WIDENER
HN G992 X

Digitized by Google

CP. 32.10

Bd June, 1862.



The Gift of
Rev. J. D. Shane,
of
Cincinnati, O.
16 May, 1862.

Digitized by Google

THE

DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR 1861.

EDITED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS:

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D., LL. D.,
EDWARD P. HUMPHREY, D. D.,
STEPHEN YERKES, D. D.,
JOSEPH T. SMITH, D. D.,
} Professors in Danville Theological Seminary.

JAMES MATTHEWS,
JACOB COOPER, Ph. D.,
} Professors in Centre College, Danville.

ROBERT W. LANDIS, D. D., Danville, Ky.
JOHN M. WORRALL, Covington, Ky.
ROBERT L. BRECK, Maysville, Ky.

VOL. I.

Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.—2 Tim. i. 10.

DANVILLE, KY., AND CINCINNATI, OHIO:
PUBLISHED BY
RICHARD H. COLLINS, 25 WEST FOURTH STREET, CINCINNATI.
1861.

Digitized by Google

P. 32.10

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

No. I.

PAGE.

ART. I. — The Relative Doctrinal Tendencies of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism in America, ... 1
II. — The Relation which Reason and Philosophy sustain to the Theology of Revelation, ... 24
III. — The Mystery of Iniquity, ... 54
IV. — Our Country — Its Peril — Its Deliverance, ... 73
V. — Immortality of the Soul, ... 115
VI. — Ulphilas. The Goths and their Language, ... 135
VII. — Nature and Revelation in relation to the Origin of our Conception of a God, ... 140
VIII. — Divine Sovereignty manifested in Divine Predestination — the only Security for the Use and Success of Means, . . 164
IX. — Critical Notices, ... 169
New Publications Received, ... 176

No. II.

ART. I. — The Claim of Emanuel Swedenborg to Divine Revelation, . 177
II. — The Nature and Import of a Christian Profession, . . . 230
III. — Ulfilas, ... 248
IV. — Cuba, from a Recent View, ... 260
V. — State of the Country, ... 292
Discourse of R. J. Breckinridge, delivered on the day of National Humiliation, Jan. 4, 1861, at Lexington, Ky., . . 319
VI. — Bibliography, ... 342
VII. — Critical Notices, ... 349
New Publications Received, ... 364

No. III.

ART. I. — The New Gospel of Rationalism, ... 365
II. — Imputation. Part I., ... 390
III. — The Conducting of Public and Social Prayer, ... 427
IV. — The Death and Burial of Moses, ... 450
V. — Design of the Sacraments, ... 461
VI. — Greek Plastic Art, ... 479
VII. — The Late General Assembly — Church and State, . . . 498
VIII. — Bibliography, ... 535
IX. — Critical Notices, ... 546
New Publications Received, ... 552

No. IV.

ART I — Imputation. Part II, ... 553
II. — Cometary Astronomy, ... 614
III. — The Civil War: its Nature and End, ... 639
IV. — Identity of the Church, ... 673

Digitized by Google

TERMS, THREE DOLLARS A YEAR, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

Library of Harvard University
from Rev. J. D. Shane

THE

DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Cincinnati, O.
4 numbers of Danville Q. Rev.

EDITED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

March, June, September, December
1861.

MARCH, 1861.

Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.—2 TIM. I: 10

DANVILLE, KY., AND CINCINNATI, OHIO:
PUBLISHED BY
RICHARD H. COLLINS, 25 WEST FOURTH STREET, CINCINNATI,
AND SOLD BY
CROSBY, NICHOLS & CO., BOSTON; ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK; WM. S. & ALFRED MARTIEN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT S. DAVIS, PITTSBURGH; JOHN D. THORPE, ROBERT CLARKE & CO., GEO. S. BLANCHARD, AND RICKEY & CARROLL, CINCINNATI; A. DAVIDSON, LOUISVILLE; KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; WM. G. HOLMES, CHICAGO.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1861, by
RICHARD H. COLLINS,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

Postage, to all parts of the U. S., when paid Quarterly in advance, 3½ cents on each number, or 14 cents for a year

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF No. I.

PAGE

EXPLANATORY NOTE i

ART. I.—THE RELATIVE DOCTRINAL TENDENCIES OF PRESBYTERIANISM AND CONGREGATIONALISM IN AMERICA 1

ART. II.—THE RELATION WHICH REASON AND PHILOSOPHY SUSTAIN TO THE THEOLOGY OF REVELATION 24

ART. III.—THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY 54

ART. IV.—OUR COUNTRY—ITS PERIL—ITS DELIVERANCE 73

ART. V.—IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL 115

ART. VI.—ULPHILAS. THE GOTHS AND THEIR LANGUAGE 135

ART. VII.—NATURE AND REVELATION IN RELATION TO THE ORIGIN OF OUR CONCEPTION OF A GOD 140

ART. VIII.—DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY MANIFESTED IN DIVINE PREDESTINATION—THE ONLY SECURITY FOR THE USE AND SUCCESS OF MEANS 164

ART. IX.—CRITICAL NOTICES 169

1. Dr. Adams's Evenings with the Doctrines 169
2. Dr. Addison Alexander's Commentary on Matthew 172
3. Dr. James W. Alexander's Thoughts on Preaching 173

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED 176

NOTE.—Other Notices omitted for want of room will appear in the June number.

Stereotyped at the
FRANKLIN TYPE AND STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY,
Cincinnati, O.

Printed by
MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.,
Cincinnati, O.

Digitized by Google

EXPLANATORY NOTE.

The following statement will enable the Subscribers to this Review to understand clearly the posture of the whole matter.

The extract which follows formed a part of the published Prospectus, and also of the Circular which was privately sent to those who were supposed to be friendly to the enterprise, which contemplated the establishment of a new and original periodical, at Danville, Ky., of the general character described in the extract;

"This publication is designed mainly for the exposition, advancement and defence of the Christian Religion, considered in its purely Evangelical sense; and for open resistance to whatever is hostile to it, or inconsistent with it. In perfect consistency with that chief design, its pages will be open to the consideration of all other interests of man, and the discussion of everything that promotes or obstructs any one of these interests. The work is projected, and will be controlled, by persons, all of whom are members of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, all of whom accept the standards of that Church in their obvious sense."

The names of the persons who compose the Association will appear from time to time, on one of the pages of the cover of the work: and whatever changes may occur in the membership of the Association, will be made public in the same way.

The work will be published at Danville, Ky., and Cincinnati, Ohio, during the first week of March, June, September, and December, by RICHARD H. COLLINS, Esq., of Covington, Ky., whose *business* address is No. 25 West Fourth Street, Cincinnati.

By the contract between the Association — which has projected the work, and will conduct it — and Mr. COLLINS, the property of the work is in him, in every sense that involves a business relation between it and those who subscribe for it. Any member of the Association will be happy to receive the names of subscribers; but

Digitized by Google

all payments must be made to Mr. COLLINS. The Association has no connection with the business part of the matter, and no control or responsibility, further than to see that the work is published in all respects, according to their contract with Mr. COLLINS, — of which, it is supposed this number will be a fair specimen. The Association think it proper to say, that in point of personal character, education, long experience, and practical knowledge and skill, they confidently rely on Mr. COLLINS to give entire satisfaction, in the whole business department of the work.

The contents of the publication are under the absolute and exclusive control of the members of the Association, — which is limited to twelve persons, — and which now consists of nine: and nothing will appear in its pages, for which one or other of them is not responsible. The contributions of persons, not members of the Association — several of which appear in this number, and which, it is both desired and expected, will constitute a large and permanent element of the publication — will, therefore, pass to the Publisher through the hands of some member of the Association.

The personal right of each member of the Association, not only to publish his own contributions, but also those of his friends which appear to him suitable to our pages, necessarily produces a large degree of freedom, as a characteristic of this work. The nature of the restraints, deemed to be sufficient, upon this freedom, is somewhat various and somewhat peculiar. The chief one is strict adherence, in the moral and religious aspect of the work, to the precise statements of the extract from the Prospectus, published above. A second is, the prohibition of direct controversy in the Review, between its different contributors. A third is, the requirement of some special signature, initial, or other uniform designation — by which all the articles from the same pen will be distinguished.

After all, however, every association has, in its origin, the elements of a fixed character, without which it could not be constituted. These elements, in proportion to their strength and uniformity, necessarily work in a definite way, and to a determinate result. Very soon, opinions, principles, character, become traditional. But, in fact, what type is finally reached, was certain

Digitized by Google

from the start — for it is implicitly contained in the original elements. What may be expected in this Review is — great personal freedom of opinion, great unity of fundamental principles, great diversity of didactic treatment, great variety on minor points.

It is the earnest desire of the Association to put this work on a secure and permanent footing. By this means, it appears to them, immense interests may be promoted, and immense perils be warded off. The Presbyterian Church in America is one of the largest, richest, and most enlightened reading communities in the world: and the whole country, as every thing shows, expects of it the full performance of its share of the work of forming, guiding, and confirming public opinion. At present, there are but two Reviews emanating from its bosom, of the general description proposed in this; and both of them are near the Atlantic seaboard; and both occupy peculiar positions, in some important respects. This attempt is to establish a third one, in the more central parts of the Church and the country — designed to occupy a position in some respects common to both the others, in some agreeing with one or other of them, in some different from both.

Digitized by Google

1862 May 16
Gift of
Rev. P. D. Chase,
of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Digitized by Google

DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. I.

MARCH, 1861.

ART. I.—*The Relative Doctrinal Tendencies of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism in America.*

FOR the purposes of the present article, the Congregationalism of Connecticut will be mainly illustrated, in contrast with the Presbyterianism of the Old School Presbyterians: the doctrinal tendencies of each, being the particular point which it is designed to illustrate.

It is, of course, well known to all who are moderately acquainted with the past history of the American Churches, that the standards of doctrine, adopted by the Congregational Churches of New England, and those of the Presbyterian Church, whether considered in its original Presbytery, its original Synod, or its General Assembly, were not only substantially the same, but were, as to the most important of those standards—namely, those prepared by the Westminster Assembly, identical. The Congregational Synod of 1648, which formed the *Cambridge Platform*, unanimously adopted the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. The Synod of 1680, at Boston, which adopted the *Savoy Confession*, whose articles of Faith are nearly identical with the corresponding ones of the Westminster Assembly, also adopted the *Westminster Confession*. The consociated Council of the Churches and ministers of Connecticut, consented in 1708, both to the *Savoy and the Westmin-*

Digitized by Google

ster Confession. The *Congregational Order*, issued by the General Association of Connecticut in 1841, and containing the standards of the associated Churches, declares that the *Saybrook Platform* had been several times formally approved by conventions, subsequent to its original adoption, and that it remained to that time, (1841) as much as ever their Confession of Faith. THOMAS HOOKER, the first pastor of the first church organized in Connecticut, (the church now, and for a long time, under the pastoral care of the *Rev. Dr. J. Hawes*, in Hartford,) was invited to sit as a member of the Westminster Assembly. And in 1799, DR. STRONG, the immediate predecessor of *Dr. Hawes*, in the famous First Church at Hartford, united with some of the leading ministers of his time, in an official declaration, affirming and explaining how, in fact, the churches of Connecticut had been from the beginning, "the same as the Presbyterian," "in the most essential and important respects;" and how, in fact, as to common usages, and the Confession of Faith, Heads of Agreement, and Articles of Church Discipline, they were not Congregational at all, in any sense in which Congregationalism departed from the Church of Scotland, or the Presbyterian Church in America. Two years after this, (1801) the *Plan of Union* was formed for the New Settlements, (chiefly Western New York and Northern Ohio,) between the Presbyterian Church, and these very Connecticut churches thus described. However much a subsequent generation of Presbyterians saw reason to deplore that *Plan of Union*, and to declare it (in 1837) fatal in its effects, and wholly illegal from the beginning, the statements we have made afford the best defense, probably, that could be made for the generation of Presbyterians that entered into the Plan of Union. And these statements, conclusive as to the doctrinal standards, and probably also as to the actual faith of the early New England churches, involve directly, in the general result which was reached in 1837, the fact, and to some extent the nature, of the divergence between the tendency of Presbyterianism and the tendency of Congregationalism — even in the very mitigated form of it presented in Connecticut. In about thirty-eight years, (from 1799 to 1837,) these two branches of the visible church incur such mutual changes, as are

Digitized by Google

broadly exhibited at the commencement of that period, by the statements of Dr. Strong and his brethren, and the adoption of the Plan of Union; and as broadly exhibited again, at the end of the period, by the Acts of the General Assembly of 1837—followed by those of 1838 and 1839. Within that period, a doctrinal tendency in Congregationalism—wholly unobserved before 1799 by Presbyterians in this country, and stoutly ignored by the best and ablest men of the Congregational churches of that day—had developed the high evangelical doctrines of Christianity, into that confused, shallow and turbulent New School Theology, against which the *Act and Testimony of* 1834, and the *Memorial* of the Convention at Pittsburgh in 1835, and the *Memorial and Testimony* of the Convention at Philadelphia in 1837, and the chief Deliverances of the Assemblies of 1837, 1838 and 1839 were mainly directed. Historically, no ecclesiastical fact of the sixty years immediately preceding the present hour, is better known to all men, than that the sympathy of Congregationalism was steadily and strongly with New School, and against Old School Presbyterianism. Beyond this, it would be no way difficult to prove that the sum of the doctrinal deterioration of Presbyterianism, from the beginning of this century to 1837, was the product of the influence of Congregationalism upon the Church, and in it. So completely was this true, that the particular direction toward error, manifested in the Presbyterian Church, under the close embrace of Congregationalism, was totally new to our Presbyterianism generically considered. And so thoroughly was it inconsistent with the whole nature and spirit of Presbyterianism, that the reaction which had manifested itself in the New School branch of the Presbyterian Church, proceeds *pari passu* toward evangelical doctrine, and from Congregationalism. We have, therefore, the whole case clearly and simply before us—as to the original faith of the Congregational churches, as to their general apparent condition to the end of the last century—as to their new direction and tendency during this century, and as to the point of doctrinal declension generally reached by them, at the period of the great crisis in the doctrinal controversies of the first half of this century, reached in the Acts and Deliverances of the Presbyterian

Digitized by Google

Church in 1837, and the two following years. We shall presently point out the progress it has made, in the same fatal direction, since that crisis.

The standards drawn up by the Westminster Assembly of Divines—which it has just been shown were, from the first, adopted, and afterward continually professed by the Congregational Churches, and which they have never formally repudiated—always set forth the faith of the Presbyterian Church from the gathering of her first congregation on this continent; nor did that Church ever adopt, as her own, any other human standards of Faith, Holy Living, Order or Discipline. To say nothing of what occurred before 1729, in that year the Original Synod formally adopted the *Westminster Confession of Faith and Larger and Shorter Catechisms*; with some brief exceptions, which the Church has adhered to as valid exceptions ever since. Again, in 1788, preparatory to the formation of the General Assembly, the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Form of Government, Discipline and Directory for Worship were adopted by the General Synod of the Church; the doctrinal portion of the standards being changed no farther than had been excepted to in 1729, and the other portions being accommodated to the new state into which the Church was about to pass, and in which it has continued till the present time. The adoption of these standards has continued to be exacted of every office-bearer of the church, at his ordination; and strict adherence to them all in practice, has been enforced in repeated Deliverances by all the courts of the Church. Anterior to the formation of the General Assembly in 1789, the schism in the original Synod, which lasted from 1742 till 1758, produced no change, by either party, in their common standards; nor from the reünion of the parts in 1758, onwards for a period of half a century, and until after the organic union with Congregationalism in 1801, is there any evidence of doctrinal declension, or even of serious doctrinal differences, in the Presbyterian Church. Following the Plan of Union of 1801, during the first quarter of the present century, ministers from New England were rapidly diffused through the Presbyterian Church, and settled over many important congregations; and they occupied, in other respects,

Digitized by Google

positions of great influence in her bosom. In like degree, during the same period, the speculations, the theories, and the expositions of Christian doctrine, which have borne such terrible fruits in New England, were silently diffused through certain portions of the Presbyterian Church. These new views and opinions, to a certain extent modified prëexisting convictions; to a certain extent merely mixed with them; to a certain extent supplanted them. Most decided, and most obnoxious to the traditional spirit, habit and doctrine of Presbyterianism, were, of course, the manifestations made of them in the great and rapidly populating regions covered by the Plan of Union, where there was the heaviest New England immigration, and the frëest scope for the new ideas.— First, claiming to be, not doctrines, but explanations of the philosophy of certain Gospel truths; defended as endurable, certainly innocent, perhaps improved methods of treating the Way of Salvation; the standards of the church were not assailed, but set aside, and the faith of God's people was not openly opposed, but diligently undermined. At the next step, the new ideas became the true, the only effective, the really divine ideas; and their hearty reception became the indispensable proof of Gospel holiness, and their vehement use the solitary way of a ministry fruitful in winning souls for Christ. The culminating point was reached, in the frantic notion that the ancient faith of the church was a heresy which the new holiness could not always endure— and in the long-suffering intimation to the true children of the church that they, and not the Apostles of the new faith, were the true subjects of Disciple. Side by side with these developments, which seem so wonderful as we look back over them, were multiplied debates and great agitations upon questions, about which it seems, to one in a calm mood, impossible for the human mind to entertain a doubt. It had to be proved that our Catechisms formed any part of our standards; it had to be proved that the statements of the Catechisms agreed with those of the Confession; it had to be proved that in accepting standards of faith any thing more was meant than vowing for substance of doctrine; it had to be proved that in accepting a system of doctrine, we thereby accepted its parts; it had to be proved that in our oaths we must

Digitized by Google

use words in their accepted sense, and not in a hidden sense of our own; it had to be proved that when we undertake to tell the truth, it means all the truth, and not such portions of it as will gain our ends. At last, it only remained for the Presbyterian Church to make utter shipwreck, or to extricate herself completely, and at whatever cost of apparent temporal advantages, from the influences which had hurried her on for a quarter of a century, and brought her to the brink of ruin. By the great grace of God, and through his wonderful working, she did extricate herself. In what manner, has already been generally indicated, but sufficiently for the present purpose. Upon what grounds of doctrine she planted herself during the great conflict from 1834 till 1839, in opposition to the combined efforts of New School and Congregational Theology, her own solemn, deliberate and repeated testimonies, then and since, abundantly declare. And as before, with regard to Congregationalism, so now with regard to Presbyterianism, the statements we have thrown together clearly set before us the true nature of the original faith of this great Church — the constant tendency of that faith — and the exact posture of it, when she threw off the enormous pressure under which she was finally staggering, after enduring, from 1801 till 1837, an organic union with Congregationalism. The illustration is immense. For besides the separate doctrinal tendencies of these two great systems, when acting separately, and each with a pure creed, before their organic Union in 1801 — which has been briefly intimated, as to each; and besides their separate tendencies, when acting alone, after their separation in 1837, one with her original pure creed restored in its power, and the other with that same pure creed perverted to the extent then reached — which remains to be pointed out; there is, in addition, this vast manifestation of their respective tendencies, afforded by the persistent attempt of the doctrinal tendency of Congregationalism, working in the bosom of Presbyterianism, from 1801 till 1837, more than one-third of a century, with the steadfast purpose to destroy its doctrinal tendency — and by the irresistible force with which Presbyterianism reacted at the perilous culmination of the event, and, freeing herself, started in a new and higher career. There is no more remarkable episode in the modern history of doctrines. No more

Digitized by Google

signal triumph of truth over error, has marked the career of the Reformed Church.

