation, and well worthy the attention of general readers, especially of theological students. He has given a succinct, but compact, lucid, and critically arranged history of the Hebrews, from their first rise in *Abraham*, down to the destruction of *Jerusalem.* To this *Harmony* of the various accounts given of persons and events, in the different books of the Old Testament, the author has added a brief account of the various nations connected with them. So that his work is, like that of his English predecessors, but with far more brevity, clearness and taste, an exhibition of "Sacred and Profane History Connected." We know of no single work, in our language,

which goes over this ground in a manner at once so spirited, luminous, orderly and comprehensive. While it certainly may be read with great advantage by all classes of readers; it is peculiarly worthy of the attention of those whose duty it is to make themselves critically acquainted with every part of the contents of the Bible.

But while we bestow this high and unequivocal praise on the volume before us; while we feel indebted to the author for the learned labor which he has devoted to its compilation; and while we feel grateful to Professor *Stuart* for encouraging its translation, and to Mr. *Stowe* for the very creditable manner in which he has executed his task, in giving it an English dress: we are still constrained to say, that the work by no means comes up to our ideas of what such a work might be, or ought to be; and that, although we rejoice in its publication, we are far from thinking all need of further effort in the same field, superseded.

Professor *Jahn* has prefixed to his plan of the "Hebrew Commonwealth," a short statement of the progress of things from the creation to the rise of the Hebrews, as a distinct people. We regret that this statement is so *very* short. It is all comprised in eight pages. A little more time and space might have been profitably bestowed upon this important preliminary to his main subject. It is true, even in these few pages, he manifests much thought and reading; but, surely, such subjects as the creation of the world and of man; the primitive state of man; his fall; the character of the antediluvian period; the deluge; the covenant with *Noah;* the building of *Babel;* the confusion of languages; and the dispersion of mankind—might have been expected to engage a larger share of attention and discussion than the learned Professor has thought proper to bestow upon them. For although these several topics do not fall, strictly, within the scope of the "History of the Hebrew Commonwealth;" they are so deeply interesting, so essentially interwoven

with the early history of the human race, and so closely connected with the rise of the Hebrew nation, as exhibiting the fortunes of their progenitors, that, in fixing on the relative proportions of such a work, we should never have thought of passing over them as our author has done.

The second section of chapter 1st, entitled "Civil Society before the Flood," despatches the history of human affairs, during 1656 years, in a single page, as follows:—

### CIVIL SOCIETY BEFORE THE FLOOD.

"In the fragments of Antedeluvian history preserved by Moses, there is nothing explicit respecting civil societies. If there was any authentic information on this subject extant in his time, it did not appertain to the book of Genesis, which was designed merely as an introduction to the history of the Mosaic legislation. As such, it preserves a knowledge of the Creator, gives a general view of the conduct of men, and a more particular account of the ancestors of the Hebrews, from the creation of the world to the origin of the Hebrew Commonwealth.

"The first man undoubtedly kept his children and other descendants about him as long as possible, and exercised parental authority over them. Cain was the first who separated from his father's society, and he was impelled to this step through fear of punishment for the murder of his brother. In the course of time, various motives, such as a desire to obtain land for cultivation or pasturage for cattle, might induce others to follow his example. Thus, there arose separate families which were governed by their own patriarchs. This is the state of nature, that *Golden Age*, which the prophets and poets of later times have painted in the liveliest colours, and exhibited as a picture of perfect happiness.*

"When families had increased to tribes and nations, then without doubt, civil societies began. Even at this early period we find that men were engaged in agriculture and in the improvement of the arts; that the laws of marriage, the rights of private property, and the public institutions of religion were recognized and observed.† These

* Isa. ii. 4; xi. 6—9; lxv. 17—25. Joel iii. 18. Micah iv. 1—5. Ovid. Metam, I. 89. Virgil, Ecl. IV.

† Gen. ii. 15; iv. 2, 3, 17—22; v. 29.

societies, however, during the ten generations enumerated in the fifth chapter of Genesis, were very imperfect; for those lawless deeds of violence which arose from profligacy and impiety, prove but too clearly, that the power of the strong then generally passed for right.* Those famous heroes of great stature, the giants of the old world, who are mentioned as the authors of these crimes, were either powerful chiefs, who engaged in open wars, or perhaps mere wandering thieves who with their lawless bands every where plundered and murdered the defenceless. The prevailing form of government during this period was probably the patriarchal; though the patriarchs were either unable to restrain and bring to punishment stronghanded transgressors, or swayed by the ties of relationship, and in some cases, perhaps, by a participation in the spoil, they were unwilling to exert their authority for this purpose."

From this extract, it will be seen that the learned author did not think proper to take any notice whatever of the event which we denominate the *fall* of man. Perhaps he did not believe in the reality of such an event. But we were particularly struck with a sentence which occurs at the end of the second paragraph of the above extract, relating to the period sometimes denominated the "*Golden Age.*" We have always supposed that the only "Golden Age" of the Bible and of the Christian, was the period, whether long or short, of paradisiacal innocence. But Dr. *Jahn* seems to refer it to the period which followed the murder of *Abel*, and the consequent departure of *Cain* from "the presence of the Lord." And for this view of the subject, he refers to the Prophets, *Isaiah*, *Joel*, and *Micah*, and to the heathen poets, *Ovid* and *Virgil*. We have always supposed that *Isaiah*, and his companions in the prophetic office, in the passages referred to, had an eye to an entirely different affair; and with respect to the heathen poets, we cannot, for a moment, hesitate to believe that the basis of all that they and others have said or sung of the "Golden Age," is

* Gen. vi. 4, 11, 13, comp. ix. 3—6. Gen. iv. 26, comp. vi. 2.

the tradition, from the progenitors of our race, of their *primitive state*, in Eden, in which all was health and order, and purity, and unmingled bliss; but which, alas! "like the morning cloud, and the early dew," soon passed away.

We infer from the whole aspect of Professor *Jahn's* representation of the early part of the history of the human race, that he considered the primitive state of man to be a state of intellectual and moral infancy, from which he arose very gradually, and by the exercise of his own powers. To this source, as it would appear, that is, to the gradual developement of man's faculties by his own efforts, he ascribes the attainment of language, and all the arts and comforts of life. We have no doubt that this view of the subject is radically erroneous. To us it appears quite clear, that the original state of man was his most perfect state; that his Maker formed him a social being; that society is, therefore, strictly speaking, a Divine institution, of which the first man was taught the use and enjoyment; that as soon as God made man, he began to speak to him, of course, to instruct him in the use of language as a vehicle of thought; and also that a knowledge of the more necessary and important arts of life was probably imparted in the same manner. It is hardly necessary to add, that whichever of these theories the historian may adopt, will give a corresponding colouring to his representation of the progress of human affairs, in a thousand cases. The theory which we prefer, is, in our view, not only most rational, and most agreeable to the whole current of the history of our race; but the only one that can be reconciled with the inspired records.

Those who take a deep interest in the great events recorded in the Old Testament, and especially those who are eagerly seeking for new light with respect to a number of points concerning which there appears to be room for diversity of opinion, will naturally expect to find much new and important instruction in the pages of Professor *Jahn*. In this

however, they will be disappointed. On such points as the rise of idolatry; the first and subsequent forms of it; the Abrahamic covenant; the origin of that singular rite by which this covenant was sealed; the wonders performed by the magicians in *Egypt;* the difficulties attending the duration of the government of Judges; and a number of others, which have called forth the display of much good learning; the curious reader will find scarcely a satisfactory hint, and no new light whatever. We cannot call to mind a single instance in which a strong original view is taken of any one subject. The author's narratives are certainly clear, lively, comprehensive, and frequently in manner somewhat striking; but remarkably commonplace, and such as will not afford the reader, who is even tolerably familiar with the matters treated of, a new thought for many pages together. If it had been his aim to avoid committing himself on important and difficult questions, and to pass over knotty points without appearing to recognise their existence, he could scarcely have taken a more direct method to attain his object. We think, in a word, that Professor *Jahn's* work on the "Hebrew Commonwealth" will often and long be read by tyros, as, on the whole, an able compend, but that it will never be quoted by any subsequent writer, as a luminous guide to direct the curious and critical inquirer in his course.

The following extract from chapter IV. section 33. pp. 99, 100, and 101; entitled "*The reign of Solomon,*" may be considered as a fair specimen of Dr. *Jahn's* manner of treating the most interesting parts of the Biblical history.

### REIGN OF SOLOMON.

"In the year 1015 B. C. David, about six months before his death, surrendered the government to his son Solomon, after a reign of forty years and a half. Solomon was at that time about eighteen years old, and consequently he was neither the first-born, nor the eldest prince:

but he was appointed to the throne by the direction of Jehovah. Adonijah, the oldest prince, made an attempt to seize the sceptre; but his design was seasonably frustrated, and Solomon confirmed himself in the government during the life of his father. The last charges which the dying monarch gave to his successor, are mentioned in the Scriptures as commendable; and let men judge of them as they please, they are neither revengeful nor unjust, but strictly conformable to the divine precepts. According to the law, criminals were to be punished for the purpose of deterring others from the commission of similar crimes; and it was with this view merely that David gave those directions, the execution of which he left entirely to the discretion of his successor.

"The kingdom under David had been very much extended and brought under good regulations. The arms of the Hebrews were feared by all the neighbouring people, and consequently the reign of Solomon was peaceable. Now the predominant tribe of Judah *lay as a lion, and as a lioness*, which no nation *ventured to rouse up*. The Hebrews were the ruling people, and their empire, the principal monarchy in Western Asia. From the Mediterranean Sea and the Phenicians to the Euphrates, from the river of Egypt and the Elantic gulf to Berytus, Hamath and Thapsacus, and towards the east to the Hagarenes on the Persian gulf; all were subject to the sway of Solomon. The Canaanites, indeed, had been neither annihilated nor expelled, but they were obedient and quiet subjects. Their whole number might amount to between 400,000 and 500,000; since 153,000 were able to render soccage to the king. The warlike and civilized Philistines, the Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites, the Nomadic Arabians of the desert, and the Syrians of Damascus were all tributary to him. Peace gave to all his subjects prosperity, the trade which he introduced brought wealth into the country, and promoted the arts and sciences; which found an active protector in the king, who was himself one of the most distinguished of the learned men. The building of the temple, and of several palaces, introduced foreign artists by whom the Hebrews were instructed. Many foreigners, and even sovereign princes, were attracted to Jerusalem in order to see and converse with the prosperous, royal sage. The regular progress of all businesss, the arrangements for security from foreign and domestic enemies, the army, the cavalry, the armories, the chariots, the palaces, the royal household, the good order in the administration of the affairs of the empire, and in the service of the court, excited as much admiration as the wisdom and learning of the viceroy of Jehovah. So much had

been effected by the single influence of David, because he scrupulously conformed himself to the theocracy of the Hebrew state.

"But in the midst of all this splendour, Solomon fell short of the virtues of his father. At first, indeed, while the example of David and the instructions of his preceptor Nathan, were yet fresh in his mind, he showed himself as faithful to the theocracy as his father, and wished for nothing more than wisdom and understanding, that he might govern his subjects well. The severity with which he treated Joab and Adonijah, is not to be blamed; for they were seditious men who would otherwise have instigated a civil war. Also the removal of the high priest Abiathar, (by which a prophecy was fulfilled,) was not a violation of the law, for the law did not determine by what power the high priest should be appointed. While there was no statute on the subject, it was a matter of policy that the nomination of so important and influential an officer should be retained in the crown. The people willingly offered their service for the building of the temple, and did not esteem it a burden. The administration of justice was also faithfully attended to.

"Notwithstanding all this, Solomon, after the example of other oriental monarchs, governed in rather an arbitrary manner. His numerous harem, which consisted of one thousand females, was an express violation of the law of Moses. The introduction of a body of cavalry, which amounted to twelve thousand men, might perhaps be excusable in an empire so extensive; and in this view it may be considered as not counteracting the law of Moses, which forbids the multiplication of horses. But the increase of the imposts to defray the expenses of the royal household, which in the East are always great, and in Solomon's court were extravagant, were burdens such as had been predicted; and which the Hebrews after the death of Solomon wished to have diminished. Even the decision respecting the two prostitutes, which called forth so many eulogies on the king's knowledge of mankind, betrays a leaning towards that arbitrary exercise of the royal power which is so common among the eastern despots. Solomon, as he grew older continually receded farther from the law of Moses, which every king of the Hebrews was bound to obey. That he as well as David, should tolerate idolatry in the foreign countries, they had conquered, was not a violation of the law, which was enjoined on the Hebrews only; but that he should allow the idolatry of his wives in his own dominions, and even in his own capital; that he should build temples to the gods, if he did not himself offer them sacrifices; this was a breach of the fundamental law of the Hebrew state; it was a seduc-

ing of the Hebrews to idolatry; it was encouraging them to rebel against Jehovah their king. On this account the prosperity of Solomon was interrupted by disquiets in Idumea and Syria, and it was foretold to him that only one tribe, (Judah and Benjamin, mentioned as one because the capital Jerusalem was situated on the borders of each,) should remain to his heirs. The dominion over the other ten tribes was promised to Jeroboam by Ahijah the prophet. Solomon died in the year 975 B. C.; and notwithstanding his glory was but little lamented."

Here, several of the most remarkable features in the character and history of this distinguished Hebrew king, are either passed over in entire silence, or mentioned so cursorily as to leave the portrait comparatively indistinct. His pre-eminent *wisdom*; the reason why he, and not his father *David*, was selected by Jehovah to build a *Temple* to his name; the erection of that far-famed and unparalleled edifice; the nature and circumstances of his defection from duty; the reason we have to believe that he afterwards repented, and returned to a sense of duty—are none of them made to stand forth with that prominence which the sacred history gives to them; and some of them are wholly unnoticed.

In other cases our author is more happy, as well as more instructive. The 163d section of chapter XV. entitled, "*Survey of the Theocracy*," is a comprehensive and well-executed sketch.

### SURVEY OF THE THEOCRACY.

"The attentive reader of the preceding history, who has preserved the thread of the narration unbroken in his own mind, and can comprehend at one view the principal subjects embraced in it, cannot fail to perceive a connected plan running through the whole. This plan commences with the call of Abraham, is sustained by the Theocracy of the Hebrew state introduced by Moses, is gradually developed by subsequent occurrences, and finally brought to perfection by Jesus Christ and his apostles. It is a plan which men could never have

devised, nor have prosecuted without interruption through so many ages, nor have finally executed in so remarkable a manner, with such important results, and to so great an extent.

"Abraham received the promise of a numerous posterity, who were to possess the land of Canaan and preserve the true religion in the world; Gen. xii. 1—4: xv. 1—21: xxii. 16—18: and xviii. 17—22, compare xvii. 4—14; and by means of these descendants, or *the seed* of Abraham, all nations who were then almost entirely given up to idolatry, were to be blessed, or, to esteem themselves happy. This benediction, or blessing, according to Gen. xvii. 4—14, and xviii. 16—22, must have had principal reference to the propagation of the true religion, which the posterity of Abraham were to preserve, but which was at that time mostly, and soon after, entirely lost among the other nations of the earth. The prophets of later times, whenever they have predicted the spread of true religion among the heathen, have understood the promise given to Abraham, in this sense. But the words of the promise are susceptible of a more extensive meaning; and, as was shown by the result, they really did refer to something more than the mere propagation of religion. Gal. iii. 16. This promise was transferred to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 1—4; and by him, to Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 12—18; and Jacob pronounced the same benediction principally on the tribe of Judah, Gen. xlix. 8—10, to which he had given a part of the privileges of primogeniture; so certain was he of the complete fulfilment of the promise, though the posterity of Abraham had increased to only seventy souls in two hundred and fifteen years, and though he had himself forsaken the promised land.

"This little tribe of the descendants of Abraham, however, during their residence of four hundred and thirty years in Egypt, increased to two millions and a half; and thus this part of the promise was accomplished, while the other part, respecting the preservation of religion, was in some degree counteracted; for the Israelites had for the most part become deeply infected with the Egyptian idolatry, and they would have become entirely idolatrous, had not God interposed to prevent it. They, indeed, always cherished a hope of settling, at some future time, in the promised land of Canaan; but, to judge from their subsequent conduct in Arabia Petrea, they would never have had the desire nor the courage to leave the fruitful land of Egypt, had they not been oppressed by the murderous edict respecting their male children and by the services which they were compelled to render to the king. Thus, even this oppression which the Egyptians designed as a means of retaining them in the country, was that which first excited

in them a desire to withdraw from Egypt, and which at last actually gave occasion to their departure.

"The miracles which were wrought both before and after their departure from Egypt, and the establishment of their theocratic constitution, were very appropriate. and indeed, necessary means of confirming their already wavering religious principles and of securing them for the future. We have seen in the preceding history, how well these means answered their purpose during the four hundred and fifty years under the Judges, the one hundred and twenty years under Saul, David, and Solomon, the two hundred and fifty-three years under the kings of Israel, and the three hundred and eighty years under the kings of Judah; for, during all these periods, the nation was always treated according to the sanctions of the Theocracy, and God himself frequently interposed by means of his ministers. An eternal kingdom and an everduring throne were promised to king David, 2 Sam. vii. 12—16. 1 Chr. xvii. 11—14; and in Ps. lxxxix. 27—38, this promise is explained by the assertion that the throne of David should stand as long as the sun and moon should endure in the heavens. Accordingly, the family of David was always preserved, though it was three times, (namely, under Jehoram, Athaliah, and Hezekiah,) in the utmost danger of extinction. Therefore the prophets, even in those times when the kingdom of Judah was overthrown and the posterity of David degraded and obscured, were always looking for some great descendant of that king, to whom even the heathen would submit; a hope which was derived from the blessing pronounced on Abraham. See Isa. ii. 2—4: xi. 1—12: 6. xlix—lv. lx. 18—20: lxv. 1—66: 24. Amos ix. 11. Mic. iv. 1—7: vii. 20. Hos. iii. 4, 5. Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. Ezek. xxxiv. 23—31. Compare Zech. ix. 9, 10. Mal. iii. 1, 2: iv. 2—6. Compare Ps. cx. 1: lxxxix. 26, 35—40. Gen. xv. 8—22.

"After the captivity, the family of David sunk still lower, as was necessarily the case, since the promised son of David was not to appear as a temporal prince. But the theocracy did not cease during this period. We have already observed how it was manifested during the captivity, and after the captivity to the time of Malachi, 410 B. C. The promise given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, respecting the possession of the land of Canaan, was fulfilled according to the condition prescribed in the theocratic constitution; and exactly as those conditions were, subsequently, more accurately defined by Moses, Deut. xxviii. xxx. 1—5, and by the later prophets. Even the duration of the Chaldee-Babylonian dominion did not exceed the predicted period of seventy years. After the captivity, the prophets

Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, made the necessary disclosures for the future; and, as these prophecies were continually fulfilling, by the building of the temple, by the victories of Alexander, by the Greek kings of Syria and Egypt, particularly by Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees; and later, by Jesus Christ, and the last war with the Romans, (which Christ himself more clearly and definitely foretold, Matt. xxiv.)—so, the divine government over the nation was continued without interruption.

"It may at first appear unaccountable, that God, during the last four hundred years from Malachi to Christ, never interposed in a supernatural manner for his people, not even in the times of the Maccabees, when men of the highest rank, and priests and high priests, did all in their power to abolish the worship of the true God and introduce heathenism. But what we have remarked above, respecting the constant fulfilment of prophecies during this period, is sufficient to prove the uninterrupted continuance of the Theocracy; not to mention, that even in more ancient times, there are long periods, in which we find nothing of supernatural intervention, and the people appear to have been left to themselves; as, for example, the four hundred and thirty years in Egypt, and the four hundred and fifty years under the Judges, during which later period, supernatural interposition was very unfrequent, as is remarked in 1 Sam. iii. 1. The divine government of the Hebrews always proceeded in the ordinary course of providence, so long as that was sufficient for the preservation of religion; and it was only when natural means failed to effect this purpose, that supernatural methods were employed. But the history in the Books of Maccabees shows, that religion could then be maintained without the miraculous intervention of God, and consequently, that supernatural aid was unnecessary, and would have been superfluous. The fulfilment of the ancient prophecies respecting the Babylonian captivity, the return to Palestine, and the building of the city of Jerusalem and the temple, had so confirmed the Hebrews in their religion, that without any new miracles, they were ready to die as martyrs for its sake. Still even during this period, the footsteps of divine providence, especially in some very dangerous conjunctures, are too plainly marked to be mistaken.

The absence of supernatural occurrences, therefore, during this period, is not to be explained on the supposition, that the Hebrews had then become wiser and more intelligent; and consequently, that those events which were anciently regarded as the supernatural

exertions of divine power, were now known and acknowledged to be natural.

"Such a supposed wisdom and intelligence was not to be found at this period among the boasted sages of Greece and Rome; they were then even far more eager after miracles and predictions than the Hebrews had ever been in the earliest periods of their history. In all unusual occurrences they saw prodigies and omens; and they pretended to immediate revelations, which they carefully distinguished from the explanation of signs. Whence, then, had the Hebrews this wisdom and intelligence, so far superior to the knowledge of all the other nations of the earth? On the contrary we know from Josephus and the New Testament, that the Jews, in the time of Christ and his apostles, were still too much inclined to expect supernatural events; for, after all the miracles which Christ had wrought before their eyes, they were always requiring of him some new sign. Matt. xii. 38, 39: xvi. 1—4. Mark viii. 11, 12. Luke xi. 16, 29. John iv. 48: vi. 30. Finally, the supposition in question is refuted by the fact, that in the founding of the perfect kingdom of God by Jesus and the apostles, miracles and prophecies were again found necessary, as they had been in ancient times; and that after the establishment of the Church, they again ceased.

"But when the promise given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: "*By thy seed shall all nations be blessed*, or, *esteem themselves happy*," had been fulfilled by Christ; the power of God, his miraculous cooperation, appeared only in the disciples of our Saviour, and afterwards, the perfect kingdom of God was promoted by the ordinary course of divine providence. As soon as this kingdom was established among the Jews and Gentiles, during the first generation after the ascension of Jesus, the Theocracy of the Jews who remained in unbelief, was left to its decline; a decline which, according to the predictions in Mal. iii. 1—5: iv. 1—5. Dan. ix. 24, 27; and Matt. xxiv, was applicable only to the old Theocracy. Since the destruction of Jerusalem, the unbelieving people, in the course of seventeen hundred and fifty years, have been scattered over all the earth, and have every where suffered the most cruel persecutions, oppressions, insults, and every species of distress, without any manifestation of the Theocracy for their relief, without any supernatural aid, without a miracle or prophecy. The people, however, are constantly preserved by divine providence in all their distresses; millions have perished by the sword since their revolt from the Romans, and we

may say, millions have become Christians, Mohammedans, and pagans; still the people remain and increase, and acccording to the prophecies, Deut. iv. 31: xxx. 1—5. Jer. xxiii. 1—8: xxxi. 35—37: xlvi. 28, they will continue to exist till the period arrives of which the apostle Paul speaks, Rom. xi. 25—28, and which some of the ancient prophets appear to have anticipated."

With respect to the *chronology* adopted by the learned Professor, we have nothing particular to say. It is a perplexing and difficult subject. And it is evident, from various passages, that he felt it to be so, and was not always entirely confident himself of the soundness of his conclusions. On a number of points connected with this department of his subject, he differs from those with whom we have been most accustomed to concur; yet we are far from being sure, that he is wrong. We should have been better satisfied, however, if in a few instances, he had been more particular in stating the reasons on the ground of which he decided. The *ipse dixit* of such a man is weighty; but, in the republic of Science and Literature, we surly Americans would rather bow to argument than authority.

With regard to the Appendix translated from *Basnage*, we cannot refrain from saying, on the whole, that we wish it had been entirely omitted. It adds considerably to the size and price of the volume, without furnishing, in our judgment, a corresponding amount of solid information. The author of the *Histoire des Juifs* is well characterized by Professor *Stuart* in his preface. He certainly was a learned, and, in many respects an able man. But judgment in the choice and concoction of his materials can by no means be ascribed to him. We think that Mr. *Stowe* himself, or even an inferiour man, might have compiled a sketch, in less than half the compass of the translation from *Basnage*, far more in keeping with *Jahn's* work, and much better adapted to give authentic and useful information to theological students.

We close our remarks on this useful publication by observing, that, while we commend the literary zeal, diligence and ability of Mr. *Stowe* in preparing it for the press; and while we sincerely wish the enterprizing booksellers who patronized the undertaking, may be remunerated by a ready and extensive sale; we, nevertheless, think that *better things* ought to be expected and attempted in the department to which the volume before us belongs; and attempted we will add, if no where else, on this side of the *Atlantic*. We are indebted to the Seminary at *Andover* for many valuable presents in reference to Biblical Literature. We should be truly gratified to welcome another from the same quarter, on this great field of sacred labour. We cannot forbear to express a hope that some gentleman there, with all the nerve and elasticity of youthful movement, will, before long set about it. Let him not, however, think of issuing his *Prospectus* for publication in eighteen months, or even two years after sitting down to the job. Let him calculate patiently to devote to it the leisure hours of twelve or fourteen years. Let him avail himself freely, but with much thought and discrimination, of the labours of *Heidiger*, *Usher*, *Buddæus*, *Spencer*, *Basnage*, *Selden*, *Vitringa*, *Shuckford*, *Prideaux*, *Bedford*, *Hales*, and some score of other folios and quartos, rich in materials of different qualities. Let him explore the pages of *Saurin's* "*Discours Historiques*, *Critiques*, *Theologiques*, *&c.*," which, we believe, have never been translated into English. Let him carefully consult *Allix*, and Father *Simon*, and *Cloppenburgh*, and *Spanheim*, and *Lightfoot*, and *Winder*, and *Stillingfleet*, and *Delaney*, and *Warburton*, and *Faber*, and a number of the more judicious modern Germans, whose writings have not yet become familiar to American scholars; taking the quintessence of their best matter from them all; compressing into a single page, in many cases, the opinions, arguments, and authorities which they often spread

over half a dozen, or more. Let him guard against the fault into which so many historians, as well as commentators have fallen, the fault of being copious and fluent on the *easy places,* and passing over, either in total silence, or with a few unsatisfactory words, the really *difficult ones*, as if he saw them not. When a work on this plan shall be executed, —and it will require nothing more for its execution than strong good sense; sobriety of mind; a pious recollection, at every step, that the great subject in hand, is nothing less than the church of the living God, in its various characters and relations; and a capacity for close, patient attention, and indefatigable labour;—then our intelligent Christians will be furnished with a companion, which they will all highly prize, as an auxiliary in every department of religious reading; and our Theological Seminaries with a *text-book*, for the first part of their historical course, more convenient, rich, and instructive than they have ever yet enjoyed. When two or three large editions of *Jahn's* work shall have been sold and worn out, we hope the next generation of Professors in our Seminaries, will be so happy as to hail the completion, and enjoy the great advantages of such a present as we have now recommended.

## BROWN'S THEORY OF CAUSE AND EFFECT.

The late Dr. Brown, Professor of Moral Philosophy, in the University of Edinburgh, some years ago, published a book, entitled Cause and Effect, in which he revived and defended the opinion of Mr. Hume, on the subject of *power*. It is due, however, to the ingenious author, to state that he distinctly disavowed Hume's skeptical inferences from this doctrine.

The same opinions, and the same reasonings, in support of them, are exhibited in his lectures on the philosophy of the mind, a more recent publication. And as the Philosophy of Dr. Brown has many admirers in this country, and has received unqualified recommendations from high authority, it will not, we trust, appear unreasonable or unnecessary, even at this late period, to bring his theory to the test of a fair examination; this is the object of the present article.

