

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1862.

No. I.

ART. I.—*The Limits of Religious Thought*, examined in eight Lectures, delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1858, on the Bampton Foundation. By HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, B. D., &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1859.

THIS book assumes that Christianity is related to philosophy. We therefore propose to consider Christianity from a speculative point of view; and, in the course of the discussion, to show the import of Mr. Mansel's argument, and to determine its value in Christian evidences.

Philosophy culminates in theology. God is the ultimate problem to which all the lines of philosophical investigation conduct. It is, therefore, proper for philosophy to inquire, whether, from a speculative point of view, Christianity is entitled to the high pretension which it assumes, of being a revelation from God of transcendental truths pertaining to the respective characters of God and man, and from these characters explaining the government of the one, and disclosing the duties of the other.

It is obvious that if philosophy must, from the principles and the laws of human reason, pronounce, there is no God; or if it

I withdraw from life, but I do not fly from it." As his children and grandchildren, for the last time before he became insensible, gathered round his bed, he took the hands of each and pressed them to his lips and said, "I commend peace and fraternal love to you all, so that you may possess in peace the inheritance and the name I leave you." On the 11th of November, 1623, he calmly fell asleep.

Such was the peaceful end of the great and good Duplessis Mornay—one of the purest spirits and brightest ornaments of his times. "You will search in vain," says La Vassor, "history, ancient or modern, for a character superior to his. Equally at home in science and the affairs of the world, he defended religion, discussed the most thorny questions of theology, he sustained the Reformed churches by his prudence, he gave good counsel to ministers of state and to princes, and even kings listened to him with respect."

ART. III.—*The Human Body as related to Sanctification.*

THE relation of the human body to the moral and spiritual condition of its occupant, is very undefined to most minds, sometimes for want of thorough attention to the subject, and sometimes from the inherent difficulty of finding the principles which adjust and determine all questions pertaining to it. At the same time, it is a question of high interest, and, as the frequent references to it in Scripture prove, the due understanding of it is important, and the sober study of it profitable.

We think an examination of the various shades of doctrine, of knowledge, and of ignorance on this subject, which have place in Christendom, will disclose the three types of opinion which obtain in reference to nearly every point of speculative and practical divinity—we mean the ritualistic, the rationalistic, and, midway between these extremes, the evangelical. According to the former, religion consists pre-eminently in "bodily exercise" of some sort; either in public

corporeal rites and sensuous ceremonies, which, as outwardly performed, confer saving benefits by an *opus operatum* efficacy, or in volunteer private bodily austerities, penances, and mortifications. The rationalists, on the other hand, incline, in various degrees, proportioned to the intensity of their rationalism, to exclude the body, with its conditions and activities, from the sphere of morality and religion. According to them, holiness and corruption are wholly aside of it. They are as irrelative and impossible to it, as to blocks and stones, trees and flowers, fruits and birds. Some go the length of denying, ignoring, or explaining away the resurrection, without which our faith is vain, and Christianity a delusion.* This, however, is not common. But otherwise to estrange the body from all relation to religion, as being alike incapable of participating in the sin or sanctity of the person, is exceedingly common with those even who do not avow it. Less than this would be inconsistent on the part of that large class of theologians who deny to the intellect, the feelings, the desires, and affections,—everything but the mere faculty of volition,—all participation in the depravity resulting from the fall, and, of course, in the holiness imparted by the Holy Spirit in our recovery from it.

Like all extremes, however, the foregoing sometimes meet. Ritualism and rationalism sometimes embrace each other in the common heresy, that body and matter are essentially evil, and the cause of all sin; hence, that perfection can be attained only by the ascetic and self-torturing purification of the body, according to monkish ritualism, or by the final and eternal release of the soul from its imprisonment in the body. This is Christianity filtrated through Platonism. Moreover, some of the late transcendental forms of rationalism, which make Christ a mere manifestation of God to men, and the incarnation only the entrance of God, or of a new divine life-power, into humanity and history, maintain that this divine human life is enclosed in the church, and communicated or actualized to men through her ministry and ritual. Thus we have a ritualized rationalism and a rationalized ritualism; of both which counter-types of *cultus* and speculation the Mercersburg school

* 1 Cor. xv. 13—19.

in our own country, on the one hand, and the new Oxford, Broad Church School in England, on the other, are conspicuous concrete examples.

Indeed, all forms of rationalism, which have a tincture of pantheistic thinking, either as born of, or begetting it, or which in any way confound and vacate the essential dualism of body and spirit, tend to condense into ritualism, unless they first evaporate into utter scepticism. In whatever way this be done, the identification of body and spirit makes the exercises of the one exercises of the other. So "bodily exercise," a sensuous ceremonial, sacerdotal manipulations, affect the spirit *per se* by an *opus operatum* efficacy, because body and spirit are one, and the exercises of either are exercises of both.

The impugners of this dualism between body and spirit in man, are reducible to three principal classes. First, the materialists, who hold that the soul is the product of the body, its "blossom and fragrance." So such materialists as Condillac and Helvetius maintained that thought was but "transformed sensation," however sublimed and etherialized it might be. Opposite to this view, which makes the soul an "efflorescence of the body," is the ideal theory, which makes the body a product, a development of the soul, or a frame-work built by it for a temporary habitation—the chrysalis in which it envelopes itself preparatory to emerging into its perfect state. This idealizes the body. A third theory may be called the transcendental, because it is logically allied with modern transcendental thinking, in connection with which it is chiefly found. It does not directly materialize the spirit, or spiritualize the body, but makes them both products of one principle, properties of one substance, which is neither the one nor the other exclusively, but develops both separately and simultaneously. "It would be erring," says an advocate of this theory, "to say that man consists of two essentially different substances—of earth and soul; but he is *soul only*, and cannot be anything else. This soul, however, unfolds itself externally in the *life* of the body, and internally in the life of the mind. Two-fold in its development, it is one in its origin, and the centre of this union is one personality. . . . We admit, therefore, of a difference between soul and body, but one that proceeds from,

and terminates in, a union."* It is very obvious that, if body and spirit are but one substance, the exercises of the one are the exercises of the other. Ritualism is the logical result.

While this sort of rationalism meets, and ossifies itself into ritualism, which exaggerates the position and office of the body in sanctification, another species, to which we have already adverted, goes to the opposite extreme. It inclines unduly to attenuate the relation of the body to religion and irreligion, sin and grace, the fall and redemption; indeed, to rule out not only the body, but all the powers, states, and exercises of the soul, except the volitional, from the sphere of morality and responsibility—from all share in corruption by the fall, and sanctification by the Spirit. The truth is, all parts of our nature, though in degrees varying in proportion to the intimacy of their connection with the rational and voluntary self, the inmost seat and centre of responsibility, partake of its corruption and sanctity. That which is in vital union with the person, and is so pervaded by our personality that whatever befalls that befalls the person, is liable to be implicated with, or to sustain intimate and important relations to the moral states of that person. These relations are, indeed, subordinate, not paramount. Still they are none the less real and important.

In this view Scripture and sound philosophy coincide, not only with each other, but with our Confession of Faith, which declares: "This sanctification is throughout the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh." In proof and explanation of this article, its framers quote 1 Thess. v. 23: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly: and *I pray God* your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."† The apostle's prayer obviously calls for a complete sanctification. This completeness, too, has reference to the several parts or elements of our nature, rather than to perfect sinlessness on earth. Such per-

* Rauch's Psychology, pp. 185, 186.