It is somewhat more than twenty-three years, since this conflict of tendencies within the Presbyterian Church was ecclesiastically terminated; and the subsequent doctrinal tendency of that Church, during those years, and after its deliverance from the interior influence of Congregationalism, is now to be estimated. No doubt can exist that the force which was competent to extricate the Church, would be competent to carry her forward with accelerated momentum afterward; and the direction the Church would take, was obliged to be determined by the direction of the force. How long the force would continue—how soon it might encounter other forces tending in other directions—in short, what might be the secret providence of God touching the future career of this Church under this impulse—no mortal could tell beforehand. But every thoughtful mind was obliged to see, that a mighty rëaction of the life of God in this Church, could not fail to produce by its victory increased repugnance to every error it struggled with, and overcame; nor could it fail to increase the devotion of God's people to every truth which sustained them during their long trial and desperate struggle, and comforted them in their signal deliverance. It was as natural, therefore, as it was noble and affecting, that the Church—at the very moment of its highest excitement, and under the flush of its first complete triumph—manifested a solicitude as tender to recall every one of her children, whom the exigencies of the times, or his own temporary delusion, had separated from her communion, as she did to be rid of every intruder, whose object was to subvert her testimony and destroy her peace. And both tendencies have remained steadfast; on the one side leading her, by repeated acts and explanations and invitations, to smooth the way for the return of every one like-minded with herself, and on the other side leading her to refuse steadfastly to relax any rule whose use helped to assure her of the soundness of her own ministers, or to allow the entrance of ministers from without upon any pretext besides their personal fitness to enter, or by any means different from those she applied to her own children. And great as is the odium which her implacable enemies have attempted to heap upon her, for her conduct in both

Digitized by Google

respects, their very malignity furnished proof of the nature and force of the tendency under which she acts;—since they reviled her in the same words for the acts and the spirit in which she revolted against their dominion over her, and reviled again in the same words for the acts and the spirit in which her deliverance was achieved.

This powerful tendency to keep herself pure, was coupled, as it always is and needs must be, with a corresponding tendency to do the work of the Lord with an earnestness corresponding to her increased fitness to be about it. The Assembly which passed the reforming acts (1837) organized the Board of Foreign Missions; and the following Assembly (1838), which perfected those acts and thoroughly provided for the movement of the Church under them, organized the Board of Publication; thus in both respects completing what had been before set on foot, and partly carried out under great difficulties, in the heart of, probably, the most orthodox section of the Church. There was in both these events, a very wide significance. For in addition to what has been just stated, and the reflections naturally suggested thereby, these acts were the result of a doctrinal tendency specifically Presbyterian, and specifically opposite to the corresponding tendency of Congregationalism—touching the nature, the powers, and the duties of the Church of Christ. The previous discussions of the principles involved, had taken a special relation to the subject of Missions—especially foreign missions; and the same New School majority which virtually made the Church responsible, by the action of the Assembly of 1836, for the system of false doctrine then struggling for mastery, also virtually made her responsible for that distinctive error of Congregationalism—that the Church of God *as such* has neither organic power, nor duty, to conduct foreign missions. It was a great retribution, that within one year (1837) the Board of Foreign Missions was established by the Assembly—the power of those who would have hindered it being utterly broken. Nor is it a cöincidence much less remarkable, or a proof much less striking of the tendency we are illustrating, that the Bi-Centenary of the Westminster Assembly in 1843, was made the occasion, by acts of previous Assemblies, at once of commemorating that great Synod—of giving special instruction

Digitized by Google

throughout the whole Church concerning the standards prepared by it—and of taking collections in all its congregations for the liberal endowment of the Board of Publication. The first known intimation of this Bi-Centenary, and its use, was made in the opening sermon to the Assembly of 1842, by the retiring Moderator of 1841; and being, under the movement of the Assembly, widely taken up, ended in those great and repeated commemorations of the day by nearly every branch of sound English-speaking Presbyterians in the world. And it may be confidently asserted that this Board of Publication has put in circulation, within twenty years, more copies of these noble standards, than all the other printing-houses on earth have unitedly done, during the same period.

And so, step by step continually, during the twenty-three years we are considering, this devotion of the Church to her professed faith, has manifested itself in inseparable connection with her increasing diligence and munificence in doing the work committed to her by God. Striving to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace with all the true disciples of Christ—openly resisting all the enemies of His cross—carefully abstaining from all worldly discussions and excitements concerning which God had given her no command; she has had great peace in her own bosom, and great prosperity in her work. In many respects, no greater contrast could well be exhibited, than that between her state and her work, during the twenty-three years preceding 1837, while the Congregational tendency was perverting and abstracting her very life—and the twenty-three years following 1837, during which the tendency that threw off Congregationalism has had free scope. Nor is it a small matter, that the very area which was covered by the Plan of Union, and that great region west of it into which it would have carried the same ruinous disorders which seemed to be its natural product everywhere, now present the proofs of a progress and a result as remarkable as has ever been accomplished, in spiritual affairs, on this continent. Who that remembers the condition of Presbyterianism in Western New York, for example, for several years before and after 1837—and the relative position of united Congregationalism and New Schoolism, in the same region, during the same period; and then calls to mind the cir-

Digitized by Google

cumstances under which the Old School General Assembly met in Buffalo in 1854, and in Rochester in 1860; can doubt, for an instant, that the specific and organic doctrinal tendency of Presbyterianism is not only honest and constant, but that it is also true, spiritual and effective? To buy the truth, and not to sell it; to be tenacious of it, when it is once acquired; to profess it openly and honestly; to maintain it steadfastly, in good report and in evil report; to use it diligently as given to her in trust for the salvation of men: this, it seems to us, is the true Spirit of a witnessing Church. If the religion of Christ is complete, as it is found in the Sacred Scriptures, a Church whose whole tendency accords with that great fact, must be a power in the earth which the human race could illy spare.

The most ungracious part of our task remains: namely, the attempt to estimate the doctrinal tendency of Congregationalism, since the abrogation of the *Plan of Union* in 1837, and the consequent immediate dissolution of the organic union it had maintained with the Presbyterian Church, for the previous thirty-six years. In the order of thought, there were three distinct steps in the proceedings, and there were several distinct acts performed. The Plan of Union was abrogated by an act of the Assembly: then, after two distinct attempts to avoid more decided proceedings had failed, the Synod of the Western Reserve in Ohio first, and then the three Synods in Western New York, were declared, by acts of the Assembly, not to be integral portions of the Presbyterian church. These are what have been called the *Exscinding Acts*. The two attempts, above alluded to, which had been previously made by the Old School majority in the Assembly of 1837, were, in the first place, to take proceedings by the Assembly either by way of citation, or by way of a Commission, to try the Synods which were afterward disallowed; and in the second place, for an amicable and voluntary separation and division of the Church. The final step, was the attempt by the New School commissioners to the Assembly of 1838, in concert with commissioners from the bounds of the four Synods disallowed the previous year, to depose the Moderator, elect one of their own party, retire from the Assembly, constitute elsewhere, and appeal to the courts of law to maintain their claim, got in this manner, to be

Digitized by Google

the only true Assembly. The counter revolution, and the suit at law, failed. But nearly the whole of those who represented the Congregational tendency then culminating in the Presbyterian Church—including some sounder men, as events prove—by these various means found themselves in a separate organization, in the month of May, 1838. The general result was the division of the Church into two not very unequal parts, the orthodox being rather the stronger in ministers, and still more in churches, professors of religion, and population generally. If this New School body had been a homogeneous one, it would have been very formidable from the moment of its separate existence; and if it had been orthodox as well as homogeneous, it would have been a most powerful and efficacious instrument for good. So largely was the New School element thus separated from the orthodox, impregnated as a body with the doctrinal tendency of Congregationalism, that the vital particles of real Presbyterianism which lay dormant in it, would probably have finally expired, if Congregationalism had been satisfied to remain stationary at the point of declension, which New Schoolism had reached when it separated from the Orthodox. To a spirit so changeful, so turbulent, and so incapable of resting in any thing as settled, this was impossible: and the progress of time and events has rendered it probable, that an effective reaction in the New School body, against the advancing errors and intolerable pressure of Congregationalism, will ultimately establish itself, and restore that body to a better condition than it occupied in 1837.

However this may be, the mode in which Congregationalism has sought to deal with the New School body, since the separation of both of them from the Orthodox, in 1837 and 1838, affords a clear illustration of its tendency, during the period we are now considering. And other illustrations of a kind equally pregnant and indubitable, are to be found all along the career of Congregationalism, during the quarter of a century now drawing to its close. One may be found in the development of that Congregational doctrine, concerning the nature of the Gospel church, whose tendency, while it robs it of all power to execute some of the chief ends of its existence, is to cast it headlong into the vortex of all temporal excitements, making the pulpit a rostrum

Digitized by Google

from which human passion is to display itself, touching every human interest strong enough to command a party. One may be found in the vehement tendency to pervert all existing instrumentalities of good doing, into engines for the promotion of objects utterly foreign to their nature:—and if utterly ruinous to the particular institutions perverted, and utterly offensive to multitudes of their wisest and best supporters, possibly that only increases the perverse urgency. One may be found in the general instability of opinion—the entire want of all apparent conception that either constancy in any particular principle, or consistency in successive principles, is a thing to be desired, much less to be sought. One may be found in the immense doctrinal deterioration of the very fountains of light and knowledge:—for example, the bulk of the eminent divines in contrast with their predecessors, some of the most distinguished Theological Professors in contrast with those now gone, whose very names should make them blush. One of the very worst illustrations may be found, in the frightful state of things produced by allowed tampering with words and phrases, concerning the holiest things and the most momentous concerns, until the uninitiated can never be certain they understand the intended sense—not uttered—but hidden rather, by what they read or hear. The faith of God's elect and the intimate convictions of the human soul, are alike paltered in a double sense. But we forbear to enlarge upon these most painful general illustrations; all the more readily, because we have at hand the means of exhibiting the doctrinal tendency we are considering, by events at once comparatively recent, narrow, precise, and of great publicity. It adds to their suitableness that they appertain to Connecticut—whose *professed* faith is nearly identical with our own, whose ministers once represented themselves to be so near to ours, and through whose highest ecclesiastical tribunal, about sixty years ago, that Plan of Union, under which Presbyterianism suffered so great evils, was successfully urged upon our too confiding Church.

During the year 1860 two ordinations took place in Connecticut, both of which were made subjects of discussion in the newspapers. The numerous publications to which the first of the two led, have been collected and printed in a stout pamphlet, with

Digitized by Google

notes, and a review of the case; at the end of which a statement, drawn from authentic publications, gives the main facts of the second ordination.* In so far as the two individuals who were ordained, are personally concerned, the cases are, of course, of no other importance to the Christian public than any other two cases of young ministers similarly situated would be—namely, as *specimen* cases of Congregational applicants for ordination over Congregational Churches in Connecticut. In this respect, they are of decided importance, as showing the tendency of opinion—the results of theological training—the character of the future ministers—and the present condition and tendencies of the Churches which insist on having such ministers. In so far as the ordinations involve the Councils,—composed of ministers and lay messengers of Churches, who, with knowledge of the state of mind of the candidates under their examination, proceed to set them apart as teachers called of God and duly qualified to be under-shepherds of Christ's flock—the cases assume a very wide and a very decided aspect; and become only more and more important, as the Councils are multiplied, as their members are numerous, are eminent, and are decided in the course they take. Other considerations, not necessarily involved in the particular cases, do, however, arise, to add greatly to the force of the foregoing suppositions—the whole of which suppositions were realized in these Councils, and the ordinations they made. For example, nothing is

* The title of the Pamphlet is "*The Hartford Ordination. Letters of Rev. Drs.* HAWES, SPRING, *and* VERMILYE, *and Rev. Messrs.* CHILDS *and* PARKER: *Re published from the New York Observer, with Notes, and a Review; to which is added, a Statement of the Manchester Case.* Hartford, Conn. Alex. Calhoun & Co., Publishers. 1860.". The compiler adds, in a foot note, on the Hartford Ordination, these words: "For the facts stated in this Pamphlet, which do not appear in the letters of the Observer, we are indebted chiefly to the Independent, the Boston Recorder, the Congregationalist, and the Presbyterian Expositor." He adds, in a foot note, on the Manchester Ordination, these words: "The facts in regard to this case are derived from the Hartford Daily Times, and the Boston Recorder. The articles in the former, were evidently written by some one friendly to Mr. Dorman. The articles of the Recorder appeared, one (July 12) over the signature H. R.; the other, (Aug. 9) signed by the Rev. G. A. Oviatt, Scribe of the Council which settled Mr. Dorman. The correctness of the statement has not been called in question."

Digitized by Google

more remarkable in the numerous publications to which the first case gave rise, than the habitual endeavor to give to the most decided conduct, such an aspect as to obscure the real motive of it; to give to the most explicit language a dubious sense; to endorse openly-avowed heresy, under the pretence that it is held merely as a doubt; to accept as sufficient, confessions of doubt, uncertainty, and ignorance, upon the pretext that unsound opinions are not avowed. In former days, plain-spoken men called this kind of dealing with any interest, human or divine, perfidious. We only signalize it here as one of the results, long ago pointed out, of the doctrinal tendency of Congregationalism —apparent in nearly all its modern theological literature—and practically developed very powerfully in the publications made in defence of this Hartford ordination. Here are eminent ministers who profess an orthodox creed, and desire to be considered in the faith of that creed: as an act in accordance with this state of case, they ordain a minister over a professedly orthodox church, who, besides other heresies, tells them he is not sure heaven and hell are the only places of departed souls, and rather believes, besides, that a certain class of souls, at least, may accept Christ after death, and be saved; then they excuse themselves under pressure to the public, by glosses upon the man's explicit language; then, when hardly pressed, they denounce the man's opinions as revolting to their moral sense; and then when hardly pressed on the other side, they explain that their moral sense revolted—not at the man's opinions—but at the opinions attributed to him!— Was there ever in this world, an enlightened, devoted, God-fearing, orthodox body of churches—except New England Congregational Churches—that could see such conduct as this to be consistent with the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ, and appropriate to a tribunal of His church? What Congregationalism does in such cases, besides ordaining the man, is to write in the newspapers, *pro* and *con*—and then, upon the first opportunity, do the thing over again; as was the fact here. But we ought to be more specific.

On the 11th of January, 1860, Mr. Edwin Pond Parker was ordained and installed Pastor of the South Congregational Church in Hartford. The Council that sat on his case, is said to have

Digitized by Google

been, "one of the ablest and most respectable that could be gathered in New England." It was composed of Pastors and Delegates from eleven Churches, and two Seminaries, making twenty-four members; amongst whom were Dr. Joel Hawes and Dr. Samuel Spring, Dr. Vermilye of East Windsor Seminary, and Dr. Harris of Bangor Seminary. It should be stated that Dr. Vermilye (formerly of the Dutch Reformed Church) voted against the ordination, and was the only member of the Council who did so; and, as we gather from various intimations scattered through the publications, Dr. Harris not only indorsed the candidate and his doctrines as he chose to understand them, but exerted considerable influence in inducing some hesitating members of the Council to favor his ordination. The conduct of these two Professors of Theology, is, we suppose, an indication of the state of opinion in the respective Schools of Bangor and East Windsor Hill. Taking the whole proof in the case, which is various and somewhat extensive—embracing written statements of Dr. Hawes, Dr. S. Spring, Dr. Vermilye, Rev. Mr. Childs, Mr. Parker (the candidate who was ordained), together with extracts from memoranda of Dr. Harris, and statements by the New York Observer—the following points, as to doctrine, seem to us to be established:

(1) *As to the Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures*, Mr. Parker would not say whether that inspiration was or was not *Plenary*, but promptly rejected the idea of its being *Verbal*.

(2) *As to the doctrine of the Trinity*, he seems to have had no *belief* at all, no *faith* at all, and scarce any knowledge; as far as he had any *opinion*, it was Sabellian.

(3) *As to the nature of sin and holiness, and the nature and power of God and of the human soul, relevant thereto*, his doctrine seems to have been, that sin and holiness are merely and always voluntary—that God himself has no *holy nature*, nor man any *sinful nature*—that every man has adequate power to change his own heart, and obey every commandment of God, unto sinless perfection, in this life.

(4) *As to the means of salvation*, he held that the knowledge of Christ and his Gospel, in this life, are not absolutely necessary to salvation, and that some heathen are undoubtedly saved without it.

Digitized by Google

(5) *As to the sacrifice of Christ*, he held that Christ died with the same *design* for all men—and he made this emphatic by adding, "Christ died with the same design for Judas Iscariot as for the Apostle Paul."

(6) *As to the future state of man, after death*; the testimony upon this subject is clear, on one side, against Mr. Parker, as borne by Dr. Vermilye and Mr. Childs; and on the other side, as borne by Dr. Hawes, Dr. S. Spring and Mr. Parker himself, it throws obscurity over the opinions of the candidate, as to what precisely, he did believe; but the whole of it concludes, we think, to this, namely, that it is certain he did *not* believe in accordance with the Scriptures, or with any evangelical creed in the world—certain also that he was either unwilling or unable to say precisely what he believed, and violently probable that his impulses, and his convictions, if he had any, were toward a state of probation, of a peculiar kind, after death. His notion as far as we can gather it, on this point, was not exactly either the Purgatory of the Papists, or the temporary hell of the Redemptionists, but a kind of heathen hades in which salvation through Christ, or in some other way, may be offered and accepted. As *to whom* offered, there is much apparent conflict in the testimony. And it is worthy of note, that after sifting the testimony, this question as to who may be recipients of a *post mortem* gospel, according to the theological system approved as sufficient by the large and respectable Council at Hartford, is in effect, the matter chiefly discussed in the published statements; the testimony, as to all the other points, beginning very much as if it meant at first to hold opposite sides, but ending virtually in a pretty common, though not very candid agreement, as to what his notions were on all other points. It is to be stated, also, that Mr. Parker had drawn up a private creed of his own—from which Dr. Hawes and Dr. S. Spring quote, in one of their joint publications, certain statements in explanation of his statements when under examination, and in defence of their own conduct, and that of the Council, in ordaining him. It seems to us that these most endurable parts of Mr. Parker's creed are beyond all endurance of any orthodox man; and the parts suppressed cannot fail to be as bad, if not worse than the parts published, on supposition that Mr. Parker is

Digitized by Google

able to follow a chain of connected thought. And the moral tendency of that declension which ends for the moment in these fundamental heresies, could hardly be more clearly or more painfully exhibited by good men, than in the shuffling of these distinguished clergymen about them—after ordaining, as sufficiently orthodox, a man who held them.

We will now briefly recapitulate the facts of a second and more recent, and possibly more aggravated case. But as Dr. Hawes and Dr. Spring—who took the lead in this, as well as in the Hartford case—had learned a sharp lesson in the public discussions which grew out of that case, they kept quiet after this second case: and no one else being, apparently, inclined to take their place in a second attempt exactly like theirs, the matter passed with less notoriety. A good deal, however, was written; and the author of the pamphlet whose title is given in a foot note on a previous page, has condensed into four or five pages, the statements contained in the *Boston Recorder*, in the *Hartford Daily Times*, and in certain communications made to both of those papers, during the summer of 1860—one of the communications in the former paper, bearing the signature of the Rev. G. A. Oviatt, Scribe of the Council which settled the candidate. This candidate was a licentiate, of about two years standing, of the New School Third Presbytery of New York, named *L. M. Dorman;* and on the 31st of May, 1860, a Council met to ordain and install him Pastor of the Congregational Church in Manchester, Connecticut. The quality of Mr. Dorman's Presbyterianism may be guessed at, in part, from what is stated above, and more accurately, perhaps, from the fact, that he refused at his ordination, to give his assent to the same Westminster Confession of Faith, he had accepted at his licensure. The quality of his Congregationalism will appear from what follows. And thus by the nature of what he rejects, and by the nature of what he professes, and by the nature of the New School *via media* between Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, we have another picture of the tendencies we are herein tracing, and of their results.