The opinion of Dr. B. to which I have referred is, that in philosophical accuracy, there is no such thing as *causation* or *power;* that *immediate invariable antecedence* is all that properly enters into the idea of a cause, and *immediate invariable consequence*, the true idea of *effect;* and accordingly, that power is nothing else but the relation between an *immediate invariable antecedent* and *consequent*. In plain English, his opinion is, that there is no such thing in nature as *power;* and that when we mean any thing more by this word, than merely to express the invariable antecedence of one thing to another we speak inaccurately, and unphilosophically. The words *cause, causa-*

*tion*, *power*, *energy*, *efficacy*, *&c.* express nothing, according to his theory, that is intelligible, besides the mere relation of *antecedence* and *sequence*.

It is admitted, however, by Dr. B. that almost the whole human race have annexed to these terms, or those which correspond with them, in their respective languages, ideas different from what he considers correct. The structure of all languages furnishes irrefragable proof of this fact. The notion of *action*, *causation*, *energy*, *&c.* is so common among men, that children and savages entertain it as familiarly as any others. It is an idea which is contained in every active verb, and no man can devest himself of it, or speak half a dozen sentences without using words which plainly convey this meaning. This fact is so manifest, that the ingenious author does not call it in question. He admits that the opinion which he maintains, is contrary "to the almost universal sense of mankind." Now such a general consent is commonly, and we think, justly considered as a strong proof, that the idea or sentiment, in which men so agree, is founded in nature, and accordant with truth. It must be strong reasoning, indeed, which shall demonstrate that an opinion entertained by men of all nations, however different in language, in manners, in education, in government, and in religion, is false. If this could be done, then all difference between truth and prejudice would be obliterated. To establish the certainty of the existence of *power* or *causation*, the argument derived from universal consent, appears to us to be irresistible; for we cannot suppose, that all men of all nations, from early childhood to hoary age, could be led to adopt an opinion which had no foundation, without admitting the absurd consequence, that all men are so constituted, that they are by necessity led to embrace error instead of truth. And this supposition would not answer the purpose of Dr. Brown, as it would render it impossible for him to establish any opinion as true; for that constitution

of human nature which leads men invariably astray, in one case, ought to be suspected in all. The true principles of philosophizing, should have led to a directly contrary course of reasoning. He should have assumed the fact, that all men possessed of reason, entertain from their earliest years the opinion that there is such a thing as *power* or *causation*; and this idea being incorporated, inseparably with every language in the world, it is a just conclusion, that this is one of those common notices, or self evident truths, which from the very constitution of our nature, we are under the necessity of receiving. Let any man attempt to form a language from which all idea of active energy or causation shall be excluded, and he will soon find that this is no vulgar prejudice, but a fundamental truth ; an idea, which if it were removed from the human mind, would leave a vast chasm in all our reasonings and systems of truth, in every branch of science. If a people should ever be discovered, who used a language which did not involve, in every sentence, the conception of *power* and *causation*, this single fact would go farther to prove them to be of another species, than all the diversities which have hitherto been observed among the nations of the earth.

But let us see how Dr. B. disposes of this acknowledged fact, of the almost universal existence of the idea of *power*. He attempts to show, that there are analogous cases, in which, prejudices have, for a long time, had an almost universal prevalence. The instance which he adduces, and to which he often recurs, is the notion of a certain *something*, existing with all bodies, which the schoolmen, after Aristotle, called *form*, or *substantial forms*. This notion, it may be admitted, was as extensive, and existed as long as the Aristotelian logic prevailed. But the case is no how parallel to the one under consideration. The opinion respecting *substantial forms*, belonged to a peculiar system of philosophy, and as long as that system maintained its ground, it

would, of course, be entertained; but it was never the opinion of the great body of the people. The mass of mankind never heard of such an opinion; and even in those countries, where it was held, it was merely the opinion of the learned. The common people then, knew as little, and believed as little, about *substantial forms*, as they do now. The idea is not incorporated, as is the case in regard to *power*, with all languages. It is not common to children and adults; savages, and philosophers. The case adduced, therefore, does not serve to account for the fact of the universal consent of mankind, in receiving this opinion. But it is time to attend to the proofs which Dr. B. offers in support of his theory; and that I may do no injustice to his meaning, I will give them in his own words:—The first is, "That we have, in fact, no other idea in our mind, when we speak of *cause and effect*, than an invariable *antecedence* and *consequence*." "Thus, when a spark falls on gunpowder and kindles it into explosure, every one ascribes to the spark the *power* of enkindling the inflammables. But let any one ask himself, what it is which he means by the term, and without contenting himself with a few phrases which signify nothing,—reflect before he gives his answer, and he will find that he means nothing more than this, in all similar circumstances, the explosion of gunpowder, will be the immediate consequence of the application of a spark. To take an example more immediately connected with our own science, we all know, that as soon as any one in the usual circumstances of health and freedom, wills to move his arm, the motion of his arm follows, and we believe, that in the same circumstances of health and freedom, the motion of the arm will constantly follow the will to move it. If we knew and believed nothing more than that the motion of the arm would uniformly follow the will to move it, would our knowledge of the phenomenon be less perfect? —"Let us suppose ourselves then to know all the antece-

dents and consequents in nature, and to believe, not merely that they have once or repeatedly existed in connexion, but that they have uniformly done so, and will continue for ever to recur in a similar series; so that but for the intervention of the divine will, (which would be itself in that case, a new antecedent,) it will be impossible for any of the antecedents to exist again without being immediately followed by its original consequent."

Again, "To him who had previously kindled a fire, and placed on it a vessel full of water, with a certainty that in that situation the water would speedily become hot, what additional information would be given, by telling him that the fire had the power of boiling water?"—"It is only by confounding *casual* with *uniform* and *invariable antecedence*, that *power* can be conceived to be something different from *antecedence*." "Such is the simple, and as it appears to me, only intelligible view of power, as discoverable in the successive phenomena of nature, and how very different from this simple view, is the common, or I may almost say, the universal notion of the agencies which are supposed to be concerned in the phenomena, which are the objects of philosophical inquiry."—"To me it appears indeed so obvious a truth, that the substances which exist in nature—the world, its living inhabitants and their adorable Creator, are all the real existences in nature, and that in the various changes which occur, there can as little be any powers or susceptibilities different from the antecedents and consequences themselves, as there can be *forms* differing from the co-existing particles of matter which constitute them."

The author feeling, however, that it was incumbent on him to account more fully for the fallacy whiuh he supposes to exist almost universally in regard to the nature of a *cause*, attributes it to "abstraction aided and perpetuated by the use of language." But the principal cause to which he ascribes this universal prejudice, is "the imperfection of the

senses." "We are frequently," he observes, "incapable of perceiving the immediate antecedent to a consequent, and are, therefore, in danger of connecting it with a wrong antecedent; by this means we are led to inquire after the true causes of things, that is, after their real and immediate antecedents." "As our senses are at present constituted, they are too imperfect to enable us to distinguish all the elements that coexist in bodies; and of elements which are themselves unknown to us, the minute changes which take place in them, must of course be unknown." "And since it is only between immediate antecedents and consequents that we suppose any permanent and invariable relation, we are, therefore, constantly on the watch, to detect, in the more obvious changes that appear to us in nature, some of those minuter elementary changes, which we suspect to intervene." "He who for the first time listens to the delightful sound of a violin, if he be ignorant of the theory of sound, will very naturally suppose that the touch of the strings by the bow is the cause of the melody which he hears. He learns, however, that this primary impulse would be of little effect, were it not for the vibrations excited by the violin itself; and another discovery still more important shows him that the vibration of the instrument would be of no effect, were it not for the elastic medium interposed between his ear and it. It is no longer to the violin, therefore, that he looks, as the direct cause of the sensation of sound, but to the vibrating air; nor will even this be long considered as the *cause*, if he turns his attention to the structure of the organ of hearing. He will then trace effect after effect, through a long series of complex and very wonderful parts, till he arrives at the auditory nerve, and the whole mass of the brain." "The expectation of discovering something intermediate and unknown between all known events is easily convertible into the common notion of power, as a secret and invisible tie."

In the conclusion of his lecture on Cause and Effect, Dr. B. inquires how this notion will correspond with our idea of the efficiency of the great Creator, in the production of the universe; and seems to find no difficulty here. The *divine will*, he makes the grand antecedent of those glorious effects which the universe displays. "The power of God, is not any thing different from God; but is the Almighty himself willing whatever seems to him good." "We do not see any third circumstance existing intermediately and binding, as it were, the will of the omnipotent Creator to the things which are to be: we conceive only *the divine will* itself, as if made visible to our imagination, and all nature at the very moment rising around. It is evident, that in the case of the divine agency, as well as in every other instance of causation, the introduction of any other circumstance as a bond of closer connexion, would only furnish a new phenomenon to be itself connected." "God speaks and it is done: we imagine nothing intermediate."

Thus, we have endeavoured to present a fair view of Dr. Brown's theory, and with the explanations and reasons by which he endeavours to support it. We shall now make some remarks on the several particulars which have been brought into view, intended to show the unreasonableness, and dangerous tendency of his doctrine.

1. It will be admitted, that Dr. Brown has been successful in proving, by an elaborate analysis, in his treatise on Cause and Effect, that we have no *direct* conceptions of any thing else but the *antecedents* and *consequents*, in those series of events, which take place within us, or without us. It is true, that in no case, we are able to form any distinct conception of the operation of *any* cause: we see the *antecedent* and we see the *consequent*, but *how* the latter is affected by the former we perceive not. If Dr. Brown had contented himself with drawing the conclusion, (which is the only one that from the premises he had a right to draw,)

that we are capable of forming no distinct idea of the *nature* of causation, we should have acquiesced in his reasoning. But, are there not many things which we certainly know to exist, of which our ideas are merely relative? This is true of every substance. We can form a direct conception only of the properties, not of the substance itself. We are, nevertheless, led by the constitution of our nature to believe that there is a subject, or *substratum*, in which these properties inhere, and to which they belong. The same may be observed respecting dispositions or principles of action. Now, our persuasion, that there is such a thing as causation, is as uniform, and as irresistible, as the belief of material and immaterial substances. It is one of the clearest, and most universally experienced convictions of the human understanding. We see an effect, and immediately we believe that some sort of energy has been excited in its production. A million of men will all have the same feeling—*there must be a cause.* But Dr. Brown asserts that this idea of efficiency or energy is a mere illusion, and that it is not necessary to assign any other cause, than merely to ascertain what circumstance invariably precedes the event. Which shall we believe to be correct, the million or the one?

2. There seems to be some inconsistency in Dr. Brown's statement of the facts connected with this subject. On the one hand he admits that the common opinion, indeed, the almost universal opinion of men, is different from what he believes to be the true philosophical opinion; and yet, he seems to say, that if we would carefully attend to the conception which we have of power, we should find that it includes nothing but simple antecedence. "Let any one," says he in a passage already quoted, "ask himself what it is which he means by the term, and he will find that he means nothing more than that, in all similar circumstances, the explosion of gun powder will be the immediate and uniform consequence of the application of a spark." From this it

would seem, that after all, the ideas of men respecting power, are not so erroneous as has been represented; that when they think of a cause, they do in fact think of nothing but an *invariable immediate* antecedent. If this be correct, we cannot but think, that the laborious investigation of the author was useless. But how in consistence with this, can it be maintained, that men are almost universally in a fallacy on this point? Indeed, if the theory of Dr. B. be correct, it will be found extremely difficult to account for the origin of the notion of power or agency. How such a conception should enter the mind of man, is incomprehensible.

3. Dr. Brown attributes this illusion of men to "abstraction aided and perpetuated by the use of language," and the unavoidable modes of grammatical construction." But how abstraction should be the cause of error in men, who are very little in the habit of forming abstract ideas; and how it should produce a uniformly erroneous effect, in men of every nation, and condition, is a problem not easily solved. Neither is it manifest, how this error could be "aided and perpetuated by the use of language, and the unavoidable modes of grammatical construction." Language receives its structure, and its forms, from ideas already existing, and from the modes of thinking which are common to all men, or peculiar to some one nation. It is certainly no very natural process to adopt such modes of speech as have no modes of thought corresponding with them; and then, to suppose that these modes of speech should generate the ideas which they represent. What the ingenious author advances in illustration of his opinions, on this point, is far from possessing that clearness and precision which usually attend him, in his attempts at elucidating an obscure subject.

4. But the principal reason assigned by Dr. Brown for the general illusion, on the subject of cause and effect, is, "the imperfection of our senses." How the ingenious author applies this to the subject, we have already seen. But

it amounts to no more than this, that from our ignorance of the true nature of things, we are often led to ascribe effects to the wrong causes, and knowing our liableness to error, on this ground, when two things appear related, as cause and effect, or as an immediate antecedent and consequent, we suspect that they are not so related, but that there is still something not discovered, which is intermediate, and thus by searching for these invisible, intermediate links, in the concatenation of events, we come by association to imagine a mysterious connexion, between the *antecedents* and *consequents;* that is, we come at length to suppose, that one thing exerts an efficacy to produce what follows. The analysis of the process of the mind in seeking after the true causes of phenomena, given by the author, may be admitted; but it casts no light on the main point in question. As to the principle so universally received, that there must be a cause for every effect, it has no dependence on our knowledge of the true cause. Our conviction is equally firm, that there must be an exertion of power, where an effect is produced, when we see no cause, as when we certainly know what it is. We may believe, that in most cases, we are ignorant of the real efficient causes of events; or we may be in doubt, of a number of apparent causes, which is the real one; but this has no effect on our conviction, that there is a real efficient cause, somewhere. Philosophers may dispute whether the effects apparently produced by the agency of material causes, are not rather to be attributed to some spiritual agency, either of the first cause, operating through all nature, or, of subordinate agents, under his control; but they all agree that these effects must have an adequate cause. When I will to move my arm, it may be disputed, whether the effect is produced by my volition, or by some other cause acting harmoniously with my will, but it never can be disputed that the motion of my arm has a real, efficient cause, whatever it may be.

So when I observe, that my thoughts follow each other in a certain order, and that thoughts of a certain kind are invariably followed by certain other thoughts, it may be matter of dispute, whether the antecedent thought or desire is the real cause of that which follows. The affirmative, however probable, is not capable of demonstration; for it is possible, that this effect may be produced by some superior and invisible agent. But while, in all these cases, we may doubt about the *real* cause, even when we are certain of the immediate and invariable antecedence of one thing to another; yet we never doubt whether there does not exist a cause of the effect produced. This conviction is one which attends us every where, and of which we can no more devest ourselves, than of the consciousness of existence. It is one of those intuitive, self-evident truths, which cannot be rendered clearer or more certain, by any reasoning. In fact, all reasoning is built upon it, as on its most solid foundation; and if it were possible to dislodge it from the minds of men, (which it is not,) all reasoning and all human exertions would cease.

5. But not to rest merely on the defensive, we would next remark, that immediate, invariable antecedence does not, in many cases, give us the idea of a cause. There are innumerable instances of immediate invariable antecedence, in which we never think of ascribing causation to the antecedents. From the moment of our birth, the pulsations of the heart succeed each other immediately and invariably, but we do not, therefore, consider one pulsation as the true cause of the next succeeding one. One portion of duration immediately and invariably succeeds another, but who ever thought that one moment was the cause of the one following. When the electricity of the clouds strikes an object, light is uniformly emitted, but we do not consider light to be the cause of the effects produced. We are accustomed to distinguish between a *sign* and *a cause*, although the former may be as *immediate* and *invariable* as the latter.

6. According to Dr. Brown's theory, there is no need that there should be any PROPORTION between the cause and effect; for if *antecedence* be all that is included in the idea of a cause, it is evident, that the most important event may be conceived to have, as its antecedent, the most trivial thing in the universe. Thus the song of the sky-lark, if it only had immediate, invariable antecedence, might be the cause of the rising of the sun; and the chirping of a sparrow, of the revolution of the planets.

7. Again, upon this theory, all reasoning from the nature of an effect to the character of the cause, and from the nature of the cause to the character of the effect, must be vain. For it matters not what be the nature of the cause or effect, provided only there be immediate invariable antecedence and consequence.

All arguments, therefore, for the existence of an intelligent first cause, derived from a consideration of the appearances of design, in the universe, must, on this theory, be perfectly futile. All we want, to account for any thing, however great, or good, or wise, is, that something, it matters not what, should precede it immediately, and invariably. Indeed, we see not, why *nothing* may not, upon these principles, be the cause of all things, as well as a self-existent Deity; for as there is no efficiency, or energy, in a cause, all the requisites of the most potent cause, may be found in *nothing*, as well as in something which has real existence. It is due to the ingenious author, to say, that he appears to entertain exalted conceptions of the great Creator, and rejects every idea of Atheism. This, however, does not alter the nature and tendency of his theory, which must be judged by its own merits. When the author speaks, as we have seen he does, of all things springing into existence from the mere will of God, the sentiment is just and noble; but in this case we do not exclude the idea of *energy*, *power*, and *efficiency*; we conceive that God is so per-

fect, that the mere act of his will includes in it *all energy*. It is the supreme efficiency. But if you view it merely as an *antecedent*, any thing else conceivable might be the cause of all things, as well. Why must *the divine will* be the antecedent to the existence of the universe, if there be no efficiency—if there be no such thing as real causation?

8. When the ingenious author makes the whole of a cause, in every case, to consist in immediate and invariable antecedence, it seems that all idea of contact, contiguity in place, or the immediate presence of the antecedent with the consequent, is excluded. Connexion *in time*, seems to be the only thing neccessary, according to this theory. Therefore, the causes of events may be at an infinite distance. If an occurrence in the planet Saturn should uniformly precede an event on this earth, it would therefore be its cause.

9. But again, an effect may have more invariable antecedents than one, and which then is the true cause? According to the theory under consideration, both. Thus we may have many causes of the same effect, which would introduce perfect confusion into every department of philosophy.

10. It does not appear, according to the theory under consideration, what we are to think of those things which occur *very often*, as antecedents and consequents, and yet not invariably; or rather it does not appear, why these do not partake, in proportion to their frequency of connexion, of the nature of *cause and effect*. Suppose one thing to precede another nine hundred and ninety-nine times, and then fails once, and so on, why is this antecedence to be excluded entirely from the class of causes? We see no good reason for it. Indeed, it is not made evident by the author, why the succession must be invariable, to constitute a cause. As antecedence in time is the whole idea of power, it would seem to be more reasonable to consider every thing a cause when it happened to precede another, whether its antecedence was invariable or casual.

11. Moreover, if invariable antecedence is necessary to constitute a cause, then those effects which occur but once have no cause; and all effects, when they first existed, were without cause; or must have been so considered by an intelligent spectator. For although he might observe that something immediately preceded the effect, it could not be known whether the connexion between the antecedent and consequent was *casual* or *invariable*. And it is the confounding these two things, to which Dr. Brown attributes a great part of our errors on this subject. Indeed, if *invariable* as well as *immediate* antecedence be necessary to the idea of a cause, it is manifest, that long experience was requisite, before men could judge any thing respecting *cause* and *effect*. And after all, our observation is confined within so narrow bounds, that we are little capable of determining whether the connexion of things which we see in any case is absolutely invariable. And what judgment could we form on these principles, of a miraculous event? For in this, the effect is contrary to those which usually follow from such antecedents as we perceive to exist. If a miracle can occur on Dr. Brown's principles, can it be of use to establish any doctrine? Suppose a manifest miracle to occur before our eyes; the question will be, to what cause must it be attributed? According to the old doctrine of cause and effect, the answer is, to the power of God, because nothing else can produce such a work. But if there be no such thing as *power*, we can draw no such inference. As it has no invariable antecedent, it can have no cause; or as mere antecedence is the only idea of a cause, it may have been produced by any cause, it matters not what, provided only it preceded the miracle. And we come to the same conclusion, if an inquiry be made respecting the cause of the existence of the world. The event being single it could have no invariable antecedent; but supposing, as Dr. Brown evidently does, that there are some cases in which mere antecedence

is all that is necessary in a cause, the other consequence presses upon us, that any preceding thing, or even *nothing*, as was shown before, may be the cause of the universe. It is in vain that the philosopher talks sublimely of the will of God being the antecedent, for it is impossible for him to demonstrate upon his principles, that any such antecedent is necessary to the existence of the universe. For if he should insist, that no other antecedent is adequate to such a work of magnificence, he immediately abandons his main and favorite principle, viz. *that mere antecedence is cause* and *mere consequence effect.* If the wisdom and will of God, as the author every where admits, are necessary, as the antecedent or cause of the universe, then there must be something in a cause besides mere immediate invariable antecedence. There must be something in the cause proportioned to the effect produced. In short, where marks of intelligence are manifest in the effect, there must be wisdom as well as power in the cause. And this brings us back to the old common-sense doctrine of cause and effect, in departing from which, there is nothing to be gained, but much to be lost.

12. Finally, if power be nothing, and causation be mere antecedence, we do not perceive how we shall be able to maintain the accountableness of man, or any other moral agent, for his actions. According to this theory, all actions are separate, independent events, which have no relation whatever to one another, except that of antecedence and consequence. We do not see, therefore, on what point we can fix man's responsibility. If we, this moment, have a will to do a good action the next moment, and if that good action should follow invariably this volition, still, according to the theory, the volition had no influence in the production of the consequent good action. They are both links in a chain which cannot be broken; or rather fixed points in a succession, which have no other dependence on one another, or relation to each other, than this, that in the succession, cer-

tain points stand next in order to certain other points. Thus *necessity*, in its most forbidding form, is established ; and human power, liberty, and responsibility, are subverted. We know, indeed, that Dr. Brown and his followers, do not admit these to be legitimate inferences from their doctrine, and of course, we do not charge such opinions upon them. But as they appear to us to be just deductions, it is fair to bring them forward as arguments against a system, which appears to us fraught with danger to sound philosophy. Nothing has tended so much to bring mental philosophy into disrepute, as the paradoxical and extravagant opinions of some ingenious men, who in their reasonings have too much lost sight of first principles, and have trusted too much to abstruse speculations. In no science is sobriety of mind and soundness of judgement more requisite, than in the philosophy of the mind.

It is a pleasing reflection, that such is our constitution, that opinions subversive of the first principles of truth, never can prevail, to any great extent. Our safety from errors of the most enormous kind, consists in the impossibility of adopting them. Men may, indeed, by pursuing a course of intricate and sophistical reasoning, come to conclusions, which are repugnant to those truths, which are primary and self-evident; and while the mind is intent on its own reasoning, there may be an assent to these absurd conclusions; and in writing, and discourse, they may be defended with much pertinacity and ingenuity, but in common life, where philosophical principles are lost sight of, the skeptic thinks, and believes, and acts, like other men. To common people, who are guided entirely by plain, evident truth, these skeptical opinions of philosophers, always appear, not only paradoxical, but nonsensical, and they feel no inclination to adopt them ; so that there is no danger of their spreading, very extensively. But false opinions of this sort are nevertheless attended with much injury. Young men, who have

learned, that many opinions which they acquired in the nursery, or in their narrow domestic circle, are mere prejudices of education, are prone to suspect every thing which they have been taught, and have been accustomed to receive as true. When we perceive that many notions which were long considered undoubted truths, are proved by the light of philosophy, to be altogether unfounded, we naturally incline to be skeptical about every thing. And this is not all. When the darkness of ignorance and prejudice begins to be scattered, by the increasing lights of science and philosophy, pride of learning is apt to spring up; and a desire to appear superior to the vulgar, leads many to embrace and cherish opinions which differ widely from the common belief. Because, in some things, they have seen that vulgar opinions are false, they too hastily conclude, that the more any opinion differs from that commonly received, the more certain it is; and by professing it, that their superior wisdom is rendered more manifest. Now, the theories of ingenious skeptical philosophers, find in such minds a soil in which they readily take root. Thus, Hume by his metaphysical subtleties, the tendency of which is often to render all things uncertain, has bewildered and perverted the minds of many aspiring youth. And although, we would by no means, put Dr. Brown in the same class as Mr. Hume, for he appears always ingenuous, and friendly to religion; yet we think it is manifest, that he had been too conversant with Hume's philosophy. He was probably carried away, before his judgment was mature, with admiration of the writings of this fascinating skeptic. And while his good principles led him to reject Hume's atheistical opinions, he endeavoured to retain and support some of the most dangerous of his philosophical theories.

What will be the effect of the publication of Dr. Brown's philosophy, in this country, it is not easy to foretell. Attention to this department of science is yet confined to a com-

paratively small number, even of our reading population. But the taste for metaphysical inquiries is increasing, and no writer is likely to attract more readers, than Dr. Brown, as he contrives, by the peculiar buoyancy of his mind, and by the elegance and frequency of his classical allusions, to spread a charm over a subject, commonly considered the least capable of being rendered amusing. There is also so much that is original and accurate, in his Lectures ; so much distinct and perspicuous analysis, so much elegant description, and so much superiority to the authority and influence of former systems, and of great names, that it is much to be regretted, that in a few points of fundamental importance, he has adopted and inculcated opinions so absurd and dangerous. That his theories have, in some instances, operated unfavourably on young men of ardent minds, we know to be a fact: but in our opinion, the right way to prevent the bad consequences of such books, is not to prohibit the reading of them, but to answer them, and to lead young men to peruse them with caution, and at the proper *time*.

# The General Assembly's Board of Education,

AND THE

## AMERICAN EDUCATION SOCIETY.

---

In the present aspect of the moral and religious world, there is something very peculiar, distinguishing it from any preceding period. Our world, in all ages, has presented a scene of wide spreading moral desolation, sufficient to call forth the sympathies and exertions of the Christian and Philanthropist. But obstacles, in the way of moral reformation, arising from the prejudices and political institutions of mankind, have existed, appalling to human reason and almost insuperable to the strongest faith in the divine promises. Since the days of the apostles, exertions, corresponding to the magnitude and importance of the object, have seldom been made by individuals, and never by the great body of professed Christians. And not unfrequently those whose hearts were engaged in the cause of God and man, have expended their strength and zeal in the use of means not sanctioned by the great head of the Church. When not groaning under the yoke of oppression, or bleeding beneath the sword of persecution, they have sought the patronage of the civil power, and endeavored, by *carnal weapons*, to secure the victory, promised to be achieved only by *the sword of the Spirit*. The history of Christendom confirms the truth, that God will honor no means in extending and building up the kingdom of the Redeemer, except the voluntary exertions of his people in the use of those bloodless weapons, furnished in the Holy Scriptures; and that these are

*mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.* Convinced by the fruitless attempts of past ages, that no reliance can safely be placed on the secular arm, Christians have been taught to look for the blessing of God on their own voluntary exertions. And if there are any so unapt to learn, as still to expect from the civil power any favor except protection and security in obeying the dictates of conscience, the fundamental principles of our government utterly exclude the most distant hope. We are reduced to the happy necessity of depending on God alone in the use of the appointed means for the fulfilment of his promises. The patronage afforded by other governments being thus removed, the Church is left to feel the full weight of her own responsibility; that on her unconstrained exertions depend the existence of a Christian ministry, the maintenance of public worship, and under God, the salvation of immortal souls. And we bless God that those who love our Lord Jesus Christ, have not been altogether insensible to the weight of obligation imposed by the circumstances in which they are placed. The various and successful operations of Christian benevolence, in the present day, furnish ample evidence that the gospel imparts to the heart an energy sufficient to sustain any enterprise required by the exigencies of the Church and of the world. It is true, nothing has yet been done commensurate to the spiritual wants of our own country, and much less of the world. But a spirit of Christian enterprise has been awakened, which we trust in God, will not rest, until the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God. Thus far, whenever, spiritual wants have been ascertained, and fields of promising usefulness pointed out; the calls for pecuniary assistance have been answered with a promptitude and liberality, which leave no ground to fear the want of means to accomplish any future enterprise. A heart imbued with the spirit of the gospel, never can be insensible to the claims of a perishing world. As soon as it

is known that the the Bible is needed, and that the people are willing to receive it, money flows from innumerable channels into the treasury of the Lord. In like manner the means of supporting ministers of the gospel to an indefinite extent, may be obtained from those who need their ministrations, aided by the voluntary contributions of the more favored portions of the Church. So numerous are the promising fields opening in our own vast territory, not to mention foreign countries, that laborers, sufficient to cultivate one half of the ground, cannot be obtained. Indeed, the operations of missionary societies are limited, not by the want of pecuniary means, but of competent and faithful men willing to endure privation and labor. A few years ago, when the first Theological Seminary was established in this country, the question was frequently asked, where will these young ministers find employment? Those already in that sacred office receive with difficulty a scanty subsistance. What will become of an additional number? Experience has shown how groundless are these apprehensions. Now, when these institutions have been multiplied ten-fold, the calls for ministerial labor are so numerous and pressing, that our young men are generally engaged before they have finished the prescribed course of study.