† See Confession of Faith, Chap. xiii. Art. 2.

fection in holiness as is implied in the sanctification of all the elements of our nature, and in possessing some measure, at least, of all the Christian graces, is required in the word of God, and has ever been recognised by the church, as of the essence of Christian piety.

Here, however, various questions arise. What precisely is meant by soul and spirit? How do they differ from each other? In what sense can the body be the subject of sin, or holiness, or sanctification? It is to this last that we shall now direct our especial consideration. We will first, however, say a word, in the hope of clearing the perplexities which are sometimes quite annoying, in regard to the former.

We can discover no better analysis of the ascending grades of being, than that given by the soundest philosophers, physical and metaphysical, which accords so well with the language and meaning of Scripture, the doctrine of the church, and the unperturbed judgment of mankind. We have, 1. Inorganic matter, endued only with mechanical and chemical energies—*υλη*—as stones. 2. Organic matter endued with a power to unfold, according to a certain law, from a germ within, by taking and assimilating matter from without—*υλη* or *σωμα* + *φυσίς* = plants. 3. Matter having not only organization, but consciousness or sensibility—*σωμα* + *φυσίς* + *ψυχη* = animals. 4. Matter having not only organization and sensation, but all this conjoined with reason, or a rational spirit superinduced upon it—*σωμα* + *φυσίς* + *ψυχη* + *πνευμα* = men, moral and accountable. 5. Pure spirit unembodied, as in God, who is a spirit, and the spirits of the just made perfect, prior to the resurrection. So plants are distinguished from lifeless things by the *φυσίς*; animals from plants by the *ψυχη*; and men from animals by the *πνευμα*.

While the *φυσίς* is not a substance separate from the bodies to which it belongs, but an energy, principle, or law working in and shaping those bodies after a certain method; the *ψυχη* and *πνευμα* form a substance distinct from the *σωμα*, but brought into mysterious and vital union with it, in order to bear imperial sway over it; yet separable, and from death to the resurrection actually separated from it, as then disorganized and dissolved; the spirit meanwhile living, awaiting its reorganiza-

tion and reunion at the Lord's second advent. And this, we apprehend, not only because in the custody of the Lord, but because being simple, without parts, and therefore incapable of dissolution, it, in the words of the poet,

"Cannot but by annihilating die."

It is by virtue of this *πνευμα, νους, λογος*, imbreathed into man when he "became a living soul," that he is made in the image of God, and, although he has defaced it, capable of being renewed therein in "knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness," Eph. iv. 2, 3, 4; Col. iii. 10; and by this withal, that he is for ever distinguished from the brutes, as a rational, moral, accountable, and progressive being. With due allowance for poetic freedom of expression, and a consequent avoidance of a too literal interpretation of certain phrases, as if higher grades of being were developed from the lower, *propriis viribus*, the substance of the foregoing analysis of the ascending orders of existence is exquisitely given in some lines of the sublimest of poets, who, like so many others, had

"A vision and a faculty divine,"

for philosophy as well as poetry; some of whose highest poetic flights are but sublimated metaphysics, and whose finest prose is but magnificent poetic reasoning. He puts the following address into the mouth of the angel, "winged hierarch," whom he represents as in converse with our first parents.

"O Adam, One Almighty is, from whom
All things proceed, and up to him return,
If not depraved from good, created all
Such to perfection, one first matter all,
Endued with various forms, various degrees
Of substance, and, in things that live, of life:
But more refined, more spirituous, and pure,
As nearer to him placed, or nearer tending,
Each in their several active spheres assigned,
Till body up to spirit work, in bounds
Proportioned to each kind. So from the root
Springs lighter the great stalk, from thence the leaves
More aery, last the bright consummate flower
Spirits odorous breathes: flowers and their fruit,
Man's nourishment, by gradual scale sublimed,
To vital spirits aspire, to animal,

To intellectual; give both life and sense,
 Fancy and understanding; whence the soul
 Reason receives, and reason is her being,
 Discursive, or intuitive; discourse
 Is ofttest yours, the latter most is ours,
 Differing but in degree, of kind the same."*

The foregoing distinctions will help to indicate what is meant by body, *σωμα*; the soul, *ψυχη*; the spirit, *πνευμα*, in 1 Thess. v. 23, to which we have already adverted. A slight comparison of scriptural passages will show, we think, that while *ψυχη* and *πνευμα* are each sometimes used for the whole interior conscious principle, of which they severally constitute a part, yet that the general usage of Scripture makes the former the principle of animal life and consciousness, including the animal appetites and desires, while the latter indicates the rational spirit, which is not only above all the powers of brutes, but imparts somewhat of its own dignity and rationality to the lower sensations, perceptions, and desires of the *ψυχη*, with which it inter-works, and is, in our present earthly state, inter-fused. Calvin interprets the *πνευμα* and *ψυχη*, as denoting respectively, reason and will, including under will, according to the old terminology, desires, affections, &c.† This, however, differs less from our exegesis in sound than in fact. For the principles of animal consciousness, sensibility and intelligence, scarcely go beyond feeling, appetite, and action, and such instinctive insight as is requisite to guide, however blindly, their action within the sphere assigned them. The intelligence of the brute is but a faint element in his consciousness, and is wholly secondary to, and comparatively lost in its feelings, impulses, and determinations to action. Superinduce upon this that reason whereby we are capable of knowing God

* Milton—Paradise Lost, Book V., vs. 469—490.

† "Notanda est autem hæc hominis partitio: nam aliquando homo simpliciter corpore et anima constare dicitur, ac tunc anima spiritum immortalem significat, qui in corpore habitat tanquam in domicilio. Quoniam autem duæ præcipuæ sunt animæ facultates, intellectus et voluntas, Scriptura interdum distincte hæc duo ponere solet, quum exprimere vult animæ vim ac naturam: sed tunc anima pro sede affectuum capitur, ut sit pars spiritui opposita. Ergo quum hic audimus nomen *spiritus*, sciamus notari rationem, vel intelligentiam: sicut *animæ* nomine designatur voluntas et omnes affectus." *Calvin's Commentary* on 1 Thess. v. 23.

and righteousness, and this brute feeling and willing are transformed into rational and responsible exercises.

In the prayer that we may be wholly sanctified, body, soul, and spirit, as it may be assumed that soul and spirit together mean the whole of that interior principle which is not body, so it may be assumed that they differ from each other according to their distinctive meanings elsewhere in Scripture. What are these? In Acts xx. 10, *ψυχή*, it is translated life. "His life (*ψυχή*) is in him." Matthew vi. 25, "Take no thought for your life." "Your life (*ψυχή*) is more than meat." Hence it is used to denote that sentient or conscious principle which animals possess in distinction from plants, and which men possess in common with brutes;—in short, that intelligence and sensibility, those perceptions, instincts, desires, which belong to animals, and which pertain to our animal, as distinguished from our spiritual nature. It thus denotes the seat of the lower or corporeal "senses, desires, affections, appetites, passions."* In this narrow and inferior sense it is used when contradistinguished from spirit, as in the passage already quoted; and when the apostle speaks of the word of God as "piercing to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit," Heb. iv. 3. The sense now indicated is quite marked and palpable in 1 Cor. ii. 14, where the adjective *ψυχικός* is translated "natural." "The *natural* man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." This clearly means a man ruled by his lower propensities, including his animal appetites and passions. It is essentially of like import with "flesh," "fleshly," and "carnal," in Rom. viii. In this meaning, soul is used when distinguished from spirit, in the manner we have specified.