The first Council which met to settle Mr. Dorman, the one just spoken of, failed; that is, his lax views on inspiration, election, depravity, probation after death, the doctrine of the Trinity, &c.,

Digitized by Google

brought the Council to the unanimous judgment that it was impossible for it to proceed to his settlement. We mention, with respect, the names of Dr. Calhoun, and the Rev. Messrs. Cheeseboro, Snow, L. Hyde, S. B. Forbes, and H. Day, who, with four or five lay delegates of churches, seem to have composed this Council. According to any idea of Church order, of ecclesiastical courtesy, of denominational unity, or of community in Christian doctrine, which any considerate person can have, the refusal of this Council to ordain Mr. Dorman, and especially on such grounds as those stated, would seem to be a rather serious obstacle to his farther progress. They who cherish such a delusion, have but small acquaintance with the turbulent and reckless spirit which lodges in the bosom of our modern Congregationalism, or of the resources for mischief which are at its command. On the 6th day of June, within one week from the meeting of the Council which unanimously rejected Mr. Dorman as a heretic, a second and larger Council convened in the same place, and after examining him three or four hours, determined by a majority of four out of twenty members to ordain him: whereupon, a part of the members withdrew—and the rest proceeded to his ordination. Dr. Hawes was the Moderator of this Council, and Dr. Spring, and the Mr. Parker whom the two former had endorsed in the Council of Hartford, as we have shown, were amongst the members of it. As far as we understand the testimony before us, Mr. Dorman held all the errors which Mr. Parker appeared to hold, or to favor, when examined at Hartford; and in some respects his heretical opinions seemed to be more decided than those of Mr. Parker. It is, therefore, needless to take up time with a new detail of particulars—once already clearly stated—which are both impious and absurd. Two things, however, are worth specifying. The first is—that even Mr. Oviatt, before mentioned as the Scribe of this Council, who was one of those who resisted the ordination of Mr. Dorman, in a publication giving account of the matter, has nothing more emphatic to say concerning the impiety of which he had been a witness, than this: "1, I seriously thought Mr. Dorman "unsound in *faith*, in some essential particulars; 2, I thought "he was too undetermined in the faith, was too full of doubts, "learned in too many different directions, to be set over the

Digitized by Google

"Church in Manchester." The second is—Mr. Dorman's curious and most suggestive answers, when asked about the doctrine of election, "I don't know, I am studying the Bible to find out;" and when asked if he believed the Assembly's Catechism, in the main, "I don't know—I don't know much about the Catechism." If it were not for the terrible wickedness of such proceedings, one might scoff at their preposterous folly.

Here then is the *present* resting place of the inherent doctrinal tendency of American Congregationalism. The van of the host at least takes breath here. How long that tendency, which has made shipwreck of the noblest standards of faith, will repose at the point herein demonstrated to be its actual posture, is not for us to determine. All along its pathway it has projected before, and scattered on every side of its progress, heresies more odious than any it tolerated within itself as endurable. But what it is not only tolerating, but propagating, nourishing and defending at the present period, seems absolutely incompatible with Christianity, whether it be considered as a doctrine, a power, or a life. A ministry, such as has been created with perfect knowledge of what it was, by two numerous Councils in the heart of Connecticut, within the past year, is the product of a system of doctrine, less coherent, and no more evangelical, than that of Arius, or of Pelagius, or of Sabellus, or of Socinus, which the universal Church of God has rejected as impious. Consider what is the sum of the heresies proved in these two cases, so widely affiliated, so openly displayed:

1. The Word of God, the only infallible rule of all religious belief, and all religious duty, is robbed of its infinite light, its infinite power, and its infinite authority.

2. The revealed nature of God, upon which, and the mode thereof, not only the reality but the possibility of salvation for sinners depends; is ignorantly denied, or wickedly disregarded.

3. The very nature of sin and of holiness is thoroughly perverted; and while God is degraded in a manner at which Deism would blush, man is exalted in a manner incompatible with the idea of his being either a creature or a sinner, either dependent or depraved.

4. The person, the work, and the glory of the Lord Jesus

Digitized by Google

Christ are stripped of all, whereon any one can predicate that He is the only Mediator between God and men—and as such the only Redeemer of God's elect, or that God ever had any elect at all.

5. The future state of retribution is subverted—the relation of this life to the life to come is abolished—the relevancy between grace and glory, redemption and salvation, faith and righteousness, holiness and blessedness is utterly confounded.

In what degree this dreadful condition of things is diffused amongst the whole body of Congregational Churches and ministers, we cannot say; nor do we suppose any means exist, whereby, under such a system of church order as theirs, the fact could be clearly ascertained, or any effectual remedy applied.—The fundamental evil lies in the very nature, and by consequence the organic tendency, of Congregationalism itself; so that to "lose hold upon the conservative and the thoughtful, and fall into the hands of the rash and the radical" is not only its ever impending peril, but is also its ever working tendency. How long and how completely the grace of God might hold this tendency in check, and make a body of Congregational Churches and ministers a mighty power for good on earth, can no more be conjectured than it could be, at what moment of declension the proportion of the unsound would be greater than that of the sound. That there are many Congregational Churches and ministers at the present time, eminent in all Christian graces, and worthy of the confidence and love of all the churches, no one will dispute. Nevertheless, no one doubts, we suppose, except the unsound portion of the Congregational ministers and churches, that there has been a widespread and woful declension in the Congregational body. To what extent this eating plague has polluted and defiled the portion still accepted as orthodox, must necessarily be a question of great doubt, as well as constant solicitude to all true followers of Christ—as long as this portion allows itself to be mixed and confounded with the mass of heresies and disorders, which seems to strengthen and fester around them. Touching the actual state of things, considered generally and from the point of view of the public discussion on the Hartford ordination, the following testimony from the closing letter of that discussion, written by the Rev. T. S. Childs of Hartford, (the Presbyterian minister who first called

Digitized by Google

the public attention to the facts connected with Mr. Parker's ordination there,) accords, we think, with the general impression of orthodox persons, out of New England, concerning the actual state of doctrinal truth in Congregationalism at large; and goes far to discharge those who speak or write on such subjects, from the necessity of apologizing either for general statements, or great plainness of speech:

"The fact is, the worst aspect of this whole case is not yet before the public; and with the exception of one point, it is not an uncommon case. I had heard the public examination of a member of this same Council, who was himself all unsettled as to a state of eternal punishment for any. Another member had declared on his examination, that there were parts of the Bible which were not inspired—had denied the Scripture doctrine of original sin—and asserted that man had natural ability to repent and believe independent of Christ and the Holy Spirit; and still another has recently said, while preaching in a *Universalist* pulpit, that "he hoped the day would come—and that day was not far distant—when all Christian denominations would overcome their prejudices, and be willing to listen to the preaching of any Christian minister without sacrificing their own ideas upon religious matters;" a sentiment, which if it meant any thing, distinctly recognized the Christian character and equal standing of Universalism. I have it also from a responsible source, that a member of this Council has publicly, in his pulpit, given thanks to God that there were such denominations as the Universalist and Unitarian, to modify the views others have of God. It stands uncontradicted that five of the students of Andover, last year, lapsed into Universalism. In these cases we have representatives from three of the Theological Schools of New England, viz.: Bangor, New Haven, and Andover. These are the fearful facts. As a New England man, I have no pleasure, but profound grief in stating them. How such good men as Dr. Spring, can look upon them with indifference—how, in view of the awful issues involved and their own near judgment, they can ever appear as the defenders of those who hold any such views, is to me amazing.—(pp.43–4.)

There are, probably, about forty ministers of the Gospel connected with the Presbyterian Church (O. S.), and perhaps half that number of congregations, scattered over New England.—This is the actual result left to Presbyterianism in that important field of Christian effort—after nearly two centuries have passed

Digitized by Google

since Presbyterianism was planted on this continent. It is a result, in every respect shameful to the Presbyterian Church; and all the more, that in order to bring it to pass, she had to neglect important interests she had in New England at a comparatively early period; she had to omit, habitually, for successive generations to spread her faith and order in that region; and on the general outbreak with Congregationalism during the New School controversy, she had to turn her back upon the most urgent opportunity to perform there a great work of evangelization, demanded not only by the glory of Christ, but also both by her own safety and self-respect. In proportion as Presbyterianism came short of her duty in efforts to plant and sustain her institutions in New England, Congregationalism became urgent in her endeavors, first to subvert Presbyterianism by means of organic union with it; and, when that had wrought evil till it was no longer endurable, then by ceaseless rivalry and opposition alike in every great mart of population on this continent, and in every new and growing settlement of the North and North-west, and in every general enterprise of benevolence concerning which it was possible for a central society to be organized. Even in the work of foreign missions, this instinctive sense of aversion to Presbyterianism may be traced clearly, just in proportion as the results have been distinct. Nor is it easy to understand how all this should fail to occur, under the organic and ever-working tendency of Congregationalism which we have traced. It seems to us that no alternative is left to Presbyterianism, but to lay out her strength in spreading the pure gospel through New England. No more imperative obligation, in our own judgment, has rested on her for many years past. And while we are fully aware of the derision with which such a suggestion has been all along met, by those who the most needed such efforts to reclaim them to the simplicity of Christ, we are as fully persuaded that abundant success would ultimately crown the work. Already, every other evangelical denomination—and nearly every form of pestilent heresy besides—has taken root there. It is in the most vague sense that New England can any longer be called Congregational; nor can it much longer be called Congregational at all, in any sense that our fathers recognized. Good men who

Digitized by Google

are identified with the soundest type of Congregationalism now existing there, may not see things in so dark an aspect; and may even resent such ideas as we have advanced. But, probably no conviction is more deeply or universally settled in all thoughtful minds out of New England, than that it is a great necessity of our times, both Christian and national, to curb and rectify the existing spirit of Congregationalism. Nor is there, probably, one such person, who is not thoroughly convinced that if this had been done long ago, our condition, both national and Christian, would have been, to-day, widely different from what it is. Nor will it be a light task for the faithful historian of these sad times, clearly to determine, whether the Congregational tendency to heresy and fanaticism, or the Presbyterian tendency against both, was the most steadfast. That there are causes, profound in their nature and powerful in their operation, from which these opposite tendencies arise, must necessarily be as certain as that such tendencies exist. At present, we have contented ourselves with tracing the doctrinal history of those opposite tendencies: though, possibly, thoughtful readers may find somewhat suggestive of the true causes, if they will reflect upon effects so striking, so constant, and so opposite, during so many and such eventful years.

* *
*

Digitized by Google

ART. II. — *The Relation which Reason and Philosophy sustain to the Theology of Revelation.*

The notion of the sufficiency of unaided human reason, or the light of nature, as a guide to the attainment of theological truth, never seems to have entered the mind of the Pagan world; and is met with only since the publication of Revelation itself. It is avowed only by those who having become acquainted, at least to some extent, with the announcements of Revelation, have availed themselves of the light which it imparts, for the purpose of disproving its necessity. Its contents, upon the whole, are not only such as the unregenerate heart cannot find pleasure in; but such as provoke its determined hostility. And hence, while a portion of its light is willingly accepted, the acknowledgment is not only denied, but the light itself employed for the purpose of superseding Revelation, and of disproving its claims; in order to ignore those portions of its announcements which are disrelished by the heart that is estranged from God.

That a revelation from God to a fallen and sinful world, and designed to recover it from sin and restore it to happiness and the favor of heaven, must, in the very necessity of the case, announce not only what is important and needful to be known; but that also which could scarcely have been known without it; seems to be a truth too obvious to require argument. And this being admitted, it would scarcely seem to be a very rational procedure, should any individual of the race thus favored demand, as a prerequisite to his reception of the divinely attested and authorised message, that he should be permitted to sit in judgment upon the truth of its contents themselves; and to decide thereon, upon the basis of the alleged facts of that very knowledge and philosophy which still left him in utter need of a revelation; and to accept only of that portion which he could explain and evince to be true by ascertaining its agreement with the ideas already in his possession, and the deductions already drawn by him from reason and the nature of things. To set up such a claim would be regarded, in the view of enlightened reason, as wholly incompatible with

Digitized by Google

either an admission of the need of a revelation from God, or with any sincere and honest acknowledgment of its claims.

Now the doctrines of Revelation are stated therein as facts, the truth of which is attested by the testimony of God himself.— And hence to claim the right to subject the question of their truth to the decision of our philosophy, as a necessary prerequisite to our reception of the Divine testimony; and the prerogative also to reject as false that which does not comport with our *à priori* notions of things; is not only incompatible with any intelligent recognition of a revelation from God at all, and therefore absurd, but it is treating the Divine testimony as no intelligent judicature ever ventures to treat any reliable testimony on which it is called to act. The reliability of the testimony, of course, depends upon the credibility of the witnesses; which being established, or admitted, the facts of the testimony, even though extraordinary in their nature, are received in evidence.

When God announces that his thoughts are not our thoughts, nor his ways our ways, it seems to be not only a very intelligible but a perfectly reasonable proposition; and just what we, from his providential administration, should expect the facts in the case to be; so much so, indeed, that a Revelation — purporting to come from an infinitely wise and holy Being, and relating to the future and unseen, not less than to the past, the present, and the visible — whose characteristics did not evince that such was truly the fact — would not comport with the deductions of enlightened reason itself, from the admitted fact of his infinite perfections.— But plain and obvious as all this appears to be, there is no subject on which there have been and still are, even in the church of God itself, more indefinite and unsettled principles than on the true relation which reason and philosophy sustain to Revelation. Nor is this the saddest feature in the picture, as will be seen presently. Not a little of the theological literature of the day teems with undiscriminating laudations of reason and philosophy. No intelligent man ever questions the importance of both to human welfare; nor doubts the necessity for their use in scanning and deciding upon the proffered evidence of the divine origin and authenticity of the Scriptures; and no one doubts the high importance of rightly using our rational powers in the interpretation of the

Digitized by Google

language employed as the medium of Revelation. But the laudations referred to aim not to set forth and illustrate this, the proper province of reason and philosophy in their relation to the subject; but, under the cover of undiscriminating panegyric, to lead them out of their proper sphere, to occupy the chair of a Judge, whose duty it shall be to say whether the testimony which God confessedly has given is true or false — whether he ought to be believed or not — and whether what he has alleged to be matter of fact, ought to be received as such; especially by certain keen-sighted and knowing ones, who have been studying Botany and Astronomy, and Physiology, and Psychology, and Geology, and German Philosophy. For if the unreasonable supposition should be entertained that persons so eminently enlightened might possibly arrive at any increase of knowledge, the question would still arise, who is able to impart it? Are we to suppose that they would consent to degrade their rational powers by believing even God himself in relation to a matter of fact which they could not fully comprehend? Such is the real aspect of the case; and that any serious, intelligent mind could become so involved in the fog of its own metaphysical theories, as to be led to the logical occupancy of a position like this, would seem to be impossible. But that many who still claim to be evangelical have assumed, and do still occupy it, in common with the Rationalist and avowed Infidel, is known to every one who has paid any adequate attention to the subject.

Before entering fully into the discussion of our topic, it will be proper here to offer a few remarks on the subject of Theology itself. In the general acceptation of the term it signifies a *discourse concerning God*, *λόγον περι τοῦ θεοῦ*. The abstract term is derived from the concrete *θεόλογος*; which is found in the epigraph of the Apocalypse — *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου*; and which was anciently applied to designate one who discourses on divine things. The name, in fact, was not unfamiliar to ancient Pagan literature. Varro, (according to Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, vi. 5,) treats of a threefold method of theology: the *mythical*, or that which treated of the fables of the poets concerning the gods; the *civil*, which treated of the public worship of the gods; and the *natural*, (*physica*,) or that which the philos-

Digitized by Google

ophers taught respecting the gods. The term came early into use in the Christian church, (whatever date be assigned to θεόλογος, in the title of the Apocalypse.) Justin uses θεολογεῖν; and in later centuries the term was employed sometimes in a wider and sometimes in a more restricted sense — as when, for example, the defenders of the doctrine of the Divine Nature of Christ were *par eminence* so designated. Augustine defines it to be either a discourse and method of treating upon divine subjects, or a discourse proceeding from God himself. * But Peter Abelard, (born in Palais near Nantes, in Brittany, A. D. 1079,) appears to have originated the phrase *Theologia Christiana.*

From the time in which that remarkable man issued under this title his *Compendium*, (which originated the so-called "Scholastic Theology,") incessant efforts have been made by the Schoolmen, and subsequently by the Papal and Reformed Divines, to present in a scientific form or method the knowledge which God has directly imparted to mankind, — till now, under the general designation of *theology* we have almost innumerable distinctions: Scholastic, Speculative, Biblical, Revealed, Practical, Moral, Dogmatic, Polemic, &c., &c. And then again, the import of the terms themselves becomes the subject of warm discussion, and the boundaries of the various departments are thus thrown into confusion and uncertainty. And what is still worse, there seems to be but little hope of adjusting these matters upon the principles of distinction and classification of topics hitherto adopted. And it is scarcely necessary to remark that all such terms, and all modes of presenting the subject, become worthless when they fail to be really subsidiary to a plain and intelligible presentation of its truths. This rule is promptly recognized in all science; and it seems strange that the recognition of theology *as a science* should not have suggested long ago the idea of presenting it in a form analagous to that which true science herself both suggests and has adopted, in every other department of her true domain without a solitary exception.

---

*Theologia est aut sermo Dei, aut de divinitate sermo et ratio. *De Civitate Dei*, lib. viii. c. 1. See also, lib. xviii. 14, Poetæ Theologi dicerentur, quoniam de Dies carmina faciebant, &c. See also Lactantius, in cap. ii. of his book, *De Ira Dei.*

Digitized by Google

When we speak of revealed theology, or the theology of revelation, the idea is associated with that of religion itself — since the design of revelation is the recovery of apostate man to holiness and to God; and hence the terms *revealed religion* and *revealed theology* are popularly employed as synonymous. Religion, from *religo* (formed of *re* and *ligo*), is the practical reception of the truth which God has revealed. It is therefore essentially distinct from a mere speculative acknowledgment of the truth; which, standing apart from the practical element, is comparatively of little real moment, so far as relates to the design of God in making a revelation to man.

In considering the relation which reason and philosophy, or the deductions of human science, sustain to this Divine science, it will be proper, at the outset, to determine the import of the phrase *Divine Revelation* as thus employed; for the phrase has been often, of late years, like the term *supernatural*,* improperly used, and then misapplied to the support of innumerable vagaries; as when, for instance, we are told that God *reveals* himself to his creatures through his works, so that all nature is a revelation, (*to itself*, we presume,) and that therefore, there can be no difference between natural and revealed theology — since all is revealed. Such an abuse of common and well-ascertained terms seems hardly to result from ignorance. It has more the appearance of a preconceived intention to confuse the whole subject, and to perplex and mislead the mind. Yet a *formal* definition of the term *revelation* or the *theology of revelation* in this connection, is scarcely necessary, as the dispute is not a dispute of terms. The fact that God has made a direct communication of his will to man, and that the Holy Scriptures constitute that communication, is admitted by all Christians: and there are a few things implied herein, the intelligent appreciation of which will assist us in obtaining a correct view of the whole subject under discussion; and enable us to define the true and appropriate domain of theology; and of course the relation sustained to it by moral, intellectual and physical science; and to which we refer in this essay, by the general phrase, reason and philosophy. We need not

*See Dr. Bushnell's "Nature and the Supernatural," *passim*.

Digitized by Google

perplex the inquiry with questions about inspiration. The various theories on that subject have really nothing to do with the fact of inspiration itself; for leaving to God the manner in which he saw proper to communicate with man, we are in the fullest manner assured by himself that he is the Author of the Scriptures. This is the *fact* in the case. But to undertake to ascertain *how* he communicated with the minds of his prophets and scribes; and to claim, moreover that our understanding of this point is a prerequisite to the admission of the fact that he did so communicate; is not more reasonable than to claim to know *how* He created the heavens and the earth before we will admit that he did create them: or to know how God is one in one sense and three in another, before we shall consent to receive the divine testimony which assures us of the fact.

Now the admitted fact that God has disclosed his will, or made a revelation of himself to man, implies, of course, that such a revelation was necessary in order to the accomplishment of his merciful designs toward our race; as the fact that he gave his Son for human redemption, proves our need of being thus redeemed. The fact of this necessity should be here considered; for, if rightly viewed, it will greatly assist in the prosecution of our main inquiry. It may be found

1. In the universal prevalence of error respecting God — his character, will and worship; for whatever of such knowledge was announced originally, had become obscure and uncertain, and was rapidly fading away. Then when false systems sprung up, as they did every where, they each claimed for itself a divine origin. Thus inextricable perplexity involved all our race. The lawgivers all asserted the divine origin of their laws; rulers claimed to derive their pedigree from the gods; and even the best of the philosophers, such as Pythogoras, Socrates and Plato, claimed to be divinely taught and directed — and so brought the divine sanction in support of all their vagaries and inconsistencies. The Oracles exacted the same deference of all who consulted them.— And the confusion thus accruing; and the utter impracticability of determining what is truth; evince the necessity not only that God should reveal a knowledge of himself and of his will, for our direction; but that this revelation should be divinely attested.