The Presbyteries connected with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, report between six and seven hundred congregations destitute of regular pastors. And we venture to affirm, that the churches of other denominations, are not, in proportion to their numbers, more fully supplied. The proportion of ministers, to the population of the United States, is every year rapidly diminishing. The tide of population is flowing to the west, to the north, and to the south; so that in less than one-fourth of a century, cultivated fields, flourishing villages and large cities, will occupy places now the abodes of wild beasts. These colonies, emigrating from Europe and the older states, carry

with them the elements of social institutions and Christian churches. They not only receive with gratitude the Christian missionary who visits their new abode, but they send back from the wilderness repeated and earnest entreaties, to give them Bibles and ministers able to teach them to understand what they read. The American Bible Society has said that they shall have Bibles—and the Christian community is responding—means shall be furnished to redeem the pledge. Missionary societies, are saying, we know where a thousand missionaries more than we can command, may be fully and usefully employed; and we know, also, where the means necessary for their support can be obtained. But men of suitable qualifications cannot be procured. Never did a field more extensive and promising present itself to the enterprise of the Christian community. The question is, shall it be left uncultivated until it be overspread with briars, and thorns, and thistles? Shall those who know the value of Christian privileges, and are willing, according to their means, to aid in obtaining them, be permitted to pass off the stage of action, and their children to grow up in ignorance and irreligion, before the heralds of the cross be sent to their assistance? Every one knows that the difficulty of instructing and reforming a people universally sunk in ignorance and vice, is an hundred-fold greater, than when a few are standing ready, at once, to take the minister of the gospel by the hand—to cheer him in his labors, and to aid him by their counsel, their influence, and their prayers. If our vast territory is ever to be filled with a Christian population, it is more economical to take possession, while we have in the bosom of the country, auxiliaries, than to gain possession after it falls, as is the certain consequence of delay, entirely into the hands of the enemy. Now only a part, hereafter the whole of the expense must be borne by the established churches. In the one case, the strength and resources of the Church would be increasing with the growth

of the country. The churches formed, would aid in forming others. In case of present inaction, not only the relative, but the positive strength of the Church would diminish.—For in the moral, as well as the physical world, action is necessary, in order to retain the vigor already possessed. All this is admitted. *The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few.* Where shall we find men of a right spirit duly qualified for this work? What is to be done in the evident destitution of laborers necessary to collect and secure the abundant harvest now ready for the sickle? Our Master has given the answer—*Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest.* This prayer has for ages been on the tongues of professed Christians, and is still repeated, whenever the wants of the Church and of the world come into remembrance. But is it accompanied with corresponding exertions? It is self-evident that to pray God to grant a particular blessing, when at the same time we neglect the use of means in our power, necessary to its attainment, is nothing less than solemn mockery. Earnestly to desire an object and not to raise a hand to receive it, when presented, is inconsistent with the invariable principles of human action. Could it be believed that a man, having the perfect use of his limbs, was really thirsty and desirous of a drink of cool water, when instead of going ten steps to a copious fountain, he would sit and beg that it might be conveyed to him by the immediate hand of the Almighty? We pray, and very justly, that the hungry may be fed, and the naked clothed, and yet if we do not minister to their wants according to our means, what advantage are our prayers to ourselves or to the needy? It is true, man cannot make ministers such as would be a blessing to the Church and the world. He cannot give them a new heart, and furnish them with the natural talents necessary to preach the gospel in a profitable manner. Therefore we must pray the Lord

of the harvest, to send forth laborers into his harvest. But is there no human instrumentality to be employed in the conversion of those who are to be preachers of the gospel? Is there no human means to be used in training and preparing them when converted for that great work? It is admitted that God could, if it seemed good, take the ignorant and illiterate, and endow them with the gift of tongues, as he did a great part of the apostles, and make them the instruments of confounding the wisdom of the learned; or he could call those already educated with a view to secular professions, and inspire them with a knowledge of the misteries of his kingdom, as he did the apostle Paul, and send them forth fully furnished to this great work. But this is not his ordinary mode of proceeding, as well in the kingdom of grace as of nature. God has provided in abundance, timber and stones, and every material suitable for the construction of houses,—but he has nowhere, or at any time, provided houses already built and furnished, without the intervention of human agency. We owe to God primarily our food and clothing, yet bread no where springs from the earth, nor garments grow on the trees precisely in the form suited to our use. A similar connection between means and ends pervades the kingdom of grace. *Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent.* Now, if salvation be not attainable without this long series of means, how can men be sent to preach without any previous preparation?

At the introduction of Christianity, when miracles were necessary to prove the divine authority of the new religion, our Lord did not send forth illiterate Fishermen to preach the gospel, without previous instruction and preparation.

They were with Him, who taught as never man taught, during the whole period of his personal ministry, they saw his miracles, heard his instructions, were witnesses of his death and resurrection, conversed with him forty days before his ascension, and finally, were endowed with the power of speaking more different languages than any minister of the present day can learn in a lifetime. Paul previously furnished with all the learning and literature of his age and country, was called to the apostleship; and consecrating his high intellectual attainments to the service of his Lord and Master, he became one of the most able, as well as most zealous and successful ministers of the New Testament. To prove the necessity of a learned and able ministry in this country, where the advantages of education are general, and at this period, when every branch of literature and science is cultivated in a high degree, seems wholly superfluous. The experience of ages justifies the opinion now generally entertained by intelligent Christians of all denominations, that in a useful minister of the gospel, mental culture must be connected with ardent and devoted piety. How can a man not furnished with the necessary information, instruct others? Or if he have the requisite knowledge, he must *be apt to teach*, capable of communicating in plain and intelligible language, his thoughts and feelings. Language is usually acquired by imitation and practice. And it is a general rule in the administration of the divine government, not to bestow gratuitously that which may be acquired by human industry. A contrary mode of procedure would hold out an irresistible temptation to indolence and folly. The question then returns, how are ministers of the gospel, equal in number and in gifts, to the exigencies of the Church, to be procured?—We repeat our Lord's answer—*Pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest.* Pray God to pour out his Holy Spirit on schools and colleges, and to convert and dispose young

men, now in a course of education, to consecrate their talents and acquirements to the Lord—and let this prayer be accompanied with means suited to produce the effect. In the next place, let the Church take young men of promising talent, and hopeful piety, who are destitute of the means of obtaining a liberal education, and train them up for the service of the Lord. There are many such young men—the fruits of the refeshing influence which God has shed down in various places on the American Churches. This fact is a manifest proof, that the Lord of the harvest has heard prayer, has selected his laborers, and is waiting for the Church to do her duty, in educating the sons He has given her. In our country there are hundreds of young men distinguished for piety and talent, earnestly desirous to serve the Lord in any way he may direct, who are utterly excluded from the hope of obtaining a liberal education by their own resources, or those of their parents. What duty more obvious and pressing, than to educate these young men for future usefulness? They are the children of the Church, she needs their services, and she is bound to take them by the hand, to instruct them, and to direct their steps to a field where their labors are likely to be most conducive to her interest. To this case the general principle of political economy is not applicable; that where labor of any kind is in demand, men will, of their own accord, without artificial stimuli, prepare themselves for the occupation in which service is required. Because in the first place, the ordinary motives of interest do not, or ought not, to operate in the case before us. In this country the Church has no patronage from the civil government—no rich prebends to tempt the cupidity of parents in directing the education of their sons—no splendid livings independent on the will of the people, where the indolent incumbent is secure of his maintenance, in whatever manner he may perform the duties of his sacred office. Such also is happily the state of public

sentiment, that the people will not long support a minister who is not active and laborious, manifesting a greater zeal for their spiritual interests than for his own private emolument. In these circumstances, when a gifted, and well educated young man, regards his own ease, or is ambitious of rising in the world, he usually turns his attention to some secular profession. And when we see a young man in independent circumstances, entering the gospel ministry, as is sometimes the case, we have strong presumptive evidence that he is governed by other motives than those of a worldly character. In the next place, many liberally educated young men lack piety; an essential and primary requisite in a useful minister. To introduce men destitute of piety into this sacred office, would be a curse, instead of a blessing to the Church, and to the world. If such men would answer, the cheaper and speedier way to supply the destitute with religious instruction, would be to raise the emoluments of the clergy. Then the same principle which preserves the equilibrium in secular employments, attracting labor where it is most needed and best rewarded, would operate, and we would have no cause to complain that the laborers were too few. Thus, where the Church is liberally patronized by the State, there is no lack of candidates for the gospel ministry. But such a state of things, when worldly-minded men, for the sake of filthy lucre are induced to intrude themselves into the sacred office, is pestilence and death to the interests of moral reformation, and vital piety. If then, the Church would preserve her holy doctrines pure and unadulterated, if she would hold forth the word of life to the multitudes perishing around her, and provide for the spiritual wants of the rising generation, she must bring into her service, by a course of intellectual discipline, these young men, whose hearts God has prepared for the work, by the operations of His Spirit.

This is no new and untried experiment. It has been

done in an unsystematic, and comparatively small way in the Presbyterian Church, for many years: and the result of the trial has been the most happy and encouraging. The mind of the Christian community seems now prepared to make a mighty and united effort, in this great cause on which every other Christian enterprise is evidently dependent.

While we are agreed respecting the importance of the object contemplated, we may, it is believed, honestly differ respecting the best mode of accomplishing it. Some years ago, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, appointed a Board of Education, to which the management of this concern was committed. We are not informed respecting the plan of operation adopted by the Board, nor of the precise extent of their labors. We know, in general, that nothing worthy the importance of the cause, nothing commensurate to the resources and wants of the Presbyterian Church, has been done. At the late sessions of the General Assembly, a proposition was made and adopted, to re-organize and enlarge the Board of Education, so that it might proceed with greater energy and effect in this important business. It remains yet to be determined whether any thing effective will result from the new arrangement. We know that many intelligent and influential members of the Presbyterian Church are anxiously waiting to see what steps will be taken. Their wishes and their feelings are in favor of the Assembly's Board, in preference to any other. But if nothing decided and effective be done the present year, they will be compelled, although with reluctance, to abandon all reliance on that Body, and to act singly, or to connect themselves with some other Society, pursuing the same object. Others think that the Assembly's Board of Education is wholly unnecessary; that the object in view may be attained more certainly and speedily, by the members of the Presbyterian Church, forming societies, auxiliary to the American Education Society. That Society, it is said, is

perfectly organized, is in successful operation, has intelligent, zealous, and efficient agents, has collected large funds, and established a great number of scholarships, and has given a solemn public pledge that no young man of piety and talent in the United States, shall want the means of obtaining a thorough collegiate and theological education: and further, a large and efficient portion of the Presbyterian Church in the States of New-York and New-Jersey, now auxiliary to the American Education Society, is laboring harmoniously and successfully in the great cause. Why in these circumstances, it is asked, should an attempt be made to destroy unity of counsel and action, so essential to success, in every noble enterprize? Why distract the attention of the Churches, and diminish the amount of contributions, by applications from different Boards, for the same great object?

We admit, that there is something very magnanimous and captivating in the idea of a great society, laying aside sectarian names, collecting and disbursing funds in educating pious indigent young men for the gospel ministry, regardless of sect or party. We admit the energy and success of the American Education Society, that it has done more in exploring the spiritual wants of our country, in enlightening public sentiment on this subject, in pressing home on the consciences of Christians, the indispensible duty of engaging heart and hand in this mighty work, than has been done by all others. With unqualified pleasure, we admit also, that the concerns of this Society are managed by men in whose intelligence, piety, and energy, we have the highest confidence. Yet we are persuaded, after the fullest consideration we have been able to give the subject, that the Presbyterian Church, in her ecclesiastical capacity, ought to provide the means, and to direct the education of those who are to be her future ministers, not depending on others to do that which she is abundantly able to do herself. This

may be done consistently with the kindest feelings, and best wishes towards others, who are seeking a similar object in a different way. That portion of the Presbyterian Church, now in no degree connected with the American Education Society, is a field sufficiently large to occupy the time and labor of one General Agent, and several asssistants.

The American Education Society has now two Secretaries, or General Agents, constantly and laboriously employed, aided by the secretaries and agents of numerous auxiliaries. And if its operations be extended so as to meet the wants of the whole United States, the labor, and consequently the number of agents, must be vastly increased. The expense of agencies could not, therefore, be saved by a connexion with the American Education Society.

It is believed, also, that the charter of corporation of the Presbyterian Church is amply sufficient for the security and management of the necessary funds. Indeed, we can conceive of no possible advantage to be attained by an union with the National Society. And on the contrary, we think we foresee many appalling evils that would result from such an union.

To this conclusion, contrary to former partialities, we have been led by a recent examination of the fundamental principles of that Society, as well as by noticing, their practical effects, as far as time, would permit their developement. When the claims of the American Education Society were first presented, impressed with the importance of the object, without examining the bearings of its principles, we gave it our approbation, and feeble aid. A closer inspection of its peculiar features, has excited the most serious apprehensions that it may in the end injure the cause which it was designed to subserve.

We are constrained by a sense of duty, honestly to state our objections, and let the Christian community decide whether or not, they are well founded.

1. The details of expenses and receipts, of clothing, of books, of donations from other societies and friends, of profits of teaching and labor, of debts contracted and paid, which young men, under the patronage of this society, are required to make every quarter, are unnecessarily and painfully minute. The design of this requirement is doubtless to guard against extravagance and imposition. These ends, it seems to us, might be attained in a less objectionable way. The committees of examination, or the teachers, under whose inspection the youth are, could judge of these matters with sufficient accuracy. And after all, if imposition be intended, a false report not easily detected might be made. The plan holds out a powerful temptation to conceal the amount of receipts and expenses, so as to form a stronger claim on the aid of the Society; placing the beneficiary in the attitude of a common beggar, whose success depends on the dolefulness of his story. Young men of delicate and ingenuous feelings, shrink from this public developement of private and personal circumstances.

We know more than one young man of unquestionable piety, and of exemplary character, who cannot, for this reason, be persuaded to ask or accept the patronage of the American Education Society. We do not urge this objection, because it may be easily removed. We respectfully suggest it for the consideration of the Managers of that institution.

2. The principle of refunding the monies advanced to young men patronized, is a doubtful, if not a dangerous feature in this institution. The reasons of introducing it seem to us more specious than solid. They are two: first to relieve the beneficiary from the mortification of being considered a *charity* student; and secondly, to augment the means and perpetuate the benefits of the society. We regret, exceedingly, that men of such high intelligence and exemplary piety, as the Directors of the American Education Society,

should have deemed it necessary to form a screen to shelter those who are educated by the piety of the Church, from the unmerited reproach often attempted to be cast upon them. We might as justly say, that sons, educated at the expense of their parents, are charity students, because they defray no part of the expense themselves, and have no expectation of making a pecuniary recompense. The Church sustains a very near and sacred relation to all her members, and especially to the young. She is their parent, their guardian, bound by the most sacred ties to give them spiritual nourishment and such an education as is suited to their capacity, and likely to be useful to the community of which they are members. On this high ground we would fix our standard, and let those, who pleased, hurl the shafts of ridicule and contempt. We would thus show the world that the Church is indeed one family, one body; that each member is the servant of the whole; and that the whole directs and aids the operations of each member. We would say farther, that a civil community, having a wise regard to its future necessities, educates some of its young citizens, in reference to a particular profession, which may be useful to the State. Look at our National Military School—the glory and defence of our country—There young men, the sons of the rich, as well as the poor, are educated free of expense. They are the adopted sons of their country, because they have talents which promise future usefulness. Look at our navy. Lads of fourteen or fifteen years of age, are appointed midshipmen, with pay sufficient for their support, when, for several years, they are incapable of rendering any essential service. In fact, they also are sent to school, free of expense; for they are placed in a situation, the best suited to prepare them for a particular profession. And, yet, in neither case, are bonds given to refund the money expended in their education. They are not even bound to serve in the profession for which they have been educated at public expense. And

what is more, their prospects of wealth and distinction in future life, are as good as those of any other class of citizens. Now, what distinguishes a cadet, educated by his country, and a youth educated by the Church, that the one is stigmatized as a charity scholar, and the other is not? It is this single circumstance, and nothing more—the maintenance of the one is obtained by law, that is, by compulsion,—that of the other is voluntary, springing from the best feelings of the human heart.

The money advanced by the American Education Society is called a *loan*, a *parental loan*. But parents do not usually take bonds of their children, to refund the money expended in their education. They trust to their gratitude, their sense of moral obligation, that they will not permit the parent who has nurtured and educated them, to suffer want in old age; and this security is generally sufficient. If a father bind a son with legal bonds, he, at the same time, cancels that of filial duty.

What, let us consider, for a moment, must be the effect on the future comfort and usefulness of the beneficiares of these loans, which are to be repaid in *one, two,* and *three years after their preparatory studies for the ministry shall have been closed; with interest after the same shall have become due.* We ask any one acquainted with the state of the American Churches candidly to say, whether the worldly prospects in the gospel ministry are so flattering as to justify any young man of common prudence, in binding himself to pay five or six hundred dollars in three years after he becomes a pastor, from the salary he expects to receive? In a few cases, where a minister remains unmarried, expends nothing for books, and gives little or nothing to the numerous benevolent institutions, which he must recommend to the liberality of his people, it may be done. But is this consistent with usefulness or duty, to consider the claims

of the American Education Society, prior to all others?

We apprehend the tendency of this regulation will be, to create a calculating craving dispositon, manifesting itself in every part of future life; or it is possible that a man of delicate feelings, seeing no prospect of relieving himself from this burden, may sink into despondency and inaction. The individual may also have other claims, equally sacred, resting upon him. As the sum afforded by the American Education Society is not sufficient to pay half the expense of an education in the cheapest college in the United States, he may have received aid from his parents or other friends, who, by a change of circumstances, have a stronger moral claim, than even the A. E. Society; and yet, if the Society chooses to make a demand, the written obligation must have the preference. It is true, the Directors have a discretionary power, and they have pledged themselves to exercise it in extraordinary cases; and we are persuaded, that the present Directors will never abuse their power; but we do not know who are to be their successors.

Some of our Colleges and Theological Seminaries have funds devoted to the education of young men, having in view the gospel ministry. Now, if these institutions aid the beneficiaries of the American Education Society, and take bonds of like tenor, the recipient of this double kindness must inevitably sink under the heavy pressure. And can the A. E. Society reasonably expect that these institutions will give their funds gratuitously to a young man, and permit him to bind himself with legal bonds to another corporation; so that he cannot, if his circumstances otherwise would permit, and his gratitude prompt him to do so, make any return to the source from which, perhaps, he received the most substantial assistance?

A young man under the patronage of the American Education Society, if he have no property of his own, must receive additional aid from some quarter; for it is not pretended that

seventy or eighty dollars are sufficient to meet all his necessary annual expenses for clothing, boarding, books, tuition, fuel, lights. Now, if private associations, or Churches, or Presbyteries make up this additional sum, they in fact become auxiliary to the National Society, and throw gratuitously whatever they contribute into a stock, pledged to refund all that has been received through the hands of the parent society. And from what source, permit us to ask, are these funds to be ultimately derived? On the supposition that the young man has no property when he commences his ministry; that he does not in some unforeseen way become heir to an estate; that he does not engage in some lucrative secular employment, the means of refunding must come from the congregation which he serves. If the salary now paid to ministers be barely sufficient to support their families, it is evident an addition must be made, in order to liquidate the debt for which they are legally bound. Thus, every congregation, which shall call to the pastoral office a beneficiary of the A. E. Society, virtually becomes tributary to that corporation.

And what becomes of these monies when refunded? The bond given by the beneficiaries shows that they go directly into the hands of the parent Society; and according to the constitution and rules of the Society, are entirely and absolutely under its control. The annual income of scholarships and donations are pledged to the auxiliaries, by whose means they were obtained, and are subject to their directions. But the monies refunded by beneficiaries, are not thus pledged to the auxiliaries from whom they originally came. For example, suppose the Presbyterian Branch in New-York educates an hundred young men, and after a few years one-half of them return what they have received, amounting to twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars, the Branch in New-York cannot, unless it be the good pleasure of the Parent Board, touch a cent of that money. Suppose farther, that

all the Presbyterian Churches in the United States were to become auxiliary to the American Education Society, the monies refunded by all their beneficiaries, as well as their annual surplus, must go to the Parent Board, and be entirely beyond the reach of the Branches. Add these monies refunded to the permanent funds and scholarships intrusted to the immediate care of the Parent Society, and it seems to us that if this process were to go on for half a century, a height of independence must be attained, sufficient to make even good men's heads turn giddy. From the very constitution of the society, whose claims to universal patronage we have presumed to examine, it must every year be growing more and more independent, not only of the original contributors, but also of the auxiliaries; and it must also be acquiring a more extensive influence over the ministers of the gospel in the United States. Let us suppose that some twenty or thirty years hence, one half of the ministers of the Presbyterian Church shall have been educated under this system, and that the bonds of many of them remain unpaid in the hands of the Directors in the vicinity of Boston, and that in these circumstances a proposition were made in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, to change some important feature in her discipline or doctrines, and that the Directors of the American Education Society were known to think favorably of these changes—what would be the consequence? We all know how wonderfully interest influences the opinions even of good men, and how prone they are to coincide in sentiment with those on whom they are dependent.

We are far from intimating that any such influence is now intended to be attained, and if it were attained, that it would be improperly used. We have the happiness to be personally acquainted with some of the Directors of this great concern, and we know the reputation of all; and we believe them to be as pure in their intentions, as single in their purpose, and as devoted to the cause of evangelical piety, as any men on

earth; and we disclaim any knowledge of a single act in their management of this great charity which has the most remote sectarian bearing. But the confidence justly reposed in their integrity, has a tendency to throw into their hands unlimited power; and this power will be delivered to their successors, and from the nature of the case, will be a rich blessing, or a tremendous curse to posterity. What security have we, that this mighty engine of life or death, of salvation or perdition, will for half a century remain in the hands of men possessing the same spirit? We answer, none, except the integrity and prudence of frail man. The promise of God assures us that he will always have a Church. But whether the descendents of this family or that family, the successors in this corporation or that corporation, shall maintain the pure doctrines of the gospel, and feel their power, we know not.

3. The first article in the constitution of the American Education Society, defining the manner of obtaining membership, connected with the second, authorizing the Directors to form a permanent fund of "bequests, legacies, donations, and grants, thus appropriated by the donors," and of any other property of the Society, at pleasure, we consider very liable to abuse, and highly dangerous. The first article is as follows: viz. "Any person who shall subscribe, and shall pay into the treasury at one time, one hundred dollars, or if a clergyman, forty dollars, shall be an honorary member; and shall have a right to sit and deliberate in all meetings of the Society. But all members hereafter added to the Society *who shall be entitled to vote, shall be chosen by ballot*, at an annual meeting."

To this article, we should have no material objection, if it were not connected with permanent funds of an indefinite amount; because there would be little or no temptation to abuse; but as it is so connected, it appears truly alarming. We are disposed to attribute the origin of this article to the

best motives; to suppose (for we have no knowledge of the fact) it was intended, by giving the present members the power of choosing their successors, to prevent the management of the Society from passing into unfaithful hands. Whatever may be the effect of this arrangement in preventing or retarding the perversion of the funds from the original purpose, it certainly increases the power of the Officers and Directors to an almost unlimited extent. It enables them, if so disposed, to select the persons who are to vote in choosing Officers and Directors; so that in fact they might as well be elected for life, with the power of nominating their own successors. Suppose that at any time a majority of the acting members of the Society are in favor of the measures adopted by the Directors, the Directors can, through their friends, have new voting members chosen, favorable to the same course; so that it will in the end amount to the same thing, as to give the Directors the power of appointing their successors. The distant members, who have a right to vote, can seldom attend the anniversaries; so that from the nature of the case, the election of officers and new members, can always be under the control of those residing near the place of holding the annual meetings. If at any time, the concerns of the Society should be mismanaged, it is evident from the very terms of the compact, that the branches and distant contributors, have no means of effecting a reformation; because they have voluntarily surrendered their rights into the hands of a body politic in the State of Massachusetts. And as this corporation can hold real estate, whose annual income shall equal ten thousand dollars; can increase permanent funds, and scholarships, to any extent; can dispose at pleasure of the annual surplus of the auxiliaries, and the monies returned by beneficiaries, and has also a veto on the appropriations of the branches; its power must become immense.* And the organization is so adjusted, the machinery

* See Rules, Chapter vi. 9.

is so admirably arranged as to concentrate the whole power in a single point; so that the hand of an infant, touching a lever in Boston, can control, and manage, and direct the whole Christian community, south and west of the Connecticut, interested in this concern.

As long as the Directors remain, such as we believe they now are, intelligent, active, and devoted to the cause of evangelical doctrine and vital piety, every thing, which the interests of the Church and of the world demand, will be done. But if the fountain should by any means become corrupt; if the mighty reservoir, whose streams are intended to pervade and refresh, and fertilize every part of our vast territory, and even to flow to Africa and Asia, and regions yet unexplored, should be poisoned, how shall its deadly overflowings be checked; what antidote can be cast in to restore the salubrity of the waters? No human power or human skill, it seems to us, can be of any avail; because no external force can touch the internal spring which moves the whole machine. Let the American Education Society proceed as it has commenced; let it accumulate in its own hands all the funds destined for the education of pious, indigent young men, and then the character and qualification of a large portion of the ministers of the gospel in the United States, will be suspended on the piety and integrity of a few men located in the same vicinity. Every man, and every corporation, think power to be safe in their own hands. But who can guarantee that no change will take place in the sentiments and character of the next, or succeeding generation? It may happen, (for it has often happened,) that one man of talents and influence, may change the religious views and feelings of a whole neighborhood or city. If such a change should take place in the Board of Directors, how shall the sacred funds of the American Education Society be snatched from their grasp? The danger of committing permanent funds of a large

amount into the hands of bodies politic, from the frequency of perversion, has become proverbial. No guards or precautions, heretofore invented, have been found effectual. And what security, not previously tried in vain, is given in the case before us? We say, none. The power is in the hands of a few men, not responsible to the donors nor to the Christian community at large, responsible only to the voting members of the Society, whom they can create at pleasure. The security is even less than what has repeatedly been ineffectual. Funds devoted to sacred uses, and guarded with creeds and formularies, and subscriptions, have been perverted from the object of the pious donors; and that, too, when those into whose hands they originally came, were men of incorruptible integrity and ardent piety. We could appeal to a well known instance, in the vicinity of Boston. Can it be a doubtful question, whether the funds belonging to the Hollis Professorship in Havard University, are now used for a purpose totally at variance with the intention of the original founder? Who could have thought fifty years ago, that so entire a change would have taken place in the sentiments of those who manage the concerns of that venerable and splendidly endowed institution?