Spirit means that rational element, superinduced upon the animal nature, which distinguishes man from brutes. It is the peculiarly spiritual, the immortal part. Added to, penetrating, informing, ruling the lower sentient principle of the mere animal nature, it raises the whole to the dignity of manhood—a grade a little lower than the angels—as rational, moral, and

* Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament, Article *Ψυχή*.

accountable. Thus, then, do we understand this triple division of humanity into body, soul, and spirit. *Body*, meaning our material organism; *soul*, our lower perceptions, propensities, and desires; *spirit*, the rational, accountable, and immortal nature.

It is still further to be noted, that, as soul and spirit, *ψυχη* and *πνευμα*, denote respectively, the one the lower, the other the higher element in our immaterial, conscious nature, so each is often used alone to denote our entire incorporeal being,—the rational, sensitive, and voluntary nature, higher and lower. Thus, “What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul,” (*ψυχη*)? “Or what shall he give in exchange for his soul,” (*ψυχη*)? Matt. xvi. 26. “Fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell.” Matt. x. 28. And in this now popular sense of the word soul, shall we use the word when not contrasted with spirit in what follows.

In like manner, spirit (*πνευμα*) is often used to denote the whole interior conscious nature. As when we read of “glorifying God in our body and spirit,” (*πνευμα*). 1 Cor. vi. 20. In such cases, spirit, like soul in the instances just cited, means the whole incorporeal, sentient, conscious nature.

When the apostle, therefore, prays that the “whole spirit, soul, and body, may be preserved blameless,” it is a circumlocution to denote our whole being; or it is explicative of the previous petition, that the God of peace would sanctify us WHOLLY.

The question now arises, in what sense can the body be sanctified, or be preserved blameless, or in any manner be the subject of blamelessness or sanctity, and of the contrary? How the rational, self-active, voluntary spirit, *πνευμα*, should be so, requires no explanation. It results from its very nature. In its very constitution it is moral, and must be either holy or unholy, good or evil. How the lower desires and propensities which are proper to the *ψυχη*, or soul, the sentient animal principle, and belong to man in common with animals, should acquire this character, is not difficult to be seen. For, although in mere animals that are void of any moral sense, or rational free will, these, and all other parts and faculties, must be void of moral responsibility, it is otherwise in man. In him they

are coupled with his higher nature; with free-will, conscience, and rationality; with the *πνευμα*, or spirit, which interpenetrates and vitalizes them with its own dignity and responsibility. Thus appetite, and its indulgence in animals, are wholly void of moral quality and responsibility, because they are wholly out of relation to conscience and rational will. There is no morality in the eating, drinking, or other instinctive indulgence of the brute. But in man temperance is an indispensable virtue, and intemperance is among the most degrading and culpable sins. The government of these appetites is remanded to the conscience, will, judgment—the whole rational and moral nature. Not only so, but it is in the due regulation of these and other animal desires, that the moral element in our constitution makes its power and supremacy felt. To eat, and drink, and move in any manner, though originally indifferent, according to circumstances, becomes a moral or an immoral act. For those who own fealty to Christ, these and all else that is subject in any degree to the will and conscience, become religious works—acts of worship. Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we must do all to the glory of God.

This being so, we see how sanctification, as a gracious state, disposition, or habit, may possess the lower propensities, appetites, and passions, as well as the higher. Temperance, not merely in the gratification, but as to the force and impetuosity of the lower appetites and desires, may become a habit, and this not only as the effect of constant practice, but through the inworking of the Holy Ghost. So of all fleshly lusts which war against the soul, whether these have their seat in the body, *i. e.*, the flesh, literally so called, or in the lower principles of our spiritual nature, when they usurp the ascendancy over the higher; as when the love of self, of kindred, of human praise, or of wealth, rise to a vehemence that overmasters the love of God. These all need, and are susceptible of sanctification.

We are now prepared to see how the same principle extends still further, even to the body itself. The body is so implicated with the spirit, as its abode, its instrument, and its organ, that their states reciprocally affect each other. The states of the body act upon the spirit, and the states of the spirit act upon the body. The highest and most salutary

moral state of the soul depends upon, and requires the fullest concurrence in the activities of the body; so that to be sanctified wholly, in the highest sense, requires that the whole man, "body, soul, and spirit, be preserved blameless." As the body is the servant, the organ, the expression, the articulation of the soul, its medium of communication with the outer world, so it is obvious that the facility of the soul in holy exercises will be greatly modified by the state of the body. It may not only greatly help or hinder the soul's sanctification, but it is, in a qualified and derivative sense at least, capable of sanctification itself.

This is contrary to the Platonic idea, which has from the beginning percolated more or less through the practical, if not the theoretical, theology of portions of the church, and which reached its culmination in Manicheism, Gnosticism, and Neo-Platonism, viz. that matter is essentially evil; that the depravation of the human soul is due to its union to the body, and will cease on the dissolution of that union. Hence Platonism treated the body as the degrading and corrupting prison of the soul, into which it had sunk from a pre-existent state of purity, and from which it must emerge in order to regain that purity. The essence of all spiritual and holy culture, accordingly, lay in sublime and serene contemplation of supersensual truth, which should lift the soul above the murky and polluting vapours of the sensible and material, to the clear upper region of pure spirit. The body was the great source of corruption. Emancipation from the body was the grand means and consummation of spiritual regeneration.

This element of Platonism, the loftiest and purest form of ancient philosophy, which almost simulated or foretokened Christianity itself, made itself felt, of course, in some schools of Christian theology, which it contributed to mould and develope. It received some plausible support from those numerous passages of Scripture which use the words "flesh," "fleshly," "carnal" "body," (*σὰρξ* and *σώμα*,) to designate the corrupt principle in fallen man. This is a false inference, arising from a mistaken conception of the ground for such use of these terms. Such terms as *flesh*, &c., are employed to denote the principle of depravity, not on the ground that the body or mat-

ter is essentially evil. The contrary is evinced by the consideration: 1. That matter and the human body are original creations of God. Whatever he hath made is pronounced good, very good. 2. The Divine Word became flesh. In that body which was prepared for him he now abides, and will abide through eternity. This for ever contradicts the doctrine that the body is inherently evil, or the source of evil. 3. When these bodies shall be raised in glory at the last day, Christ shall change them that they shall be "like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." This could not be, if body were essentially evil, or the source of evil. 4. The body serves innumerable uses, and is the organ of some of the best and holiest activities of the soul. 5. The reason why depravity is designated by the terms "flesh," "carnal," &c., is not that the body, or its appetites, or the animal nature and desires, are essentially evil, but that when not controlled by those higher spiritual principles of love to God and righteousness, which ought to control them, they are sinful; the whole man thus becomes sinful; that general disorder and lawlessness supervene which constitute the sinfulness of our nature. It is not that the lower principles are in themselves evil, but evil when out of place, dominating over and bearing down the higher.