Digitized by Google

2. The same necessity is equally apparent from the fact that God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts. This fact though so fully announced in the Bible, is very apparent also from nature and Providence. What human wisdom would ever govern the world as God governs it? Witness the history of Joseph and the events connected therewith; and the revolutions of empires, and other events in the moral world; and in nature's kingdom the storm, tempest, pestilence, earthquake, &c. These things confound and ever have confounded all human wisdom. In relation to his administration we are taught that "It is the glory of God to *conceal* a thing," Proverbs xxv: 2. And an inspired apostle in view of the whole matter has expressed himself as follows: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! for who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" Rom. xi: 33, 34.— If these things are so, (and what serious mind will doubt them?) then what could we hope to know of God, of his works and ways, save so far as he has seen proper to reveal them to us? And, therefore, can any thing be more absurd than to attempt to judge of God by ourselves? or of the facts which he announces by our knowledge and philosophy? or to adjust the truths of revelation to our notions of reason and common sense? We shall refer to the facts of revealed theology presently; in the light of which we shall be able to form an estimate of the probability that exists for hoping that unaided reason and philosophy may be competent to decide on their truthfulness or the contrary; but here we wish to consider this point in the light of the then existing necessity which required a revelation to be made. And on this point it is quite proper, in reasoning with professed Christians, to refer to the testimony of Revelation itself on the subject. Even Episcopius, the great Arminian champion of philosophy, concedes that philosophy is out of her province when she assays to meddle with the facts of Revelation. *

On what ground, therefore, can mere human philosophy, which

*"Res ipsas quas Theologia tractat non attinget Philosophus: Hæ supra naturam sunt, nec cognoscuntur nisi doceantur cælitus." Opp. Tom. 1, p. 583, *folio.*

Digitized by Google

makes no account of the fall, or of a mediator, or of the necessity for regeneration, undertake to sit as a judge upon the facts announced in a revelation given by God; and undertake to say whether they are consistent with his nature or with truth itself? when that very revelation announces such canons on the subject as the following: "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." "Men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." And in view of God's omnipresence, the Psalmist exclaims, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it." If these things be so, what can man of himself, with all his powers and faculties, know of those truths which it was the design of revelation to announce? And then again we are assured that "the world by (its) wisdom knew not God;" and that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered the heart of man the things which God has prepared for them that love him." "The wise men — have rejected the word of the Lord; and what wisdom is in them?" Surely facts like these are sufficient to settle the point. And how are we without assistance from God to arrive at a knowledge of the truths thus adverted to? Human wisdom, philosophy, reason, not only fail us here, but positively regard those truths as foolishness when announced; and hate, and receive them not. On what principle then may fallen man be supposed able to discover them, or claim to decide whether they are true or false, when God has declared them to be true? "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to these, it is because there is no truth in them." The principle is rationalistic and dangerous which would subordinate the authority of Scripture to reason, to philosophy, or to the intuitional consciousness. "It is very like sending the statute-book of the commonwealth to the state-prison, to be revised and amended to suit such principles of honor and right as are in vogue among its guilty inmates." *

* Presbyterian Review, for 1854, p. 569.

Digitized by Google

Such, then, is the utter weakness and insufficiency of unaided human reason to discover those peculiar truths which it was the design of God by his word to make known to mankind. And hence revelation was needed to teach us not only what reason and philosophy never could have taught; but likewise to confirm the right and the true already existing amongst men.

3. In order to estimate properly what may be accomplished by reason and philosophy either in discovering or in modifying the truths which are the subject-matter of revelation, it is neither unfair nor improper to advert to their achievements, in a department somewhat similar, anterior to the diffusion of Christianity. These have been so fully and accurately portrayed by Leland in his great work on the "Necessity of Revelation," that nothing need be added thereto; and a mere reference to that work is sufficient to warrant the declaration that in the hands of their ablest disciples, reason and philosophy utterly failed to attain to any true knowledge either of God or of man. And the same is true of their modern disciples who have rejected the testimony of revelation. What have they ever *determined* or settled — I will not say respecting those sublime truths which are the subject-matter of the Scriptures — but respecting the simplest points of morals? — the principles of duty and obligation; self-denial, the indulgence of the passions, and the like? Let Herbert, Hobbes, Shaftsbury, Bolingbroke, Hume, and the German rationalistic philosophers answer. They have unsettled many things, in the view of their adherents; and have settled nothing whatever, except the fact, so clearly intimated in the Scriptures, that philosophy becomes folly in every attempt she makes to modify or supersede the revelation which God has made to man. Such, then, were the necessities which required that God should either instruct man directly in the way of truth and duty, or abandon him to endless ruin and death. The fact that he has imparted instruction is admitted, as above stated. And that this instruction, in the very nature of the case, must contain the infallible truth on the subjects of which it treats, is likewise perfectly obvious.— A denial of this proposition is necessarily fraught with the consequence of denying Revelation itself.

And finally: The Scriptures themselves claim that the truth,

Digitized by Google

on the subjects of which they treat, can be learned only from God. The following are a few of their statements hereon: Isaiah lv: 8, 9, has been already referred to. In full it reads as follows: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Also chap. viii: 20. "To the law and to the testimony: (that is, to the law which is God's testimony,) if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." And in John v: 39, Jesus plainly intimates that by the Scriptures alone is the true way to eternal life to be learned. Compare also Luke xvi: 29, and 2 Timothy iii: 14–16.

Let us, therefore, in the next place, briefly glance at the subject-matter of revealed theology, that we may form an accurate idea of its true domain. Of course its proper elements are the teachings of the Bible; of which illustrations may be derived from the works and providence of God. The revelation He has made, however, is, of course, the true theology, as distinguished from all merely human philosophy, and all mere deductions from his works of creation and providence; since it cannot be presumed that he revealed either what was already known to man, or what was unnecessary to be known. And the admission, therefore, that the Scriptures are, in the true sense, a revelation from God, clearly involves the inference that they have a main design; and also a plain import in every thing relating to this design.

And then further: That God in the very beginning of the world communicated a knowledge of himself and of his will to man, will not be questioned by any believer of the Bible. Even after the Fall he communed with our first parents and instituted sacrifice. And the fact of such a revelation is, moreover, clearly announced in the recorded prophecy of Enoch, and implied also in the statements that Enoch and Noah *walked with God.* How much of this revealed knowledge was traditionally preserved until the time of Moses, we know not; but it is obviously fair to affirm that whatever traditionary knowledge, (such as that which related to man's originally happy state and subsequent fall, the institution of sacrifice, the immortality of the soul, &c.,) existed

Digitized by Google

among the nations, and is in accordance with the written revelation; owes its origin, not to philosophy (which would be absurd to suppose,) but to the revelation originally imparted to the race.— And it would be deeply interesting to take up and consider the manner in which Philosophy, from her first institution until now, has sought to dispose of those truths — now denying them, and then compelled to acknowledge their power; she has been forced to grapple with them in the vain endeavor either to ignore their existence, or to reconcile the principles implied therein with her own approved and vaunted utterances. And the effort, though continued now for more than two thousand years, leaves the matter still unadjusted; and the result no nearer its attainment than when the effort began; — an impressive illustration of her capability to modify, improve upon, or supersede the knowledge which God has communicated to man.

Now in the written revelation, called the Scriptures, we are taught that man was originally created in the image of God; and that through voluntary transgression he was brought into a state of sin, condemnation and death;— that there is a trinity in God — the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and that they entered into covenant to redeem man from sin and death; and that for this purpose the Son of God should become the Mediator between God and man, while the Spirit of God should assume the office of applying the redemption thus achieved to all the covenanted seed of Christ; — that the Son, in accomplishing his redeeming work, became man, and assumed the office of Teacher, Priest and King; and expiated sin by making satisfaction for sinners through the endurance of the penalty of the law — in consequence of which salvation is freely offered to the whole race of man. Then in connection with this is revealed the doctrine of God's eternal predestination and election; and those, too, of regeneration, repentance, justification by faith, self-denial, sanctification, adoption, &c., and the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper. Also the immortality of the soul; the resurrection of the body; the general judgment; and an eternal heaven and hell for the good and the bad of both men and angels; and the ultimate restoration of the earth to its pristine condition, after which it shall go on to accomplish its high destiny, as though sin and Sa-

Digitized by Google

tan had never made an inroad thereon — and so become the abode of righteousness. 2 Pr. iii: 13. And "we must remember," as Edwards remarks, "that it is a revelation of what God knows to be the very truth concerning his own nature; of the acts and operations of his mind with respect to his creatures; of the great scheme of infinite wisdom in his works, especially with respect to the intelligent and moral world; a revelation of the spiritual and invisible world; a revelation of that invisible world which men shall belong to after this life; a revelation of the greatest works of God, the manner of his creating the world, and of his governing of it, especially with regard to the higher and more important parts of it," &c. * This very brief abstract is sufficient for the purpose of illustration; for our design here is not to go into historical detail or topical discussion, but merely to illustrate what are the design and province of revealed theology. And in this connection we affirm the proposition that on all the aforesaid topics, at least, God has announced not only the infallible truth, but also all that is necessary to be known by man in order to secure his salvation from sin, death and hell. He only is the true theologian, whatever other knowledge he may claim to possess, who earnestly labors to understand the import of this revelation, and to cöoperate with its design. His grand study must be of the Book, and by its words he is to be saved or to perish at last.

Such, then is revealed theology. And on what principle either of reason, common sense, "the intuitive consciousness," or of true philosophy, is it to be claimed that human reason or philosophy is competent to sit in an *à priori* judgment on the grand themes thus announced? What can be alleged as a proper basis for such a claim? God has uttered his clear testimony to the facts in the case: And on what principle, therefore, can any man claim to be an honest recipient and believer of that testimony, and yet claim the prerogative to subject the question as to the truth of those averments to the test of his reason and philosophy; and to ignore, reject, or modify whatever will not comport therewith? And yet this is precisely the attitude which some men now, who claim to be evangelical Christians, sustain in reference to the rev-

* Works, vol. vii. p. 268. New York, 1830.

Digitized by Google

elation which God has made. Its averments are wholly beyond the reach of human reason and philosophy, and pertain to matters of which man in this world, and in his fallen and depraved condition, can know absolutely nothing except what God has revealed; and yet it is claimed by such men, that the truth of these averments may be rationally subjected to the scrutiny and decision of a reason and philosophy which, in the very nature of the case, can know nothing about them!

Before proceeding directly to point out the precise relation which human reason and philosophy sustain to this divine science, it may be in place therefore to remark that many things seem to indicate that the whole conflict in relation to the distinguishing doctrines of revelation, and especially of those known as the doctrines of grace, is to be gone over again. This is owing mainly to the fact of the prevalence of those extremely loose and vague views which are entertained of the true province of reason and philosophy in respect to revelation; and of the concessions which have been incautiously made either directly or by implication on the subject. Attempts not only to undermine revelation itself have been of late years renewed from almost every stand-point; but many, under the profession of receiving the Bible as the word of God, endeavor in every conceivable way to ignore all the distinguishing truths which it announces. The church doctrine of Inspiration, likewise, has been in every form assailed; and the shallow utterances of amateur geologists, and physiologists, and what not, are impertinently insisted on as furnishing ground for the demand that this idea of inspiration be essentially modified, if not wholly relinquished. A so-called philosophy must set up its claim, that revelation cannot possibly be so absurd as to teach the resurrection of "the disintegrated corporeal organism," even though it be admitted to teach the resurrection of the dead; and the philosophy of Socinus is brought forward, by men claiming to be evangelical, to explain away every thing in the doctrine of the Atonement which the perverted powers of our fallen nature cannot regard as reasonable; while that of Schleiermacher, is, in like manner introduced, to evince that the doctrine of the uninterrupted immortality and conscious existence of the human spirit between death and the resurrection

Digitized by Google

is a mere figment; and in a like spirit the exploded philosophies of former days are solicited to lend their aid to render the cardinal doctrine of Imputation sufficiently clear, but from such an explanation of the *modus* as must logically undermine our confidence in other averments of the Scriptures. We say nothing in disparagement of a true philosophy; but on the contrary claim, in the most decided manner, that she should not be undervalued while content with her appropriate domain. But when she oversteps the line, and undertakes to perform the functions of a judge where she should occupy the position of a humble disciple; and ventures not only to mingle her speculations with the holy utterances of God, but to palm them off as of equal importance, and even to ignore some of his plainest and most imperative announcements; she must expect to be treated as an intruder. The domain of revelation is too sacred to be thus tampered with. — What God has announced for the purpose of bringing us to salvation and to himself, is not to be treated in any such manner. — We devoutly believe, with old Hilary, that God cannot be known except by light imparted from himself. *

The positive domain of true theology, therefore, is the revelation which God has communicated to man. His eternal power and Godhead appear in the works of his hand; and are seen with sufficient clearness to render unbelief therein, and all forms of idolatry, inexcusable. Rom. i: 19–21. But human speculation has fully evinced in every age, that unassisted reason, or the human intellect without light from heaven, has failed to derive saving knowledge therefrom. And it is obvious that this must be so; since, were it otherwise, a revelation would scarcely have been necessary. Upon the same principle on which the apostle argues that if for fallen man there is a righteousness by law, Christ has died gratuitously, (Gal. ii: 21,) so it is equally obvious that if saving knowledge were obtained through the works of creation, revelation was unnecessary. Philosophy could never have learned the truths of revelation from the works of creation, as is fully apparent from the nature of those truths themselves which relate to things invisible and eternal; and to matters of which it

* *De Trinitate*, lib. 1, non potest Deus nisi per Deum intelligi.

Digitized by Google

is impossible that reason should know any thing until instructed from heaven. And how then shall she presume to sit in judgment upon those truths themselves; and undertake to decide whether the averments of the infinite and eternal God are consistent with themselves, and with his own character?

Upon the whole, then, it is obvious that revelation is the true and appropriate domain of positive theology; and of all our actual knowledge of God; and of the real position which man sustains to him, and to future and eternal things; — and the necessity for limiting our speculations in respect to the saving knowledge of God to this province, appears from the necessity which existed for a revelation itself. It was needed; for without it, man could not have been directed aright in the way to life and salvation. And if this be so, then it is further obvious that the true domain of human philosophy is wholly diverse from, though, in the true sense, not inconsistent with, that of theology; and, moreover, that whatever actual knowledge may be obtained from the works of creation and providence, from science, the light of nature, "the intuitional consciousness," and the like, cannot be really inconsistent with revelation itself. The facts, or the actual knowledge, communicated by these various departments, *are not, however, to be confounded with the deductions which men may draw from those facts*, although this obvious distinction is perpetually ignored by all who attempt to make revelation subservient to philosophy and reason. The real facts of geology, for example, are one thing; the inferences, however, which are attempted to be deduced therefrom, are quite another thing. The former may be admitted to be true in all their length and breadth; while the latter may be utterly discarded as unsupported and false. The knowledge thus obtained, therefore, can be really only subsidiary to the higher knowledge communicated by God himself; and really can be regarded as illustrative only of the truth announced in revelation. The denial of this position logically necessitates the doubt whether God has really uttered a testimony to man. For to claim that he has done so — and at the same time to claim that this testimony may be contradicted by the testimony which he has uttered in his works — is too absurd a notion to be seriously entertained by any reflecting mind. And the man who will take such a position is

Digitized by Google

bound, in all honesty and consistency, to acknowledge that he does not receive the Bible as a revelation from God, in the true sense of the term. And on the contrary, where there is any apparent or real collision between the plain and undoubted averments of God in his word, and the deductions of our reason or philosophy; it is no surrendering of our rational powers, but truly consistent with their highest and best exercise, to admit that God has spoken truly, and that our own deductions are fallacious and wrong.

It is known to the intelligent reader, that not a few who profess to receive with deep reverence the Bible as a revelation from God, yet protest against this course; and denounce it a "blind faith," a "hoodwinking of the faculties," &c., very like the old skeptics, who, when the doctrine of the Trinity, or of original sin, or of predestination was asserted, used to exclaim, "You are trying to make asses of mankind." It is well worthy of note in this connection, that these very men who thus openly endorse the leading principle of the naturalism of the 17th century, and (as we shall see presently,) the rationalism of the 18th and 19th, do not hesitate to do the very same thing in other respects; and to ignore the clearest deductions of their reason and philosophy, whenever they come into collision with each other, and with common sense. In mathematics, for instance, we have axioms running directly athwart definitions and demonstrations; and the same is true in philosophy; and has been owned to be true ever since the time of Aristotle. And, to instance no others, the arguments against the very existence of a material world, and against the existence of motion and extension, continue to be wholly unanswerable on the acknowledged principles of reason and philosophy; — and yet these men believe in a material world, and in motion and extension, despite their reasoning and deductions. In such matters they receive the testimony of common sense, and reject the deductions of their reason and philosophy; and dream not that it is "hoodwinking" their rational powers to do so. And yet the same men will claim that it is hoodwinking their faculties and ignoring their reason to rely upon what they concede to be the unerring utterances of an infinitely wise God, when such utterances come into conflict with their deductions from the same reason and philosophy! If their

Digitized by Google

shallow inferences from geological assumptions, or from their dull and one-sided notions of human rights and freedom, square not with the divine testimony, then they openly announce that "man is not bound to receive the word of God as a Divine revelation." And this is called *believing the Divine testimony!* And in this way the baldest and most unblushing infidelity has crept into the very sanctuary of God.

The real domain of reason and philosophy, and their relation to revealed theology, cannot better be delineated than in the following words of the prince of philosophers, Lord Bacon. Every word deserves to be seriously pondered in this connection. "Divine philosophy," says he, "is that knowledge, or rudiment of knowledge, concerning God, which may be obtained by the contemplation of his creatures; which knowledge may be termed truly divine, in respect of the object, and natural in respect of the light. The *bounds of this knowledge* are that it sufficeth to convince atheism, but not to inform religion; and, therefore, there was never a miracle wrought by God to convert an atheist, because the light of nature might have led him to confess a God." "But on the other side, out of the contemplation of nature or ground of human knowledge, to induce any verity or persuasion concerning the points of faith, is, in my judgment, not safe. *Da fidei, quæ fidei sunt.* For the heathen themselves conclude as much in that excellent and divine fable of the golden chain: 'That men and gods were not able to draw Jupiter down to the earth; but contrariwise, Jupiter was able to draw them up to heaven.' So AS WE OUGHT NOT TO ATTEMPT TO DRAW DOWN OR SUBMIT THE MYSTERIES OF GOD TO OUR REASON; BUT CONTRARIWISE TO RAISE AND ADVANCE OUR REASON TO THE DIVINE TRUTH. So as in this part of knowledge, touching divine philosophy, I am so far from noting any deficience, as I rather note an excess; whereunto I have digressed, *because of the extreme prejudice which both religion and philosophy hath received, and may receive, by being commixed together; as that which undoubtedly will make an heretical religion, and an imaginary and fabulous philosophy.*" * Again in the same book he remarks that "*the prerogative of God extendeth as well to*

* *Advancement of Learning.* Book II. Works, vol. i. p. 34. London, 1838.

Digitized by Google

the reason as to the will of man; so that as we are to obey his law, though we find a reluctation in our will; so we are to believe his word, though we find a reluctation in our reason. For if we believe only that which is agreeable to our sense, we give consent to the matter, and not to the author, which is no more than we would do towards a suspected and discredited witness: but that faith which was 'accounted to Abraham for righteousness,' was of such a point, as whereat Sarah laughed, who therein was an image of natural reason."

Such, then, is the domain of true or divine philosophy; and in its relation to revealed theology, it has been illustrated by Bishop Butler with wonderful depth and precision. This philosophy admits the statements of revelation as facts, and seeks to illustrate their truth by reference to the operations of God in nature and providence. And it is a spurious and pretended philosophy; a mere strumpet, arrayed and bedecked with robes and gems stolen from the heavenly visitant; that while it professes to receive and accredit the testimony of God, questions its veracity at the besotted tribunal of an ignorant and perverted reason; pretending to find antagonisms to those truths in nature, and at the same time to admit them to be from God. To call such a procedure *philosophy*, and *philosophising*, is a perversion of language; and it can be pursued intelligently by no one who does not in fact, or *in thesi*, deny that the Scriptures are from God.

In order that the exact point may be fully and practically before us we shall proceed to illustrate the subject by a reference to fact. The experiment of commingling philosophy with revealed theology, so emphatically condemned in the foregoing language of Bacon, has been fully attempted in former times, and in other nations, and with some little show of reason, before the subject was fully understood; and before its practical bearings had developed the fatal results which cannot but accrue from such a procedure. But for professed adherents to the Gospel of Christ, to attempt it now, with those results fully and unequivocally before them, may justly be regarded as leaving them without excuse, save on the ground either of an utter want of acquaintance with the subject of their lucubrations; or on that of an actual intention to undermine the foundations of religion itself. Facts evince that

Digitized by Google

no other alternative remains to them, or is even possible in the case. To attempt to justify such a procedure now, on the ground that true progress in enquiry calls for it, is only trifling with the subject; and is no more reasonable than it would be for the Socinian to claim that the progress of inquiry demanded a reiteration of the exploded cavils of Socinus; or the infidel to claim the like in respect to the exploded follies of Hume and Voltaire and Paine.