Piety and talents are the only qualifications prescribed in the charter and constitution, to limit the appropriation of the funds belonging to the American Education Society. Admitting that genuine piety is one of the best religious tests that can be proposed; yet the opinions of men are so various respecting it, that this qualification cannot possibly be any restraint to a corporation, wishing to introduce into the ministry, young men hostile to the fundamental principles and spirit of the gospel. We would confide in the judgment of the present Directors, and also of their examining committees, as far as they are known, yet we must again repeat,—we know not who are to be their successors.

As this institution is intended to "*continue for genera-*

*tions and ages to come,*" and as consequences the most tremendous, that can be conceived, must follow from a perversion from its original design, it becomes us to examine well the foundation on which its security from abuse rests. We ought not to be dazzled with its wonderful success and the good which it has already achieved, so as to lose sight of remote consequences. We should recollect the profound remark of the Roman Senator, *Omnia mala exempla ex bonis initiis orta sunt.* Nations never voluntarily resign their liberties into the hands of a known tyrant. They must be dazzled with the splendour of foreign victories—They must see the spoils of conquered cities brought home in his triumphant chariot.—They must share in the corn and the wine he distributes in profusion—and then they will hail him as their master, and bind themselves with chains, which neither they nor their children's children can burst asunder. Religious vassalage is commenced and consummated in the same manner. An open and confessed heretic seldom begins the work of corruption; but he succeeds to the confidence and power acquired by some zealous and faithful servant of the Lord Jesus, and then he employs the authority with which he is invested in spreading around him moral pestilence and death. Men of corrupt principles have not usually zeal enough to commence a religious charity, or liberality enough to contribute the necessary funds: but when the funds are collected, they see an object sufficient to excite their ambition, and they are not deficient in expedients to gain the management and control of what men of a different spirit have accumulated. Suppose such an event should happen in regard to the American Education Society—it is not more unlikely than some things that have occurred in the same vicinity not fifty years ago—and then all the power and resources now lodged in the hands of the present gifted and eminently devoted Secretary, and of his equally distinguished counsellors, would be brought to bear against the cause of evangelical

doctrine and vital piety. It would remain for the friends of gospel principles, stripped of the means provided by their pious predecessors to weep and pray in secret. They must again retreat to the mountains and retired vallies, recruit and discipline their forces, and again come forth and meet an enemy formidable in numbers, insolent with victory, and clad in burnished armor recently seized by stratagem.

For reasons similar to these stated, there are many intelligent and influential men belonging to the Presbyterian Church, who cannot connect themselves with the fortunes of the A. E. Society. They see and feel the importance of the general object, but they dread the dangers to which they conceive this institution is exposed. They dislike also, the negligence and want of energy which have hitherto characterized the proceedings of the General Assembly's Board of Education, and they are now waiting with anxious and prayerful interest the result of the new organization. It is believed the Churches are ready to sustain the exertions of the Board, if an active, intelligent, and faithful agent would lay before them the want of able and well furnished minsiters in the Presbyterian Church. And if there be evils and dangers connected with the operations of the A. E. Society, (as we verily believe there are,) they are not to be corrected and averted by finding fault and complaining, but by immediate and spirited exertion. The work to be done is important and urgent. Those who love our Lord Jesus Christ, will not listen with indifference to the calls for ministers of the Gospel, by whatever agent they are communicated. And if a channel for their liberality, such as they would prefer, be not speedily opened, it will flow in some other way.

Perhaps it may be asked, whether funds in the hands of the Board of Education will not be liable to the same abuse dreaded in the hands of the A. E. Society. We answer, No. First, because if young men be educated by

the Presbyterian Church, they will not be under the influence of a foreign institution, and in the deliberations of her judicatories, they will be at liberty in all matters to decide according to the dictates of their own judgment and conscience, unawed by the frowns of a displeased creditor. In the next place the General Assembly which appoints the Board of Education is not a permanent and fixed body. It does not elect its own members. It is annually dissolved, and a new Assembly is chosen by the Presbyteries in various parts of the United States, each member expressing the views and wishes of the Churches he represents, and accountable for every vote he gives. For this reason it is impossible that funds deposited in the hands of the Assembly for a sacred purpose, can be perverted from their original object, until the whole Church, or at least a large majority of the Presbyteries become corrupt. And if permanent funds for religious purposes be secure from perversion any where, it is under the management of a body thus constituted. And further, business is not conducted in the General Assembly in the same manner as in the annual meetings of voluntary associations. Here the reports of different Boards are read, and submitted to a rigid examination. All their plans and acts are canvassed, and if any thing be radically wrong, it is competent to the Assembly to change the members of the Board. In the annual meetings of the other, there is, strictly speaking, no deliberation or examination of the measures pursued. The report of theDirectors is read, eulogies prepared for the occasion, are pronounced, and avote of approbation passed by acclamation. There is, in reality, no meeting of the contributors, nor of their representatives, but only of the voting members chosen by those who had the previous management of the concern, drilled to respond Aye or No, as they may have been previously instructed. We do not say any thing like this has taken place. Our perfect confidence inthe integrity of the Directors, forbids the slightest sus-

picion. Our meaning is, that there is nothing in the constitution, or in the manner of conducting the annual meetings calculated to prevent it. We have discharged an important, and in some respects an unpleasant duty. We had long noticed things in the arrangements of the American Education Society which seemed strange and novel; but so full was our persuasion of the importance of the sacred cause, in which it was laboring, that we did not dare permit ourselves to think there was any error. A closer examination of the constitution and rules, has convinced us that so imminent are the dangers connected with the operations of that Society, it would be treason to the cause of piety, any longer to be silent. We have not designedly distorted a single feature of the great Society whose claims to universal patronage we have canvassed. And we most devoutly pray God, that none of the evils anticipated may ever happen, that the exertions of the Society, in a cause so noble and sacred may be a rich and lasting blessing to the Church and to the world.

# PUBLIC EDUCATION.

*Plans for the Government and Liberal Instruction of Boys in large numbers; as practised at Hazelwood School.* Second edition. London, 1827.

THEORIES of Education are of all theories the most useless; nay, sometimes positively pernicious. The general principles of the science, if science it may be called, are, in fact, the principles of the science of the human mind, with which, not only every pedagogue, (whether schoolmaster, tutor, or professor,) but every man whose business brings him into collision with his fellow minds should be well acquainted.

Notwithstanding all the plans, and systems, and discoveries in this department, which have been ushered into the world, within the last fifty years, with so much pomp and assurance, we are still of opinion that much fewer substantial improvemcnts have been made than is generally supposed. The solid glories of the more antiquated, "monastic," and labor-imposing methods, under which the gigantic minds of the last century were formed, are not entirely eclipsed by the more modern, "cheerful," "practical," and labor-saving methods which would clamourously oust their predecessors from their long undisputed possessions.

We are thus sceptical, because we are tolerably well acquainted with the difficulties of education. These difficulties, which we cannot now stop to enumerate, spring from the character of the pupil, from the parent or guardian, from the

public sentiment, and especially from the character and qualifications of the teachers and governors.

In regard to the pupils, no *two* can be found to whom precisely the same system is adapted. Every parent knows this even in a small family. If fifty, eighty, one hundred, or two hundred pupils are congregated together, the difficulties of successful government are greatly increased, and, we might add, in a geometrical, rather than in an arithmetical ratio.

In regard to parents, every one who begins to look around him for a suitable school for his boys, has his own crude views of education, to which no school in existence is sufficiently conformed. One school is too near, another is too remote; one is too rigid, another is too lax; one teaches every thing, another teaches nothing; one is too cheap, another is too dear; one is too republican, another is too aristocratical; one has too many pupils, another has too few; one is too formal and ostentatious, another is too simple and unassuming. There are some parents whose expectations in regard to their children, never will be realized, because it is impossible, in the nature of things, that they ever should be. The teacher has a hard task of it, if he attempts to please *all;* a painful one, if he succeeds in pleasing *a few;* and a most servile one, if he is able, by means which a man of sterling dignity and independence would scorn to use, to call forth the praises of *the majority.*

Public sentiment, in our land at least, sways the sceptre. It is not only difficult, but, in many cases, impossible for a teacher to array himself against this hydra. Or, if he has the hardihood to attempt it, he retires from the contest with a good conscience and a prospect of starvation.

The excitement on the subject of education, which pervades, at present, the civilized world, will, if it receive a right direction, undoubtedly exert a favourable influence upon the public sentiment. Already the standard of intel-

lectual culture has been elevated; the bearing of education upon individual and national prosperity has been better appreciated; the employment of a teacher of youth is assuming the rank which it deserves; a higher degree of moral as well as intellectual worth is beginning to be expected in those who occupy stations of such influence; and the press teems with essays, which are leading to the adoption of important plans, and the modification of existing systems, to meet the additional demands of the present age.

On this score, the difficulties which the instructer has to encounter are immensely serviceable to the community, because they render it necessary for him to strain every nerve in forming and sustaining his intellectual character. But in some particulars the public sentiment is exerting a somewhat deleterious influence. We have no doubt that this influence will be temporary, because it is in the nature of most abuses to work out their own remedy. We allude, among other things, to the fashion, which seems to us to be in a good degree countenanced by the public sentiment, of placing, with all due parade, our public or private schools, upon the shoulders of some sixty or eighty sturdy sons of literature, who condescend to carry and recommend the bantling as a child of extraordinary promise.

In regard to the character and qualifications of an instructer, we hope to be able to say something below; and will only add, that we are deliberately of opinion, that not one in a hundred is "cut out" for a teacher of youth, and not one in a thousand, for a good disciplinarian.

The number of schools for the education of boys, in this country and in Europe, so far from affording any ground for discouragement to the teacher, who may wish to try his fortune in this way, may be hailed as an auspicious omen. It indicates a general degree of interest in the subject, an excitement, a public feeling and countenance. That the supply of pupils is likely to fail, at least on this side of the At-

lantic, where every circumstance encourages population, will certainly not be pretended by our wisest political economists. We allude to this, for the consolation of well-meaning pedagogues, who are fearful that before the year 1840, there will be more schools than pupils.

Besides, we are inclined to believe, and experience is daily confirming us in this belief, that there may be more than *one* method of educating boys—even those of the same standing and prospects in life. All may be *substantially* right, or embrace enough of good to stamp the character of excellence and usefulness upon them; while the particular means employed to attain this end, may differ widely from each other, and would seem to promise very different, and even opposite results. It would not be safe to conclude, that of so many apparently conflicting systems, a few only can be valuable, while the far greater number are specious and hollow. Many of these institutions adapt themselves to a particular description of pupils, and aim to supply some acknowledged deficiency; or, as in our own case, are designed to meet some peculiar demand, growing out of the singular and interesting attitude of the Republic.

The various modes of education, which justly claim our regard on account of their amount of solid usefulness, and their long continued success, are not like straight paths, of which one alone can ever reach an object from a given point. They are bye-paths, remote at times from each other, and leading through plains, or forests, or flowery fields; over the noisy brook or the silent river; by the mountain side, or through lofty passes; but all arriving at the wished for land. One traveller, it is true, may reach this spot, torn by the brambles, bespattered with mud, and emaciated with toil; and another may arrive there as clean and fresh, and nice, as if he had just emerged "from my Lady's band box." Still they are *there*,—liberally educated. The only difference, (no small matter we confess,) will be, that *one* is cal-

culated to become an intellectual Hercules; the *other*, a pretty little compliant Ganymedes.

For the same reason as we confidently believe, and not from the mere pertinacity of prejudice, some institutions for the education of boys, (those of Eton and Westminster, for example,) have pursued a steady and undeviating course, undisturbed by the projected innovations, or the clamours for reform—venerable as their moss-grown towers and massive edifices; whilst others of very recent origin, and just launching forth upon the tide of experiment, have listened to the expression of popular opinion, have bowed to the influence of existing political institutions, have regarded the changes in the aspect of society, and the noisy demands for a modified system of education.

In England and Wales, the Endowed Grammar Schools are about 500 in number. Amid such a galaxy, only here and there a star of first magnitude can show its face; such, for example, as Eton, Westminster, and Winchester. These venerable establishments, founded by royal or private liberality, and originally designed for the service of the Church, have educated, as scholars on the foundation, and as "Oppidans," some of the brightest luminaries in every department that have ever shone upon Great Britain. The Greek and Latin classics (let our anti-classical men ruminate on this) have ever been cultivated here with eminent success. They are characterized by a rigid attention to the Greek and Latin quantities and metres. At Westminster, a boy must be able to repeat the greater portion of the Westminster Greek and Latin Grammar from memory, at the time of his admission; and no instruction is provided in the French and Mathematics.

These seminaries have necessarily been fettered by the requisitions of their original charters; and, like the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, have preserved a great degree of uniformity in the form of discipline and mode of instruction.

In a country where classical attainments are the only passport to distinction in literary life, and the number is so great of those who can afford the expense of a thorough classical education, such seminaries are immensely valuable. They occupy a very important part in the wide field, the whole of which ought to be assiduously cultivated.

We cannot, therefore, join in the outcry, recently raised, against these seminaries, as "monastic" establishments, some six or eight centuries behind the improvements of this "practical" age, and oppressing the intellectual energies with a load of Greek and Latin, to the exclusion of more palatable and congenial food. These objections may be traced, sometimes to malevolence and envy; sometimes to levity and superficialness; sometimes to a distaste for severer intellectual toil; and, not unfrequently, to sheer ignorance of the primary object of an elementary education, which aims to draw forth and invigorate the expanding energies of the mind, and not merely to furnish it with a knowledge of insulated facts, very useful, we admit, in their proper time and place, and furnishing materials upon which the well disciplined intellect may employ itself with success, at a subsequent period.

In France the schools for boys are closely interwoven with the other parts of the grand system of education, and form, together with them, "*The University of France.*" This immense establishment stretches its branches over every part of the kingdom, regulating and controling every institution for education, with the exception of those connected with the public military and naval service. Its ramifications are exceedingly minute, and a large body of men is exclusively occupied in the management of its concerns. The Royal Council of Public Instruction, with the minister of ecclesiastical affairs at its head, holds its periodical meetings, and has a number of subordinate officers for the management of its complicated business. The academies, twenty-six in number, amongst which "the Academy of Paris" stands

forth in bold relief; the colleges, the institutions, the boarding houses, and primary schools, are all inseparable parts of this stupendous system. The academies, which are scattered in different parts of the kingdom, are visited regularly by the Inspectors General of the University, who are vested with full authority to examine the condition of each academy and its appendages. So that the movements of every establishment for education in France, must be subject to the control of the council, and its connexion with the University must be avowed and unreserved.

It is obvious that a fearful amount of influence over the minds and character of an immense population, is thus deposited in the hands of the monarch and his minions. The elevation or degradation of a whole people hangs upon the nod of a fellow-worm. On the other hand, by a wise administration, this connexion of the several parts of the system with one another and with the whole, this gradation of intellectual culture, this playing of one institution into the hands of another, may subserve the most important ends. The dependance of all the inferior schools upon the University and the Royal Council, represses individual enterprise, which frequently leads to valuable improvements. On the other hand, it prevents the impositions, so repeatedly practised, upon the credulous public, by ignorant pretenders or designing knaves, who catch the attention by some novel but futile plan, and expend their useless or pernicious labors on the most delicate materials ever committed to the care of man.

In Germany, where the most refined intellectual culture and the most grovelling ignorance are cherished side by side; where the light of science and the literary ferment which prevails in one portion of the community, serves, by its contrast, to deepen the darkness and to aggravate the stupidity which broods over the other; where literature, the sciences, and the arts, when unconnected with politics, secure the patronage of dukes, electors and monarchs, and fur-

nish the restless spirits of the community with a pleasurable and honorable employment: where the number of well-endowed universities is unparalleled, and the host of keen-sighted and industrious professors is almost incredible; where a constant demand for intellectual efforts of the highest order is created and cherished, and the success of distinguished talents and attainments is inevitable, it was natural to expect, that the systems of education designed to prepare the boy for the enlarged sphere of the university studies, would partake of the general impulse. We find, accordingly a profusion of these preparatory schools or "*Gymnasia*," scattered throughout the principalities and kingdoms of Germany, which are still bound together by the bond of a common language. They are more or less subjected to the control of the governments under which they are established, according to the degree of liberality in their political systems. In all, however, they are sufficiently unfettered to answer the more important end of education. In some instances, the royal, ducal, or electoral patronage serves only to secure, more unequivocally, their numerous and superior advantages. In the Prussian dominions, special legislative enactments have a bearing upon the literary and moral character of the teachers, which tends to exclude the mischievous effects of incompetency, while it leaves the corps of well-informed and well-meaning instructers to employ their best talents and attainments in the training of the youth committed to their care. Individual enterprise is repressed in no degree that can call for a just complaint.

The Gymnasia of Germany may be regarded in the light of a psychological experiment, to ascertain to what extent the cultivation of the intellectual powers can be advanced, by their seasonable and judicious application to the several objects best adapted to this purpose. The present operation of the system certainly is, to throw the mental and coporeal faculties of the boy into the most favorable circumstances for their full and unlimited developement.

That the best Gymnasia of Germany advance the pupil, by the time he has attained his fifteenth or sixteenth year, provided he has been confided to their care at a period sufficiently early, far beyond the limits which bound our college course, is no more than might naturally be expected from the principles and operation of the system. We speak here of the general character and tendency of these German Gymnasia. We do not wish to touch the question of the adaptedness of these institutions, with *all* their German excrescences, to the wants of our own country. On this point we have more than *one* doubt.

The Gymnasia of Elberfeld, Nordhausen, and Dresden, are probably the best known in this country. In these, every hour has its appropriate employment. The nobler objects to be attained by this regularity of employment, dignify the employment itself, and raise it above the irksome monotony of the illiberal arts. The external arrangements which strike the eye, are all adapted to gratify the sense of the beautiful, and to cultivate taste. The collisions of intellect, sharpen the wit. The vigorous exercises of the body, which constitute an essential part of the system, give firmness to health; and the diffusive stimulus of health imparts a zest to study. Idleness with its baleful retinue of immoralities is not tolerated for a moment.

Our limits forbid us to pursue the subject into Italy, and other foreign countries, from whose systems of Education many useful hints might be suggested to the projectors of new plans. Looking abroad upon our own country, we are presented with a curious spectacle. We behold a large number of systems, in full operation, side by side; teachers from almost every nation under heaven, with their peculiar pedagogical notions; no legislative enactments to regulate the qualifications of the higher order of instructers; private enterprise, with its irresistible allurements, open to all; and not a few keen "speculators," ready to flatter parents with the prospect of initiating their children, in the

twinkling of an eye, without the toil imposed by other teachers, into all the refinements of a language, or the abstruseness of a science. Startling as this republican state of things may be at the first view, experience has convinced us, that in a *free* country, this is the only way in which the ultimate advantages for which we labor, can be secured.

Passing by our Colleges, which may be regarded as schools preparatory to a professional education, or to the studies of a University, properly so called; passing by, also, our Academies, and private Seminaries, and classical institutes, (some of which are an honor to our land,) and the numerous institutions, designed to furnish the means of a limited education, at a moderate expense: we shall limit ourselves to a few remarks on the military schools, which are independent of the Government, and are designed to educate our youth, under the influence of a military system, for the peaceful occupations of civil life.

Against the military discipline and instructions of the West Point Academy, under the control of the Government, and for the service of the country, in a military capacity, no reasonable objection can be made. And in the observations we design to offer upon the system, as adopted and enforced under other cirumstances, we desire to be understood as awaiting the issue of the experiment, which, possibly, may prove our objections to be utterly groundless.

The principal advantages insisted on by the advocates of the military system of education, we believe to be the following: The healthful exercise of the body, which it secures; the practical acquaintance which it furnishes, with an art, about which, (say they,) every citizen ought to know something; the assistance which it affords in the government of youth; the manliness of deportment which it inspires; the ability which it gives to the foreign tourist, of judging correctly of the military systems of other countries, which knowledge, (say they,) would prove of incalculable advan-

tage to our country, *in case of war;* the light which this knowledge of military tactics throws upon the pages of ancient and modern history; (the reader of Herodotus and Thucydides, for example, will be able to marshal, upon paper, the combatants at Marathon and Plataea, and project the famous siege of Syracuse under Nicias;) and, above all, "the practical turn" that it communicates to the studies and energies of our youth, which, (say they,) admirably fits them for their duties as men.

A large number of enlightened citizens, who cannot be accused of a pertinacious adherence to established forms, have expressed their fears in regard to the influence of a military education upon the taste and predilections of our youth, and have avowed their preference of a mode of education, more civil in its character. And if the proposed advantages of the military plan, so far as they are real and valuable, can be secured, and every possible disadvantage, avoided, by the operation of any other system, their preference is, to say the least, a reasonable one.

The invigorating influence of military exercises upon the corporeal frame, will not be disputed. But experience has satisfactorily shown, in our own land, and more particularly in Germany, that the full developement of every portion of the human frame, the most elastic and vigorous health, and all that is desirable in the government of youth, can be secured without the aid of military discipline.

And whether it be a solid advantage to the community, that its citizens should be early imbued with a military knowledge and spirit, in reference to some hypothetical demand for their services in future life, admits of doubt with every serious statesman, who is acquainted with the history of past republics.

And the supposed practical utility of the military art, especially in time of peace, is no greater, to say the least, than that of many others of a more civil character, the

knowledge of which, may promote, essentially, the comfort and interests of ourselves, our friends, and our country. Such, however, is the constitution of society, that the wheelright, the blacksmith, the ship-carpenter, and the soldier, must continue to benefit the community by their exclusive pursuits; while the more intellectual portion of society, must content themselves with ignorance, when knowledge can be purchased only by the sacrifice of those peculiar and almost exclusive attainments, which ennobled the mind of a Newton, a Boyle, a Bentley, a Porson, a Johnson, a Burke, or a Pitt.

With regard to "the practical turn," which the military system of education communicates to the studies of our youth, and the obvious tendency of our country at large to undervalue every thing in education, the immediate bearing of which, upon the active business of life, is not directly manifest, we acknowledge and deplore the fact; while we feel persuaded, that every additional year of our national existence and prosperity, will diminish the influence of these views, and place the purely intellectual pursuits, and literary attainments, upon their proper basis.

In the education of youth who are designed for the higher departments of intellectual life, where intellectual vigor is certainly not less desirable than attainments in knowledge, the short and precious period of preparation, when, if ever, the mind must be formed, its energies awakened, and its powers enlarged and prepared for efficient application to the business of the future man, cannot, consistently, be devoted to the acquisition of a knowledge of insulated facts, however valuable they may prove at a future day. And it may reasonably be doubted, whether the time consumed in long military marches and encampments, or in wheeling a machine for the measurement of distances, on the mail route from Maine to Georgia, be spent in the most profitable manner for those whose military pursuits must cease on their departure from the military school.

Again ; the inflexible dicipline, to which the soldier is inured, however necessary in a well-ordered army, in the unity of whose operations the safety of a state may depend, is not so obviously adapted to the government of a school of boys. The government in this case may be firm, and the discipline as inflexible as the circumstances may demand, and the motives may be brought to bear upon the moral sense, without the mechanical operation of a military system. It may be doubted, indeed, whether in such a system the moral powers are sufficiently appealed to, and whether the ideas of right and wrong, of virtue and vice, of honor and dishonor, of greatness and littleness, are not regulated simply according to the degree of obedience or disobedience to the imperious commands of a superior ; whether the restraint be not too mechanical, and the principles too conventional ; whether, upon the removal of this restraint, and the relinquishment of these principles, a reckless indulgence in vice, accompanied by an astonishing destitution of *moral* principle, be not the unhappy consequence ; and whether the subdued feeling of respect, the genuine sense of honor, the fixedness of principle, and the due estimation of our own importance as moral, intellectual, and accountable beings, which are created and fostered by a judicious exercise of *parental* discipline, be not inexpressibly more valuable.

So far, also, as our own observation has extended, the undue importance which these seminaries attach to military science and its auxiliary branches, leads, and perhaps necessarily so, to a very low estimate of the value of literary attainments. To enlarge upon the beneficial effects of a zealous cultivation of literature, upon individual happiness and national character, and on the necessity of combining studies of a literary character, with those of a more scientific cast, in the education of youth, and in the riper pursuits of manhood, would call us away too far from our present object. It will suffice barely to hint at this objection, for we

are fully persuaded that our readers will at at once appreciate its importance.

A few words upon another feature of the military school, which will serve to account, in some measure, for its attractiveness and popularity, with inexperienced boys, and weak parents, apart from any intrinsic value it may possess. A company of boys, (we had almost said children,) is paraded through our towns and villages, to the sound of the spirit-stirring fife and drum, with colors floating in the breeze, with nodding plumes, and martial tread. They are greeted with the roar of cannon, like veterans returning from the field of victory. They are feasted, toasted, exhibited, and escorted. A tilt and tournament of the olden time of chivalrous achievement, could scarcely have assembled such an admiring rabble. Can it be a matter of astonishment, that the peaceful children of the town or village should lay aside their paper caps and wooden guns, and long to shoulder a real musquet? That even gray-headed parents should be captivated by the imposing parade, and the flattering attentions, with which these liliputian warriors are received? And that the pupils themselves, especially if the Principal of the establishment has been bred a soldier, and glows with all the enthusiasm of his profession, should gradually be impressed with the belief, that science, as distinguished from literature, is not only exclusively valuable, but chiefly so, on account of its bearing upon, and connexion with, the cultivation of military studies?

We have yet to call the attention of our readers to a school for the education of boys, which has attained to some degree of notoriety, in England. We allude to the "Hazelwood School," to describe and to recommend which, seems to have been the laudable object of the work of nearly 400 pages, which stands at the head of this article.

This school was established about fourteen years since, in

the neighborhood of Birmingham, by Mr. T. W. Hill; to whom, and to some of his sons, engaged with him in this enterprise, we are indebted for the very sensible book which explains, with great minuteness of detail, the daily proceedings of the seminary, and unfolds some very valuable views on the theory and practice of education.

The disciples of Dr. Buzby, of flogging memory, would have laughed at the idea, that the government and discipline of a large school, embracing one hundred and twenty boys, might be successfully conducted, without the interference of the rod. But they would have pronounced the man to be "non compos mentis," who should venture to assert that this government and discipline may be safely entrusted to the boys themselves. Such, however, is the bold experiment which is now making at the "Hazelwood School."

This School embracess ten resident teachers. At a weekly conference, the amount and mode of instruction are determined. Here the authority of the teachers terminates. The boys select from their own number a committee of fourteen, whose business is to legislate for this little community, and to appoint the school officers. The Principal of the school reserves the privilege of a *veto* upon the general laws of the institution. Over the appointment of the officers, he has no control. These officers are: the Judge, the Magistrate, the Sheriff, the Keeper of the Records, the Prosecutor General, and the Defender General. The Judge nominates the Clerk and Crier of the court, and the Magistrate nominates his two Constables.

It would be marvellous, indeed, if the bosom of this little community were never disturbed by unhallowed passions; —if a petit-larceny, or a case of defamation, or an assault and battery, should never furnish the officers with an opportunity of exercising their authority. A jury-court is holden every Wednesday afternoon, and at other times upon extraordinary occasions. A jury of six is empanelled.