This, however, is not peculiar to the bodily appetites and propensities. It is true of all the lower propensities and longings of our nature, whether corporeal, animal, or spiritual. In place, they are good. Out of place, or, at least, overruling those principles which ought to govern them, they are evil. The love of human approbation is good in its place. Exalted above the love of righteousness, by which it ought to be controlled, it is evil. So the word "natural," as we have already seen in the sentence, "the natural man discerneth not the things of the Spirit," is translated from the adjective of the word usually translated soul, and means the man under the dominion of unholy appetites and desires. So the apostle speaks of those dead in trespasses and sins as "fulfilling the desires of the flesh and the mind." The "desires of the mind," when irregular or exorbitant, are just as much, therefore, and, because of their superior power, more the

seat and source of depravity, than the "lusts of the flesh," strictly so called. This phraseology of Scripture, then, which employs the term "flesh" to denote depravity, in no manner proves matter or the body to be evil, or the prime source of evil; or, in its normal state, otherwise than good, and promotive of goodness in the soul to which it is united. But there can be no doubt that the theology and discipline of the early and medieval church were deeply tinged with the contrary idea; sometimes transmitted from the Platonic philosophy, sometimes suggested, and always strengthened, by the interpretation of the Scriptures which we have just combated. This is seen in the bodily austerities, penances, flagellations, and macerations, which formed so large a part of the *cultus* of the Romish church. They were designed not merely as penances, or inflictions in punishment and satisfaction for sin, thus usurping the office of Him who was "bruised for our iniquities;" they were designed to reduce and subdue the body, as the grand seat and source of sin. Phraseology sometimes current among Protestants looks the same way. We often hear the body spoken of as the great incubus and prison of the spirit, which enthrals it under the bondage of corruption, as if the perfection and glory of the soul required its perpetual separation from the body; as if its encasement in its clayey tabernacle were the great clog to goodness and purity. It is indeed true that the soul is not made perfect in holiness, till death separates it from the body as now corrupted by sin. It is no less true, that the spirit does not reach the fulness of joy and the perfection of glory, till it is reunited to that body risen and glorified; so that our flesh rests in hope, and the spirit, even if among the just made perfect, "waits for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." We well remember that the language we were accustomed to hear on the subject in childhood, in sermons and elsewhere, left the impression, doubtless undesigned, that the spirit could become sinless and glorious only by separation from the body; and it was only in later years, notwithstanding our early drill in the Assembly's Catechism, that the doctrine of the resurrection dawned upon us with all the freshness and power of a new truth. It was not so much rejected, as forgotten and ignored, in the teachings to which we refer. All such

ideas, wherever propagated, are contrary to the plain truth of Scripture.

If the body is not, then, intrinsically evil, how, and in what sense, can it become the subject of that sanctity and blamelessness which the apostle implores for it?

1. The body is sometimes spoken of by the sacred writers as comprising the whole sentient animal nature which possesses and actuates it; and this again considered as including the lower desires and principles, even of the spirit, in a condition of excess; in insubordination to the higher; thus engendering that disorder and lawlessness, which, as already explained, constitute the depravity of our nature, so often by the sacred writers denominated "flesh." So Paul says: "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the BODY, ye shall live." Rom. viii. 13.

Indeed, as the body is the seat of the animal appetites, which in excess and lawlessness become sinful and domineering lusts; run into the brutal vices of intemperance and lawlessness; or, failing of this, constitute an impetuous and overpowering force, which overbears higher principles of our moral and spiritual nature; and impels us to exalt self, the body, and the world, above God, righteousness and the spirit; its conditions are deeply implicated with our moral and spiritual state. It may be in a state favourable to the violence and tyranny of these lusts, or to their normal and duly regulated action. It is susceptible of an influence from that Holy Spirit, which quickens our mortal bodies and makes them his temple. This can render the appetites and the feelings, together with the desires and thoughts implicated with them, temperate and lawful. In the absence of this influence, in our present fallen state, they all degenerate into those fleshly lusts which war against the soul. In close connection with all this, it is to be observed,

2. That there is the most intimate inter-dependence between the body and the mind, both soul and spirit. Such is their mysterious union, that all the workings of the mind, in this present state, are in and through, and dependent upon the body, through the brain, the nerves, the senses, and the members. It is a familiar fact, that, in our present state, the activities of mind and the energies of consciousness manifest

themselves in and through the agency of the brain and nerves, and are conditioned by them; that hence the intellect and sensibility are respectively styled the head and the heart, in popular and scriptural phrase; and that the word of God speaks of the whole head as being sick, and the whole heart faint. The senses are the gateways of communication between the soul and the eternal world. It is only through them that we know anything whatever of outward and material objects. It is, moreover, only as we become acquainted with external objects, that our minds are first roused to the recognition of spiritual and super-sensible truths, which they imply or suggest. The range of knowledge and thought, as we can readily see, would be exceedingly narrow, dry, and lifeless, were we bereft of the organs of sense. On the other hand, how greatly are our moral feelings, judgments, and purposes, affected by the impressions made by external objects! What a new world has been opened to us on these subjects by the sciences of Ethnology and Physical Geography!* And how much depends upon our manner of beholding or knowing such objects! Are we not warned against the "lust of the eye," which feeds on vain ostentation, or polluting spectacles, as ranking with the "lust of the flesh and the pride of life"? Are not the wicked characterized as "having eyes full of adultery"? Is it not through the taste, that intemperance and gluttony come to tyrannize over soul and body? Is not the drunkard's fiery appetite a depravation of the body and soul? And through the senses, generally, does not sensuality enter and enslave the man?

There is the gift of articulate speech which voices and perfects man's spiritual and rational nature, while at the same time it reacts upon that nature. If, "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh;" if speech is to the soul what radiance is to the sun, its outbeaming and expression; it returns upon, it brightens or tarnishes, it purifies or corrupts its own source. As it is with the motions of all the faculties, physical, moral, and intellectual, which develope and strengthen, or debilitate and pervert, the powers which thus go forth in exercise, so is it eminently with speech. It is a stream

* See especially Professor Guyot's *Earth and Man*.

which returns upon the fountain whence it issues, to cleanse or defile it. There can be no doubt that profaneness of speech tends to beget impiety; that envious, malicious, revengeful, infuriate words on the tongue, kindle, and feed, and fan, like passions in the soul. So Paul charges us: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice," (Eph. iv. 31,) as if such speech and dispositions were mutually auxiliary. So, in evidence of the utter depravity of our race, Paul, echoing the Old Testament writers, declares: "Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness." Rom. iii. 13, 14. James tells us, "The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; so is the tongue among our members that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell." James iii. 6. How true, vivid, and terrible! There can be no doubt, that in this gift of speech, which is a chief organ and crown of our higher being, there are habits which interact with the profoundest habitudes of our moral and spiritual nature—habits instinct with pollution or purity—which not only betoken, but deepen our holiness or vileness; which are therefore proper subjects of sanctification; which, in short, need to be rectified by the Holy Spirit, as he actuates all our parts and faculties with a divine life. So we are charged to "let our speech be with grace, seasoned with salt;" to "let no corrupt communication proceed out of our mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace to the hearers," Eph. iv. 29; "neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not becoming, but rather giving of thanks." Eph. v. 4. So, "if any man among you seem to be religious, and bridled not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." James i. 26. To guard the tongue, train it to right and holy habits of speech, through divine grace, is among the foremost Christian duties and attainments.

3. The same principle holds, in an inferior degree, in regard to all the members of the body, as well as those which are specially organs of the mind. If not immediate organs, they all are instruments of the soul in fulfilling its behests, either in

the service of Christ or of sin. We are accordingly charged by the apostle, not only generally, that we should "let not sin reign in our mortal bodies, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof;" but Paul adds in particular: "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." Rom. vi. 12, 13. And here it is unquestionable, that there may be an aptitude and facility, natural, acquired, or infused by the Holy Spirit, for either right or wrong, holy or wicked activity, on the part of the members of the body, as well as the faculties of the mind. There are the motions of sin, the law of sin in the *members*, (including, to be sure, all that is so often denoted by the flesh, but, nevertheless, not excluding special respect to the members themselves,) warring against the law of the mind. Rom. vii. 23. So, of the wicked, it is declared, that "their feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and misery are in their ways." Rom. iii. 15, 16. Their "hands are defiled with blood, and their fingers with iniquity." Isa. lix. 3. The force of evil habits is felt in begetting aptitudes and tendencies to evil, to whatever part of our nature they pertain. The force of good habits is manifested in the contrary facilities. We see it in the aptitudes and dexterities acquired by the different members and muscles in the various mechanical arts, and especially in the marvellous fingering of musical instruments—a dexterity so commonly attained by persevering practice. Well has it been said by an illustrious physicist, "the fingers in this case think—the brain is projected into them." Says a writer on Political Economy,* "It is a well known physical truth, that the exercise of a muscle increases its volume and strength. An operation which was difficult at first, becomes easy by frequent repetition—that which at the beginning could only be done slowly, comes by dint of frequent practice to be done with rapidity—that which required close mental attention to do it with accuracy, is done at length without any conscious watchfulness, and with a precision that rivals the action of machinery. Delicacy of touch,

* E. Peshine Smith.

as well as rapidity of movement, are susceptible of indefinite cultivation. In some manufacturing operations, children repeat a hundred times in a minute, and for hours in succession, motions involving the action of several muscles."