Early in the 17th century, and soon after the publication of the *De veritate Christ. Religionis* of Hugo Grotius, skeptics began to realize the hopelessness of their attempt to call into question the truth of the historical records of the Word of God. And they subsequently varied their ground, and assumed the position that as the God of nature and providence is the true God, no revelation purporting to come from him could be antagonistic to, or inconsistent with, the knowledge of him which is obtained from his works. Lord Herbert in his *De Veritate*, and subsequently Woolston in his *Discourse on Miracles*, and Tindal, in his *Christianity as Old as the Creation*, argued this point with much learning; taking their own deductions from the works of nature as the true exponent of the character of God and of his claims upon man; and insisted that on this ground the claims of the Scriptures as a revelation from God should be tried and decided. The argument was elaborate, and in a measure new; and until its results were fairly and practically developed, not a few of the theologians and other friends of the Gospel, were short-sighted enough to assent to its reasonableness; of which we shall cite a few instances presently. They all (i. e. Herbert, Hobbes, Blount, Shaftsbury, Collins, Woolston, Tindal, Morgan, &c.,) professed to regard the Scriptures with great reverence; and some of them even asserting that they are the voice of God, and may have been given by immediate inspiration; and yet asserted that they were without authority, save so far as their utterances were sustained by the voice of nature;—which voice, according to Lord Herbert, taught that the indulgence of lust and anger were no more to be blamed than the thirst occasioned by dropsy; and according to Hobbes, taught that the civil law is the only foundation of right and wrong; and according to Bolingbroke, that ambition, sensuality, and avarice, may be

Digitized by Google

lawfully gratified if they can be safely gratified. And so of the whole series: for it is needless to particularize any further.

Now, as was remarked above, instead of denying the truth of this principle at the outset, and demanding that the Scriptures should be tried by the evidences which they proffered of their divine origin; the foregoing principle was admitted and even inculcated by many prominent Christians. Tillotson, for example, in the first of his Sermons on the education of Children * scruples not to say that the duty of the mother to nurse her child, "is a natural duty, *and because it is so, of a more necessary and indispensable obligation than any positive precept of revealed religion.*" And in his sermon on Rom. i: 18, 19, that "The *natural knowledge* which men have of God, when all is done, is the surest and fastest hold that religion hath on human nature." And in his sermon on Joshua i: 13, 14, that "Every man ought to govern himself in the interpetation of Scripture *by those natural notions which men have of God and his perfections*: for when all is done, this is one of the surest ways of reasoning in religion." Spencer (Dean of Ely, obiit 1693,) in his celebrated work, *De Legibus Heb. Ritualibus*, elaborated this conception in the fullest and most decided manner; and it was supported too by Locke, Clarke, Hoadley, and many others.

Thus emboldened, the skeptics renewed their assault with great vigor and high confidence; and claimed as a true and undoubted principle of philosophy, that the truths of Christianity should be tried and settled upon the basis of the utterances of reason, and the light of nature; and to sustain them herein quote and applaud the incautious admissions of her advocates. Tindal, in perfect consistency therewith, asserts that "The truth of all revelation is to be judged by its agreement with the religion of nature."† "The Gospel, since it is impossible for men at the same time to be under different obligations, cannot command those things which the law of nature forbids, or forbid what it commands." Such were their sentiments; and their next and obvious step was to divest the Bible of its miraculous and supernatural aspect altogether. Let one instance out of a thousand suffice, as it is a fair illustration of

* On Proverbs xxii: 6, Works vol. i, p. 606.

† See Christianity as Old as the Creation, chapters 4, 11, and 14.

Digitized by Google

the mode of the whole procedure. Toland, in the preface to his Dissertation on this subject, says: "My design in this publication is to make Moses better understood, and consequently more easily believed; which is as well to defend him against those who unreasonably believe him not at all, as also against those, who by their absurd belief render him incredible. The style of the Old Testament is extremely hyperbolical, even in the books that are written in prose," &c. And in the body of the work itself, he undertakes to prove that Hobab was "the angel of the Lord, who directed the pillar of cloud and fire," by carrying a smoking stick in advance of the army. "He was Jehovah the King of Israel's ambassador or messenger, to guide his subjects through the wilderness." Such were then the unavoidable results of attempting to judge of the truths of revelation on the basis of reason and philosophy; and surely the example might, with reason, have been regarded as sufficient to deter any serious and sober mind from a similar attempt: but it was not all that has been furnished for our admonition. A still more melancholy one, if possible, looms up before the mental vision; and the world has seen Germany transformed into a nation of infidels, from the adoption and assertion of the same principles. May the melancholy beacon serve as a warning to the Church of God, in our own land. *

In the earlier half of the last century, philosophy had asserted in Germany, that nothing in revelation could possibly be inconsistent with her deductions: and as many things in the Bible were found to be decidedly incompatible therewith, the principle of accommodation was subsequently resorted to, in order to bring the

* The results of the adoption of the same principle and modes of reasoning in France, Italy, and Switzerland, are thus succinctly and forcibly described by Dr. d'Aubigné: "I dread this subjective tendency in our times. I dread it, convinced that it cannot fail to have the same developments, and the same consequences, that it had in the sixteenth century. Châtillon simply taught the doctrine which substitutes the authority of the individual spirit, for the authority of Divine Scripture. But every seed bears its fruit. This doctrine, soon after professed by Servetus and Socinus, first overthrew all the doctrines of faith; then, interpreted by Coppin, Pocquet, Gruet, and the libertines, overthrows all the precepts of morality. It thus brought forward great heresies, and frightful irregularities. *The progression is terrible, but inevitable.* The foundation of Christian dogma and Christian morality, is involved in these opinions."—*Authority of God*, pp. 189, 190, cited by Pearson on Infidelity, p. 226.

Digitized by Google

two into harmony. But without attempting to enter into detail, it will be sufficient here to remark that Bretschneider and other Rationalists, frankly admit that the above named English skeptics were their real predecessors in the work of discarding the supernatural from revelation. The position adopted by rationalism, is thus defined by Röhr, perhaps the ablest of all its champions. Let the reader contemplate it; and compare it with the language above quoted from Tindal; and also with that which we shall presently cite from some reputedly evangelical divines in our own land; and their complete identity of sentiment will be at once apparent. Röhr says: "Christian Rationalism denies not the fact of an extraordinary revelation from God in the Holy Scriptures. It does not, in respect to finding and pursuing the way to eternal life, refer man to his own reason, as to the source of the highest ideas and truths; *but only claims for him the right, and imposes on him the duty of sifting and proving that which the Christian revelation makes known on the subject, by comparison with the religious ideas and principles of human reason; in order that in the concerns of his eternal salvation, he may show himself to be neither blind nor credulous.*" A man, therefore, according to this notion, may be both blind and credulous in believing what the infinitely wise God asserts to be true! Again he says: "With the rationalist it is reason alone which decides in matters of faith, and in the adoption of religious doctrines. He admits the authority of the Scriptures *only when they coincide with his own convictions, for these he regards as true on their own grounds of reason.*"

It certainly can require but few words to show the utter and hopeless absurdity of any attempt to reconcile such notions with any serious or intelligent reception of a revelation from God; for assuredly they constitute that a teacher and a judge, which God, by the very act of bestowing a revelation, designs should occupy the position of an humble learner and disciple. But while the foregoing is before the mind of the reader, we ask him to compare these utterances of rationalism, and this clear and accurate delineation of what constitutes the rationalizing theologue, with the following distinct and unambiguous utterances of some in our own country who would, in defiance of all propriety and consistency, still claim to be regarded as teachers of evangelical religion. The

Digitized by Google

first is from Dr. Edward Beecher; who, in his "Conflict of Ages," p. 29, uses the following language: "If any alleged actions of God come into collision with the natural and intuitive judgments of the human mind concerning what is honorable and right, on the points specified," (i. e. those which relate to human probation,) "there is better reason to call in question the alleged facts, than to suppose those principles false, which God has made the human mind intuitively to recognize as true." And on, p. 27. "To test any alleged acts of God by such principles, is not improper rationalizing. God not only authorizes, but even enjoins it as a sacred duty." It is of little consequence, therefore, how strongly God may allege that he performed the action in question; we are not bound to believe him, according to this notion, if we are unable to reconcile the action itself with what we conceive to be the principles of honor or right. It would be pleasant to hear the men who assert these things, explain the grounds on which they reconcile with their principles of "honor and right," or with "the intuitional consciousness," the slaughter of the children of the Canaanites by Joshua; and that of "the little ones" of the Midianites, together with the reduction of their young women to hopeless slavery; and also the utter destruction of the Amalekites for a crime perpetrated by their ancestors four hundred years before. We doubt, however, whether Dr. Beecher would condescend to attempt any explanation; for on p. 35, he expressly avers that "The principles of honor and right demand of God not so to charge the wrong conduct of one being to others, as to punish one person for the conduct of another, to which he did not consent, and in which he had no part." Of course, then, the foregoing facts, and the thousand others of similar character which the Bible ascribes to God, it falsely ascribes to him. And, therefore, the Scriptures assert what is utterly false; and neither ought to be nor can be regarded as the Word of God. Is there any way to avoid this plain and obvious inference? If not, then is there any way consistent with honor and right, and moral integrity, in which an individual who takes this ground can yet claim to be a minister of Christ, a preacher of his Gospel, and a member of his church? Do not the principles of the Gospel, and of honor and right, and moral honesty, demand that the Church of Christ should cease to hold fellow-

Digitized by Google

ship with such; and to regard them as enemies of the cross of Christ? Dr. Beecher, in the assertion of this principle, takes common ground with the infidel Paine, who adopted, and made it the basis for impugning the Divine origin of the Bible narrative, on the ground of its assertion of the facts above referred to. But let us advert to another instance.

A living commentator on the Bible, whose works before they were justly appreciated, found considerable favor with the Christian public; and in which is found under various forms the like insidious principles of infidelity; in a recent essay employs the ideas and almost the very language of Tindal and Paine on the same subject. We refer to the Rev. A. Barnes of Philadelphia; who, speaking of the institution of slavery, asserts the very principles on which the aforenamed infidels have sought to impugn the Divine origin of the Scriptures. He says: "There are great principles in our nature, as God has made us, *which can never be set aside by any authority of a professed revelation.* If a book claiming to be a revelation from God, by any fair interpretation defended slavery, or placed it on the same basis as the relation of husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, *such a book would not and could not be received by the mass of mankind as a Divine revelation.*" Thus, on this subject also, Revelation is to be not only made subservient to reason, but its claim to a Divine origin must be tested and decided thereby. The principle here asserted is precisely that of Messrs. W. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, J. L. Giddings, Gerritt Smith, H. C. Wright, (formerly also a clergyman), and others; who, finding that the institution of slavery was recognized by the Bible, have consistently discarded it as a revelation from God.

It is unnecessary to lengthen out these illustrative details. The intelligent reader will remember that on precisely the same principle the doctrine of future punishment is got rid of by the Universalist. In fact, Bayle himself uses the following language on the subject: "*So long as a man shall adhere to his natural reason,* and not humbly submit to some passages in the Gospel, *he will look with abhorrence* upon that doctrine of the infinite torments of the whole human race except a few only.* On the same prin-

* Critical and Hist. Dict., Vol. V., p. 175.

Digitized by Google

ciple, they have likewise rejected the doctrine respecting demoniacs and demons; while the Unitarians and Swedenborgians adopting it, have on the same basis discarded the doctrine of the Trinity, and the vicarious satisfaction of Christ. Let these instances suffice, for they are all-sufficient for illustration.

Such, then, are some of the results of attempting to obtrude a perverted human reason and philosophy into the sacred enclosure of revelation; and to constitute that a judge, which God has announced to be merely a learner. Reason and philosophy have their appropriate province, and that province is fully recognized and defined by revelation itself. It is acknowledged as a fundamental principle in all true philosophy that things may be incomprehensible and yet demonstrable. And the simple recognition of this rule will obviate the alleged difficulties aforesaid, and teach reason her true limits and proper position. It is true the Bible nowhere claims to be a system of natural science; of astronomy, geology, physiology, natural philosophy, and the like: but while it does claim to reveal all the fundamental truths which pertain to human redemption, as before remarked, it likewise claims that all its references to the subjects treated in natural science, are in strict accordance with truth. And it claims, moreover, that its utterances are to be received as true, even where they appear to be in conflict with the deductions of our reason, and with the so-called intuitional principles, or principles of honor and right, entertained by fallen and selfish creatures. Nor can any real force be allowed to the objection so persistently pleaded by the assertors of rationalism, that this would stultify reason itself in its relation to the inquiry, whether God has, or has not, imparted a revelation to man. For while the announcements of the Gospel commend themselves to every man's *conscience* in the sight of God, the evidence whether God has actually spoken, does not depend upon our being able to perceive that *what* he speaks is true on the grounds of our deductions from reason, or on the principles of honor and right, or on any thing of the kind; but is a mere question whether such testimony has been given and verified by God, as has been a thousand times shown. The question as to the truth of the allegations given in testimony is altogether different from the question whether the witness has given those allegations in testimony;

Digitized by Google

and yet this distinction, so plain and obvious, is perpetually confounded in all the discussions of the subject which we have had from rationalizing divines.

In every attempt which human philosophy has made to intermeddle with the theology of revelation, she has wrought only confusion and disaster, not to religion alone, but to herself. From the time of Abelard to the present, she has, for example, claimed the right to arrange the system of theology; and what strange work she has made of it, any one may see, who will cast a glance over but a portion of her innumerable systems. The plain and obvious method of inculcation, suggested alike by the Holy Spirit, and by true science, (which has adopted it in all her other departments,) was too plain and simple. To *begin* with man, seemed to be a reversing of the idea; though every thing in true theology has either a direct or indirect reference to man. And when a truly scriptural and scientific presentation of the whole is given, this vaunted philosophy, in exhibition of her utter unfitness and incapacity to meddle at all with the subject, undertakes to scoff and to sneer and ridicule; and to push forth her own claims in antagonism; and then, upon receiving a fair and frank and scholarly overture to join issue on the question of the validity of her pretensions, retires in silence from the field.

The true connection sustained by reason to revelation, can scarcely, in the present age, be misapprehended intelligently by the serious and devout mind. It is her undoubted right and duty to consider and determine upon the claims of that which purports to be a revelation from heaven: to examine rigidly and thoroughly, and then decide upon the evidence which it proffers of a Divine original; and, moreover, to settle and establish the true principles upon which the language employed in that revelation is to be interpreted. She may also compare the utterances of God in his word, with his utterances in his works, so far as these latter can be truly ascertained: (See Psalms viii and xix, and Rom. i: 20;) but having done all this, and having upon satisfactory grounds ascertained that the alleged utterance of God is indeed a revelation from himself to man; what is the next and appropriate duty of reason in the premises? Is it to sit in judgment upon the truth of the facts, to the verity of which God has

Digitized by Google

confessedly testified? and so to intimate that even though God has spoken, he may after all have spoken that which is incorrect and false? Will any serious mind undertake to aver this is the province of right reason. And if not, why do we find it so perpetually attempted by men who profess to receive the Sacred Scriptures as a revelation from God? To claim that reason justifies or requires such a procedure, is an outrage upon all the rational and moral powers of mankind, not less than an outrage against the infinitely wise and eternal God. No, the true and highest exercise of our rational powers would demand in such a case, that we deferentially and humbly receive the declarations of the infinitely wise and holy God as unerringly true; and regard as utterly false every thing which arrays itself against them. "Let the fair grammatical import of Scripture language be investigated; and whatever propositions are, by an easy and natural interpretation, deducible from thence, let them be received as the dictates of Infinite Wisdom, whatever aspect they may bear, or whatever difficulties they present."* "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

Upon the whole then it is obvious that every man who now assumes the opposite ground should honestly concede that he does not truly receive the Scriptures as the testimony of God. For since he positively refuses to receive their statements on a given subject, as consistent with truth and justice, he is brought to the alternative of either denying them to be the Word of God, or of asserting that God has testified to the truth of that which is irreconcilable with truth, and therefore false. And if those who are willing to assume logically such a position without either a disclaimer or an explanation, can be properly regarded as representatives of the Christian Church in this age and country, then, indeed, has the hitherto acknowledged division between skepticism and Christianity ceased to exist, and rationalism may be regarded as already having possession of the Church of Christ.

All attempts to rest upon a philosophical basis, the truth which God has revealed, should be regarded as unauthorised and unsafe: since that truth does not result from any perceptible relations in our ideas, but from the wisdom and authority of God himself. And it is to be regretted that too much countenance is still af-

* Robert Hall. Works, Vol. II, p. 309.

Digitized by Google

forded by men of undoubted intelligence and piety, to the tendency of the unsubdued and unregenerate heart to pry into the unknown and unsearchable: and it is one of the most remarkable of all developments in theological literature, that while all this is seen and acknowledged; and the importance of regarding the distinction between philosophy and theology is freely conceded and insisted on in relation to some of the utterances of revelation; it seems to be with difficulty apprehended in relation to others. For instance: When Philosophy enters the province of Revelation and ventures to pronounce dogmatically upon the truth of the trinity in God; or on the incarnation; or satisfaction of Christ; or the resurrection of the body; we feel that she is out of her province, and scruple not to tell her so; but on other points, where the principle equally applies, we hesitate to speak with decision. And the theological world is at present edified by the remarkable spectacle of several brethren of learning and ability exhibiting their skill in dialectics, metaphysics, and philosophy, and each in antagonism to the others; in the vain effort to subject the great cardinal doctrine of Imputation to philosophical analysis. The entire truth of the doctrine is of course admitted in all its fulness: but this does not satisfy these brethren; they must ascertain *how* and *why* it may be regarded as true. So, at it they go; the utterances of philosophy and logic are brought forward with great assurance; and yet all are at variance with each other.

Now we have no disposition to add to the number of these combatants, by entering the lists with either or with all of them, but we must be permitted to say that we can see no sufficient reason for making the doctrine of imputation an exception to the other doctrines of revealed religion, on the score of any peculiar adaptedness, to be the subject of philosophical analysis; and we should have been better entertained with the discussion itself if either one or all of the three brethren engaged in it had, at the outset, favored the world with a discriminating characterization of those features thereof which render it exceptional. Why bring in our philosophy to explain the *how*, to understand the *why*, and to exhibit the *modus*, in relation to this doctrine, rather than in that of the hypostatical union? or any other of the great announcements

Digitized by Google

of the Word of God? This should be explained, and the principles on which it is justified brought forward, before the thing is seriously attempted. And until it is done we must protest against every such procedure. It embroils the Church in a useless controversy; which, while it tends to waste and exhaust her energies, suggests no plausible or even probable ground on which the dispute can be adjusted; and not the slightest prospect of ever arriving at even a proximate knowledge of the *why*, *wherefore*, &c. Nor is this all: for if the *why* and the *modus* could be even elicited in the clangor of arms, and amidst the shoutings of the captains; and could we really ascertain all that these divergent and hostile philosophies endeavor to elicit; it would be of no practical benefit or available use. A moment's reflection will evince this to any reader who has intelligently observed the controversy. God has told us on the subject all that can be of real and practical benefit to man; and let us be content to leave the matter where he has left it; (Deut. xxix: 29:) and while we reverentially seek to learn what he has said, endeavor to be satisfied with it, and to put it to the best practical use.