When the challenging is finished, the cause is tried—the witnesses are heard, the plea is conducted, the jury is charged, the verdict is returned, and the defendant is acquitted or condemned with all the grave ceremonials of a legal proceeding. The jury must keep fast until it is unanimously agreed. In one instance on record, these patient little jurors fasted from breakfast-time until a quarter past eight in the evening! The other departments of the school are declared, in the book before us, to be conducted with the strictest regard to economy of time.

This system is plausible, and even captivating, in its general outlines, when the difficulties which encumber it in its practical operations are veiled from our view. Those, however, who have been engaged in the government of youth, are well aware of the universal agitation which is occasioned by the arraignment of one of their number. An intense interest is awakened. Every faculty is absorbed. It is proverbially a season of indifference to study. Add to this, the formal informations, the preparation of indictments, the procuring of witnesses, the instructing of the counsel, the prolix operations of a jury court, and the cautious management of appeals, indispensible to the due administration of justice, and we are constrained to ask, what amount of valuable time is thus consumed? What encroachments are thus made upon the regular studies? What grudges are thus engendered? What secret and counteracting combinations are formed? And how far will these circumstances prove an obstacle to the intellectual and moral culture of the pupils?

The information thus obtained, in regard to judicial processes, and the glowing interest imparted to the debates and pleadings of this little court, whose proceedings are regarded by the boys themselves as involving the dearest rights of their community, are inexpressibly valuable. All these advantages, however, and many more which might be spe-

cified, can be secured, and the disadvantages, above-mentioned, avoided, by the preparation of an extraordinary trial, when the Principal can select a case whose issue will be favorable to the discipline and order of the school, while it acquaints the Pupil with the legal process, and relieves the monotony of the school-exercises.

We cannot disguise our suspicions, however, that there is here "a wheel within a wheel"—some master hand, turning the crank at the centre, of which the rest of the machinery, as well as the by-standers, are totally unconscious. If so, then the book before us proves what we have long been disposed to believe, that the *system* is comparatively of little importance, provided a master-spirit is at the head. The man shows off the system, and not the system the man. The jury-court system, in any other hands than Mr. Hill's, would, in all probability, present quite a different appearance.

There is one feature of this establishment with which we are exceedingly pleased. The teachers form a council for frequent deliberation upon all points suggested by their daily experience. This council, amenable to no higher board, discuss freely whatever is proposed, improve *immediately* what is susceptible of improvement, supply what is defective,—in a word, add, subtract, and variously modify the system, as the stubborn circumstances demand, without the delay necessarily incurred by waiting some six months or two years, for the approbatory sanction of a superior body, composed, as is sometimes the case, of every kind of men but teachers, and well acquainted with every other business, but the enactment of laws for the government of youth.

The following extract reminds us of Dr. Parr's (if we mistake not) unconquerable aversion to the abolishment of pugilistic contests; while he so far acceded to the improving spirit of the age as to discourage these combats by word and law: but, at the same time, permitted a "fight" when

the combatants went to work on a certain spot, conveniently situated to enable him to see and enjoy the "fun" from his study-window. The passage also leads us to surmise that if this little self-governing community should be generally tinctured with such sentiments, the pugilistic predilections of boyhood would carry the day.

"It would be in vain to attempt any concealment of the fact, that our pupils, like all boys in the full tide of health and spirits, do not always see the folly of an appeal to the *ultima ratio regum* in so strong a light as that in which it *sometimes* appears to older eyes; and resort is now and then had to trial by combat, in preference to trial by jury. The candid and experienced teacher, who knows the difficulty and the danger of too rigorously suppressing natural impulses, will not censure us for endeavouring rather to regulate this custom, than to destroy it altogether. In the hope of lessening the number of these *frays*, (never very large,) a law was proposed, which the Committee adopted, to render it penal for any person, except the Magistrate, to be present at a battle. Six hours' notice must be given by both parties, and a tax paid in advance. During the interval, it is the duty of the Magistrate to attempt a reconciliation. These regulations were intended to give opportunity for the passions to cool, and to check the inclination for display which is often the sole cause of the disturbance. We consider the effect on the minds of the spectators as the worst part of the transaction. There is something dreadfully brutalizing in the shouts of incitement and triumph which generally accompany a feat of pugilism. Neither boys nor men ought ever to witness pain without sympathy. It is almost needless to say, that, with us, fighting is any thing rather than a source of festivity and amusement.

"If a pugilistic contest should take place without due notice having been given, the parties are liable to a heavy fine, and it is the duty of the eldest boy present, under a heavy penalty, to convey immediate information to the Magistrate, that the parties may be separated.

"These regulations were made in April 1821. During the first few months, the number of battles did not appear to be materially checked, four contests of the kind having taken place between April and July in the same year; but from July 1821, to the present time, (April 1825,) two battles only have been fought, according to the regulations laid down. It is true that a few other contests have ta-

ken place, or rather have commenced, without notice being given; but in every instance early information has been conveyed to the Magistrate, who has immediately separated the belligerents. We have reason to be confident in stating that no contest of this latter kind ever lasted two minutes." p. 33.

We most decidedly object to the foppery of some of our modern schools—those preconcerted tricks intended merely to make an impression upon the susceptible public. Enter some of these schools, (whose superior advantages the portentous recommendations, and the splendid prospectuses have already proclaimed far and wide,) and some imposing manœuvre must be forthwith gone through with, with the exactness, it may be, of clock-work, (which we like exceedingly in its place,) for the purpose of captivating the minds of visitors, and impressing them with the desirableness of such a situation for their boys.

We are sorry to see something of this deliberate puffing, and well-planned self-commendation, in the school now under consideration, because we find so many other things which evince real good sense and judgment, as well as an estimable degree of modesty.

The following extract will explain our meaning.

"April 12, 1825. At nine hours and forty-five minutes the bell commenced ringing; the boys being at this time distributed about the premises, and many in the play grounds, some parts of which are 200 yards from the school-room door. At nine hours and forty-seven minutes the bell ceased, and a rally was beaten immediately on the drum. With the ninth and tenth seconds two blows were given; the band was now in readiness. The eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth seconds were also marked by blows on the drum. The doors were instantly closed, and the band struck up "Home, sweet home," which the boys accompanied with their voices, giving us the whole of the song, which made this part of the process longer than usual. While the air was playing, at forty-seven minutes and forty seconds, the placard with the word "Place" inscribed upon it was exhibited, at which time all present were in their ranks. At fifty minutes and

forty-five seconds the singing ceased, and a boy immediately called, "Five—forty-five;" meaning that five minutes and forty-five seconds had elapsed since the ringing of the bell commenced. The registrar recorded and repeated the time. *The teller of the eighth rank* then called—"One out of fifteen absent from the eighth rank." *The first boy in the same rank*—"Stamos Nakos."* *The registrar, while recording the name*, "Stamos Nakos." *A member of the band*—"The band fourteen complete." *A teacher*—"Nine decads complete." *The teller of the eighth rank*—"Fourteen;" *The member of the band*—"And fourteen make twenty-eight;" *The teacher*—"And ninety make one hundred and eighteen;" *The registrar*—"And one absentee makes up one hundred and nineteen; which completes the list." *The boy watching the dial*—"Six—ten;" (meaning six minutes and ten seconds from the moment the bell began to ring.) *The registrar*—"Six—ten." *Another boy looking at the dial*—"Twenty-five seconds," (the whole time occupied by the calling and casting.) *The registrar*—"Twenty-five seconds." *The presiding teacher*—"Form." The drummer now beat the drum fifteen times, each interval making a second. In the mean time, all the boys, except one or two, had arrived at their places; in two or three seconds more the ranks were complete; when a boy called out, "I am last." *Teacher*—"Ten;" (meaning that the boy had incured a fine of ten marks, which was immediately paid to the prefect of the class.) *Teacher*—"March." The band played, and the classes at the same time proceeded to their respective places." p. 87.

The "proceedings of a day," will serve to show the extremely complicated, and somewhat imposing, transactions of the school. It must be recollected, that these forms and ceremonies, marchings, musters, ringing of bells, drumming, &c. &c., are to be superadded to the complex operations of the jury courts and police.

"At six o'clock the bell rings for the boys in general to rise.

"At the three general musters, at those for meals, and at the one for evening prayers, the bell rings two minutes, at other times a few strokes only are sufficient.

"Just before the six o'clock bell rings, a member of the band hav-

* A Greek, who was unwell at the time.

ing received notice from the monitor, goes into the passages which lead to the dormitories, and plays a *reveillée* on the Kent bugle, to arouse those who are not already awake.

"All the boys leave their beds at the word of command, which is given as the bell rings; and when dressed, arrange themselves in each room in a certain order for marching down stairs.

"Here it may be well to observe, that in each dormitory there is a teacher, and likewise a superior boy who is called the prefect, with other officers under him, each having the care of a division. The boys who serve the offices of prefect and sub-prefect, have salaries of marks, and are considered as responsible for the behaviour of those who are under their care. If any improper conduct should take place in either of the dormitories, it is the duty of the sub-prefect of the division in which the irregularity may have arisen, to report it to the magistrate at the muster for prayers. If this is not done, the officers themselves are fined, upon the report of the prefect.

"At $6^h$. $10^m$. the bell rings again, when it is expected that the boys in each room shall stand prepared to march down stairs.

"If this is not the case, the last in each dormitory who takes his place, is reported by the sub-prefect and pays a fine. The boys being arranged, each division under the care of a sub-prefect and all in the same dormitory, under the command of their prefect, the word "march" is given, and the different companies follow each other down stairs in regular order, accompanied by music. Having reached the principal school-room, they form in the order of march, in ten ranks along the parallel lines before-mentioned. As the boys when at a muster always place themselves along these lines, it will be necessary to speak of them again. The shoes are now distributed from baskets, one belonging to each division; having been collected the night before in the same baskets and placed in readiness.

"At $6^h$. $15^m$. one division of the boys goes to the wash-houses.

"At $6^h$. $20^m$. a second division goes to the wash-houses, and at $6^h$. $25^m$. a third division.

"The arrangement of these three divisions which include all the boarders, depends partly on rank, and partly on age. There are two

wash-houses with a supply of water, carried by pipes into every part. The little boys go to the inner apartment, and are washed by servants. Each boy receives a slice of bread as soon as he has left the wash-house.

"At $6^h$. $35^m$. Prayers.

"The business of the muster is gone through in the manner described at p. 82; with this exception; that as the day-boys are not present, their ranks are altogether omitted in the account, and a total made up which includes the boarders only. This is invariably the case at all musters which the day-boys do not join. When the business of the muster has been gone through, the reports of the sub-prefects are made: Prayers are then read. In the selection of these, great care is taken that they shall contain those expressions of devotion only, in which every denomination of Christians may join with perfect sincerity. At the conclusion of prayers, the boys are at liberty.

"At $6^h$. $45^m$. the monitor goes round to call any who may be in bed on account of slight indisposition or other causes.

"At $6^h$. $55^m$. a rally on the drum.

"This is to give notice of the general muster to all officers or others who may have preparations to make. Such a signal precedes all general musters and all changes of classes, at an equal interval.

"At seven o'clock, a general muster, as has been described.

"Immediately after, the boys form into the reading or into the parsing classes; which alternate every fortnight. In either case, certain boys are drawn off for Latin, and others for French. It is also necessary to remark that the boys in the lower school (ten or twelve in number) do not join these classes, but at all times retire to their own room immediately after the general musters. Here they have a peculiar set of exercises, varying more frequently than those for the other boys. The lowest class of readers consists entirely of foreigners; who, whenever they read, are taught individually, each being placed under a member of a superior class.

"At $7^h$. $30^m$. the reading or parsing is discontinued.

"The books are collected, and the classes disperse to prepare for Latin. Five minutes before this time, at the signal on the drum, the three highest boys in each class receive small rewards and are allowed to depart. In one or two of the highest classes, however, where a motive of this kind is not required to excite ardour, it is usual for all the members to remain to the last moment. It must be understood that this mode of proceeding is invariably adopted with respect to the classes throughout the day.

"After ringing the bell the monitor waits a minute: then strikes upon the drum, and the door is closed at the end of twenty seconds, as at the general musters. He then strikes twenty-five blows, each at an interval of a second, during which time, all in the school are expected to join their Latin classes at the parallel lines: if any are too late, the last is fined. At the head of each class hangs a list of the members, which is examined if any doubts arise as to a boy's place. The order to "march" is given, and the classes proceed to their places, stepping in measured time, but without music: the band playing only at certain musters, which will be mentioned. If any boys are excluded by the closing of the door, they are fined by an individual who remains out for the purpose, and are then sent directly to the places where their classes are exercised. The mode of proceeding here detailed is adopted at all changes of classes.

"The Latin classes now go through certain lessons which they have prepared the night before. A few boys who do not learn Latin are engaged throughout the remainder of the morning, some in writing exercises under the French master, and others in transcribing from printed books. The foreigners make a distinct division, and receive lessons in English. Sometimes they learn little English dramas.

"At $8^h.\ 5^m.$ the classes form for extemporaneous construing, and for instruction in the grammar; some in Greek, and others in Latin.

"At $8^h.\ 50^m.$ the lessons conclude.

"Some of the younger boys, and others who have not acquired a character for neatness, now go into a room, where they are individually examined as to personal appearance. In the mean time, the great majority, to whom such an inspection is necessary, form into ranks, in which they arrange themselves alphabetically: that is, all whose surnames begin with certain letters, stand in a given rank,

and so on. A boy having previously assorted according to the same arrangement of the owner's names, all articles which have been found out of place the day before, and have not been claimed; these articles are now distributed, and a small fine is demanded for each by the class-Prefects. Those articles which have no names inscribed upon them are put into the *Trovery;* a book-case, with doors of open wire-work, through which every thing it contains may be seen. During this distribution, an officer reads the list of recorded fines for the previous day, which have been posted the evening before by certain boys; these fines must now be paid. Some teachers are engaged in distributing rewards to those who bring voluntary labor, and another is prepared to give out stationary to such as may want it—both of these distributions being confined to this part of the day. The boys who are examined as to personal appearance, also occupy certain teachers in receiving their recorded fines, and in paying for their voluntary labor. The *Troverer* is likewise in attendance to restore, for a certain fee, any article to the owner. All this multifarious business is concluded by

$9^h$. $10^m$. when the bell rings for breakfast."

As the whole "proceedings of a day" would be somewhat tedious to our readers, we beg leave to stop at a very important operation, in which the mechanism of the school is wonderfully assisted by the instinct of nature, viz., the discussion of a breakfast.

We regret to find the authors of this work inclining so much to the side of what is speciously styled "practical utility," in the education of boys. We venture to assert, after some years experience and observation in these matters, that an education conducted upon these principles, must prove unsuccessful, as to the main object in view—the developement and invigoration of the mental powers. We hold that a pupil may derive incalculable benefit from the study and "*recitation*" of Euclid's Elements, under a skilful teacher, who understands the nature and the magnitude of the object to be attained in early education, and knows how to employ the best means in the best manner. And yet, the

same pupil may, at the time, be utterly unacquainted with the practical applications of which these beautiful theorems are susceptible; much less does he need to be made acquainted with their "practical utility," in order to stimulate him to perseverance, or enflame his ardour. We have our fears, lest, in this "practical age," the substance of education be forgotten, while we are playing with a fleeting shadow; lest the conscious vigor and intrepidity of a well cultivated intellect, be exchanged for the light and fastastic trappings of the modern "dandy," or the ball-room huzzar; lest we consult and follow merely the natural (not always the *best*) taste and inclinations of the wayward boy, in place of *forming* that taste, elevating his views, enuring him to intellectual toil, and enabling him to adopt and feel the noble motto, "*labor ipse voluptas.*"

The question may be stated thus: Is the education of boys to be conducted with little or no regard to their comprehension and appreciation of the practical utility of their studies; or is the study and pursuit itself to be of an immediately practical character, and is this fact to be understood by the pupil, and insisted on by the instructer, as the means of stimulating him to continued exertion? We candidly confess ourselves of the number of those, who deprecate the influence which the latter mode of proceeding, to the neglect of the former, must exert upon literature, upon study, upon intellectual cultivation, and the cause of educa- in our country. And we are not a little chagrined, when we see men of standing and consideration in the literary community, by their conversation ond writings, and especially by their efforts and example, as instructers, attaching so much importance to the "practical" and the "useful" department of study, merely because they seem to promise immediate advantage; and denouncing, as "fools" or "pedants," all those fundamental teachers, ancient and modern, who strike at the mind itself as the grand instrument of

thought, and succeed in drawing forth its hidden energies, proving its resources, invigorating its powers, and giving keenness to the edge of its faculties.

We are inclined to believe, that what is (somewhat presumptuously) called "the natural method of learning languages" derives most of its importance from the admitted fact, that a smaller amount of intellectual toil is necessary, than in the "*un*natural" method. The pupil is not obliged to inure his mind to patient labor, to develope his own intellectual resources, to climb the rugged steep, much to the discomfort of his tender feet, nor to seek for vigorous and elastic intellectual health, in the only way in which it can be secured,—by indefatigable exercise.

The authors of the book before us, although by no means so extravagant as Hamilton, or Hall, or Dufief, lean too much to the plan of teaching languages by translations, and repeated repetitions, very proper, as we admit, when judiciously employed, and to a certain degree, by an experienced instructer; but by no means adapted to supersede the more toilsome plan, which we must still be permitted to think embraces *intellectual* advantages of the highest order, upon which, however, our limits will not permit us to enlarge.

It is not the system, however, as we have before remarked, but the men, from whom we are disposed to expect great things in education. One man will employ the natural method of teaching languages, with great success, and with great benefit to the intellectual powers of the pupil; another, with the same method, will accomplish nothing, or worse than nothing. One man will so conduct the study of the ancient languages, even in the older and more "unnatural" method, that the memory, the attention, the powers of taste, of combination, and of analysis, will all be exercised in beautiful harmony; another, with the same method, will exhaust the spirits and patience of his pupils, contract their

minds, and inspire them with a hearty disgust for languages and the classics, for Ciceronian eloquence, Demosthenean fire, Athenian simplicity, "et hoc genus omne." And we feel constrained to believe, that if any teacher can accomplish all that the so styled "natural method" promises, it is certainly the highly gifted principal of the Hazelwood School.

We have not room to notice, at present, the remarks contained in this volume, upon instruction in Geography, Orthography, mental Arithmetic, and Geometry; upon Theatrical Exhibitions; the use of Rewards and Punishments, and the exercise of Composition;—some of which remarks are exceedingly judicious, and will furnish the liberal instructer with many valuable hints.

We would particularly refer our readers to the chapter entitled "*Review of the System*," which proves the writer to have been an accurate observer of men and things.

We solicit the patience of our readers for a few moments more, while, reviewer-like, we set forth a few notions of our *own*, upon this subject.

To us, the very idea of *one hundred boys*, of various ages, dispositions, and capacities, forming *one* family, for the purposes of paternal government, is preposterous. In this age of monogamy, the *bona fide* experiment can never be tried, it is true. Some parents, however, whose "quiver" is well supplied, and who are tolerably good disciplinarians, tell us of the difficulty of studying the dispositions and talents of even *twelve* boys. Perhaps our scepticism on this subject is unreasonable, but we do seriously doubt, (and our acquaintance with "High Schools" and "Gymnasia," at home and abroad, has not removed this doubt,) whether a larger number than *Forty*, or, at the utmost *Fifty*, can be thus studied by any *one* man, who professes to apply the principles of family government. Nor is it possible for *two* men to share this government of one hundred boys, (such, at least,

is *our* idea of a paternal government,) without dividing the school numerically,—making, in fact, *two* schools.

We would have the number sufficiently large, to secure all the advantages of a public education over a private one; and yet sufficiently limited, to secure all the advantages of a private education over a public one. The extremes may be made to meet.

We would have a boy, in the course of his education, before his transplantation from the seminary, anticipate, *as far as it can safely be done*, the excitements, the collisions, the competitions, and the bustling activity of the world; because we are convinced that in this way alone, his moral powers or faculties can ever receive their healthy developement. A boy may know theoretically, even from the nursery, that he is a moral agent, that truth is universally commendable, and that falsehood is base; he may be furnished with a goodly number of abstract principles, clothed in the technical language of moral systems, which he has drunk in almost with his mother's milk. But we would have him, if possible, thoroughly imbued with a moral *feeling*—a *sentiment*—a *conscientiousness*. And this is precisely the very thing which can never be engendered by a secluded and solitary education, although we are very far from believing, that it will *always* be generated and confirmed by a public one. Still, our observation, experience, reading, and reflection, all concur in persuading us, that a certain amount and kind of intercourse with our fellows, is necessary, in order to engraft upon our moral knowledge the powerful influence of moral sentiment.

For the same reason, we would wish the boy to *realize*, (for the confirmation of this moral sentiment,) to *some extent*, the personal consequences of virtuous or vicious conduct. It is plain, that, in a course of private, secluded, and solitary education, he can have little or no practical acquaintance with these. If the circumstances of the public

course are such (and such we certainly would have them to be,) as to secure this advantage, without detriment to the moral character of the pupil, we should confidently expect him notwithstanding some occasional indiscretions,) to be far better prepared for the momentous part he is to perform in the great world, than a boy who has been secluded from the world, and whom, like a plant of sickly hue, an ungenial frost, or an unwonted blast, may wither or prostrate.

Again; we would have the number sufficiently large, to admit of the existence and influence of a public sentiment in this little community,—a kind of "*esprit du corps*," in the best sense; but not so large, on the other hand, as to permit that public sentiment to assume and maintain a wrong direction. We consider this of vital importance, in the preparation of boys for the bustling, specious, noisy, and flattering world, into which we would have them pass, (for into it they must sooner or later pass,) without being confounded and disconcerted, or thrown off their guard, by its entire strangeness.

We would, therefore, throw together, without hesitation, as many as *forty* or *fifty* boys, of a suitable age and character, because we think it within the bounds of possibility, that this number may be *parentally governed;* while, at the same time, all the real advantages of social intercourse may be secured.

We need hardly add, that we would have the parental governor act the part, also, of a wise shepherd, who separates in season, the rotten sheep from the sound; well knowing, that "*one scabby sheep infects the flock.*" But we have not time to specify the various expedients, which the skilful governor of boys will resort to, in order to accomplish the greatest possible amount of individual and general good. As we have said before, in relation to other points, so we say now, in relation to the *government* of a school: we have no confidence in the very best system, on

paper, that the wisdom and experience of man can devise. If valuable, it must be so general as to admit of innumerable modifications in its application ; and, however plausible and unexceptionable it may be, it will depend for its efficiency, upon the master-spirit that applies it ;—as the sceptre, however grand and imposing in appearance, is powerless without a hand to grasp it and an arm to sway it.

Having brought together a manageable number of boys, *what* shall they be taught? Whatever says one, will best prepare them for their active duties as men. True ; but what *will* best prepare them for their active duties as men? Is it a knowledge of the *facts* unfolded in chemistry, botany, mineralogy, and natural history, which enables the boy to exhibit a specious precocity, and transports him, in the opinion of the fond parent, to the confines of manhood?

The mind, says another, is a workman, and the intellectual powers and faculties are its tools. The main business of education is, to give edge and temper to the tools, and skill to the workman. Solid, intellectual, and moral culture, adapted to develope and invigorate the mental faculties, furnishes *a power*, inseparable from the man ;—just as the hewer of wood finds that a sturdy and practised arm, and a keen axe, is a possession of universal advantage, and well repays him for the toilsome exercise of the one, and the careful tempering and whetting of the other.

It seems to us, that either method to the exclusion of the other is defective ; or rather, that the advantages of the latter method, cannot be secured, without the adoption, to some extent, of the former. The mind is susceptible of indefinite expansion and invigoration. But some degree of positive knowledge—matter-of-fact knowledge, (to what extent and of what kind, we cannot now stop to show,) is necessary to form the *pabulum*—the *nutriment*—the *stimulus*. How shall we account for the insatiable curiosity of early life, the want of which is regarded as an indication of stupidity?

And how shall we account, at the same time, for the exquisite pleasure, experienced by generous minds, upon the clear comprehension of indubitable and unchangeable truth?

From the existence of these principles in the soul, at so early a period, we conclude that our Creator designs that *both* should receive their appropriate gratification,—that *both* should be appealed to, in forming the mind.

If these things be so, we think we may safely conclude, that the *primary* object of education (we refer particularly to the education of the more intellectual classes of the community) ought to be, to *educe* or draw forth the energies of the mind, to bring to light its capabilities, to invigorate its faculties, to enlarge its views, and to instil and cherish the purest sentiments of patriotism, morality, and piety; while, at the same time, as great an amount of positive and practical knowledge ought to be furnished, as the circumstances of the pupil, and a constant regard to the primary object, above specified, will permit. It is solid, seasonable, and thorough instruction, in the branches of science and literature adapted to this end, which accomplishes the great end of intellectual education. The lighter studies, the miscellaneous reading, the polite accomplishments, and the gymnastic exercises, are all subordinate to this end, and efficient auxiliaries, when employed by a sagacious teacher. A superficial teacher we would not permit to cross the threshold of a school for boys. "*Procul, O! procul, este profani.*"

We regard, therefore, with unlimited abhorrence, the practice of some instructers, of pompous pretensions, and unblushing impudence, who would hurry the pupil over the substantial part of education, in order that the attainments of manhood may be forced upon the unripe boy;—just as the drawing-room graces and dress, are sometimes appended to the Miss of eight or nine years old, that she may pass

from childhood into ladyhood, in a moment, and thus obliterate the obnoxious period of youth.

We are more than ever impressed with the conviction that, for the purposes above mentioned, the mathematics, and the Greek and Latin languages, when skilfully applied, are the best adapted. We shall refrain from any remarks upon the invigorating influence of mathematical studies, because the subject has been so repeatedly and ably discussed. We are inclined to believe, however, that an *original* and inveterate distaste for the mathematics, has no existence. There may be, we admit, such an obtuseness of intellect, as disqualifies it for the clear perception of mathematical relations, and the enjoyment of the pleasure which accompanies the perception of unchangeable truth. But will not this same obtuseness of intellect, disqualify the mind for the prosecution of real study in every other department? The supposed want of taste for mathematical studies, is more frequently owing, as we have reason to fear, to the injudicious management of the study, particularly at the commencement. Some minds, like that of Pascal, will grasp at the most abstract mathematical relations, at a very early period. Others must be stimulated and encouraged by theorems and problems of a more mixed and practical character. To some minds, we need only *point out the way.* Others must be *led and supported step by step.*

It is obvious, however, that a mind that is formed solely upon the basis of mathematical studies, will be but partially cultivated. To supply the deficiency, the study of languages—the Greek and Latin languages in particular—are not merely valuable, but, in the present state of the world, indispensable.

Here, so wide a field opens before us, that we are almost tempted to lay down our pen. While it is in our hand, however, we must be indulged in a few observations on the exercise of "translating;" which, though it may suggest in the

minds of some of our readers, the frightful ideas of "*parsing*," "*scanning*," "*recitations*," and "*academical drilling*," we do assure them, conduces, when properly conducted, not a little, to the cultivation of the intellectual powers, the refinement of taste, and to an enlarged and accurate acquaintance with our vernacular tongue.

No intellectual faculty is of more importance than a keen-sighted discrimination, which, at a glance, can see distinctions where the vulgar eye can detect none; which distinguishes, also, by the words employed to communicate the ideas, the nice shades of thought, and the evanescent hues of sentiment.. Among the exercises promotive of this habit of discrimination, that of "translating," should occupy a very high rank.