The work of sanctification is complete when all the members become prompt, expert, faithful servants of righteousness; when they are always quick and strong to fulfil the behests of the spirit within. This work will go forward as sanctification goes forward; and will only be perfected in the glorified body, united to the glorified spirit in heaven. Here the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak—and this as the effect of habits of wickedness, native and acquired—motions of sin in its members bringing forth fruit unto death.

4. Conformably to the views already presented, divines have often observed that distempers of body have much to do with distempers of the soul. We know how much sanity of mind is dependent upon sanity of body, insomuch that the first treatment for mental alienation is bodily medication. As sin is a species of madness, we find here a nexus between the condition of the body and the sanctification of the soul. We know how certain kinds of depression of health depress the spirit. They promote melancholy, dejection, unbelief, despair. All these are hurtful, sometimes fatal, distempers, which war against, damage, and sometimes destroy the soul. In such circumstances, it is difficult to rise to the peace and joy of believing. The bones wax old, and tears are daily and nightly food, while the spirit is thus in the horrible pit and the miry clay. It must grow weaker till it is able to plant itself on Christ, and apply to itself the healing and cheering medications of the great physician. Other conditions of body favour buoyancy, firmness, energy of soul. They help to brace us up, so that we stagger not at the promise, but are strong in the faith, giving glory to God. They help us to joy in God through the atonement, and the joy of the Lord is our strength. They conduce to that peace, firmness, stability, courage, fortitude, which enter so largely into the highest type of Christian excellence. Judicious experimental counsellors, have been wont to counsel the desponding not to mistake dyspeptic or nervous prostration for spiritual apostasy, or divine aban-

donment. And there are few pastors of long experience who have not seen the most obstinate religious melancholy vanish along with morbid conditions of the body.

This subject speaks its own importance. Too many are in the habit of regarding the noble human frame as so much animated matter, which is almost as indifferent in regard to our moral and spiritual states as mere animals, plants, or stones. They will, indeed, recognise the value of health for its own sake. They recognise the duty of keeping the appetites in subjection, so far as to shun intemperance and licentiousness: but they forget that it is the abode, the organ, the expression and outbeaming of the immortal soul. They forget that every exercise of the conscious soul, in our present state, is in and through states of the body, which at once affect, and are affected by it; that in consequence of its mysterious union to the rational and immortal spirit, it is implicated in its actings, its character, and borrows somewhat of its dignity and its glory; that hence it participates in, and promotes the sanctity or pollution of the soul; that hence its sanctification, along with our whole nature, is to be sought for, in the use of due means, and the avoidance of all hindrances on our part, and through the inworking of the Holy Spirit on the part of God, that it may be "a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work." Many forget that mysterious union and interpenetration of body and spirit, by which, although different in substance and nature, they constitute one person, for ever inseparable, except for a short period between death and the resurrection; both partaking in the fall and depravation of our nature, and requiring to be restored by the new-creation of God, to newness of life, according to the working of that mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead. So we are required to "yield up our bodies (doubtless as representative of our entire persons) as living sacrifices, holy and acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service." And in reference to the body specially, says Paul, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest that, by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." 1 Cor. ix. 27. "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" 1 Cor. vi. 15.

“What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.” 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. “If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy.” 1 Cor. iii. 17.

Among the practical relations of this subject, we think it worth while briefly to call the attention of our readers to the following, as we conclude this article.

1. The proper treatment of certain forms of religious melancholy is closely connected with the foregoing discussion, and has already been suggested by it. We do not propose to treat this matter in any fulness: but there is no phase of religious experience, and no condition of soul, which more hopelessly baffles young ministers and private Christians, who have not been trained to meet it by some special teaching or experience. It is evident that religious despondency may arise from, and be aggravated by, various causes. It often arises from allowed sin, neglect of duty, declining spirituality, backsliding, and presumption. Of course, so far as despondency springs from such causes, the only remedy is a corresponding repentance. The appropriate spiritual treatment is obvious. But there are cases of terrible religious depression, either amounting or approximating to despair, obstinate, invincible to all spiritual counsel and religious discipline, which confound the inexperienced pastor when first brought in contact with them. These phenomena sometimes appear in those who have only been known as most exemplary and devout Christians. Some are haunted with blasphemous thoughts. Others feel that they have been abandoned by God, or committed the unpardonable sin, or passed their day of grace, or they torture the most harmless and cheering indications into grounds of despair. They “refuse to be comforted” by any ray of hope. In such cases the cause is often purely physical, some acrid bodily distemper which oppresses the brain, prostrates and irritates the nerves, and poisons all the organs of thought and sensibility. The ancients evinced their profound appreciation of the mysterious influence of man’s physiological upon his psychological condition, when they named this fearful malady melancholy or *black*

bile. So it is the habit of the old experimental divines, like Baxter and Edwards, to speak of melancholy as a bodily affection. Much in a similar strain may be found in that quaint and pedantic, yet amusing and instructive work, the *Anatomy of Melancholy*. It is hard to improve upon the diagnosis of this disease, and the hints as to the proper remedy, contained in the following extract from Baxter's *Saint's Rest*, chap. viii. sect. 10.

“Another ordinary nurse of doubtings and discomfort, is the prevailing of melancholy in the body, whereby the brain is continually troubled and darkened, the fancy hindered, and reason perverted, by the distempering of its instruments, and the soul is still clad in mourning weeds. It is no more wonder for a conscientious man that is overcome with melancholy, to doubt, and fear, and despair, than it is for a sick man to groan, or a child to cry when he is beaten. This is the case with most that I have known lie long in doubting and distress of spirit. With some, their melancholy being raised by crosses or distemper of body, or some other occasion, doth afterwards bring in trouble of conscience as its companion. With others, trouble of mind is their first trouble, which, long hanging on them, at last doth bring the body also into a melancholy habit: and their trouble increaseth melancholy, and melancholy again increaseth trouble, and so round. This is a most sad and pitiful state. For as the disease of body is chonical and obstinate, and physic doth seldom succeed where it hath far prevailed; so without the physician, the labours of the divine are usually in vain. You may silence them, but you cannot comfort them; you may make them confess that they have some grace, and yet cannot bring them to the comfortable conclusions. Or if you convince them of some work of the Spirit upon their souls, and a little at present abate their sadness, yet as soon as they are gone home, and look again upon their souls through this perturbing humour, all your convincing arguments are forgotten, and they are as far from comfort as ever they were. All the good thoughts of their state which you can possibly help them to, are seldom above a day or two old. As a man that looks through a black, or blue, or red glass, doth think things which he sees to be of the same colour;

and if you would persuade him to the contrary he will not believe you, but wonder that you should offer to persuade him against his eye-sight;—so a melancholy man sees all things in a sad and fearful plight, because his reason looketh on them through his black humour, with which his brain is darkened and distempered. And as a man's eyes which can see all things about him, yet cannot see any imperfection in themselves; so it is almost impossible to make many of these men to know that they are melancholy. But as those who are troubled with the ephialtes* do cry out of some body that lieth heavy upon them, when the disease is in their own blood and humours; so these poor men cry out of sin and the wrath of God, when the main cause is in this bodily distemper. The chief part of the cure of these men must be upon the body, because there is the chief part of the disease."