If the analysis of thought and of the subject of thought (or the mental powers,) be, as they are, the foundation of all true philosophy, (which is fully conceded by Descartes, Locke, Kant — inconsistent as he was hereon — Reid, Sir Wm. Hamilton, Cousin, and others of the best and ablest of her pupils;) then the true province of philosophy is as plain and apparent, as that of revealed theology itself: and no man professing an intelligent acquaintance with the subject can be held excusable for now disregarding those boundaries. Man may be competent to analyse his own thoughts and intellectual powers; but God alone is competent to the analysis of his. Of the true nature and character of God; of the principles which regulate the administration of his providence; and of the whole scheme of saving mercy through the mediator; as well as of the future stages and conditions of our being; we neither have nor can have any knowledge whatever, and know absolutely nothing, except that which God has communicated in his Word. The thoughts, therefore, which we have received on those subjects are not our thoughts, but the thoughts of God; and they are as far above the thoughts of fallen man in rela-

Digitized by Google

tion to such matters, as the heavens are above the earth. This is obvious; and is conceded by all who receive the Scriptures as a revelation from God. And such being the fact, on what principle of reason, or of common sense, can human philosophy pretend to claim that she is competent to the analysis of the thoughts which dwell in the bosom of the Infinite and Eternal God? and which pertain to his eternal purposes and plans: and only a few glimmerings of which have been communicated to us, incidently, as it were, in the revelation which he has made to direct us in the way of life and light and salvation? That we can truly and adequately criticise that only which we know as a whole, is an obvious maxim of common sense. And on what pretense therefore can reason or philosophy presume to say that any portion of those Divinely communicated thoughts is inconsistent with the nature, purposes, or character of God; or that any action attributed to him in his Word, is contrary to his character? So far from sanctioning any such procedure, true Philosophy disowns and scorns it; and rejects as a spurious brood — the merest pretenders to her fellowship — all who presume to plead her sanction of the preposterous procedure.

The Apostle has pointed out the limits of human knowledge; and this certainly ought to be satisfactory to all who receive the Divine testimony. God only hath immortality, *dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto. For we know in part, and we prophecy in part.* But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. *For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known.* "When Philosophy succeeds in exhibiting in a clear and consistent form the Infinite Being of God; when her opposing schools are agreed among themselves as to the manner in which a knowledge of the Infinite takes place, or the marks by which it is to be discerned when known; then, and not till then, may she speak as one having authority in controversies of faith. But while she speaks with stammering lips and a double tongue; while she gropes her way in darkness, and stumbles at every step; while she has nothing to offer us but the alternatives of principles which abjure consciousness, or a consciousness which contradicts itself; we may well pause before

Digitized by Google

we appeal to her decisions as the gauge and measure of religious truth." * She is useful only as proving her own utter uselessness. L.

Art. III. — *The Mystery of Iniquity.*

1. *Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini:* Lipsiæ, 1854.
2. *Catechismus Concilii Tridentini:* Lipsiæ, 1854.
3. *Catholic Christian Instructed:* Challoner, Baltimore, 1852.
4. *Bulla in Cœna Domini:* Baltimore Magazine, June, 1836.

No duty is more urgent upon the Church of the Living God than to contend earnestly for the faith delivered to the saints.

The questions at issue between the Church of Christ and the Papal Hierarchy are of long standing, and momentous import to every human being. In the controversy between Rome and us there can be no compromise, no peace; one or the other must be annihilated. If Papists hold and teach a system of truth, then we hold and teach a system of falsehood; if Rome be a true Church of Jesus Christ, then we are the Synagogue of Satan — on the other hand, if we hold and teach the truth, then Rome holds and teaches lies; if we are the true Church of Jesus, then Rome is the Synagogue of Satan. The statements herein made may be relied upon as correct; they have all been verified by a careful comparison with standard Papal authorities; and whoever will take the trouble to examine the citations here made, will find them accurate. The differences between Rome and us are too great to allow for one moment, the idea that both systems are from God: one or the other is from Satan. These differences are fundamental and may be thus stated, viz:

(*a*) As to God: — Rome teaches that God is a spirit to whom worship must be offered; that he may be truly worshipped by means of images and pictures; that divine worship is also due to

* Mansell, Limits of Religious Thought, p. 88.

Digitized by Google

the Virgin Mary, the True Cross, and the Consecrated Bread; that angels and saints are to be invoked, that religious adoration is to be paid to them, along with images, pictures and relics. We hold that the only Being to whom worship may be rendered is the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that worship offered Him must be spiritual, not sensuous; nor by means of images or pictures; that all worship of Him by means of images or pictures, and adoration of other beings than God is idolatry. Concerning, then, the object of all religious worship the questions at issue are fundamental: if the Second Commandment, as we hold and believe it, be true, then Rome is guilty of idolatry, the most horrible of sins.

(*b*) As to the Word of God: — Rome teaches that the Word of God is not a perfect rule of faith or practice; that the traditions of the Church are of Divine authority; that the canons and decrees of the Councils, and the writings of the Fathers are to be received along with the Word of God; that no one shall believe the Scriptures in any other sense than that held by the Church in her Creeds, Canons, Bulls, and Fatherly writings; and to make sure work, forbids any one to read the Scriptures without a license from the Priest. On the other hand, we hold that the Word of God only is of Divine authority; that it is a perfect rule of faith and practice; that every man is bound to interpret it for himself, and that all not only have the right, but it is their duty to search the Scriptures.

(*c*) As to the Head of the Church: — Rome teaches that the Pope is the visible Head of the Church, is the Vicar of Christ, and as such must be venerated; that all Christians and churches are bound to recognise him as their visible Head and Lord. We hold that the only Head of the Church, visible or invisible, is the Lord Jesus Christ; that he only is to be recognized and venerated as such; and that the only Vicar of the Church is the Holy Ghost, the third person of the blessed Trinity.

(*d*) As to Sin: — Rome teaches that some sins are venial, others mortal; that disobedience to the Church is more horrible than disobedience to God; that sins must be confessed to the Priest, and that he may absolve the penitent; that the Church may grant indulgences, releasing the punishment of sins. We hold that sin

Digitized by Google

is the transgression of the Law; that all sins are mortal; that sins must be confessed to God only, who only can absolve the penitent; that none but God can remove the punishment due to sins.

(*e*) As to the State of the Dead: — Rome teaches that beyond the grave there are three estates, Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory; that souls may be released from the pains of purgatory by the suffrages of the faithful. We hold that there are but two states, Heaven and Hell; that the souls of believers are with Jesus in Paradise as soon as separated from the body; that the souls of the wicked go, at once, to their own place; and that between these two estates, there is a great gulf fixed, which cannot be passed.

These differences, commencing with the object and mode of worship, terminating with the condition of the soul after death, are selected merely as specimens. They are fundamental, and cover a large portion of the field of religious controversy between Rome and us. It will be seen at once that both of these systems cannot be from God: one or the other must be destroyed.

Let us now pass in review, one by one, some of the most noteworthy features connected with this Mystery of Iniquity, proving each charge as made, from standard authorities.

1. *Rome in Prophecy.* — It was given to Daniel and John to see further into the future than to other men: and in the second and seventh chapters of Daniel, under the figure of an image, and the figure of four beasts, we have portrayed before us the rise and downfall of the four great Universal Empires, the Assyrian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian and Roman. God himself gives the interpretation: These great beasts which are four, are four kings that shall arise out of the earth. [Dan. vii: 17.] And in the second chapter, Nebuchadnezzar is expressly told that he was the head of gold, the first king that should arise. Commentators, both Papal and Christian, have universally accepted this interpretation. The only one that now concerns us, is the fourth Beast, the Roman Empire. Daniel saw that this one was *diverse* from the other Beasts, and that it had ten horns; and the interpretation of these ten horns is given us — the ten horns of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise. [Dan. vii: 24.] Now every reader of Roman history knows that out of the old Roman Empire, after it was

Digitized by Google

dismembered, there arose ten kingdoms, having ten kings: these ten kingdoms as given by every historian of this period, are the Anglo-Saxons, the Franks of Central France, the Ullman Franks of Eastern France, the Franks of Southern France, the Visigoths, the Suevi, the Bavarians, the Vandals, the Ostragoths, and the Lombards: the last three will occupy our attention again. If we turn now to the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, more light will be given us. "I saw," says John, "a Beast having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns." Now turn to the seventeenth chapter, and the interpretation is given: The seven heads are seven mountains. Now, every child knows that Rome is situated on seven hills or mountains, and is called the "Seven Hilled City." And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings. [Rev. vii: 12.] This much then is clear, the fourth Beast of Daniel is the Roman Empire; the ten horns are the ten kingdoms into which it was divided; the seven heads are the seven hills on which Rome is situated; the ten crowns are the ten kings who ruled over the ten kingdoms. While Daniel was considering these ten horns, behold there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up; and behold! in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things. [Dan. vii: 8.] What is the meaning of this little horn, and what interpretation does God himself give us? The ten horns are ten kings that shall arise, and another shall rise after them, and he shall subdue three kings. [Dan. vii: 24.] After the disruption of the Roman Empire, what other kingdom arose, *diverse* from the ten kingdoms into which Rome was divided, before which three of the first kingdoms were plucked up? Was it not the Papacy? the little horn with the eyes of a man, and speaking great words? There was no other kingdom so utterly *diverse* from the first ten kingdoms, as to have attracted the attention of Daniel, than the kingdom of the Papacy: that was *diverse*, and it came up *after* the ten kingdoms; and three of the first kingdoms were rooted out by this diverse kingdom. The three kingdoms plucked up by the little horn of the Papacy, were the Lombards, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths. Let the appeal be made to Gibbon, the enemy of our religion, in proof of the true interpretation of these prophecies. Does history

Digitized by Google

show any thing answerable to these statements? "At the entreaties of Stephen, the Roman Pontiff, Pepin crossed the Alps at the head of a French army. The Lombards, after a weak resistance, obtained an ignominious peace, swore to restore the possessions and respect the rights of the Roman Church."* "The final battle which decided the fate of the Vandal Monarchy, was fought about twenty miles from Carthage. The Vandals were totally defeated. As soon as Justinian had received the messengers of victory, he proceeded without delay to the full establishment of the Catholic Church. Her jurisdiction, wealth and immunities, were restored and amplified with a liberal hand."† "The Goths were again defeated; Teias their last king slain: the remains of the Gothic nations evacuated the country, or mingled with the people. The civil state of Italy was fixed by a pragmatic sanction, which the emperor promulgated at the request of the *Pope*."‡ Can any one doubt that the little horn was the Papacy; that the three kingdoms plucked up by it were the Lombards, Vandals, and Goths?

John says, I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored Beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. This Beast, as we have seen, is the Roman Empire; the ten horns are the ten kingdoms into which it was divided: now have we any interpretation of the Woman? The Woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth, is the interpretation which God Himself gives us: [Rev. xvii: 18.] What city of all the cities of the earth has ruled over the kings of the earth? Is it not Rome? Can we hesitate to identify the Woman upon the Beast, with the city of Rome? This Woman is a whore. [Rev. xvii: 15.] Now the figure used throughout the Bible to represent the Church is a Woman; the apostasies of the Church are the whoredoms and adulteries of the Woman:‖ The Church of Rome is utterly and hopelessly apostate, and is therefore called the Whore. The true Church is a chaste woman — the apostate Church is a whore — on her forehead is written Mother of Harlots, and abominations of the earth; and to perfect the portrait of Rome, the Woman is arrayed in purple and scarlet — the official

* Student's Gibbon, p. 434. † Idem, p. 312. ‡ Idem, p. 332, 333.
‖ Old Test. passim.

Digitized by Google

colors of Popery — and drunk with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus: [Rev. xvii: 1–6.] The wayfaring man though a fool, need not err in identifying the Whore with the Church of Rome.

Another noteworthy prophecy is in the second epistle to the Thessalonians: For that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God: [2 Thess. ii: 3–10.] Had the apostle lived in our day, and had he written a description of the Pope, he could not have better portrayed his character and claims, than he has in this chapter: for the Temple of God is his visible church; and in that, the Pope exalteth himself, even above God, and is even worshipped. Does he not claim to be the Head of the Church, the Vicar of Christ, ousting the Holy Ghost? Do not his followers bow in adoration before him? Do they not even kiss his toe? Has he not declared that the commands of God had better be violated than his? He has commanded abstinence from meats and marriage; exalted the words of the Pope above the words of God; and in a hundred ways proves, by his arrogance and presumption, his perfect right to the title of the Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition. From these testimonies we are in no doubt as to the character of this body. To call it the Synagogue of Satan, the Mother of Harlots, the Whore of Babylon drunk with blood, the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, is but using the words of the Holy Ghost, to express the nature of this horrible caricature of the religion of Jesus; this Bastard that has thrust himself into the heritage of the Lord; this mingled combination of God-defying blasphemy and bloodthirsty ferocity; this sworn hater of all truth, freedom and righteousness; this enemy of God and man, triple crowned and triple cursed, whose end is everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, when he shall be revealed from heaven, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on his enemies.

2. *The Structure of Popery.* — When we compare the form or structure of Popery with the form given by God to His Church, we find scarcely the appearance of a resemblance. In the original structure of the Christian Church, it was entirely separated from

Digitized by Google

the State. Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's: there was no connection between the spiritual kingdom of Christ and the temporal kingdom of Cæsar. The Church had entrusted to her, the keys of a spiritual kingdom; the State had given her the sword of civil power and authority. When we turn to the Church of Rome, we behold the successor of Peter with the keys of the kingdom of Heaven on his girdle; with the sword of Cæsar in his hand, claiming not only spiritual but civil power. When we look for the cöequal Presbyters of the ancient Church we find them not; but in their stead an ascending grade of civil and spiritual officers, from the parish Priest, up through Confessor, Bishop, Archbishop, Cardinal, Primate, and all terminating in one supreme Pontiff to whom all lower officers swear "*veram obedientiam*," and who claims to be the visible Head of the Church, the successor of Peter, the Vicar of Christ. So far as the people are concerned, they have no voice, no power whatever in the Church of Rome: Priests, Confessors, Bishops, and Prelates, are placed over them without their vote or consent. Every one who will be esteemed a good Catholic, must go to the confessional at least once every month, and there tell the Father Confessor every sin, of thought, word, and deed, upon pain of perdition: and unless he confesses once a year, he shall be excommunicated from the Church, anathematized, and handed over to the fires of purgatory. The combinations of power in the Papal Hierarchy are absolutely terrible; and woe unto the man who falls into the condemnation of the Church; they will shut the gates of Heaven upon him; send him to Purgatory; where they have temporal power, will confiscate his property to the Church, and send him to the dungeon or rack. Every person who joins the Church of Rome, and every spiritual officer in it, is compelled to swear that he will yield a true obedience to the Pope. The following is the form of the oath: it is taken from the Bull of Pius IV, and is found in the canons of the Council of Trent. *Romanoque Pontifici, beati Petri Apostolorum principis successori ac Jesu Christi vicaris, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro.* * (To the Roman Pontiff, the successor of the blessed Peter, the chief

* Can. Trent. Bulla super forma Juramenti, p. 228.

Digitized by Google

of the Apostles, and the vicar of Jesus Christ, I promise and *swear* a true obedience.) And thus every officer of the Romish Church is bound, body and soul, to the Pope by the most solemn oath.

The fearful powers combined in this Papal Hierarchy have been fully seen. The case of the Jewish child Mortara still lingers in the memory of men; the wails of the Madiai family, imprisoned for reading the Word of God, still ring in our ears; the bones of dead men in the Inquisition of Spain attest this terrible power; the blood of the Netherlanders, shed by Rome, for one hundred years, knows what the power of the Romish Church has been. We need not hesitate to affirm, that the Romish Hierarchy exhibits the most frightful and terrible combination of powers, for crushing down the souls of men, that man or Devil has ever imagined or devised. Not less than two hundred millions of the human race wait upon the nod of the Pope; and at his command, no matter what that command may be, are bound by a solemn oath to render him a true obedience. The Pope of Rome wields a power not inferior to that of any king on earth.

3. *The Idolatry of Popery.* — God wrote with his own finger upon the tables of stone the following command concerning his worship — Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them. No wonder that Rome has expunged these words of the Law, this Second Commandment from her books; and divided the Tenth, in order to make out the requisite number.

We charge the Church of Rome with Idolatry — she worships other Beings than the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; she worships the true God by means of images and pictures; she offers adoration to the Saints, and venerates their relics; while in all of her worship, the name of Mary occurs far oftener than does that of Jesus Christ. We are not making hearsay charges against Rome: her own canons and decrees say: *Similiter et sanctos una cum Christo regnantes venerandos atque invocandos esse, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, atque eorum reliquas esse venerandos. Firmiter assero imagines Christi ac Deiparæ semper Virginis, necnon*

Digitized by Google

aliorum sanctorum habendas et retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam." * Saints are to be venerated and invoked; their relics are to be venerated; images of Christ, of the Virgin, of other Saints, are to be had, kept, honored, and venerated: and every Catholic is commanded to do these things. In vain does God tell us neither to make, bow down to, nor worship, images or pictures; Rome, in the face of this express statute of Jehovah, commands the Faithful to make, hold and bow down to images, and to worship God by means of them. If what Rome holds, teaches and acts, in this particular, is not Idolatry, according to the Law of God, then it is not competent for the human mind to say what is Idolatry. The Pater Noster is the Lord's prayer; the Ave Maria is the Hail Mary, the invocation to the Virgin; now the Catholic always repeats *ten* Ave Marias for *one* Pater Noster; why more invocation of the Virgin than prayer to Almighty God? Is it not because the Church of Rome worships Mary more than God.

But even the invocation of Saints and Angels, the worship of the Virgin, the use of images and pictures in the worship of God, does not constitute the highest form of the Idolatry of Rome. When the Priest has pronounced the words of consecration, the Bread and Wine are changed into the Blood, Body, and Divinity of Jesus Christ; it is then called the Consecrated Host; and offered in sacrifice to God. Now what does Rome herself say concerning this Bread and Wine over which the Priest has mumbled some Latin words? "*Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur quin omnes fideles pro more in Catholica ecclesia semper recepto Latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant.*" † There is no doubt, therefore, that all the Faithful, after the custom always received in the Catholic Church, should exhibit in veneration to this most holy Sacrament, that worship of Latria, which is due to the true God. "*Si quis dixerit in Sancto eucharistæ Sacramento Christum Unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu Latriæ; et eius adoratores esse idolotatras; anathema sit.*" ‡ Thus not only does Rome command all the Faithful, by

* Can. Trent, p. 227.

† Idem, Sess. xiii. C. v. p., 61.

‡ Idem, p. 64.

Digitized by Google

formal and infallible decree, to give the highest worship, the worship of Latria, to the Bread and Wine; but hands over to the fires of hell, and the tender mercies of the Devil, any poor Protestant who shall dare affirm that bowing down before and praying to a piece of bread is Idolatry. Thus by her own showing, by her own infallible decree, we have convicted the Church of Rome of the horrible sin of Idolatry; and this in several particulars, viz.: she worships the true God by means of images and pictures; she invokes and venerates Saints and Angels; she has declared the Virgin sinless, and has placed her in the seat of Christ, calls her "Queen of Heaven and Mother of God," and prays to her as such; and offers to a little bit of Consecrated Bread the highest worship of Latria, due to God only. When we pass through her temples and churches, we are amazed and horrified as we gaze upon the images and pictures of the Eternal Father, of the Incarnate Son, of the Saints and confessors that adorn Her walls: when the Host is elevated, the whole vast throng of worshipers bow in religious adoration before the Wafer. Such horrible Idolatry as this were too gross and revolting for belief, were it not transpiring before our very eyes. The Idolatry of Aaron and Israel when they made the Golden Calf, and worshiped Jehovah under that revolting form, is devout worship when compared with the insane and infernal Idolatry of Rome. The fetich worship of the besotted Africans, the divine worship paid to cows, lizards, reptiles, and serpents, becomes absolutely respectable when compared with the shameless and revolting worship of Roman Idolaters.

4. *The Blasphemy of Popery.* — When we charge the Church of Rome with the fearful sin of Blasphemy, for which there is no forgiveness in this world, neither in that which is to come, we must look to the Word of God for a definition of blasphemy. Jesus claimed that he was the Son of God; the Jews said, Thou blasphemest, *because* that thou, being a *man, makest thyself God:* [John x: 33] — they looked upon Jesus as a man. We define blasphemy, therefore, the usurpation on the part of man of the attributes and prerogatives of God; or his claiming to exercise the powers that belong to God. Now, has Rome ever claimed and usurped the attributes and prerogatives of God? *She has*, and in *three* particulars, viz: (*a*) In granting Indulgences; (*b*) in forgiving

Digitized by Google

sins; (*c*) in adding to and taking from the Word of God. Rome claims and exercises the power of granting Indulgences. In the Bull of Pius IV., issued at the Council of Trent — and we quote from the Bulls of the Popes as often as possible, because they are held to be infallible — the following claim is made: "*Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem a Christo in ecclesia relictam fuisse;*" * the power of granting Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church. "*Quum potestas conferendi Indulgentias a Christo ecclesiæ concessa sit.*" † It only remains to find out from Papal authors what an Indulgence is. Protestants have believed that an Indulgence was a license to commit sin. Tetzel used to sell them, and said his were of such efficacy that who ever had one might "*deflour* the *Mother* of *God with impunity.*" Papists deny the Protestant view. Let us hear an American Papist. He asks "What is meant by a Plenary Indulgence? Ans. That which when obtained *releases* the whole *punishment* that remains *due* upon *account* of *sin.*" ‡ Now Papists may call Bishop Challoner's definition of an Indulgence whatever they choose; but whoever undertakes to release the punishment due on account of sin, has usurped the power and prerogatives of God. If this be not blasphemy according to God's own definition of blasphemy, then we defy any man to say what is blasphemy.