A writer of talents (and such alone should be placed before the pupil for improvement in this exercise) deals in *thought*, and in *words* only as they are best adapted to convey the thought in a clear, impressive, glowing, or elegant manner. His thoughts are not apt to be vague and general, but particular and definite,—characteristic of the man—an image of his mind. The translator must discriminate. He must separate and analyse, and construct again, a luminous whole, from these luminous parts. Can this be done by a *vague* translation? Can it be accomplished without a mental effort? The translation must be searching and discriminating, in order to be profitable. We venture, confidently, to assert, that every clear discernment of an actual difference in shades of thought, however blended in common language, renders the mind itself more penetrating and efficient, raises its standard of intellectual excellence, whets its powers for future exertion, and confers an enjoyment which the sluggard or the literary lounger never felt.

The pupil should have *one* language as the common depository of his ideas, whether obtained by reflection or "translation." That this language (which in this case, may

be called the "*universal solvent*") should be our vernacular tongue, will not, we think, be doubted.

Now, our knowledge of the precise signification of the words in our own tongue, and of the modifications of meaning they admit by shifting their connexion, displays itself, frequently, in a kind of habitual feeling of the propriety or impropriety of this or that translation of a given word in a given connexion. With an intuitive judgement, we accomodate ourselves to the circumstunces of the case; and are frequently sensible of some incongruity, without being able to remedy it.

It needs, therefore, no labored argument to prove, that, on the one hand, a tolerable acquaintance with our vernacular language is requisite in order to conduct, understandingly and advantageously, the exercise of "translating;" and, on the other, that when conducted in a liberal and discriminating manner, it induces in the pupil an accurate and discriminating use of his own language.

This important circumstance is too apt to be overlooked in our schools. There is no commanding station in life, (and such stations are mostly occupied by our liberally educated men,) where a discriminating use of our vernacular language is not demanded, or where a perfect command of it is not desirable. And in what way can we more easily and pleasantly acquire the desired fluency, copiousness, and accuracy, in the use of the English tongue, than by means of a judicious management of the exercise of "translating," in the earlier stages of education? The pupil has the thought provided. He must clothe it worthily. The unfurnished mind finds it not only irksome, but comparatively unprofitable, to torture a vague thought of its own, into a hundred Proteus-shapes, to pass muster for a "composition," which, turn it any way you please, whether it be fish, or bird, or beast, is old Proteus still. In "translating," the thoughts, (and those, it may be, of the most ennobling cha-

racter,) are furnished; the ideas are connected; the logical travail is over; the empty brain is not racked for something to talk about.

We do not wish to discountenance the practice of original composition. We mean only to say, that if composition is made to supersede this exercise of "translating," one of the best means of promoting an early acquaintance with the powers of our vernacular language, is neglected. Nor do we design to discourage the use of translations, in the earliest stages of the study of a language. Nay, if the views we have propounded be correct, the propriety of their introduction, *at a proper period, to a certain extent, and under skilful management,* provided the translations themselves be rigidly accurate, can hardly be doubted.

This view of the exercise of "translating," as a literary exercise, demanding, and at the same time promoting, an acquaintance with our vernacular tongue, may be still further illustrated by a comparison of the *idiomatic phrases* which abound in all languages. One peculiarity of these idiomatic phrases, is, that they do not admit of a literal translation into another language; which, however, unless unusually defective, will supply a corresponding idiom. Take the following examples:—

The Romans said: "*duos parietes de eadem fidelia dealbare,*" which, literally translated, runs thus: "*to whitewash two walls out of the same tub.*" But, properly translated, it means: "*to kill two birds with one stone.*" A German would translate the phrase thus: "*mit einer Klappe zwey Fliegen schlagen,*" which denotes, literally, "*to kill two flies at one slap.*"

Again; a German, wishing to convey the idea, that the wife rules the husband, says: "*die Frau hat den Hut,*" that is, "*the wife wears the hat,*" which *we* translate, idiomatically, "*the wife wears the breeches.*"

Again; the Romans said: "*nodum in scirpo quaerere.*"

that is, "*to search for a knot in a bulrush*,"—to look for a knot in the stalk of a plant, which is naturally destitute of them. But the corresponding English idiom is: "*to stumble on plain ground.*"

Again; the Greek phrase, "πλυνειν τινα," denotes, literally "*to wash one.*" But in common language, it means: "*to rebuke one sharply.*" So the Germans, in the same sense, say: "*einem den Kopf waschen*," that is, *to wash one's head*," which the Hollanders, also, express by "*washing one's ears.*"

Again; the French phrase, "*trouver la fêve au gateau*," that is, "*to find the bean in the cake*," is properly translated: "*to hit the nail on the head;*" and the phrase, "*partager le gateau*," that is, "*to share the cake*," is equivalent, in common language, to our English expression, "*to go snacks.*"

It is for this reason that Plautus, Don Quixote, Aristophanes, Theophrastus, (in his Characters,) Shakespear, (in his Comedies,) Tassoni, (in his Secchia Rapita,) and other works of this class, are so difficult to translate well into another language, whose corresponding idioms are of a very different *literal* signification, and yet are the only phrases adapted to express those of the other language.

We might enlarge here upon the different degrees of literalness or freedom, in translating, to which the pupil will resort, under the direction of a skilful teacher, for the purposes of intellectual improvement, literary cultivation, or refinement of taste, but we must forbear.

Some one will now ask, shall the fascinating and instructive study of natural history be neglected in a course of early education? By no means. If the general principles which we have advanced, be correct, the grand object of education cannot be fully attained, without the aid of some studies of this character, as *auxiliaries.* The danger is, in making them too prominent and absorbing, to which we are disposed to object; because there are other indispensa-

ble studies, in which the pupil, at this early age, ought to be *mainly* employed.

Still, it is a matter of astonishment, considering the inexhaustible curiosity of the youthful mind, that so little use has been made, even incidentally, of this department, in our systems of early education. Our astonishment increases when we reflect, that every saunter among the fields and groves, and every excursion for amusement, health, or science, presents to the mind of the casual observer objects of the highest interest, which are generally unnoticed in later life, because, in our earlier days, when curiosity is keen, the memory tenacious, and imagination on the wing, the mind has not been accustomed to derive any portion of its enjoyment from this exuberant source. It is in the power of an enlightened instructer, who can control the whole time of an ingenuous pupil, to graft upon his mind, during the eventful period between six and sixteen years of age, the general principles and the most striking facts of Natural History, of Botany, and even Astronomy, without retarding, *in the least degree*, his progress in severer closet study. Let any one of our readers, who is a parent, lead forth an intelligent child, when the vault of heaven is studded with stars; and, as his curious eye gazes upon the scene above, let the parent inform him in familiar language, that these brilliant specks, are probably the central suns of other systems,—vast, innumerable, and harmonious,—in which the power and the goodness of the Deity are unceasingly displayed; and when he rivits his gaze in mute astonishment upon these seen but unknown worlds, let the parent inform him that these *myriads* of systems, to which our eye can reach, are but the *outer-skirts* of an infinitude beyond, buried in unfathomable space; and we will venture to predict, that the questions from the astonished child, will, sooner or later, convince the parent, that he has touched a string which will long continue to vibrate.

In regard to the character and attainments that we should expect to find, in the man who assumes the high responsilities of a governor and instructer of youth, we can only say, that the superintendent of the whole conduct and training of boys, ought to be morally and intellectually competent to the task;—neither a novice, nor a pedant, nor a scheming enthusiast; nor a cold-blooded, and shallow-pated drudge, with no more *soul* for this noble employment than the rod which he applies as the corrective of every evil; nor a mere school-keeper, destitute, as is often the case, of those literary attainments, that gentlemanly and affectionate deportment, those benevolent feelings, and that devoted piety, which expend their united and benign influence in forming the intellectual and moral character of the youth.

On the popular subject of "Gymnastics" we would barely remark that they propose to themselves the developement and perfection of the several portions of the human frame, by bringing every joint, muscle, and limb in active play, particularly while the body is receiving its growth. They not only minister present health, but look forward prospectively to firmness of constitution in subsequent life.

Most of the Gymnastic games, also, are of a social kind, and awaken an intense interest in the competitors; absorbing the attention, sharpening the perception, and communicating alertness to the motions of the mind as well as the body. Thus they become invaluable auxiliaries to the more direct methods of promoting intellectual culture.

The Gymnastic exercises of a more simple and elementary kind, consist of various movements and exertions of the particular muscles and limbs of the interior and exterior portions of the frame. Here, the superintendance of an experienced teacher is indispensable, that the exercises may be vigorous, without being violent, and adapted to the gradual developement of each portion, in its strength and beauty.

The exercises of a more complex and difficult character,

succeed to these, and prevent that partial developement which we discover in the brawny arms of the blacksmith, or the protruding muscles in the lower extremities of the rope-dancer.

If the Gymnastic exercises, however, become too prominent a feature, in an institution for the education of boys, whose primary object is intellectual and moral culture, there is danger on the one hand, of making them more expert as tumblers and mountebanks than as students; or, on the other hand, of fatiguing them daily, to such a degree, as to blunt the delicate sensibilities of the mind, clog its movements, induce a drowsy and inefficient exertion of its powers, and lay the foundation of incurable disease.

The Gymnastic exercises, *judiciously modified*, may be combined with excursions for mineralogical, geological, and botanical purposes, for surveying, and for the mensuration of heights and distances ; in which, the acquisition of useful knowledge will be combined with wholesome recreation.

We cannot forbear to add, that we would have religious instruction assiduously inculcated, upon the broad basis of the Scriptures.

On this subject, we have not much to say, not because its importance is not, in some good measure, realised, but because we are persuaded that every thing here will depend under Providence, upon the talents, sagacity, judgment, experience, and enlightened piety of the instructer ; and that no definite prospective plan of proceeding, can be devised. Here, if any where, the instructer must feel himself unshackled by arbitrary rules.

If, amidst the multiplicity of books which demand our attention, *one* book presents itself, in which the piercing eye of criticism has never yet detected the slightest incongruity to tarnish its pretensions to a celestial origin ;—a book, whose influence is doing more to tame the fierce passions which render our world "a field of blood," to eradicate the

propensities which brutalize our species, and to accelerate and confirm the progress of civilization, than all the philosophy and legislative wisdom, and refined literature, which have been poured upon society, in ancient or modern times ;—a book, whose preservation and existence, in its present unexceptionable form, is itself a miracle ;—a book, in fine, whose doctrines are so sublime, whose morality is so pure, whose historical narrative is so simple and faithful, whose various portions are in such admirable keeping, whose prophetic character is so incontrovertibly established, whose instructions look forward so impressively, to the consummation of all things, and to the eternal destination of man, and whose literary execution anticipates, in so unequivocal a manner, the boldest imaginations of genius ;—if, we say, such a book exists, surely it may be said, not merely to *invite*, but to *demand* the early attention of all those for whom its instructions, its warnings, its denunciations, and its promises, were designed.

Those instructers are not, therefore, mad with overmuch learning, nor misguided by a wild enthusiasm, who assert, in an affectionate, consistent, and parental manner, the claims of this "book of books ;" especially if their Christian deportment stamps the character of sincerity upon their own profession.

Let us not be understood to advocate the cause of any particular sect. We would wish the instructer to set before the pupil the evidences of the religion of Christ, and its paramount claims. If any parent should object, because the claims of the Episcopalian, or the Methodist, or the Baptist, or the Presbyterian, are not urged, we would reply, it is enough for the instructer to introduce the pupil into the unappropriated field of Christian knowledge and principles, and leave it to the parent to exert whatever influence his judgment may suggest, in marshalling him under any particular banner.

We must now take leave of the subject of education, for the present, with many thanks to the Messrs. Hill, for the benefit already conferred by them on the community, and with some regret, that our own notions have, in the course of this review, put themselves forward so unceremoniously, that we have hardly given *their* system as much space as its magnitude would seem to demand, or courtesy require.

---

## CHURCH MUSIC,

### CONSIDERED IN REFERENCE TO ITS ORIGINAL DESIGN

AND

### ITS PRESENT STATE.

---

Those who believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, will admit, that Church Music was instituted for the purpose of aiding the devotions of the pious worshipper. It is equally evident, also, that the patriarchs, the prophets, and the apostles, were in earnest while they sang. Their songs had constant reference to circumstances with which they were conversant, as well as to facts which were then sealed in the language of prophecy. The Psalmist of Israel, though highly favoured of God, was subject to the most remarkable vicissitudes of affliction and prosperity. Yet he ever sung out of the overflowings of a full heart. See him convicted of his deplorable iniquity under the reproof of the prophet Nathan. He cries out, in the bitterness of his soul, "Have mercy upon me, O God, according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my trans-

gressions." See him at another time banished among outcasts, from the commonwealth of Israel. "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God?" Again, while engaged in removing the ark, he exclaims, "Arise O, Lord, unto thy rest, thou and the ark of thy strength. Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness; and let thy saints shout for joy." On another occasion, he is seen pouring forth his full heart in gratitude, "Bless the Lord, O, my soul, and all that is within me, bless his holy name." Again, we see him cast down in despondency—"Are his mercies clean gone forever?" At other times, he breaks forth at once into the highest raptures, "Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord."—"Let the floods clap their hands, and let the hills be joyful together before the Lord." Such were the themes of ancient minstrelsy. The same themes were also sung by the apostles, and by the churches which they instituted; and the same are to form the authorised basis of sacred songs down to the remotest ages of time.

It must be allowed that the subject of singing is spoken of less frequently in the New Testament, than in the Old. Some have hence derived an argument in favor of diminishing the importance of the institution. But if their reasoning is sound, it will follow, that in proportion as the established *themes* of song are better appreciated, amid the light of a gospel dispensation, they may be sung the less heartily, and with the less effect—the very reverse of which is true. If the early Christians paid less attention to the *cultivation* of psalmody than the Jewish nation had done before them, we must remember also, that they were placed in peculiar circumstances. They had not synagogues and houses of worship, which they could call their own. They were persecuted, afflicted, tormented, driven from city to city; without were fightings, and within were fears. Yet, in the

midst of perils, they did all that was necessary, by example as well as by precept, to give the highest sanction to the art. The first annunciation of a Saviour's birth was immediately celebrated by a song of angels. The disciples sang at the sacramental supper. Paul and Silas sang at midnight in the depths of a dungeon: and the Revelation of St. John, contains such high-wrought specimens of minstrelsey as show clearly, that the art was expected to lose nothing of its real power, under the fulness of a gospel dispensation.

But again. If we examine more minutely these specimens of consecrated poetry, we shall find that in general, they presuppose an elevated state of the affections, as necessary to the very commencement of the exercise of singing. There is often required a more entire commitment of soul to God, in these songs of praise, than usually takes place in the exercise of social prayer.

This is a remarkable circumstance, and one which is full of instruction. In prayer, for instance, we plead for the grace of humility: but in song, the Psalmist says,—"Lord, my heart is not haughty,"—"My soul was as a weaned child before thee." In prayer we plead for the grace of submission: the Psalmist says, "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth because thou didst it." In prayer we ask for fixedness of strength, for the spirit of love and obedience: the Psalmist exclaims—"My heart is fixed, O God my heart is fixed."—"O, how love I thy law; it is my meditation all the day."

In perfect accordance with this statement is the fact, that singing appears anciently to have been, for the most part, introduced as a sort of climax in the exercises. Witness the services at the dedication of the temple. Skilful leaders were chosen on the occasion. The wise, the pious, and the honourable were among them; and the singers stood close by the altar. Yet, we hear nothing of the singing till the countless sacrifices had been offered, accompanied by the

prayers of the people: nor even then, till the priests had taken the ark, that holy symbol of the covenant, and placed it within the oracle. But when all this had been accomplished, and the people were thus prepared for the exercise, "it came to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound, to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord,—saying, For the Lord he is good, for his mercy endureth forever, that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord." Then, and not till then, was manifested the special symbol of the Divine presence; and it then appeared in such majesty, that even "the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God." Here was an order of the exercises instituted by God himself; and left on record for the instruction of future generations. The same order appears substantially in the early history of the Christian dispensation. The song of angels was preceded not followed, by the story of a Saviour's birth. The singing at the sacramental supper was preceded by a participation of the sacred emblems. The same analogy is preserved throughout the book of Revelation. The songs of the heavenly hosts are all preceded by some marked and special displays of the Divine glory. There the singing is neither a preparative to devotion, nor a "drop-scene" in the exercises. It is called for by the attendant circumstances, and bursts forth spontaneously from the enraptured bosoms of the worshippers.

It appears also from the history of the art, no less than from the preceding observations, that singing in the churches was an exercise peculiarly spiritual. The apostle seems to convey this idea, when he says "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? [joyful or possessing elevated affections,] let him sing psalms." The fathers understood the subject in the same analogy; so did the reformers. Both have left their testimony in favor of the benign influence of this part of the services.

The Bible, then, as we have said, furnishes us with the themes of song which are peculiarly spiritual; and these themes, or the substance of them, must ever constitute the basis of devotional music. We will now add what is equally obvious, that the music, according to the nature of the institution proposes to superadd something of its own, to the interest and solemnity of the themes.

Poetry is the language of feeling; and music, when properly applied to it, is expected to heighten its influence. A sentiment of penitence, for instance, may be supposed under favorable circumstances, to produce some given degree of emotion, though expressed in the humblest prose. Let the same sentiment be uttered in that species of poetry which speaks to the heart; and according to the acknowledged principles of human instrumentality, we may look for a higher degree of emotion. Now music, which is also the language of feeling,* proposes to assist our devotions, by superadding something of its own, for the further increase of emotion; and if it generally fails to do this, then, most undoubtedly, it fails to answer the design of the institution. The subject matter is furnished to our hand; the themes carry with them their own definite interest; and, if while singing them, we cannot habitually discover the increase of pious emotion; then we may rest assured that we are not deriving legitimate effects from the institution.

Now, we venture to ask, whether this is not the precise state of the case in most of the worshipping assemblies throughout the land; and we make the suggestion after years of the most careful and extensive observation.

Go where we may into the place of worship, there is the solemn stillness of devotion, while the Scriptures are read, while prayer is offered, and while the sermon is delivered. Also while the minister is reading the psalm or hymn in ever so indifferent a manner, there is generally the appear-

* At least, it ought to be such a language.

ance of attention and solemnity. Not so when the singing commences. Then the congregation are either on the one hand, gazing at the select performers to admire the music; or, on the other, expressing their dissatisfaction by general symptoms of restlessness. The latter case is the most common. While the minister is reading the themes, then there is devout attention; but when the exercise commences, which according to its nature, should superadd something to the pious interest of these themes; then we observe the universal appearance of restlessness or relaxation. The words require, perhaps, a more entire commitment of soul before God, than is usually implied in the office of social prayer. Do the congregation—does even the minister, join in the petitions, and professions, and vows which are taken upon the lips of the singers? No; most evidently they do not; for their attention for the most part, is diverted from the subject. The minister is turning over the leaves of the Bible; adjusting the pages of his manuscript, examining a written notice which is handed him; beckoning to the sexton; whispering with some one who sits by his side; or leaving the desk to speak with some member of the congregation relative to an appointment, or to some clergyman sitting below, whose assistance is desired in the pulpit. All this, and often much more is done directly in presence of the congregation; and the example, of course, loses nothing from its conspicuity. The sexton follows it, in the performance of his noisy offices; the *silent* worshippers too, are in motion, and even the singers, perchance, where there is a choir, are gazing about the house, to ascertain whether any one is pleased with their style of performance. In some churches we even see the penny contribution box handed round during the exercise. Are these the characteristics of spiritual worship? By no means. Yet abuses of this nature are generally prevalent in the churches; and they are almost endlessly diversified in character. The language of such a state of things cannot possibly be misinterpreted.

But there is a single fact in the history of the art which pours additional light upon the subject. The music of the ancients up to the third century of the Christian era, was scarcely any thing more or less than a refined species of oratory, cultivated in such a manner, as to give to the words, not only a melodious, but a distinct and impassioned enunciation. This was undoubtedly its character, when the laws of the institution were established; and it had the same character, when the examples of singing were recorded in the New Testament.* The precepts of the Bible, also referring to "the understanding," as well as to "the heart," require this express feature of the art; and the modern rules of composition and execution, if rightly interpreted, fully recognise its existence in theory at the present day.

Here then, is it not evident that the churches have departed from the very first principles of devotional music? The Bible furnishes the language of the themes; but in singing we annihilate this language. The Bible requires us to sing to edification; but we sing virtually in an unknown tongue. The words are not distinctly uttered—are not heard. The music instead of augmenting the interest of the themes, actually does away their character.

It is not enough to say, as an apology in this connexion, that the words are first read, and afterwards placed before us. For in most cases we fear they are read but indifferently in the first instance; and, as we have seen, they afterwards receive comparatively but little attention. Yet, were the fact otherwise, the plea would be inadmissible: for vocal music is, or should be, the very soul of elocution itself. It proposes to superadd something to the themes of song; not to destroy or neutralize them. It proposes to enforce them by the power of a distinct and impressive enunciation—not to substitute a monotonous style of reading, as a preparative which is to be followed by inattention and the confusion of tongues.

* See Burney's History of Music.

Taking the Bible as a standard then, our worshipping assemblies may here discover how widely they have departed from the ancient simplicity of singing "with the spirit and the understanding,"—singing, and "making melody in their hearts to the Lord."

Some writers of high respectability, however, tell us that music has lost in a great measure, its original power over the human mind; and that we are, therefore, no longer to expect such results from it as were realized in ancient times. This position serves as a quietus to the conscience of thousands who would otherwise be awakened to the conviction of personal responsibility. And, indeed, if the position is a sound one, we see not, but the thousand may still sleep on, without ever thinking of a remedy. Nay, more—if this position is tenable, then it will follow, of course, that the institution of psalmody has become a thing of nought—that the grand themes of salvation must hereafter, of necessity, be depreciated as they fall from the lips of the worshipper. Yes, if the position is true, we may even infer from it, that the Omniscient founder of the institution—with reverence be it spoken—has committed a great oversight; has given us a species of language for our edification, which could not retain its required character, while yet the laws respecting it, as instituted by Himself, were to remain unalterable. Those who would be shocked at the impiety of such a conclusion, would do well to pause, before adopting a position which necessarily leads to it.

Speaking of the art as it is, in its present neglected state, we must, indeed, acknowledge that it has lost some of its power over the susceptibilities of the human mind; but to say that this loss is irretrievable is a position which we utterly deny. Nothing could be further from the truth, as will be abundantly shown in the course of these remarks. Nor is there the least difficulty in restoring the art to its proper basis, but what arises from a habit of indifference, and a want of correct information.

But again, some will be ready to tell us, that low as the art is, in its practical results, its pretensions are even now, elevated high above their reach; and that it is useless, therefore, to come forward with additional requirements. But here we beg leave to say, that the things we are about to propose, are neither very new nor difficult, however much they may have been forgotten. And we would add, also, that much of what is called cultivation at the present day, is so far from being indispensable to the art of psalmody, that it proves, when thus applied, to be nothing more nor less, than the work of misdirection.

To illustrate the full importance of this last remark, would lead us too far from the present design. We shall now proceed to speak only of those properties of style, which in church music may be termed radical. This we shall do in as few words as possible.

The grand desideratum in church music, it must be remembered, is, to unite the singing with the speaking tones, in such a manner as to produce a distinct and impressive enunciation.

The first thing required is a good voice. It is the opinion of experienced vocalists, that almost every one might learn to sing, if the necessary instructions were given in early life. A musical ear or a fine tone, is in no instance, the exclusive gift of nature. Either may be vitiated by bad management, lost by neglect, or recovered by practice. The most gifted, require cultivation; and those who are the least susceptible, are found to improve under it more or less, except in extreme cases.* Any person who would preserve his voice from decay, or recover it when it has decayed, must use it freely and constantly. The revival of the ancient practice of singing in family worship, would secure

* We know that some will deny this: but we are aware also, that the best methods of cultivation are but little understood by the generality of teachers.

both of these objects. If this subject was fairly understood, would not multitudes who now plead the want of voice, or ear, or strength, or lungs, in excuse for their neglect, be readily convicted of delinquency?

The second thing required, is a knowledge of time. This knowledge, so far as an efficient style of psalmody is concerned, might be easily gained by cultivation. To say nothing in this place, of the intrinsical importance of time, there are two reasons why it should be kept with accuracy. The first refers to the preservation of that harmony which results from the union and combination of voices, without which, a performance must wholly cease to be musical. The second refers to the simultaneous utterance of syllables which is equally indispensable to the preservation of a distinct language. Singers are generally deficient in time. In the uncultivated style of congregational singing, it is never kept with any degree of accuracy; and while one singer presumes to lead the whole, by the mere powers of his voice or instrument, it is impossible that it ever should be. There is evidently, according to this arrangement, a mechanical necessity for singing out of time.

Accent and emphasis have also, so far as mere music is concerned, their intrinsical importance. These with the properties already noticed, and their usual concomitants, may be considered as together constituting upon the lowest estimate, the fundamentals of correct execution, and they may be all inculcated with the greatest facility by the skilful instructer. Most of our musical cultivation, however, proceeds thus far, and here spends itself upon the endless refinements of harmony, melody, and rhythm, to the almost total neglect of vocal enunciation. Yet it is evident that all this, unless there is something more, must pass for nothing in the account of Christian worship. For, as an apostle says, "unless they give a *distinction* in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?"—"If I know not the

*meaning* of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh, a barbarian; and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." Yet as the art of singing is cultivated at the present day, it may call forth all its powers and combinations, deck itself with every charm of the muses, and waken even the fastidious critic into raptures; and, at the same time, leave the language, for the most part, perfectly dead and uninteltigible. Indeed, so extensively has vocal enunciation been neglected in our best performances, that many respectable teachers have been known to pronounce it impracticable.

The secret of a good articulation is soon told. The vowels only, are sung: the consonants, consisting of mutes and semi-vowels are whispered, or uttered as in speech, only with greater precision, distinctness, and force. Take, for example, the word *thrive*. The first three letters are whispered in a forcible manner, as an introduction to the musical sound on the letter *i*, which, when sufficiently prolonged, terminates in the utterance of *v*, effected by bringing the upper teeth in close contact with the under lip, so as to vibrate it, and then forcing the breath between them. Here the *i*, only is sung; the rest of the letters are articulated. Singers in general, confine their attention to the vowels, while the consonants are either uttered too feebly, or omitted, or transposed, as in the following example:

"He feeds and cheers them by his word."
'ef eed san' chee' sthem 'y 'i swor,

If the singers are merely exhorted in general terms, to "sing the words with greater distinctness," they will only lay the more stress upon the vowels, which has an effect directly opposite to the one intended. But let the secret of the art be revealed to them, and their errors pointed out for a while at the moment of their occurrence, and the required result will soon be realized. The rules of articula-

tion are easily reduced to practice. Even the pupils of an infant school have been known to profit by them, so far, as in their multitudinous efforts at singing, to articulate with perfect distinctness. What children so readily learn, may be easily acquired by adults. Where then is to be found excuse for delinquency?

Articulation alone, however, does not constitute language. The following lines, for instance, when deliberately uttered, with an equal stress upon each syllable, will scarcely convey an intelligible meaning:—

"FEAR—NOT—THE—WANT—OF—OUT-WARD—GOOD—
FOR—HIS—HE—WILL—PRO-VIDE—"

Before this language can be rendered perspicuous, syllables must be arranged into words, and words into phrases, by sensible pauses too minute for musical *notation*: the words, also, must have their proper accent, and some of them must be strongly marked by emphasis:

"FEAR NOT | the *want* of *out*ward *good*;
*For* HIS | *he will* pro*vide*."