There can be no doubt of the general truth of the foregoing quaint but graphic portraiture, or of the wisdom which advises a resort to medical counsel and treatment in a large proportion of this class of cases. With regard to those instances in which a troubled conscience and desponding spirit have preyed upon the body until it is infested with this melancholic distemper, which again reacts upon the soul, to aggravate its despondency, till body and spirit are mutually pressing each other to hopeless anguish and prostration—in such cases, it sometimes happens that no bodily or spiritual medication will suffice, without an effectual diversion of the mind from the particular topic which induces such morbid action of soul and body. This diversion of the mind is sometimes as indispensable as a change of scene, air, and diet, for obstinate chronic maladies. Such treatment is especially applicable to those blasphemous suggestions of Satan, which we have sometimes seen exorcised by depletion, and again by recovery from other bodily ailments. The following counsels, in regard to such cases by President Edwards, himself, like Baxter, no stranger to religious despondency arising from a depression of bodily health and spirits, are eminently sound and judicious. We find them in his letter to Mr. Gillespie, of Scotland, in answer to some inquiries put

* Night-mare.

by the latter in regard to certain points raised in the treatise on the *Religious Affections*.

“Satan is to be resisted in a very different manner in different kinds of onsets. When persons are harassed with those strange, horrid injections, that melancholic persons are often subject to, he is to be resisted in a very different manner, from what is proper in case of violent temptation to gratify some worldly lust. In the former case, I should by no means advise a person to resist the devil by entering the lists with him, and vehemently engaging their mind in an earnest dispute and violent struggle with the grand adversary, but rather by diverting the mind from his frightful suggestions, by going on steadfastly and diligently in the ordinary course of duty, without allowing themselves time and leisure to attend to the devil’s sophistry, or viewing his frightful representations, committing themselves to God by prayer in this way, without anxiety about what had been suggested. That is the best way of resisting the devil, that crosses his design most; and he more effectually disappoints him in such cases, that treats him with neglect, than he that attends so much to him as to engage in a direct conflict, and goes about to try his strength and skill with him in a violent dispute or combat. The latter course rather gives him advantage, than anything else. It is what he would; if he can get persons thus engaged in a violent struggle, he gains a great point. He knows that melancholic persons are not fit for it. By this he gains that point of diverting and taking off the person from the ordinary course of duty, which is one great thing he aims at; and by this, having gained the person’s attention to what he says, he has opportunity to use all his craft and subtlety, and by this struggle he raises melancholic vapours to a greater degree, and further weakens the person’s mind, and gets him faster and faster in his snares, deeper and deeper in the mire. He increases the person’s anxiety of mind, which is the very thing by which mainly he fulfils all his purposes with such persons.”

The late Dr. Hope, of the College of New Jersey, published an instructive article on this subject in the July number of this Journal for the year 1844. He brought to the subject a thorough theological and medical training, a deep christian as well

as ministerial and missionary experience, together with a highly reflective and philosophical cast of mind—qualifications rarely found in combination. The article is rich in the examples it furnishes of cures of religious melancholy effected by hygienic and medical treatment, such as bleeding, tartar emetic, exercise, and diet, sometimes prescribed by himself, combined with a judicious spiritual regimen. But we have nowhere met with any actual case which so fully and profitably illustrates many of the views and suggestions we have presented, as the following, which has the advantage of being given from his own personal and professional knowledge. He says:

“We give as a type of one sort of these cases, to which perhaps no other may exactly conform, and yet which illustrates the essential elements of many others, the case of a young lady whom we have long and intimately known. Of a temperament highly nervous and sanguine, she embarked very young, with all her ardour, in the gay pleasures of fashionable life. A single season convinced her fully of their emptiness and folly. She was soon after brought under the influence of pungent preaching, and convinced of sin. The struggle was sharp and long; but the result was, that she gave herself, with all her heart, to a course of rigid religious duties. Above all, she seemed to live in an atmosphere of prayer. Her faith in the truth and promises of God, was without the shadow of a cloud. And yet she had not the pure enjoyment which she supposed to be the necessary fruit of real piety. She did not, therefore, look upon herself, as a child of God; and her consequent anxiety wore upon her spirit, and secretly undermined her health. At length, one day, as she rose from prayer, the thought struck her like a thunder-bolt, ‘what if there is no God after all.’ She repelled the thought with horror, and went her way. But the shock had struck from her hand ‘the shield of faith,’ and all her efforts were unable to grasp it again. From henceforth she found herself exposed to a constant shower of darts, fiery and poisoned, and she could not resist them. They stuck fast in her vitals, and drank up her spirits. The poison thus injected into the heart of her religious experience soon spread, and blighted the whole. She never knew a moment’s peace, when her thoughts were upon her

once favourite, and still engrossing subject. She called herself an infidel, and applied to herself the dreadful threatenings and doom of the unbeliever. And yet it was evident she was not, in any sense, an unbeliever. She was one of the most devout and consistent persons we ever knew. She was conscientious even to scrupulosity. She was a most devoted and faithful Sunday-school teacher, and God blessed her labours to the conversion of nearly all her scholars. She rejoiced to hear of persons becoming Christians, and would often say, with despair in her tones, how she envied them. When any of her acquaintances died without giving good evidence of piety, she became excited, and, as she expressed it, was ready to scream aloud. She gave every possible evidence that she had not, in reality, a shadow of a doubt about the truth of revelation. And yet no one ever dreamed that her difficulties were connected with disease of any sort; for her mind was remarkably clear and active. The advice of pious friends and ministers, therefore, based upon the supposition that her case was one of spiritual darkness, or satanic temptation, was to persevere in prayer—to struggle on more earnestly, and God would give her light after he had tried her faith and patience and love. But the more she prayed and struggled the worse she grew. She would come from her closet, exhausted with the fearful conflict, and looking ready to sink into utter despair. The Sabbath was always the worst day of the week; and the labour and exhaustion of teaching aggravated her symptoms.

“The only treatment which was successful, in this case, would by many have been rejected with horror. She was advised to give up the struggle which she had maintained so unequally, and which would only have resulted in disastrous consequences—to think as little as possible on the subject—to spend less time in devotional exercises, and allow her mind to gather its scattered strength by relaxation. The form of prayer advised was short and audible, and such as took for granted what she had been struggling to convince herself of. Incessant pains were taken to present the character of God in a simple, affectionate, parental light, when anything led to the subject. The simplicity of faith, and the certainty of salvation, were occasionally flashed across her mind, when it was in a suitable

frame. The only two evidences of piety which her state of mind rendered available, were kept prominent as the basis of new feelings and hopes, viz., her love to the people of God, and the pain she felt in the absence of divine favour, and the longing for its return. These were untouched by the dismal monster that had preyed upon her hopes.

“By a judicious perseverance in a course like this, accompanied with well directed hygienic measures, suitable recreation, exercise, and diet, for improving the general health, and especially the tone of the nervous system, the mental energies will often, in such cases, react; and new views of truth, and new hopes will then spring up in the mind.”