Another form of the Blasphemy of Rome is the doctrine of absolution. "Ques. Is then your doctrine that any man can forgive sin? Ans. We do not believe that any man can forgive sin by his own power; but we believe that God has been pleased to appoint that his ministers should, in virtue of his commission, as his instruments, and by *His power*, absolve repenting sinners." ‖ Of course, Bishop Challoner, no man would forgive sin by his own power; it would not be blasphemy if he did. We have never charged you with forgiving sin by your own power; — you do it "by the power of God" — you have usurped the power of God. This is what we charge upon you, and this is blasphemy. It is this high-handed and daring assumption of Divine Preroga-

* Can. Trent, page 228.

† Can. Trent, Sess. xxv.

‡ Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed. p. 130.

‖ Challoner's Catholic Christian, p. 116.

Digitized by Google

tive, that you claim constantly to exercise, that constitutes the very head and front of your offending and blasphemy. Well did the Jews say, and Jesus indorsed the truth, "Who can forgive sins but God?" The Jews charged him with blasphemy, for doing what Rome has always claimed and exercised the right of doing, viz.: forgiving sin.

The third particular of the blasphemy of Rome is, her additions to the Word of God. The Holy Ghost is the author of the sacred Scriptures; it is his province to reveal little or much, as Divine Wisdom may direct: no man dare add to his revelation, except by usurping his prerogative. Now what treatment has the Word of God received at the hands of Popery? By formal and infallible decree passed at the General Council of Trent, the following books have been added to the Canon of Inspired Scripture, viz: "Tobias, Judith, Sapientia, duo Machabæorum, primus et secundus."* These books have never been received by the Jews as any portion of the Word of God; while the books of Machabees were written *after* the canon of Old Testament Scripture had been closed. Not content with this wholesale blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, Rome has exalted *Unwritten Traditions* to equal authority with the written Scriptures inspired by the Spirit. "*Omnes libros tam veteris quam novi testamenti. . . . . nec non traditiones ipsas tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes . . . . . pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.*" † Traditions, whether pertaining to faith or morals, shall be venerated with the same affection and piety as the books of the Old and New Testament. Thus does Rome exalt the words of man to equal authority with the words of the Holy Ghost; usurp the place of God, and assume the functions of the Eternal Spirit. Cardinal Hossius, who presided at this same Council of Trent, says: "*Multoque maxima pars Evangelii pervenit ad nos traditione; perexigua literis est mandata.*"‡ The greater part of the Gospel reached us by tradition. "*Creditum est ecclesiæ sine omni Scripturarum præsidio.*" ‖ The Canon Law of Rome affirms "That men do with such reverence respect the seat of Rome, that they rather desire to know the in-

* Can. Trent., Sess. IV. Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis.
† Idem, page 15.
‡ Hossius Confes. Fid. Cathol., ch. 92, p. 133 fol. ‖ Idem, chap. 15.

Digitized by Google

stitutions of the Christian religion from the Pope's mouth than from the Holy Scriptures. They inquire what is his pleasure, and according to *it* they order their life and conversation." * And then, lest any man should read and interpret the Word of God for himself, they affirm by solemn decree: "*Nemo Scripturas contra eum sensum quin tenuit et tenet Sancta Mater ecclesiæ, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimen consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam Sacram interpretari audeat.*" † No one shall dare interpret the Scriptures in any other sense than that held by the Church of Rome. And then they prohibit any man from printing or circulating any edition except the old Latin Vulgate — "*Vetus et Vulgata editio*" — and even for this he must get a permit from his priest. ‡ "*Probatique fuerint ab ordinario.*" Thus has Rome silenced the voice of God, and the words of the Holy Ghost in all of her assemblies; taken away all right of private judgment; bound the man over, body, mind and soul, to the Pope's councils and Fathers; exalted the authority of the Church far above the authority of God: and then anathematizes and binds over to hell forever all who will not unite with her in this atrocious blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, by which she has ousted God from His place in his blood-bought Church, and driven the Holy Ghost away from her Assemblies. Thus has the Man of Sin and the Son of Perdition — sitting in the Temple of God, and exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped, placing the authority of the Church above the authority of God, boasting then of his brazen blasphemy, and binding over to hell all who will not blaspheme with him — shown that He and his Church are of the number of those who receive not the truth in the love of it; upon whom God hath sent strong delusions, that blinded by their own blasphemous folly, they should believe a lie rather than the truth; that thus they might and ought to be damned, because they took pleasure in blasphemy and unrighteousness rather than in the truth.

5. *The Cannibalism of Popery.* — Let us pass still deeper into this sink of superstition, idolatry and blasphemy. Of all the

* Corpus Juris Canonis, Dist. 40, ch. 6.
† Can Trent. Sess. IV.
‡ Idem, Sess IV.

Digitized by Google

horrid and disgusting customs on earth, that of eating human flesh is the most revolting. When men reach this point of pollution and degradation, they seem almost to have passed the limits of humanity; devils in hell would look with disgust and aversion upon them; and hyenas and jackals would vie with them for mastery in their blood feasts. Turn now to the Church of Rome, and what do we behold? The Priest takes the bit of unleavened bread, called the Wafer, he pronounces the words of consecration —lo! according to their decree, faith and practice, the whole substance of the bread is changed into the Blood, Body, and Divinity of Jesus Christ. In each one of the pieces of bread there is a "Totum Christi," a Whole Christ. This conversion of the Bread and Wine into Blood, Body, and Divinity of Christ is called by them Transubstantiation. This doctrine is so absurd and horrible that it must be stated in the very words of Rome herself: "*Si quis negaverit in Sanctissimæ eucharistiæ Sacramento contineri vere, realiter et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christi, anathema sit.*"* These very words as quoted, also form part of the Bull of Pope Pius IV., wherein the form of profession of Faith is given. † According then to the creed, Councils and Bulls of Rome, a whole Christ, body, soul, and God-head, is contained in, or rather composes the Wafer — the Wafer is Christ! And now what do the Faithful do with this made Christ? They take the Wafer — the Blood and Body of Jesus; they receive it into their mouths; they melt it on their tongues; they receive it into their stomach; they pass it through their bowels. Great God! that such blasphemous cannibalism should pollute the earth! Were the most degraded heathen of the darkest and most besotted portion of Africa guilty of such blasphemy and cannibalism as to make and eat millions of Gods, we would cry out Away with such a fellow from the earth. Yet when such things are practiced by the highly respectable and ancient Church of Rome, we run the risk of being called bigoted old Presbyterians, for even indicating our horror at such besotted superstition and cannibalism. It may be affirmed that Rome, by her own confession and according

* Can. Trent. Sess. xiii, p.68.

† Can. Trent. p. 227.

Digitized by Google

to her own creed, has eaten more human bodies, drank more human blood, and made and murdered more Gods, than all the fiendish cannibals who have infested the earth from the creation of Adam down to the present moment. In this fearful climax of cannibalism, the superstition, blasphemy, and idolatry of Rome culminate: Satan himself grows disgusted at his own favorite institute for ruining souls, blaspheming God, and filling his dark domain with the spirits of the damned; and is now venting his spleen and amusing his infernal malice by seeing into what mingled depths of pollution and iniquity, he can plunge those who are led captive by him at his will, and whom God has given over to blindness of mind, to work uncleanness with greediness, to believe lies that they may be damned.

6. *The Corruptions of Popery.* — Among all the organizations of men on earth — whether Jewish or Christian, Pagan or Protestant, Papal or Infidel — the Church of Rome may safely claim the bad prëeminence of being the most filthy, the most polluted, the most corrupt. Vices, crimes, and corruptions have doubtless existed in the bosom of other organizations, but these have existed along with redeeming virtues: Popery may well challenge the world to point out what redeeming features relieve the dark and gloomy portrait she has painted for herself. It were impossible in the space allotted to a Review Article to enumerate even the heads of the corruption of Popery: the reader who wishes details is referred to "Gavin's History of Popery," "Edgar's Variations of Popery," "Ranke's History of the Popes," and the works of Peter Dens, Bellarmine, and Baronius. We will confine ourselves to some of the crimes, vices, and corruptions of the Roman Pontiffs, the successors of Peter, the Vicars of Jesus Christ; we will hold up to view the lives of those who have been pronounced infallible, whose Bulls, decrees, and examples, are sent down to all generations for the obedience and imitation of men. The historians of Rome herself shall tell us of the lives of these men, their crimes and corruptions. Genebrard, Du Pin, Baronius, Platina, shall give evidence. Fifty Popes from John VIII. to Leo IX., covering a period of 150 years, says Genebrard, entirely degenerated from the sanctity of their ancestors, and were Apostates rather than Apostles: "*Apostatici potius quam Apostolici.*"* Many

* Geneb. 10,

Digitized by Google

shocking monsters, says Baronius, "intruded into the Pontifical chair, who were guilty of robbery, assassination, simony, dissipation, tyranny, sacrilege, perjury, and all kinds of miscreancy." "The Church," says Giannone, "was then in a shocking disorder, in a chaos of iniquity," "L'eglise etoit plongée dans un chaos d'impiétés." Barclay tells us that "the Pontifical chair was polluted with the filthiest immoralities." We can give but a few specimens. John XII. ascended the Papal throne in 955, at the age of 18: his youth was characterized by barbarity and pollution. He surpassed, says Platina, "all of his predecessors in debauchery, and his Holiness was found guilty by a Roman Synod, of blasphemy, perjury, profanation, impiety, sacrilege, adultery, constipation and murder:" this villain was deposed by a Roman Council, afterwards regained the Holy See, was caught in the act of adultery and murdered. Boniface VII. is called by Baronius, a thief, a miscreant, and a murderer. Gregory VII. was pronounced by Benno and the Council of Worms, guilty of sacrilege, adultery, perjury, and murder. Boniface VIII. to all other sins added the horrible one for which Sodom perished. Sixtus IV. was a drunkard and an assassin. Julius II. was a Sodomite. We might continue to quote from Papal authors this filthy citation of facts until the pages of many Reviews the size of this had been filled; but the task is too revolting. These men were the Popes Infallible, the Vicars of Jesus Christ, the Successors of Peter. How awful must have been the condition of the masses when this was the character of the Heads! We shudder with horror when we see such men as these claiming to be the Visible Head of the Church of the Holy Jesus; in vain are we asked to recognise any Body as part of Christ's Church, having such a Head as these Popes. We cannot speak of the horrid crimes and corruptions of the priesthood, of the nuns, monks, and orders of the Romish Hierarchy; nor can we even point to the degraded and polluted condition of the people in all lands where the religion of Rome is dominant. You will search the annals of the human race in vain for such a picture of filth, pollution, incest, adultery, murder, and villany, as is presented in the lives of the Priests, Confessors, Monks, and Popes of Rome. The *Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth*, is the name given to Rome by the Holy

Digitized by Google

Ghost: and well and truly does this name indicate her pollutions and corruptions.

7. *The Murders of Popery.*—We regret that this topic, so fruitful for investigation, must be condensed into a few lines. The Woman that rode forth upon the Beast, was drunk with the blood of the saints. If all the blood of the saints shed by Rome in her blind and brutal fury, could be collected into one vast reservoir, the navies of Europe could ride upon it. Rome *claims* the *right* to murder all who will not submit to her commands. The Bull Unigenitus was issued by Clement XI., and signed at Rome Sept. 8, 1713; it can be found in the Dublin Edition of Dens' Theology in the original Latin: a correct translation of this Bull will be found in the "Spirit of the XIX Century," for 1842, page 481–90. In that Bull the following command is issued, viz:—"We moreover charge our venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ordinaries, and moreover the *Inquisitors of Heretical Wickedness*, utterly to *coerce* and *compel*, by the above mentioned censures and penalties, and by the other remedies of law and deed, all who oppose or resist the *aid of the Secular Arm being invoked for this purpose, if it be necessary.* In the Bull "In Cœna Domini," the following sentence occurs: "*Excommunicamus et anathematizamus ex parte Dei Omnipotentis Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sanctus, auctoritate quoque Beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ac nostra quoscunq; Hussitas, Luteranos, Calvinistas.** That is, Rome excommunicates and curses all Lutherans and Calvinists. This much for the right claimed by Rome to curse and murder all who will not submit to her commands. If you wish to know what she means by Coercion, by the Secular Arm, by the Anathema, and Excommunication, then go ask John Huss, whose bones she burnt, and whose ashes she sprinkled upon Lake Constance: go ask Wicklif whose bones she dug up and burnt, and whose ashes she sprinkled upon the Avon; go ask the 5,000 Parisians and 50,000 Huguenots murdered by her upon the fatal night of St. Bartholomew; go ask the 18,000 heretics butchered by Alva in the Netherlands in six weeks; go ask those 38 Spanish noblemen burnt by order of Philip II., at the stake; go ask the Lombards, the Waldenses, the Albigenses, whose goods were confis-

* Balt. Mag., 1836, p. 225.

Digitized by Google

cated, whose houses were burnt, whose children and wives were massacred; go ask the 1641 Irish Protestants butchered on the 23d of Oct., 1641; go ask the 2,300 plague-stricken citizens of Harlem, who were murdered by Alva; go ask the 300,000 French people butchered by Rome's Agent, Charles IX.; go ask the 4,000 inhabitants of Ireland who were killed in the year 1641; go into the dark dungeons of the Inquisitions of Popery, and ask those bones that lie around you; ask those instruments of torture that hang upon the walls; — go ask all these what Rome means by the Secular Arm, by Coercion, by Anathema, by Excommunication? They will tell you, in words that will make the hair of your head to stand, and the blood in your veins to tingle. Alas, alas! the heart grows sick at such harrowing recitals. The blood of the Saints still cries unto God from the earth. The Woman is drunk with Blood.

There are those who think that the Church of Rome is melting away, before the light and the heat of the Church of the Living God; that she will perish by the light of civilization, and the increase of knowledge; that already her power is on the decline, and soon she will pass away, and be numbered with the things that were. For ourselves we indulge no such pleasing illusions of hope. We have no confidence that the instrumentalities now at work will ever destroy this Mystery of Iniquity. The Man of Sin is revealed, and must continue until he is consumed by the Spirit of the Lord's mouth, and destroyed by the Epiphany of his Personal Coming. The Son of Perdition must abide, during and unto the end of the thousand and two hundred and three score days; he must exalt himself until the end of the forty and two months of the down-treading of the people of God are ended. The end of Popery will not be easy and gradual, but sudden and terrible; and if, as Paul teaches in Second Thessalonians, its end shall be accomplished by the Personal Coming of Christ, what a day of awful judgment it will be upon the Drunken Whore, the Apostate Church of God. The relation of this question to the Personal Coming of Christ is clear. We can hope for no "Universal Reign of Righteousness," until Popery is destroyed from the earth; and Paul says plainly: That the Popery is revealed and will continue until destroyed by the Brightness of His παρουσίας — Personal

Digitized by Google

Coming. If this be true, does it not settle the question that Christ's Coming will precede and inaugurate the Millennium, and not follow it? Can there be any Millennium until Popery is destroyed? Will Popery be destroyed until consumed by the Spirit of his mouth, and destroyed by his Bright Appearing?

How solemn and abiding the duty of the Church of God to contend for the faith delivered to the Saints; to expose in all their hideousness the limbs of this Drunken Harlot; to proclaim to the world that the errors of Popery ruin the soul for evermore!

How utterly worthless and vicious any theory of the Church, whether Prelatical or Presbyterial, that leads logically to the recognition of the Church of Rome as a true Church of Christ, the reception of her baptism and ordination as valid baptism and ordination!

How infinite the folly and guilt of those Protestants who aid in establishing the power of Popery by sending their children to Papal Schools!

P.

Digitized by Google

ART. IV. — *Our Country — Its Peril — Its Deliverance.*

I. THE SPIRIT OF ANARCHY: Its Rise — Progress — Present State — Nature — Tendency.

II. GROUNDS OF HOPE AND EFFORT: Statement of the Facts, Principles, and Considerations, on which the Preservation of the Union depends.

III. NEGRO SLAVERY: As the Cause or Occasion of Sedition, Anarchy, and Revolution — Considered in the light of our Civil and Political Institutions, — of the Law of Nature, — and of the Word of God.

IV. AMICABLE SETTLEMENT: Statement of the Case — Relation of the North and the South to the Rendition of Fugitive Slaves, and to Slavery in the Territories, — Rights and Duties of both Parties, — Amicable Settlement as Simple and Equitable, as it is Wise and Patriotic.

V. THE DOCTRINE OF COERCION: Its Abuse — Nature — Relation to the actual State of Affairs — The Power, Duty, and Responsibility of the General Government.

I. 1. What we propose is, *first*, to make such a statement of the condition of affairs as may be of use to upright men, in enabling them to determine what ought to be attempted, and what can be accomplished, in the way of preventing the ruin of their country; and, *secondly*, to make clear to all men, the position of a vast party in this country, who desire and who deserve, in all possible events, to be understood by posterity — and who, even if their principles are now overborne and their counsels are now rejected, may, if they are faithful to themselves, retrieve from the wreck of their country, whatever survives when the period of exhaustion shall come upon its destructive madness.

2. There is no lesson which the universal course of human affairs teaches so thoroughly, as their own instability. And yet there is no lesson so hard for men to learn; no lesson so pregnant of results, and so little heeded. How faithful ought men to be when overtaken by defeat and adversity — if they would consider that defeat and adversity, with courage and wisdom, are a preparation for triumph? How just and forbearing ought men to be in the midst of power and prosperity, if they would consider

Digitized by Google

that power and prosperity, in the degree that they are corrupt, make the road to destruction broad and sure? And how immense, how unexpected, how effectual are the resources of God, in the accomplishment of what he ordains to be results of human conduct?

3. Look at the actual position of public affairs throughout this great nation — consider whither they are tending — consider whence that tendency has arisen — consider by what means it is propagating itself: and then reflect upon the unexpected and extraordinary means by which ruin is overtaking every interest and hope of the country — and upon the absolute completeness of the ruin, when these means shall have worked their full effect. In a state of security apparently perfect, and of prosperity apparently complete — a small and fierce party, scattered through some of the Northern States, commenced a systematic and persistent agitation connected with the Black Race on this continent; and in the heart of their system lay this idea, that laws and institutions and rights and duties and interests of every description, ought to give way, if there was need of it, to the accomplishment of their designs. In the progress of time and events, and the ruin of political parties, this fundamental idea — which is the essence of lawlessness and anarchy — attaches itself in the public mind of some of the Northern States, to that particular aspect of the question of the Black Race which relates to the obligation, under the Federal Constitution, of delivering fugitive slaves; and laws of various kinds are passed, throwing the weight of State authority against the obligation of the very highest national law. And so the idea and process of disintegration, as the tendency to lawlessness and anarchy strengthens, has thus risen from the condition of a fanaticism, to the dignity of a principle recognized by States and asserted in laws. As if to warn men of the breadth of the ruin involved in this tendency, and to mark the extremity of the peril arising from its connection with the question of the Black Race, one of the slave States had already, under a similar, but directly opposite tendency, formally asserted its right, not only to obstruct the execution of the laws of the United States, but to nullify them absolutely, and upon its own sole and sovereign discretion; so that the spirit of lawlessness and anarchy, in its

Digitized by Google

absolute and universal tendency to disintegrate all things — moved, though not first, yet more rapidly and by more decisive acts, at the South than at the North.