These requirements, though essential to the nature of language, and quite within the reach of the juvenile mind, are generally neglected in church music; and the only reason why every one is not disgusted with the monotony which hence ensues, is, that the language being wholly annihilated in the performance, the mind rests upon the tune, deriving from it, by the power of association, such indefinite ideas of solemnity, as might be suggested by a musical instrument, or a "church-going bell." But the moment that articulation becomes distinct, the further claims of language present themselves. The syllabical manner of utterance must, in some measure, give place to the flow of language, with its accents, emphasis, momentary pauses, and pauses of longer duration where the sense requires it,

all of which, though not expressly pointed out in the musical *notation*, are consistent with the rules of the art.*

But again. It is no less obvious that the claims of enunciation must, to some extent, govern the character of the movement, as to slowness or rapidity. The force of the lines above quoted would be lost, if the utterance were to be retarded by a very slow time. A quick movement, on the contrary, would as infallibly destroy the sentiment contained in the following lines :

> The Lord! how fearful is his name!
> How wide is his command!

This distinction is so obvious as not to need a moment's illustration ; yet, it seems scarcely to have been thought of, by our compilers and teachers of psalmody.†

The enunciation is also frequently injured by the untimely introduction of musical graces or embellishments. This is especially the case in the simple congregational style, where every one manages according to his own notions of taste. The discrepancies which thus arise, would often prevent the words from being understood, even where there was no other difficulty.

But further.—Mere distinctness and propriety of utterance will not alone suffice. For the enunciation, as we have seen, should be impassioned. It should be loud or soft, slow or rapid—should kindle with the sentiment, or diminish as the

* Long pauses in the midst of a line, however, are very dfficult of execution; and for this reason, the poet who would furnish us with suitable hymns, should never place them there. The line—"He died: the heavens in mourning stood," may serve as an example in point. Omit the pause, and take breath, as is usually done, after the word "heavens," and the proposition is, that he *coloured* the heavens.

† The claims of sacred poetry, are thought of still less, it would seem, by the compilers of psalms and hymns. And a similar species of inattention is very observable among clergymen, in selecting portions to be sung.

cast of thought is varied. In short, it should partake more or less, of the nature of oratorical delivery; and for this too, the art of style makes ample provision. A loud tremulous tone, unvaried in its intensity, is expressive of alarm, terror, or distress. A tone loud and abrupt at its commencement, but rapidly diminished in its intensity, is characteristic of joyous emotions. A tone just the reverse of this, characterises sentiments of exultation, irony, burlesque; while a tone formed delicately, by the union of the two emphases, last mentioned, (*i. e.* by a swell and diminish,) is susceptible of the highest degree of pathos. These four forms of emphasis, more or less distinctly marked, and continually varying in character, according to the nature or strength of the sentiment, are applicable to almost every emotion of which the human mind is susceptible. When explained and illustrated by oral examples, a child may understand them and reduce them to practice. They form, in some sense, a language of emotions which may be applied as the words require. That they have been so generally neglected and forgotten, is attributable in part, to a circumstance already mentioned—the total absence of vocal enunciation. Let the words but once begin to receive a distant utterance, and we shall soon begin to feel the want of characteristic expression.

We shall here be told, perhaps, that music has, within itself, aside from the consideration of articulate sounds, the power of controlling the emotions; and that, therefore, the claims of enunciation are comparatively unimportant. We admit the fact alleged; but we deny the inference. The latter, is indeed just opposite to the one we should have deduced. If certain sounds, in themselves considered, have such power over the emotions; then why should not these sounds be superadded to the consecrated language? This is the very thing contemplated in the institution of psalmody. The characteristic tones which nature furnishes, must anciently have had as much power as they now possess; yet

Infinite Wisdom saw fit to employ distinct and intelligible language as the basis of psalmody, leaving characteristic tones to be employed only in the superstructure. And, if we attempt to substitute the one of these for the other, we must do it without the least authority. We ourselves well know the influence of these tones. We have often felt it. We know that even instruments, aside from voices, may speak powerfully through the imagination to the heart. But in the important business of worship, who shall fully understand their language? Who can calculate on the precise nature of their appeal? Certainly, they here need the living voice of appropriate enunciation, as an interpreter. This voice is capable of conveying ideas with precision and energy; and when seconded, as it ever ought to be, by the characteristic tones which nature places within the reach of obvious cultivation, its power in psalmody is irresistible. The nature of these characteristic tones, as connected with emotions, we have just briefly considered. How evident is it, that, till these are, in some measure, understood, we do not begin to superadd any thing of special interest or solemnity to the themes of song.

But once more. It is perfectly evident, that in music, as well as in other species of oral communication, there may be the exhibition of sentiment, without any thing like the spirit of real eloquence. There may be the form of oratory without the unction. There may be the exhibition of much skill and cultivation, both as to tones and language, while yet the music is quite destitute of true devotional expression. It would be strange, indeed, if the fact were otherwise. We find this principle exhibited at times in religious conversation, in reading, in preaching, in social prayer. Where is the Christian who has not sometimes felt it, till his very soul would seem to die within him? Hence, the necessity of a careful preparation for these exercises, the necessity of watchfulness, of meditation, of secret prayer, of keeping "a con-

science void of offence towards God and towards man." And is it possible that church music should form an exception against this rule? May we here, by mere dint of cultivation, acquire a species of language which will generally secure results that are highly spiritual, as by the influence of mere machinery? The supposition would be impious. Spiritual worship must be conducted by spiritually-minded worshippers. The principle is true of every other species of religious exercise; and shall it not hold good, in reference to an exercise, which, according to its divinely constituted nature, is peculiarly distinguished for its spirituality? Christians cannot be edified even in conversation, unless they "speak often one to another." The Bible, unless there is the habit of constantly reading it, will prove but a sealed book to them; preaching requires preparatory exercises, both in the study and in the closet; and the same is abundantly true of social prayer. But, may Christians enter at once without preparation, upon an exercise which more especially requires an elevated state of the affections? May they here presume to commence their devotions "as the horse rusheth into the battle," and yet be enabled at once to pour out their full hearts in the themes of supplication or praise? May they here plead the promises?—implore forgiveness?—break forth into expressions of gratitude?—pay their solemn vows to the Most High?—call upon every thing that hath breath to praise him?—call upon the floods to clap their hands, and to be joyful together before the Lord? Yet the thing is continually attempted without the least suspicion of its impropriety. Even at the commencement of the exercises of public worship, while the worshippers are yet assembling, while the trampling of feet is heard, while the doors are grating upon their hinges, and all, comparatively speaking, is noise and confusion—just then, the singers have often been directed to "break forth in a shout of sacred joy"—or in "loud hallelujahs to the Lord!"

And who are they that thus commence these lofty themes, these soul-stirring accents of holy joy! Who are they that essay to mingle the earthly lispings of praise with the "mighty thunderings" of the upper sanctuary! Perhaps they are a few thoughtless individuals who confessedly have neither part nor lot in this matter—individuals who have cultivated sacred song for purposes of mere amusement, tasteful gratification, or display. Possibly their teacher too, was a base man, or their present leader is an infidel. And if the music has much professional excellence, it is more than probable, that the performers are indebted to the theatre for it. Or, on the other hand—suppose the performers to be scattered through the whole assembly where all is bustle, inattention, and noise. One half of the multitude do not pretend to sing, or even to look at the words. Not a syllable is distinctly uttered. There is neither tune, time, articulation, accent, emphasis, or characteristic expression. There is virtually, no theme employed in the song; and no song that could, of itself, superadd any thing to the theme. All is jargon—systematic jargon! A few individuals whose musical susceptibilities are happily obtuse, and whose souls are hungry for the bread of life, may glean a little from the exercise and think it solemn and impressive; but it is needless to say that not one of the rest of the assembly can be edified.

How evident is it then, from all these considerations, that there should be a thorough work of reform in this portion of the services. Music has indeed, been cultivated in many places to a considerable extent. The countless refinements of melody and harmony, of modulation, of measure, of movement, have sometimes been sought out and cherished with great industry and zeal; and where, from the *vicinity of the theatre, professional* performers could be obtained; the charms of a powerful orchestra, of a thundering chorus, of a melting solo or duet, with every thing that is tasteful in

musical execution, and descriptive, or impassioned imitation, have been put into requisition for the public amusement. Many have been greatly delighted by such performances; nor do we ourselves pretend to be without susceptibility. But what has all this to do with the plain business of worshipping God? The journalists, to be sure, have often told us that it is the very thing required to give tone to the music of our worshipping assemblies. Go then to the oratorial rehearsal. Draw back the curtain before you. See that professional performer, the victim of intemperance, staggering along into the orchestra. Listen to his song "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day." He is succeeded perhaps with one whose mouth has just been fouled with profaneness, or blasphemy. He gives the *professional pathos* of "He was despised and rejected of men." Another, whose studied attitudes bespeak her emphatically, child of earth, is seen *pathetically* imploring the angels to TAKE HER TO THEIR CARE. And now, perhaps you will hear what purports to be the voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thundering, saying "Hallelujah, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth." Have the choir and the orchestra, then, at length caught the true spirit of heaven? The composer, (he too, if we may credit his biographer, could swear successively in five different languages,) has by dint of genius almost unparalleled, produced a happy arrangement of the music. Do we now hear any thing like the emphasis of joyous heavenly acclamations? No, nothing like it. This and all the other *powerful* choruses must, to be sure, have the same orchestral emphasis—the strong emphasis of *alarm*, not of *joy*, or *exultation*.

Give to these men, all that is due to them! Place them with the Campbells, the Scotts, and the Byrons, of our own times; but not among the schools of the prophets. Let them not aspire to the office of holy David, and Asaph, and

Heman, and Jeduthan. As well might we ask the mere master of oratory, to preach to us, or lead us by dint of his melifluous tones, in the exercise of social prayer. David, and Asaph, and their successors, addressed their inspired poetical effusions "to the chief singers." Would they have inscribed them to such characters as we have here alluded to? No: they would have driven them from their service.

Again, we say there must be a reformation. It must be begun, and carried forward perseveringly on Christian principles. Untiring zeal must be associated with intelligence and sound discretion. Christians must not rise up suddenly and cast out the minstrels whom they have so long permitted to occupy their place. They themselves have been the chief delinquents. And if we mistake not, they have long been suffering the consequences of such delinquency. We appeal to the conscience of the spiritually-minded worshipper. Why is it, that men of this character, have in late years, almost universally absented themselves from the schools of cultivation? Why have they so generally abandoned devotional singing in their families? Why in seasons of revival, have they so often discouraged music schools, and nearly excluded singing from their meetings for social prayer? Why too, have the clergy, the only men, who of all others, could exert themselves to the best advantage in this cause, so generally taken the lead in this abandonment of the art? Why is it, that at the present moment the preponderating influence in favor of church music is without the pale of the visible church? The reason is obvious. Christians have for more than two centuries been sleeping over the subject, while the enemy has been busily sowing tares. The abuses now every where so preponderate that the art is lost upon these worshippers. And were they at length to rise up by a sudden impulse, to restore the art to its required rank among the exercises of the sanctuary; it is to be feared, that there would not now be found among them

influence, or skill, or intelligence, sufficient to enable them to carry the object into successful execution. Christians must first become cultivators, to some extent, in their own proper persons, before they can understand the exact length and breadth of the work that lies before them. And is it not time to commence the work of preparation? Surely, the lame, the blind, the torn, and that which costs them nothing has long enough been offered in sacrifice. God is a Spirit, those who worship him must worship in spirit and in truth. He is a just God; he will not accept of robbery in the sacrifice of praise. He is a zealous God; he will not be mocked. His glory he will not give to another.

---

## ON THE SONSHIP OF CHRIST.

One of the most difficult points of knowledge, is, to know how much may be known; to decide where the limits are to be placed to the speculations of the inquisitive mind of man. Neither philosophers nor theologians, have, in any age, observed these limits, and the consequence has been, that philosophy and theology, instead of being a systematic arrangement of the phenomena of the material and spiritual world, so far as they come within the range of our observation, or of the facts revealed in the word of God, are to so great an extent, the useless and contradictory speculations of men on things beyond the reach of our feeble powers. These speculations, as it regards divine things, are so mixed and enwoven with the facts and principles contained in the sacred Scriptures, that it is no easy task to determine, in every instance, what is revelation, and what is human philosophy. Yet with respect to almost every doctrine of the

Christian faith, this is a task, which, every sincere inquirer after truth, is called upon to perform. The modes of conceiving of these doctrines, in different minds and in different ages, are so various, that it is evident at first view, that much is to be referred to the spirit of each particular age, and to the state of mind of every individual. The history of theology affords so much evidence of the truth of this remark, that it probably will not be called in question. It must not be supposed, however, that every thing either in philosophy or theology is uncertain; that the one and the other is an ever changing mass of unstable speculations. There are in each, fixed principles and facts, which, although frequently denied by men whose minds have so little *sense of truth*, that evidence does not produce conviction, have maintained, and will maintain their hold on the minds and hearts of men. With regard to theology, the uniformity with which the great cardinal doctrines of our faith have been embraced, is not less remarkable, than the diversity which has prevailed in the mode of conceiving and explaining them. The fact, that there is one God, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are this God, that there is such a distinction between the Father, Son, and Spirit, as to lay a sufficient ground for the reciprocal use of the personal pronouns, has been the faith of the Christian church from first to last. And yet there is probably, no one doctrine contained in Scripture, which has been so variously defined and explained, as this. In the earlier ages of the church, when the religion of the Gospel was glowing in the hearts of all the followers of Christ, when it was peculiarly a religion of feeling, it was not to be expected that this mysterious doctrine should be very accurately defined. To the early Christians, Jesus Christ was God, to him their prayers were directed, their praises given—in him all their confidence was reposed. In their preaching, sermons, and apologies, they presented God the Father, Son, and Spirit, as the

great object of their worship, as the Christian's God. It is true, that very early, some few of the fathers, who had previously been speculative men, introduced their speculations into the doctrine of the Trinity, but this was far from being the prevalent character of this period. Irenenus is a much better representative of this age, than Justin Martyr, and we find him expostulating against the various attempts which had been made to explain the inexplicable mysteries of the Godhead. When religion had in some measure, passed from the heart to the head, when the different modes of thinking and speaking on the subject of the Trinity, which had long prevailed, began to give rise to serious evils; and when opinions where adopted, inconsistent with the great Bible-fact, which had previously been almost universally admitted, then a necessity arose for those in authority, to state with more precision, what was the faith of the church on this important point. That the modes of expression employed in their authoritative exposition of this doctrine, were derived from the prevalent modes of thought of that age, and were intended to meet particular forms of error, may be readily admitted, while we maintain that the truth which they meant to convey, was nothing more than the great fundamental doctrine of the Christian church. It need not be concealed, that the expressions, which in various ages, and by distinguished writers, have been employed on this subject, have often been infelicitous and improper. Expressions, which if strictly interpreted and urged, would imply either, Tritheism on the one hand, or Sabellianism on the other. While at the same time, to the minds of those who used them, they implied only what all Christians recognise as the corner stone of their faith. It is much to be lamented, that so much animosity has been excited, and so much time and labor wasted on points of dispute, which arose from the imperfection of human language, or the weakness of the human mind. There has this good

effect, however, resulted from these controversies, that the church has been driven from one unguarded mode of expression to another, until it has come back to the simple statement of the word of God, and consented to leave the inexplicable unexplained. It is to be remarked too, that this advantage has been derived mainly from the opposers of the doctrine in question. They have seen and exposed the difficulties attending the various definitions of the doctrine of the Trinity, and have falsely imagined, that in showing the inconsistency of a theological definition, they have thereby refuted the doctrine itself. It would certainly be very unjust to accuse the modern defenders of the doctrine of the Trinity, of having renounced the faith of the Church, because in their statement of this article, they abstain from the exceptionable or unintelligible terms, which in former times, have been employed to set it forth. The Bible-fact has ever been, and still is, by the great body of the Christian community, maintained and defended, although we have been taught to confine ourselves more closely to what the Scriptures more immediately teach.

The same series of remark, may be applied with equal propriety, to the doctrine of the Sonship of Christ. With regard to this doctrine, even in a greater degree than the one just alluded to, it is true that the explanations and definitions of which it has been the subject, have obscured the great truth, meant to be taught. It may be stated with the consent of the opposers of what is called the *eternal generation* of the Son, that in every age of the church, the great body of Christians have believed that Christ is called the Son of God, on account of the relation existing between him as God, and the first person of the Trinity. Whether this doctrine is taught in the word of God, is disputed, but that it has been the faith of the church, is admitted. In the early ages, it is not impossible that the ideas attached to the expression, were more vague even than those, which from the

nature of the case, are still entertained by those who maintain the common doctrine on this point. Christians were taught to believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and they were led to consider these terms, as the appropriate names of the several persons of the Trinity as such. As soon, however, as men began to ask what was the nature of the relation indicated by these terms, we find the same variety of modes of thinking, and the same diversity of language, which have been exhibited in the explanation of most other leading doctrines of the Scriptures. In the first few centuries, almost every mode of explanation and illustration was adopted, which has ever been employed since. Some of the Fathers had recourse to the distinction between the Logos ἐνδιάθετος, and the Logos προφορικος. To what extent this philosophical theory prevailed in the church, it is not our object to enquire. We merely wish to note the diversity which obtained among those who all united in believing that Christ as Logos, was the Son of God. Ireneus objected to this, and all other explanations of the doctrine, while he maintained the doctrine itself. What the nature of Christ's Sonship, or generation was, he pretended not to say, and complained of those who did. "When any one asks us," he says, "how the Son is produced from the Father? we answer, no one knows. Since his generation is inexplicable, they who pretend to explain it, know not what they say. That a word proceeds from the understanding, every body knows. What great discovery then, is made by those who apply what is familiar to every one, to the only begotten word of God, and undertake to explain so definitely, his incomprehensible generation."*

Origen's explanation was derived from the Platonic doctrine of the relation of the νους to the ὀν, as the latter was always revealed in the former, so the Father is from eternity

* Adv. Hær. L. II. C. 28.

exhibited in the Son, as the effulgence of his glory. He maintained an eternal generation of the Son, but rejected every mode of expression, and every illustration borrowed from material objects, as utterly inconsistent with the spirituality of the Supreme Being. He objected to the expression, "generation from the divine essence," (γεννησις ἐκ της οὐσιας του Θεου,) as implying that God was capable of division. Tertullian's mode of thinking, was far less refined. "He could," as Neander (Kirchengeschichte, p. 1035,) says, "very well conceive, according to his emanation theory, how a being could emanate from the Godhead, possessed of the same substance, though in a less degree; just as a ray emanates from the Sun. He maintained, therefore, one divine essence in three intimately united persons." Una substantia in tribus cohaerentibus. And says of the Son, Deus de Deo, modulo alter, non numero.

The mode of explaining this doctrine, adopted by the Nicene Fathers is familiar to every one. "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one essence with the Father, by whom all things were made, &c." Since this period, this has been the general, though by no means, the universal, method of speaking on this subject.

Amongst Protestant divines, there is a general coincidence as to the manner of explaining the generation of the Son of God. It is commonly defined to be, "an eternal and incomprehensible communication of the same numerical essence, from the Father to the Son."* Not that the divine essence produces another divine essence, but the Father, as a Person, communicates the same divine essence to the

* Æterna et incomprehensibilis, ejusdem numero divinae essentiae communicatio a Patre facta Filio. De Moor Com. in Markii Comp. Tom. I. p. 742.

Son.* It will be seen at once, that this is not a simple statement of a Bible-fact, but a philosophical explanation of what the Scriptures are supposed to teach, viz. that Jesus Christ is the eternal Son of God. This definition is founded almost exclusively on the idea of generation itself, and has arisen from urging unduly the analogy of the relation between Father and Son, among men, when applied to God. De Moor expressly says, we must consider the generation of Christ, as including all that is essential to the idea of generation; and as among men, generation is the communication of life, therefore, there must be a like communication in the case of the Son of God. See De Moor Tom. I. p. 736. This analogy, and the passage in John v. 26, in which the Father is said to have given the Son to have life in himself, (which some of the advocates of this doctrine explain as referring to Christ in his divine nature,) are almost the only grounds, as far as we know, for this particular view of the subject. It should be remarked, however, that the venerable men, who felt themselves constrained to present the doctrine in question, in this light, were very far from attaching any of those gross ideas, to the phrase "communication of the divine essence," which have been supposed to be necessarily included in it. They expressly state, in what sense they use the expression; that all ideas, inconsistent with the spirituality and infinite perfection of God, are to be excluded from it; and consequently, all idea of posteriority, dependence, or change. Generatio, non nisi summa ὑπεροχῇ Deo tribuitur, ita omnes imperfectiones, quae finitam creaturarum generationem sequi solent a generatione hac divina longissime sunt removendae, nimirum dependentia, successio mutatio, divisio, multiplicatio, &c., De Moor, p. 736. If it be said, that the ideas of posteriority, dependence, and mu-

* Generatio inquam Filii à Patre, non enim essentia gignit essentian —— sed Persona generat personam. De Moor Commentarius in Joh. Markii Compendium, Theol. Christ. Caput V. § 8.

tability are necessarily included in this phrase, and that if these be denied, the very thing asserted is denied; the friends of this definition would say, that all such objections arise from transferring the gross ideas which we derive from sensible objects, to an infinite spirit. That it is just as impossible to conceive how the Father and Son should have the same divine essence, and yet remained distinct persons, as that this essence should be communicated from one to the other. And we are free to confess that if the *à priori* objections urged against this doctrine, are to be considered valid, we cannot see how we can consistently remain believers in God's omnipresence, eternity, or any other doctrine which is confessedly incomprehensible. We are not, however, the advocates of this definition, nor do we consider it, as at all essential to the doctrine of Christ's divine and eternal Sonship. It has never secured the favor of many who are firm believers in this doctrine. Lampe, in his Commentary on John v. 26, expressly rejects the interpretation of the passage, which is considered as the chief ground of this particular view of the Sonship of Christ. The life there said to be given to the Son, cannot, he maintains, be referred to his divine nature; because such a gift would be inconsistent with his independence and necessary existence. He opposes strenuously, the idea of any communication of essence, and yet declares, se Generationem Filii Dei naturalem, ad ipsam divinam essentiam pertinentem, unicam, aeternam absolute necessariam, sancto agnoscere, libere confiteri masculeque asserere. See Preface to Vol. III. of his Commentary. It is true that Lampe, by many of his Brethren, was blamed for taking this course, and they accused him of thus committing an "atrocious injury," on the cause of orthodoxy. This, however, does not alter the case, nor affect the correctness of our position, that the doctrine of Christ's divine Sonship does not consist in this idea of the communication of essence. The same view of John v. 26,

as that presented by Lampe, had been given before, by Calvin, Beza, and many others.

Morus, in his Commentarius Exegeticus in suam Theol. Christ. Epitomen Tom. I. p. 256, would explain the doctrine thus: Filius per Patrem est, et talis, qualis est, per Patrem est; which in the language of the church, would be, Filius natus est ex Patre, and in philosophical language, Pater cum Filio essentiam communicavit. On page 249, and seq. when speaking of the appellation υἱος του Θεου as applied to Christ, he says, Significatus dogmaticus nominis υἱος του Θεου huc redit: *aequalis Deo, qui habet eandem naturam; eadem attributa, eadem opera, quae Pater.* Such passages as John v. 26; Matthew xxviii. 18, and John xvii. 2, in which life, power, and ability to save, are said to be given to the Son, he understands, not as referring to Christ as mediator but as God, and consequently as affording ground for the statement, that the Son has what he has, and is what he is, through the Father. He appears to lay no stress upon the philosophical definition of the Sonship, so often mentioned; but says that we should tell the people, that when they hear the word generation used in reference to Christ, they should think that the Son is even as the Father, has the same essence and the same attributes; that he can and does do whatever the Father does. Only the Son is through the Father.

Knapp, in his Vorlesungen über die Christliche Glaubenslehre Erster Theil, p. 214, in speaking of the sense in which God is called the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, after stating that the expression sometimes refers to the relation which Jesus, as the Saviour of men, sustains to the Father, says that "it undeniably refers in several passages, to a certain internal relation in the Godhead, of the Godhead of Jesus to the Godhead of the Father; the real nature of which, however, the Bible has nowhere clearly explained, and which indeed must be incomprehensible to men. Only

the Son, says he, has all from the Father, although he makes himself equal with God." In like manner he maintains that the name υἱος του Θεου in Rom. i. 3—4; John v. 17; John i. and Heb. i., unquestionably refers to the divine nature of Christ. The name Son of God, he says, should only awaken in us the idea of the participation of Christ in the divine essence—that he is of the same nature with the Father, even as among men, a son is of the same nature with his parent.

Zachariä, in his Biblische Theologie, Göttingen, 1775, vol. I. p. 503, gives, as the result of his examination of the Scriptural doctrine of the Sonship of Christ, in substance the following statement. There is in God himself, that is, in the divine essence, an internal relation which has some similarity to the relation between Father and Son among men. This follows from the names Father and Son, if these names refer, as in his opinion they do, to the first and second persons in the Trinity as such, and are founded on their relation the one to the other. This relation includes the idea of the sameness of nature, and this is the only idea essential to it. Every thing else included in it, being merely human, cannot be transferred to God. The Son, therefore, must have the divine nature because the Father has it, or in other words, there must be a certain relation, in virtue of which, the Son is a partaker of the divine nature or essence. A nearer or more definite explanation of the nature of this relation between the Father and the Son, cannot be given, on account of our limited knowledge of the divine Being; or because there is nothing analogous to it among men. And at best our analogical knowledge of God extends but a little way. This relation must have existed from eternity, and is therefore a necessary and unchanging relation.

The idea of generation, strictly speaking, considered as an internal act of the Father, by which he confers the distinct character of Sŏn to the second person in the Trinity, is

neither in his opinion taught in the Scriptures nor essential to the doctrine of Christ's divine and eternal Sonship.

We think that it must be admitted, that the essence of the doctrine under consideration is something different from any, or all of the various definitions of which it has been the subject. The revealed fact, as we believe, is that Christ, in his divine nature, is the Son of God. That this implies that there is some ground in the nature of the relation of the Father and Son, for the application of these relative terms, will hardly be questioned. But *what* the nature of this relation is, the Scriptures have not revealed, and we therefore cannot undertake to decide. It will not be denied, that much evil has been produced, by the attempt to reduce to distinct formulas the general truths of the Bible, nor that many have been led to reject this, as well as other doctrines of the word of God, from the difficulties with which they conceived the definitions of them to be incumbered. Calvin long ago exclaimed, Utinam sepulta essent nomina (Tritinatis ὁμοουσίου, &c.) constaret modo haec inter omnes fides, Patrem Filium et Spiritum Sanctum esse unum Deum: nec tamen aut Filium esse Patrem, aut Spiritum Filium; sed proprietate quadem distinctos. Inst. Christ. Lib. I. Cap. 13, § 5. It might, with equal propriety be desired, that theologians had contented themselves with asserting the Bible fact on this subject, without attempting to decide whether Christ was the Son of God by emanation, communication of essence, or merely by oneness of nature.