2. The bearing of the considerations that have been presented on the Christian sacraments, is worthy of consideration. It is quite clear that these, as signs which symbolize the blessings of redemption, and seals which ratify the promises stipulating them, are so shaped as to enlist the bodily senses in the service of the spirit. They are not only, in the language of an old father, “the word made visible;” in them the word is also tangible, besides being presented to the taste as well as the eye. Through these great inlets to the soul, are the blessings of salvation set forth and promised in the word, signified and sealed to us. So God graciously condescends to enlist all the lower, as well as higher cognitive and sensitive powers, in apprehending, appreciating, and appropriating the gifts of his grace, and the benefits flowing from faith in Christ. Touch, taste, sight, and hearing, are thus marshalled in this holy service. Under the old dispensation, in which, from the more inexplicit and inchoate unfolding of the spiritual elements of salvation, the sensuous forms of representation had a greater predominance, the remaining sense of smell was also enlisted in burnt-offerings and incense. There is a large class who undervalue, and fail duly to improve, if they do not utterly neglect, the sacraments and other outward means of grace, because they cannot see their rationale, or comprehend their utility. This plea is, of course, sufficiently answered by the fact that these are God's ordinances, and that the due observance of them ensures his blessing, because he has covenanted to bestow it. This proves such observance to be needful for us; to be required because of

its adaptation to our spiritual welfare; and that none can refuse it without suffering spiritual loss or ruin. Nevertheless, it assists our faith and intelligence, and consequent improvement in observing those ordinances, if we see something of their special reasons and uses. When we know that they are not mere sovereign, and, to us, meaningless rites; that they are adapted to our sensitive and cognitive nature; that they so exhibit the blessings of grace as to enlist the senses in appreciating and appropriating these blessings; that they are to the verbal promises withal, what seals are to written instruments, solemn ratifications, fitted to reassure our faith, so prone to "stagger" at their amplitude and freeness; that they not only appeal to the senses, which are organs of external perception, but still further to the vaguer yet cheering inward senses of exhilaration, nutrition, and invigoration, in assisting our appreciation of the Saviour's body and blood; we are surely all the better prepared to "discern the Lord's body" in the supper, and "put on Christ," with the "answer of a good conscience," in baptism.

3. This subject sheds light on all matters affecting the outward attitudes, arrangements, order, and other sensuous manifestations in connection with divine worship. The intimate connection and powerful interaction of the body and the soul, which has been set forth, render all such matters significant and important. It is the undoubted tendency of every feeling of the soul, when in vivid exercise, to externalize itself in its own appropriate bodily manifestation. It is obvious and familiar in the case of love, pity, tenderness, anger, malice, revenge, rage, shame, joy, sorrow, and the like, that they have their appropriate outward expression, not only in words, but in the countenance, the motions, and attitudes of the body. It is no less undeniable, that these outward expressions react to strengthen the feelings of which they are the out-beamings. And the want of them, contrariwise, tends to deaden the feelings of which they are the normal exponents. The stifling of all outward manifestations of joy and sorrow, anger and kindness, tends to extinguish them; as what stifles the outburst of flames, in due time extinguishes the fire. Those feelings must

press themselves upward and outward, which root themselves inward and downward.

This being so, there can be no doubt that reverential attitudes in prayer, private and public, have an important connection with reverential and devotional feeling. We speak not now of exceptional cases, in which physical infirmity or exhaustion disable any from assuming a devotional posture without a degree of pain that would conflict with devotional feeling. The principle that mercy should prevail over sacrifice, will by no means justify the aspect and attitude of a very large proportion of our Protestant, evangelical, but non-liturgical Christian assemblies, in public prayer. In some a few, in some more, in some none standing, others inclining the head, a larger number sitting, staring, or gazing, or lounging—what can be more unseemly than such a spectacle as this, during prayer, presented by such numbers of Christian congregations? The only devotional attitudes known to Scripture or the church are kneeling, standing, and prostration. There can be little doubt that he who needlessly refuses to adopt one of these attitudes in prayer, suffers loss in his own spiritual feelings, and in the sight of God. Since public prayer is a social act, and is designed to bring into salutary action the social element in our nature, there is a power in the assumption of a uniform devotional attitude by the great congregation, of all upon each, and of each upon all. It is a high power for good. Who has not felt it? It is not merely as he kneels or stands himself, but as the whole assembly kneels or stands with him, that he feels kindled and inspired by this great sympathetic devotional manifestation in the entire assembly. It is doubtless a joyful act of praise and adoration to sing the Christian doxology alone. How much more with the assembly of the saints? And how vastly more, if this whole assembly rise to sing it in token of adoring reverence, and united praise? What are all exquisite artistic musical performances by hired quartettes, or other vicarious choirs, in comparison with this swelling, multitudinous voice of praise to the Triune God? And is not this remnant of uniform attitude, together with that in receiving the benediction, the most impressive of all our solemnities? On the other hand, are not the irregular, heterogeneous atti-

tudes, the listless, vacant, indolent appearance of so many of our congregations in prayer, enough to infuse a chill into devotion, and to impair the impressiveness of public worship upon children and unbelieving adults? Is it not bringing confusion into the church instead of "doing all things decently and in order? Is it worshipping God in the *beauty* of holiness? Can we have this disorder in our public worship, and offer, without misgiving, the holy challenge:

"Let strangers walk around
The city where we dwell,
Compass and view the holy ground,
And mark the building well;

"The orders of Thy house,
The worship of Thy court,
The cheerful songs, the solemn vows;
And make a fair report.

"How decent and how wise!
How glorious to behold!
Beyond the pomp that charms the eyes,
And rites adorned with gold."

We confess that it is easier to indicate this great evil, as we conceive it to be, than to prescribe a remedy. We have attempted more than once to work a reform in our own sphere, and always with one result. For a time, after presenting the arguments in behalf of a uniform reverential posture, the congregation would generally rise in prayer. But as soon as the freshness of the plea began to fade from memory, the indolent habit of sitting would reassert its mastery, first in one, then in another, until, in three or four months, the assembly would subside into its former attitudes. This of itself is one illustration of the tyranny of habit over the body in its actings as the organ of the soul, and thus over the soul itself; consequently of the importance of training the body to right habits as the servant and organ of the spirit. Despairing of relief in this way, many congregations, in order to secure uniformity at least, have adopted the rule of sitting in prayer with a reverential inclination of the head, and of rising in singing. This, however, has proved a failure. Old habits soon show their gravitating force. All, indeed, sit in prayer; only a portion,

however, bow the head. The rest sit in vacant and undevout indolence. After a while, more than half the congregation will decline rising in singing, through the same *vis inertiae*. And in its best estate, a sitting posture is far from being that which is most congenial to, or expressive of worship.

We know not the origin or history of this decline from the former wholesome practice of standing in prayer, in Presbyterian and Congregational churches, so far as the country generally is concerned. We only know that in the region of which we had personal knowledge, it was an inheritance bequeathed by what were called the New Measures of thirty years ago. A new measure preacher from Western New York was procured to conduct a protracted meeting, in churches in which the practice of standing in prayer had been almost universal. During these meetings he directed the congregation to sit and bow their heads in prayer. They complied. With rarest exceptions, the people never resumed their former practice of standing. Although they, with the preacher in question, long since renounced all the peculiar measures in question, they retained the habit which he introduced, and which indolence, supported by growing fashion, favoured. Whatever its origin, there is no doubt of its prevalence everywhere, to a very injurious, though in different congregations, very various degree. And while we are not now prepared to suggest a remedy, we think the devising of one well worthy to enlist the mind of the church.

The same principle applies, *mutatis mutandis*, in reference to some lesser matters, at which we can barely hint. It is undoubtedly easy to overdo, in minute prescriptions as to clerical costume, manners, &c. Any important truth may be rendered ridiculous by being driven to extremes. It is also true that official costumes, so made as to be the insignia of a sacerdotal or hierarchical caste, or of ritualistic incantations, are offensive to our taste; and scarcely less so, any feeble aping of it by those who disown such a caste. Yet we do not think it to edification for a minister to be arrayed in the garb, or assume the manners of a coxcomb, a fop, a sloven, or a jockey, whether genteel or vulgar. Nor is it otherwise than to edification, if there be not only entire congruity between the outward

aspect and the sacred office, but somewhat in the former that suggests the latter.

Similar observations may be made in regard to church architecture. It is certainly desirable that church edifices should have a form and aspect which harmonize with and suggest their divine uses. They should not appear, within or without, like theatres or public saloons. On the other hand, if this ecclesiastical aspect is purchased at the sacrifice of all accommodations for the comfortable and intelligent worship of God, and for the preaching and hearing of his word; if it is obtained by a height of ceilings, a length of audience room, a forest of pillars, stories of arches, and a "dim religious light," which hinder alike the comfortable, intelligent, and edifying conduct of divine service, we say, give us buildings of the most secular appearance in preference, for the use of the people of God in worship and hearing the word. Let us never sacrifice the chief end to a subordinate end. There is, however, no need of either extreme. Churches may be, should be, and often are, so planned with respect to light, form, ornamentation, and needful fixtures, as to serve in the highest degree all the purposes of public prayer and preaching, while they have a decided churchly aspect which separates them heaven-wide from the opera-house, the saloon, or the town-hall, and tends to awake hallowed associations consonant with their sacred uses. This is the normal standard, at which all in charge of such matters should ever aim.

4. These principles serve to illustrate the ordinance of fasting, and to explain, in some degree, its grounds and uses. The same principles apply here as to the sacraments. If it is divinely appointed, and has the promise of God's blessing on its due observance, this is enough, whether we can understand the intrinsic reasons of its utility or not. It must be beneficial to the soul. But, according to the representations of Scripture and the custom of the church, fasting, whether public or private, is connected with occasions demanding special humiliation and penitence, either for personal or social sins. And it is a principal duty in connection with it, to "afflict our souls," in view of our sin. Now, fasting facilitates this inward exercise and discipline through that wondrous implication of the states

of the body with the states of the soul, which we have been considering. We know that it is the instinct of men to manifest and promote good cheer and hilarity, by feasting as its natural expression and symbol. Hence public thanksgivings usually associate with themselves bountiful and delicious repasts. The same is true of that day which most of Christendom recognises and celebrates as the joyful anniversary of the Saviour's birth. On the other hand, it is certain that sadness of soul depresses the appetite, and indisposes the subject of it to take food. And reciprocally, abstinence from food, by depressing the vital energies, also dejects the spirit in such mysterious sympathy with them. Thus it is in a better condition to discern, and feel, and bewail the aggravation of sins, whether its own or others, private or public. So they look to Him whom they have pierced, and mourn. But no language can depict this so graphically as has been done by the pen of inspiration. Says the Psalmist, "Fools, because of their transgression, and their iniquities, are afflicted. Their soul abhorreth all manner of meat; and they draw near unto the gates of death. Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and he saveth them out of their distresses." Ps. cvii. 17—19. "Therefore also now, saith the Lord, Turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning: and rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God; for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil. Who knoweth if he will return and repent, and leave a blessing behind him; even a meat-offering and a drink-offering unto the Lord your God?" Joel ii. 12—14.

This great ordinance for spiritual discipline and culture, so signalized in the Old Testament, is recognised and continued in the New. It is not, indeed, commanded to be observed on any certain days. Christ rather left it to the judgment, candour, and fidelity of public authorities, civil and ecclesiastical, and of private persons, to decide when prevailing iniquities, or threatened calamities, or private spiritual declension require their observance. It is unquestionably of great moment to avoid that superstitious reliance on the external observance of fast and feast days which corrupts and enslaves the more prominent

ritualistic churches. But it is no less unquestionable, that the practice of fasting has fallen into an unwholesome desuetude in our evangelical churches, especially as concerns its observance by private Christians. While no laws can be prescribed on this subject, as to times and seasons, the most saintly men have been exceedingly apt to have frequent and regular seasons of religious fasting. There is little doubt of the edifying efficacy of this means of grace, duly employed. And as little doubt that, if we would successfully practice, we must form the habit of it, *i. e.*, acquire aptitude and readiness for it by frequent and somewhat regular repetition. Otherwise the contrary natural habitude will be likely to assert its natural mastery. And hence, in spite of the best resolutions, most Christians gravitate into the ordinary neglect of this important means of spiritual growth, of recovery from lapses, and advancement in holiness.

Indeed, the habitual and punctual performance of many religious acts is to be recommended for the sake of the habits of devotion thus nourished. The security for the daily performance of devotional duties, personal and family; for the weekly performance of duties appropriate to the Sabbath; for the proper attendance on the weekly lecture and prayer-meeting, lies in forming the habit, by the timely and regular attendance on all these services whose times are fixed, and by fixing regular and convenient seasons for those private duties which it is left to us to time, in which they may be regularly performed. In this, that concurrence of the body with the spirit is required, which we have seen is so largely involved in all religious discipline, cultus, and experience. Those habits of the body which lead to the regular outward performance of these services, are of great moment. Many things, says Paley, the shrewdest of utilitarian moralists, are "to be done and abstained from, solely for the sake of habit," and he pronounces it a "rule of considerable importance." This is eminently true of those outward habits, which, indeed, do not constitute religion, but are essential either to its being, or its thrift and vigour. Outward services, of course, do not alone suffice. Mere "bodily exercise profiteth little." "He is not a Jew that is one outwardly" only. Neither can one be an

inward Christian, whose religion does not externalize itself in fit manifestation. Moreover, many inward exercises, for reasons already shown, require a certain bodily coöperation. Good outward habits in regard to religious services are the frame-work in which genuine inward exercises are protected, nourished, supported; without which they fail of due development, and wither, and die. They are the shell which encases and guards the seed, the germ, the interior vital principle. They are not, indeed, that principle, or any substitute for it; but they are essential to its sustenance and growth. Thus, though the form of family prayer, Sabbath observance, and church-going may be maintained, there may be but the "form without the power of godliness." But the power of godliness cannot long survive the loss of these outward forms. Nor will these outward forms be duly and permanently observed, unless they have the support of habit. Men whose habits are wrong in these respects, often make good resolutions. But unless these resolutions are supported by correspondent habits, nothing but the "exceeding greatness of God's power" can prevent their being transient in duration, feeble in authority, and spasmodic in the efforts they incite.

ART. IV.—*De Mensch en de Dichter Willem Bilderdijk*, eene bijdrage tot de kennis van Zijn Leven, Karakter, en Schriften, door Mr. IS. DA COSTA. Haarlem: A. C. Kruseman. 1859.

THIS work is, we believe, the last that came from the pen of the lamented Da Costa. It bears the impress of his original, peculiar, and highly cultivated mind. Ascribing not only his conversion from Judaism to Christianity, but also his spiritual change to the instrumentality of Bilderdijk; greatly indebted to him for his early intellectual training, and for the development and culture of his own poetic talent; enjoying from his early youth a large share in the affections and confidence of this illustrious man, and admitted to the greatest intimacy