A mere statement of the principal à priori objections to the divine Sonship of the Redeemer, will be sufficient to show, that they are all directed against the idea of derivation of the second person in the Trinity from the first, and consequently that they bear not against the doctrine itself, but against some few of the forms in which it has been exhibited. We shall mention the principal of these objections, as they are given in substance, in Roell's Dissertatio de Generatione

Filii Dei, as they are the same which have been presented both before and since. It is said that the doctrine contains a contradiction in terms, that it is utterly incomprehensible how the divine essence can be communicated to the Son, and yet retained by the Father.* That this objection is directed to the idea of communication of essence, its very terms imply. And that it is valid, may be admitted, if the word communication is to be taken in a physical sense. But those who employ this term, tell us that this is not the sense in which they use it; that being applied to a spiritual being, it is absurd to speak of whole and part, as though God were capable of division; and that if it be allowable to demand *how* the divine essence can be communicated from the Father to the Son, and yet retained by the Father? the objector must submit to a similar demand, *how* three distinct persons can have the same numerical essence? *how* God can be in heaven and on earth at the same time, and yet not partly in the one and partly in the other? It is evident, that when we speak thus, we use words nearly without meaning, human language is so little adapted to the things of God, and our knowledge is so limited, that we may be said not to know what we say, nor whereof we affirm. When speaking of God's essence, his omnipresence, his unsuccessive eternal existence, or mode of subsistence, our ideas are at best merely negative. We endeavor to deny every thing inconsistent with absolute perfection, but we are unable to state affirmatively, what we mean by any of these terms. Frequently as the distinction between the ὁτι and the πως is upon our lips, we are constantly disposed to forget it. Nor do we feel as we ought how infinitely such subjects are beyond our reach.

A second objection is, that the doctrine in question is in-

* Vel Pater totam Filio dedisset vitam, quando ipse eandem amisisset; vel partem essentiae divinae tantum, quando nec Pater nec Filius eam possideret. See, De Moor Caput V.

consistent with the eternity of the divine nature of Christ, since from the nature of the case, the Father must be prior to the Son.* And thirdly, it is objected that it necessarily involves a denial of the independence and self-existence of the Son.† These objections amount to the same thing, that this doctrine is inconsistent with the proper deity of the Son of God. Now whether this is so or not, it should be recollected that the uncaused, self-existent, independent divinity of Christ, is as strongly asserted by the advocates of this doctrine, as it is by any class of theologians whatever. It is true that some of the Fathers used language apparently inconsistent with this statement. But even Bishop Bull objects to calling the Son and Spirit (αἰτιατους) caused. Although he says he can conceive of a sense, in which the Son may be called an eternal and infinite effect of an eternal and infinite cause. Such language, however, has never been adopted by the great mass of believers in the eternal generation of the Son of God. It is impossible to express in stronger language, faith in the uncaused, self-existent, and independent deity of Christ, than has been done by these men. Calvin, Beza, Mark, De Moor, and as far as we know, Protestant divines generally, teach that Christ is properly called αὐτοθεος, Deus a se, and prove that it must be so, from the verity, supremacy, and independence of his Godhead. De Moor says, (p. 772.) Si Filius sit verus Deus est Deus independens : nam independentia est inter attributa Dei facile prima, atque ab essentia Dei inseparabilis. See also Calvin's Theological Tracts, Tom. 7, of his works p. 672, where he maintains that the Son and Spirit not less

* Si generatio illi tribuatur qui cum conscientia operatur, ut enti mere rationali, vel ratione saltem predito, voluntarius sit oportet generandi actus. Ex quibus opertum est, in ejusmodi propric dicta generatione generantem esse genito priorem.

† Quis non hoc per se intelligit,—id omne quod et quatenus genitum est, eatenus dependere a generante, tanquam effectum a causa.

than the Father are to be called αὐτοθεος. They further deny any kind of dependence of the Son on the Father, in reference to his divine nature, but maintain that the several Persons in the Trinity are alike independent, of equal dignity and perfection. Omnis ingitur ὑπεροχη Patri supra Filium tributa, spectat non ad naturalem Patris et Filii subsistendi modum in se consideratum, sed ad redemtionis oeconomiam et munus mediatorium a Deo Filio voluntarie susceptum.—De Moor, p. 721. It must not be supposed, therefore, that it is the exclusive privilege of those who deny the Sonship of Christ, to regard their Redeemer as self-existent, uncaused, and independent,—nor that it is necessary to give up the self-existence of the Logos in order to believe that he is the Son of God. The only question is, whether the communication of the divine essence from the Father to the Son, be consistent with this belief in the self-existence and independence of the latter? We find the advocates of this definition, almost with one voice, asserting that it is; declaring that they associate no ideas with the phrase in question, inconsistent with these divine attributes; that it is as unreasonable to force upon them a meaning of the expression which they disclaim, as it is for Unitarians to assert that we are necessarily Tritheists in believing that there are three persons in the Godhead; that there is no more necessity for using the word "communication," as applied to God, in its common sense, than there is for using the word person in the same sense when applied to God, as when applied to men; that the πρωτον ψευδος of all such objections lies in pressing the analogy between divine and human things too far, and thinking and speaking of God as though he were material, or at least altogether such an one as ourselves. It is plain that if it be permitted to apply to God forms of expression in the same sense in which they are used among men, there is no one subject on which we may not be involved in contradiction and absur-

dity. We say that the Father and Son have the same numerical essence, and yet we say that the Son became incarnate, and the Father did not, that is, that the same numerical essence did and did not become incarnate. Is it not something worse than useless for us to speculate so confidently on subjects at such an infinite remove above our conceptions, and to avail ourselves with so much confidence of the most dangerous of all arguments, the reductio ad absurdum, when applied to subjects like the present. We are, however, no advocates for the definition under consideration, not because we consider the à priori arguments against it as just and conclusive, but because we cannot find that it is founded on the clear statements of the word of God, and because we regard it as one of the vain attempts to bring down by formulas and definitions, the infinite mysteries of the Godhead, within the grasp of man's infant intellect. Still we think that it is much to be lamented that so many distinguished men should have been influenced, either in whole or in part, to reject the doctrine of Christ's divine Sonship, by objections, which, if of any weight at all, bear only on a philosophical formula for expressing the nature of the fact on which the doctrine is founded. It is still more to be regreted that they should have been led to use such harsh language as has at times been applied to this doctrine. That it is an "infinite" and "awful absurdity," even in its most objectionable form, would require stronger arguments than any which we have yet seen, to induce us to believe. Nor do we think that after all that has been written upon the subject, and the express denial on the part of its advocates of all ideas of derivation and dependence, that exclamations against the thought of "a derived Deity" are altogether candid or courteous. The idea that "this strange conceit" was derived from the Platonic or Gnostic Philosophy, is about as reasonable, as that the doctrine of the Trinity was derived from Plato, because the terms employed to set it

forth, were borrowed from the new Platonic school. We have no objection to the rejection of all such terms, but do not let us reject with them the great Bible-fact upon which the whole Gospel rests. Let who will reject the explanation of Origen, Tutullian, or the Nicene Fathers of the divine Sonship of Christ, but let him seek some better reason than the faultiness of a definition, for rejecting the doctrine itself. We do not mean to intimate that these à priori objections are the only ones urged against the doctrine in question, but we verily believe that they are by far the most efficacious. For that any man can believe that a doctrine is "abhorrent to reason," and inconsistent with all just notions of the spirituality of God, and yet go with a perfectly unbiassed mind to see whether it be taught in a book which he regards as infallible, we deem a moral impossibility. And should he find it there, he would not, and could not believe it. No man can believe what he deems to be absurd. He must either renounce his faith in the Scriptures, or explain away the passages in which such absurdity is taught.

We have been led to the consideration of this subject, from observing how frequently and strongly the divine Sonship of Christ is denied, and from noticing that the main objections to it, are directed against a mode of presenting it neither essential to the doctrine itself, nor adopted by some of its ablest advocates. The question is a very simple one, Why is Christ called the Son of God? Is this name given to him in reference to his divine nature, and founded on the relation which as God he sustains to the first Person in the Trinity, or are his incarnation, resurrection, exaltation, &c., the sole reasons for his being so called? Our object in the remainder of this article, is to show that there are passages in which the name, Son of God, is referred to the divine nature of Christ, or in which it necessarily involves the assumption or ascription of equality with God.

Our first argument is an à priori one, that *such has al-*

*ways been the faith of the church.* This may be regarded as unworthy of a Protestant, and some may revolt at the idea of an appeal to the authority of men as to the meaning of the word of God. We have, however, no intention of calling in question the right of private judgment. The argument is only one of presumption, and as such, is founded on the very first principle of Protestantism, viz. the perspicuity of the Scriptures. We assume the fact, (because it has often been admitted, and cannot with any plausibility be denied,) that in all ages, the mass of intelligent readers of the Bible have believed that Christ, in his divine nature, is the Son of God, that the names, Father and Son, are applied to the first and second Persons in the Trinity, as expressive of their mutual relation as such. If this be so, then it affords a presumption, strong as proof, that such must be the obvious meaning of the word of God. For how is the supposition, that the mass of readers have always mistaken its meaning, to be reconciled with the favorite principle of Protestants, that the Bible is easy to be understood? We are unable to call to mind any one doctrine which has been thus generally received, by the great body of intelligent and pious Christians, as taught in the Scriptures, which the Scriptures do not really teach. The explanation of these doctrines may vary as the systems of philosophy and modes of thinking vary, but the doctrines themselves are retained; nor can they be rejected, without rejecting what we have the strongest of all reasons for regarding as the plain and obvious meaning of the word of God. We cannot see how the force of this argument is to be denied, without denying that the obvious meaning of Scripture is its true meaning, which, after all our learning and laws of exegesis, is the sheet anchor of the church. By obvious meaning, is not to be understood, the import which at first view an individual would be disposed to assign to an isolated passage, but that sense which the general tenor of Scripture, the logical con-

nexion, and constant comparison of analogous passages would naturally lead, and in fact have led the mass of Christians to adopt. This is the general way in which men form their opinions of what is taught in the word of God; and if this be not a safe and proper way, then must the Scriptures be but little adapted for general instruction, and the bulk of the people must depend on what the learned shall tell them, of the things involving their eternal interests. These remarks, of course, apply only to those doctrines which are so plainly taught, as to secure the assent of the great mass of the readers of the Bible. The results which are thus obtained, are in the great majority of instances, the same as those at which the learned exegete arrives after a laborious and scientific investigation. And when they differ, the presumption is in favor of the multitude, rather than of the learned individual. The ground of this presumption is, that the causes which operate upon the latter, to produce error of judgment, are peculiarly numerous and powerful. It is rare to see any commentator, even if his general theory of interpretation is correct, who does not carry some one principle to an inordinate length, or who is not unduly swayed by one species of evidence, to the neglect of others, of equal importance. Giving, for example, opinions respecting the meaning of particular passages, on merely philological grounds, contradicted by the whole train of the argument and drift of the context. The writings of J. D. Michaelis afford many striking illustrations of this remark. A whole class of commentators, whose main principles of interpretation are perfectly correct, might be brought as examples, of pressing some favorite principle unduly. Thus, because the apostles were Jews, and used the same words and phrases which were common among their countrymen, these words and phrases are presumed to mean exactly as much, and no more, than they would do in the mouth of an ordinary Jew, as though there were no modification of their im-

port to be expected, when used to express the peculiar doctrines and feelings of Christians. It is in this way Paulus, Rosenmüller, and to a certain extent, Morus, have rendered flat and powerless some of the most spiritual portions of the word of God.

We are clearly of the opinion, therefore, that far more respect is due to the clear common-sense view of Scripture, that which commends itself to the judgment and pious feelings of the mass of Christian readers, than to the views of the learned few. This is the ground of the presumptive argument, which we have stated in favor of the divine Sonship of Christ. If it be a fact, that the readers of the Scriptures have, as a body, been led to think that the name, Son of God, is applied to Christ in reference to his divine nature, there is a presumption in favor of the opinion, that the name is so applied, which it should require the strong evidence to induce us to resist. To ascribe the prevalence of this opinion to the influence "of fathers, doctors, and framers of systematic divinity," is to have a strange notion of the relation of cause and effect. And to suppose that it could not stand a day before the light of "sacred philosophy," without this adventitious support, argues a forgetfulness of the fact, that it has stood its ground, amid the wreck of the whole fabric of scholastic terminology and divinity. That such men as Morus, Knapp, Flatt, and others, who will not be despised as deficient in philological knowlelge, nor suspected of being held in the trammels of system, have retained the doctrine in question, is a sufficient answer to such an assertion.

But we proceed now to the examination of a few of those passages, which seem to us clearly to teach that Jesus Christ, as to his divine nature, is the Son of God. And here we would remark, that it is not to be expected that a name or title, which so frequently occurs, should in every case, be attended with circumstances, which enable us to decide with certainty what is the ground of its application; it is enough

if some few passages of this kind occur: such a passage we consider Romans i. 3, 4.

Paul commences this Epistle with his usual assertion of his apostolical authority. He had been divinely appointed to preach the Gospel concerning the Son of God. "Who was, *indeed*, born of the seed of David, as to his human nature; *but* powerfully exhibited as the Son of God, as to his divine nature, by the resurrection from the dead."—του γενομενου εκ σπερματος Δαυιδ κατα σαρκα, του ὁρισθεντος υἱου του θεου ἐν δυναμει, κατα πνευμα ἁγιωσυνης, ἐξ ἀναστασεως νεκρων. That γενομενος ἐκ σπερματος Δαυιδ, means born of the race of David, will not be questioned, γενναθαι and γενεσθαι being used precisely in the same sense: as Gal. iv. 4, γενομενος ἐκ γυναικος made or born of a woman. The first point to be established in justifying the interpretation given of this passage, is to fix the sense of κατα σαρκα. It need hardly be remarked, that the word σαρξ is used in such a variety of significations in Scripture, that we must depend, in a great measure, on the context for its meaning in any particular passage. It is used for the flesh literally, for the body, for the body and soul united, for man, mankind, human nature, the corrupt principle in man, &c. &c. Hence κατα σαρκα may mean according to the flesh, in any one of these senses, which the context demands. The question here is, in what sense was Christ born of the family of David? the answer is κατα σαρκα as to his human nature, or, in so far as he was a man. The word is used in this sense, Acts ii. 30, (according to the received text,) Rom. ix. 5. Philem. 16v, &c. The word then admits this sense, and the context would seem to require it, since it is only as a man, or as to his human nature, that Christ can properly be said to be the Son of David. A comparison of this passage with Rom. ix. 5, will serve to confirm this interpretation. There, the apostle says, that Christ in one respect το κατα σαρκα was descended from the Fathers, while in another he was God over all, blessed for-

ever. That κατα σαρκα here, is correctly rendered—according to his human nature, or, as a man, is generally admitted, and the similarity of the passages, would constrain us to take them in the same sense in both cases.

The corresponding clause in the antithesis, is κατα πνευμα ἁγιωσυνης: as to his human nature, Christ is the Son of David; as to his divine nature, the Son of God. The grounds for this interpretation of this latter phrase are the following. 1. That the word πνευμα is the proper and Scriptural designation for the divine Being, or nature, as such. The word ἁγιωσυνη, which by a very common Hebrew idiom, qualifies πνευμα, as an adjective, is used in the LXX. Ps. cxliv. 5, for הוֹד *decus, majestas;* in Ps. xcv. 6, for עֹז *robur*, and in Ps. xcvi. 13, for קֹדֶשׁ, that is, it is a general term for that which is the object of admiration or veneration, and, therefore πνευμα ἁγιωσυνης is majestic, glorious, or holy Spirit. The idea expressed by πνευμα is by the addition of this word exalted. It cannot be denied, therefore, that the proper import of the phrase is suited to express the divine nature. But 2nd, the higher nature of Christ is elsewhere called πνευμα, as 1 Peter iii. 18, θανατωθεις μεν σαρκι, ζωοποιηθεις δε πνευματι, which is thus rendered, in Robinson's Translation of Wahl's Lexicon, "subjected to calamity and death in his human nature, but enjoying perfect happiness and glory as to his spiritual nature." (See article πνευμα.) Wahl makes πνευμα as spoken of Christ, equivalent with ὁ λογος as used in John i. 1. Perhaps 1 Tim. iii. 16, belongs here also. In 1 Cor. xv. 45, Christ is called πνευμα ζωοποιουν, and in Heb. ix. 14, his divine nature is called πνευμα αἰωνιον. We shall have occasion to refer to these passages more particularly afterwards. 3rd. The antithesis requires that κατα πνευμα ἁγιωσυνης should answer to κατα σαρκα. If the latter, therefore, be understood of his human nature, then the former must be understood of his higher or divine nature; if the one informs us in what respect he was the Son of David, the

other must inform us in what respect he was the Son of God. This is so plain, that few critics have felt themselves authorized to interpret one of these phrases, in a way which destroys its correspondence with the other. Hence, the sense put upon σαρξ determines that which is given to πνευμα. Those who make the former mean *a low condition*, make the latter mean *an exalted one*. To this it may be objected, that this sense of the word σαρξ, does not so well suit the context, nor the form of expression, (κατα σαρκα,) as to the flesh: since it was not *as to a state* that Christ was the Son of David. The use of the phrase also in Acts ii. 30, and Rom. ix. 5, is against this interpretation, and finally, it would require us to give a very unusual, if not, an entirely unauthorized sense to the words πνευμα ἁγιωσυνης, viz. state of exaltation. We cannot find a single passage, either in the Old or New Testament, where πνευμα has this meaning. No such sense is assigned to it by Wahl, or Schleusner. Those passages which are adduced by the author of the article Vom Wort πνευμα, wenn es von Christo gebraucht wird; in Eichhorn's Repertorium, Vol. 2. p. 1—24, are to us entirely unsatisfactory. The first, is 1 Peter iv. 6, where the apostle is exhorting Christians to holiness, in view of a future judgment, and then refers them to the case of those who had already died, to whom the Gospel had been preached, so that (ινα) though they might be condemned of men (σαρκι) as to the body, yet through God they live (πνευματι) as to the spirit. Here, from the opposition of σαρξ and πνευμα, the latter can hardly have any other sense than the soul. Though their bodies be dead, their spirits live. The second is 1 Peter iii. 18, χριστος θανατωθεις σαρκι, ζωοποιηθεις πνευματι. Here the word ζωοποιεω, after the Hebrew חָיָה may either mean, to preserve alive, continue in life, or, to render happy. Wahl takes it in the latter, Pott in the former sense. According to the first, the meaning of the passage is, Christ indeed was put to death as to the body, (σαρκι

Dative as before,) but continued in life as to the spirit, (πνευματι.) For Wahl's view see above. The sense in which πνευματι is here taken, depends upon the view adopted of the following verse, ἐν ὡ (i. e. πνευματι,) και τοις ἐν φυλακῃ πνευμασι πορευθεις, ἐκηρυξεν κ. τ. λ. The spirit, therefore, here spoken of, is that in which Christ preached to the spirits in prison. If this preaching occured before the flood, then is πνευμα his pre-existent nature, i. e. his divine nature. If it occurred immediately after his death, then πνευμα may be his human soul: but in neither case can it be his *exalted state.* The third passage is 1 Tim. iii. 16, where Christ is said to have been "manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, &c." That is, he was proved or shown to be just; to be all that he claimed to be, the Messiah, the Son of God. This was done ἐν πνευματι; which may mean either, by the influences of the Spirit miraculous and ordinary, by which the claims of Christ were established; or it may mean his divine nature, the πνευμα which dwelt in him, and which was manifested in all his life and in all his works; and in, and through which he was justified. To render πνευμα here, *his exalted state* would be to make this clause tautological with ἀνελημφθη ἐν δοξῃ. Besides, it is inconsistent with the natural order of the particulars here specified by the apostle, according to which, the glorification of Christ follows his justification. In the passage, as commonly understood, every thing is natural. The incarnation of Christ, the establishment of his claims as Messiah, his being seen and served of angels, preached and believed upon in the world, and his ascension to glory, follow each in natural arrangement. We have, therefore, no reason, and consequently no authority, for adopting so unusual a sense of the word πνευμα in this place. The only other passage is Heb. ix. 14, where Christ is said δια πνευματος αἰωνιου to have offered himself unto God. Though Storr in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. p. 167, renders these words by "in dem Zustande

einer ewigen Herrlichkeit," *in the state of eternal glory*; and although Professor Stuart, in the XVIIIth Excursus to his commentary on the Hebrews, inclines to the same view, we cannot think it correct for the following reasons. 1. We think the passages adduced, and which have been noticed above, are insufficient to prove, that πνευμα is ever used in Scripture, for the exalted or glorified state of Christ: and if not, then this interpretation of the word here, is contrary to the usus loquendi. 2. The sense given by the word in its ordinary acceptation, is perfectly good and suitable to the context. "If," says the apostle, "the blood of bulls and goats purified——how much more the blood of Christ, who was endowed with an eternal spirit," i. e. was a divine Being. That δια may be taken in this sense, is admitted: it occurs frequently in this way, particularly in the writings of Paul—δια γραμματος having the written law, δια περιτομης with circumcision, &c. See Wahl's Lexicon under δια. 3. The words εαυτον προσηνεγκεν are descriptive of what occurred on earth, i. e. of Christ's sacrifice, see v. 25, and v. 28 of this chapter, and not of what was done in heaven. Besides, the point of the comparison is not between the different places, where the sacrifices of bulls, and that of Christ were offered, but between the sacrifices themselves, and therefore δια πνευματος αιωνιου must express the personal dignity of Christ; which it does in the strongest possible language. If the blood of animals was of the least value, what may we not expect from that, of a Being possessed of a divine nature.

As these are the only passages adduced to show that the word πνευμα may be rendered, *exalted state*, if these are insufficient, it will certainly not be contended that we are at liberty to give it that sense in the passage under consideration. To make it mean, *according to the revelations or predictions of the Holy Ghost*, as is done by Calvin, and more recently by Michaelis and Ammon, is so directly at

variance with the structure of the passage, which requires us to make κατα πνευμα ἁγιωσυνης, answer to κατα σαρκα, that this interpretation cannot be considered sound, and has, in fact, very few advocates. Nothing but the exigency of the case can authorize us to do violence to the rule, which governs the interpretation of antithetical passages. As no such exigency exists here, it evidently should not be departed from, especially as Paul, perhaps more than any other of the sacred writers, abounds in such passages, and depends most on his readers gathering his meaning by the aid of the mutual light afforded by the contrasted terms.

The only other ground for the interpretation given of the phrase in question, which we shall present, is the analogy between this passage and Rom. ix, 5. There the apostle, as before remarked, is speaking of Christ in a two-fold respect. According to the one, he is descended from the fathers, according to the other, he is God over all, blessed for ever. So here, in one respect, he is the Son of David; in another, the Son of God. As Son of David is equivalent with being descended from the Fathers, so is Son of God, equivalent with God over all, blessed forever.

We designedly passed over the word ὁρισθεντος, that we might be permitted to derive an argument from the interpretation, which we have endeavoured to show, must be given to the words κατα πνευμα ἁγιωσυνης in favor of that given of ὁριζειν. This word is properly *to fix the limits of any thing, to define*, &c., in the New Testament, *to appoint, constitute, determine*, &c. Accordingly, the most obvious meaning of ὁρισθεντος υἱου Θεου is *constituted the Son of God.* But it is familiar to every student of the Scriptures, that it is very common to say of any person, (or thing,) that he is made that, which he is only pronounced or declared to be. Thus to make guilty, is to pronounce guilty; to make just, is to pronounce just; to make clean, is to declare clean; and so in cases without number. See Storr's Observationes

ad Analogiam Heb. p. 14. Hence ὁρισθεντος υἱου θεου, in the strictest accordance with the usage of the Hebrew-Greek, *may be* rendered, *pronounced*, or *declared*, the Son of God. That it must be so rendered, we think, clear from the following considerations: 1. Christ cannot be said to be constituted the Son of God, κατα πνευμα ἁγιωσυνης, if these words mean, as shown above, the divine nature. 2. It cannot be said, that he was constituted the Son of God, by or after his resurrection, as he was the Son of God before it. If this title is equivalent with Messiah, or king of Israel, still he was Messiah and king of Israel before his resurrection. And hence, even those, who make πνευμα here to mean exalted state, translate ὁρισθεις by *declaratus*.

There is another process by which the same sense may be shown to be expressed by the term, without having recourse to the familiar Hebraism above alluded to. Thus Morus says, ὁριζω in communi vita est: *terminos pono*, nam ὁρος est *terminus*, limes, agrorum terminus. Iam metonymice ὁριζειν in communi vita est, *confirmo aliquid, facio ut sit certum*.—Ita ὁρισθεις υἱος του Θεου erit: der bestätigte Sohn Gottes, certo confirmatum est eum esse υἱον του Θεου. Yet Morus translates κατα πνευμα ἁγ. quoad statum suum excelsiorem. He cannot, therefore, be supposed to be biassed in his judgment as to the force of the word ὁριζειν, by theological prepossessions. We shall not undertake to decide, whether the passages quoted from the common Greek authors, in support of this sense of ὁριζειν by Elsner, are sufficient to prove the point, as the process by which Morus explains the term, is so simple and satisfactory. Does not however the phrase ὁριζειν τινα θεον more properly mean to declare or pronounce that one is a God, than to constitute one a God?

Both Chrysostom and Theodoret, (if further confirmation of this point be necessary,) explain ὁρισθεντος by ἀποδειχθεντος. The Syriac gives it the same sense. The majority

of modern critics, however they may differ in their expositions of other parts of this passage, agree here. So Koppe, declaratus per resurrectionem filius Dei. Flatt, für Gottes Sohn kräftig erklärt wurde; Tholuck—ist nun offenbar worden als Gottes Sohn. And to the same effect, many others.

The words ἐν δυναμει may either be connected adverbially with ὁρισθεντος, or adjectively with υἱος Θεου. In the former case, the sense would be, was powerfully manifested as the Son of God: in the other, he was manifested as the powerful Son of God. This manifestation was ἐξ ἀναστασεως νεκρων, either by the resurrection from the dead; or after the resurrection, as ἐκ admits of either sense. In both cases the meaning is the same, it was the resurrection which was the great decisive evidence that Christ was all that he claimed to be, the Messiah, the Son of God, and Saviour of the world. It is in this light that the apostles were accustomed to speak of the resurrection of their Master. It was one important part of their offcial duty to bear testimony to this fact. Hence, when Judas fell, they said, "one must be ordained to be a witness with us of his (Christ's) resurrection." It is recorded of them, that "with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." Paul tells the Jews that the evidence that God had fulfiled the promise made to their Fathers, was that he had raised up Jesus. And in 1 Cor. xv. he makes all our hopes as Christians to depend upon the fact that Christ has risen from the dead. This was the final proof that he was the Son of God.

We have now given the grounds, on which we are constrained to believe that the passage before us, contains an explicit declaration, that Christ in his divine nature is the Son of God. The view here given, is not only that which Beza and the older commentators had presented, but which such men as Flatt, Knapp, and others, who cannot be considered as influenced by theological prepossessions, have adopt-

ed. The oftener we have examined the passage, the more thorough has been our conviction, that the interpretation given above, is not only admissible, but that it is the only one which the text will consistently bear. And, therefore, we consider this passage decisive on the point at issue. For all that we have undertaken to prove, is, that Christ as Logos, is called the Son of God; not that this title in the mouths of Jews, Heathen, and evil Spirits, or even of the apostles, was uniformly used in a sense involving the ascription of true divinity. The further consideration of this subject must be postponed to our next number.

## LIST OF AGENTS.

LITTELL & BROTHER, Philadelphia
J. LEAVITT, New-York.
MALTBY & Co., New-Haven.
CROKER & BREWSTER, Boston.
C. WHIPPLE, Newburyport, Mass.
ALFRED HAMILTON, Pittsburgh.

## NOTICE.

*As all the pecuniary responsibility of this work, now rests upon the Editors, the Subscribers will see the necessity of complying, as soon as possible, with the terms of their subscription.*