4. Once more in the progress of time and events, and the ruin of political parties — the whole nation finds itself arrayed, in the last Presidential election, into two opposite parties, (of which the defeated one is mad enough to sub-divide itself into three); and this same question of the Black Race, both in the aspect of the rendition of fugitive slaves, and in the aspect of slavery in the Territories — and these same questions of supreme law and of lawlessness as connected therewith — mounting to the highest national importance, and apparently swallowing up all other questions, are resolved, so far as that election could resolve them. But the solution is every way remarkable. For while Mr. Lincoln is elected President — the majority of the nation is so decidedly against him, that he would have been beaten if the power of Congress to create uniform electoral districts had ever been exercised; nay, would have been beaten under the existing system, if all opposed to him had been allowed by the corruption or folly of parties to unite on one opponent. Moreover the solution is further remarkable, in this, that both Houses of Congress, and, as is alleged, the Supreme Court of the United States, held his most dangerous opinions to be unconstitutional: and it is still further remarkable in this, that Mr. Lincoln himself, while representing the Northern section of the anarchical tendency of the times, is known to repudiate the original principle of that faction concerning the rendition of fugitive slaves, — and is by universal consent, even of his candid opponents, an able, honest, and patriotic man. At the end of thirty years of working of the spirit we have been tracing, a decisive event had thus put the country in a posture where it would clearly appear whether the hereditary law-abiding spirit of our race remained, the great prop and safeguard of all our institutions; or whether the spirit of anarchy, already so signally manifested at both extremities of the nation, had so far poisoned the national life of our race at its fountain, that the time had come for one of those great explosions of human passion which fill so many melancholy pages in the history of our race.

5. It is not easy to conjecture, and it is impossible to say with

Digitized by Google

certainty, what would have occurred if the late presidential election had terminated differently from what it did, — in any one of the various ways in which a different termination was possible. This far we may now speak with certainty, that in some form or other, the spirit of turbulent fanaticism which had pervaded the States of the extreme North so long and so deeply, would not without a miracle, such as history does not record, have been allayed or composed under any defeat that was possible, in the state of national parties as they are now known to have existed at that time. For there was this fatal element, long concealed — not generally believed — but openly avowed since the secession of South Carolina — that secession, as the final and deliberate choice of the extreme South, was the point to which political opinion had been long and carefully trained, and political parties long and singly directed. This fatal training, added to the widely diffused spirit of anarchy, smarting under a defeat equally signal and unnecessary, and stimulated by considerations of the very highest importance connected with the question of the Black Race in every aspect of that question — produced the apparently sudden revolution which has already, when these pages are written, led the six cotton States (South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia and Louisiana) to pass separate acts of secession from the United States of America. Here then is the consummation of this spirit of lawlessness and anarchy, working as we have already said it universally works, unto the disintegration — the morcelment of all things; — the consummation of it, so far as to embrace all the States producing cotton, sugar, and rice, as their great staples. What is next to be determined is, the fate of the mixed slave States — those divided between farming and planting, (North Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Texas): and then the fate of the border slave States, (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri): and then, we may confidently add, the fate of the nation. Whatever, in the meantime, it is of the last importance to bear in mind, shall be the conduct of the whole of the free States, and especially of the border free States (New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa), may be decisive alike of their own fate, and of that of all the rest, and of the nation itself for many generations.

Digitized by Google

6. Is it possible for any thoughtful person to suppose, that this spirit of reckless disregard of all existing institutions, has already accomplished all the results of which it is capable? What shall prevent it from swallowing up all the remaining slave States? What shall, after that is accomplished, prevent a counter-revolution in every one of those slave States? What shall prevent its taking some new direction with still more vehement force, throughout the whole North? What shall prevent a counter-revolution in every Northern State? And who can venture to hope, that a spirit which everywhere tramples under foot those institutions which everywhere have been esteemed most sacred, and everywhere despises the most venerable and the most cherished traditions of our country and our race; will finally slake its thirst in any thing but human blood, or fail to assuage its insatiable rapacity by universal plunder? Cannot even the blind see, that when laws are violated in the name of morality and order, and constitutions are set at nought in the name of liberty and security, and revolutions are accomplished by terror and conducted under the guidance of irresistible fanaticism; that there can be no result to such a career, as long as it has way, but the destruction of everything that human governments are instituted to protect; and that at every step of the career, the overthrow of every salutary power and the disintegration of every healthful force of society, more and more confirms the existence and the reign of universal anarchy? It is as if God should destroy every principle of cohesion in the physical universe, and leave every separate force in it working to the destruction of all things. It is as if he should destroy every idea of subjection in the moral universe, and leave the passions of men to work out all the horrors of an infinite disorder. It is as the steady working of omnipotent force, unto the production of universal helplessness. It is, when it shall pervade the earth, the realization of the conjectures of those who expound the divine predictions concerning the condition in which *The Son of Man* will find all nations at his second coming — the universal reign of lawlessness after the universal disintegration of every element capable of restraining it. What we say is — not that these results are inevitable: God forbid! But we do say they are natural — they are imminent — they are far more

Digitized by Google

to be apprehended, than what has already occurred, both in the North and in the South, was to be apprehended thirty years ago. And we may say these things with a greater confidence of an insight of the terrible future, and a more eager beseeching of our generation to beware; since during more than thirty years we have not ceased to lift up an unheeded testimony, both against the principles and the proceedings, both at the North and at the South — whose frightful results the country is now beginning to realize.

II. 1. Let us now seek, amidst this chaos, for some ground of hope and effort. Throughout the eighteen free States, society is supposed to be under the control of the Republican party. As indicated by the presidential election in November last, it may be conceded that the majority in all those States, did at that time, believe the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency, to be the best of the alternatives then offered to their choice; and it may be further conceded, though it is not strictly accurate, that, at present, the local political and military power, in all those States, is in the hands of the Republican party. But it is also true that a minority in those States, numerically almost as large as the entire voting population of the fifteen slave States, voted against Mr. Lincoln — and are thoroughly opposed to the distinctive principles of the Republican party. It is also undeniable that a very large number of those who voted for Mr. Lincoln, are far more Whigs or Americans than they are Republicans: — and it is equally certain that a very large number of the Republican party itself, strictly speaking, are patriotic men, who, while they preferred the success of their party to the success of any other party, prefer the peace, the prosperity, and the security of their country above anything that could be obtained by the triumph of their party. If any political result in the future, therefore, can be considered certain, it is certain, that a revolution in opinion, more or less decided, will manifest itself throughout the free States, whenever the issue is clearly put to them between their country and any political party. And it is equally certain, that whatever party shall hurry those States, by whatever means, into the horrors of civil war, and the anguish of that impending anarchy of which we have spoken; will perish by a counter-revolu-

Digitized by Google

tion, just as apt to be bloody there as in any other portion of the nation.

2. In the position of all the slave States there are peculiar circumstances much overlooked, both amongst themselves and others; but nevertheless decisive in the long run. No force, however small, but will accomplish its end, if sufficient time be allowed: even that which is infinitely minute, if it operates through an infinite period. The six cotton States appear to us to have taken their course in such a temper, with such purposes, upon such principles, and under such foregone conclusions, that they neither desire to return to their former position, nor would at present agree to anything that they believe would accomplish that result. It is, of course, possible that we are mistaken in this painful conclusion, and we should heartily rejoice to know that we are: but, seeing no ground on which we can doubt that the case stands thus, neither do we see any on which we can avoid stating our belief. It would be gross injustice to many thousands of patriotic men in all the cotton States, to suppose that either of those States would have been allowed to take the course it has pursued, without a desperate political struggle in its own bosom; if the circumstances of these men, in each of those States, had appeared to them to allow of resistance to the organized force which swept society away. There are also thousands of persons in all those States, who even now consider it a slander and a reproach, that ulterior designs are ascribed to those who direct this secession movement, which it seems apparent to all mankind, except themselves, are not only certain to be realized if the movement is permanently sustained, but which were amongst the earliest and most powerful causes of the long cherished desire to be relieved from the real restraints of the Federal Government, and the imaginary perils and injuries of the Federal Union. In the actual condition of the States which have already seceded, as we understand that condition and the manner in which it has been brought about, we deem it perfectly obvious that a counter-revolution must manifest itself in every one of them — equally as decided, and perhaps more violent, than the revolution which has already occurred. That counter-revolution may be in a direction more and more fatal — bringing into uncontrolled power, parties wholly unfit and

Digitized by Google

unworthy to possess it. It may be in a direction eminently favorable to the security and prosperity of those cotton States, and terminating in their restoration to the Union, under the lead of a party whose elements now lie scattered, or even as yet totally undeveloped. But the present revolution, in its very nature, its causes, and its designs — must go deeper, in one direction or the other. In *which* direction, depends in our opinion, in the first instance, in a great degree, upon these contingencies: 1. The conduct of the present ruling faction in those States; its forbearance on the one hand, or its violence on the other: 2. The conduct of the Federal Government towards those States; as it may be firm and yet temperate, or as it may be vacillating and timid: 3. The conduct of the slave States continuing in the Union; as they may share the madness of the six seceding States, or as they may arrest the pestilence at the cotton line, and by their wisdom and courage restore the Union: 4. The conduct of the free States, and especially those along the slave border; as they shall obstinately persist in fomenting opinions and performing acts touching the whole question of the Black Race, which they can now clearly see must involve the country in one common ruin, or as they, by a common consent, or by a counter-revolution in their own bosom, restore public opinion to a condition under which slave States may safely live in peace with them. Under such circumstances it is easy to see, how great and difficult is the task laid on true statesmen, everywhere, and how immense and how dubious are the issues submitted to them.

3. The remaining nine slave States, of which five are border States, and four are mixed slave States, have in each of these classes peculiarities as marked as those which distinguish the cotton States; yet as the whole nine occupy a similar position at the present moment, with regard to the revolution which has swept over the cotton States; they may, for the sake of brevity, be thrown together in developing the great ideas we are endeavoring to disclose. What the exact issue will be in these nine States — or whether it will be similar in them all — or in which direction the prevailing opinion will settle, if different courses are taken — are questions which it is impossible to determine at this time. But it is very obvious, that if the whole nine — or even the greater

Digitized by Google

part of them, embracing the leading and powerful States, refuse to unite in the movement taken by the six cotton States, that movement must necessarily prove a failure, both as to its avowed, and as to any concealed object; a counter-revolution in the cotton States becomes presently inevitable; and those cotton States must ultimately accommodate themselves to the policy, whatever it may be, adopted by the other and leading States, instead of being able to force those far more powerful than themselves, to follow blindly and servilely a course disapproved by them, and which rests for its ultimate reason, upon nothing better than the sudden caprice of South Carolina, or her chronic hatred of the National Union. There are immense considerations, altogether independent of the real merits of the great cause which is under trial — why the course dictated by South Carolina, and adopted by the other cotton States, should be steadfastly rejected. Amongst these are such as follow: 1. This method by secession annihilates the very idea of all force in permanent constitutional union, or common government over sovereign States, and establishes as inherent in all possible future unions, the idea of anarchy, and deprives liberty forever of the possibility of being either stable or strong: 2. The method of secession, by *separate* State action, is founded on illusions utterly fatal and absurd, that the American people are not *a nation* — the Federal Constitution not a government — the American people not bound to be loyal except to local authorities, which being assumed, condemns this continent to be the everlasting habitation of every thing feeble, factious, and extravagant: 3. The adoption of ordinances of secession, by conventions called by ordinary Legislatures — without allowing the people to determine by a previous sovereign act whether or not the convention shall exist, and by a subsequent sovereign act whether or not its proceedings shall have force — destroys the very idea of the sovereignty of the people, makes constitutional liberty and security impossible, and invites factions, in proportion as they are corrupt or incompetent, to usurp and to abuse sovereign power: 4. The utter refusal to consult with States, all of which were united by the highest human obligations — and many of which were involved in perils the very same in kind and higher in degree — is a line of conduct reckless in itself, insulting to all

Digitized by Google

others, apparently adopted with the purpose of rendering all peaceful, considerate, or even decorous arrangements impossible, and necessarily jeopards, in the result reached, the profitable continuance of slavery, if not its very existence, in the greater part of the slave States, and amongst them the most powerful, the most loyal, and the most enlightened of them all. At the present moment two most important truths are perfectly distinct. The *first* is, that the action hitherto taken in the States whose position we are now considering, — no matter what that action may lead to — involves a fundamental dissent from the conduct pursued by the six seceding States — and contemplates redress in a different way, and upon opposite principles. The *second* is, that a very great portion of each of these nine States, probably the majority of the people in most of them — possibly in all of them, — are warmly attached to the Union, — are resolutely determined to maintain their loyalty to the nation as their nation, at the same time that they maintain their loyalty to the particular States of which they are citizens, and are far more inclined to compose existing difficulties, than to drive matters to extremity in any direction.

4. These facts and considerations, taken in detail and taken all together, are worthy of the very highest consideration; — and whatever the issue of events may be, they reveal to the people and to those they trust, the grounds on which, and the manner in which, the country may be saved: and they disclose to posterity the pregnant and enduring truth, that at the utmost peril of the country the *people* would have saved it, if they had been bravely and wisely led. For under fair and true statesmanship, the chances are more than equal, in the *first* place, to rally the immense masses of the nine slave States whose people are now pondering their course, to such an action as will make their position secure in the Union, and satisfy them: in the *second* place, to secure such a treatment of the subject of secession by the Federal Administration, as will at once give efficacy to the laws, and avoid armed collision, except in repelling force by force: in the *third* place, to seek and to rely upon, such a reaction among the masses of the people in the free States, as will, by a common consent, or if it becomes necessary, by hurling from power those who stand

Digitized by Google

in the way, make manifest the determination of those masses to put an end to the reign of that atheistical and relentless fanaticism, which is the original cause of the ruin that stares us all in the face: and in the *fourth* place, to expect and await with confidence, the inevitable counter-revolution in the States which have already seceded, which will disabuse the minds of men of the delusion that the revolution there has been, as to the popular masses, either spontaneous or cordial, and restore those States to their true position in the confederacy. It is in this manner that results, equally indispensable and glorious, are attainable, — results capable also, no doubt, of being defeated; and that in ways far too various to be traced here. But when defeated, let us never forget that they who defeat them will share in full measure with us, all present evils, and will bear alone the execrations of posterity. And when defeated, what will remain for this generation, will be to realize the calamities of that frightful condition we have traced in the commencement of this paper; — or, as we have attempted to show on a former occasion, to construct even upon the line between the free and the slave States, a new and central power — competent at once to preserve all our institutions, to develope our national progress, and to direct the destinies of this continent.

5. Besides the special considerations which we have developed, as particularly relevant to the condition of our country, and the manner in which her destiny may be retrieved: there are many other considerations of a more general kind, and of the highest force, all pointing in the same direction, which it behooves every man to ponder deeply, before he despairs of his country, and before he lays his hands rudely on our existing institutions, in the vain hope of something better. Of these, there are two so prëeminent, that we ought to direct special attention to them. The *first* relates to that view of the subject which discloses the indestructible power of life in such a nation as this, and the length and depth and breadth of the agony which it can endure, and yet live. They who know the past of human affairs, and they who reflect on that eternal logic which is of the essence of things and events, know that a nation like this *cannot die.* It is hardly possible to conceive how it can *even be murdered;* but *die*

Digitized by Google

it cannot. It would be as easy to conceive that France could be blotted from the map of Europe as one of its greatest nations, and restored to the condition it occupied before its conquest by Cæsar; as to conceive of the American nation being annihilated, its sublime career cut short, its boundless possessions parcelled out, and an ignominious retinue of numberless aristocracies, democracies, dukedoms, and principalities, permanently filling its seat of empire and of glory. After eighteen centuries of anguish, Italy, hailed by the acclamations of mankind, is purging herself in a baptism of blood from the very condition which men are preparing for us; and the consuming instinct of her restored life is for that very *national unity* which we are expected to sacrifice, and in default of which she has suffered every form of evil, in every stage of civilization, under every kind of government. What have they to offer us, in exchange for our national unity, but sorrow without an object — and degradation without a limit — accompanied with struggles and suffering for its recovery, renewed, and suppressed in blood, and renewed for evermore — until in some distant age, perhaps, it shall be restored amidst the rejoicings of all peoples! This blind and fierce spirit of anarchy which has fastened upon the extremities of the nation, and is threatening to eat into its heart, has no aspect more startling, than its frightful antagonism to the absolute tendency and the total civilization of the age, in which it has made itself manifest. The *second* of the two great considerations alluded to, relates to the dominion and purpose of God over and concerning our country. The revolting disregard which this whole movement towards destruction exhibits towards God's dealings with our country, the shocking conceptions it proclaims of our mission as a people, compared with the conception of that mission as indicated by God himself, present almost the saddest aspect of the case. Nor is it the least remarkable feature of the lawless spirit which underlies the entire revolution, that while in both extremities of the nation it fastens upon the same idea — the slavery of the African race — as the controlling idea of God in all his purposes concerning us; it should give that idea its utmost destructiveness to us, and its utmost offensiveness to God, by making it work in directions precisely opposite. Is it conceivable that God should teach his

Digitized by Google

children at the North, that his highest purpose concerning the American people is, that they should extinguish African slavery; and at the same moment teach his children at the South, that his highest purpose concerning the American people is, that they should perpetuate African slavery? Rather is it not utterly inconceivable, that he should have taught any of them that his purposes concerning African slavery, or the African race, in any way whatever contain his chief purposes concerning the white race on this continent? A more melancholy instance can scarcely be produced in all history, of the destructive extent to which religious opinion can be made to take the prevailing hue of a fierce enthusiasm, or an intolerant fanaticism, which reigns around it. It is not in this manner, on the one side or the other, that the tens of thousands of God's children, scattered over this great empire like salt which has *not* lost its savour, interpret the teachings of his word, the indications of his providence, or the tokens of his infinite mercy towards us. It is not in any such sense of the mission of our country, or our race, that the people everywhere, have so lately come before God, in a great service of national humiliation, confessing their sins, and praying for his gracious interposition in this time of sore need. Who is authorized to say, that God has not heard the cry of his people? Who will dare to say, that God is not able to save? In the utmost extremity of Israel, God said to them by Moses, Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of God, which he will shew to you to-day.

III. 1. At present, and during a long course of preceding years, it has been the very general impression that Negro slavery was the *direct*, if not the *single* difficulty, in all the commotions of which we have been speaking. As far as these commotions have had a moral and religious element, and have manifested themselves in the bosom of the different Christian denominations, this wide-spread impression has probably been true. But in other respects the connection of Negro slavery with these commotions, throughout, has been *indirect;* and its moral and religious aspect has had little significance, except as the abolition movement has been *free-thinking* in religion, and as political and sectional parties have coerced religious opinion in particular directions, for party and sectional purposes. The nullification movement many years

Digitized by Google

ago, in South Carolina, related to slavery only in the most indirect way — and in no connection with any moral or religious question. It was a question of revenue, taxation, commerce, tariffs, wealth: a false theory of political economy enraged by the peculiar condition of labor. More recently, the commotion about slavery in the Territories, has been a struggle for political power, aggravated on the side of the North by the urgency of its numerous emigrant population for cheap homes in fertile regions. And at the present moment, the States which have seceded, are of all the slave States the very ones which would not have seceded, and the slave States which are most anxious to preserve the Union are the very ones which would have promptly seceded, if the current impression of the case was true and complete. If at any time within the last thirty years, a revolution in production, in trade, in commerce, in any thing, had wrought a thorough change in the general opinion of the South, touching — not the essential nature — but the incidental advantages of slavery in a political and a financial point of view; of course, no one would ever have heard of secession in the South — or even seen the remotest approach to the existing state of opinion at the North. It is the idea of power — power to be diminished by remaining in the Union and to be incalculably augmented by leaving it; the idea of wealth, of conquest, of advancement — all of them, we are thoroughly convinced, in the highest degree illusive and fatal; but it is these ideas — far more than any disgust that the North condemns slavery as immoral, or any apprehension that slavery will be disturbed, or slaves stolen, or the South annoyed in the Union — that pervades the present dominant party in the cotton States, and enabled it to precipitate them into revolution. How far this aspect of the case aggravates or alleviates the difficulty of dealing with it, in any hope of such an issue as we consider fortunate, must depend on many considerations which can not be discussed here. In any event, it seems clear that they who would heal a malady must understand its exact nature. And if it is never healed, they who eagerly desire that it should be, owe to themselves and to posterity a fair and complete statement of the case, and of the remedy they propose for it.

2. Human servitude, considered in its widest sense, and of

Digitized by Google

which hereditary slavery as it exists in our slave States is the extreme form — may be discussed in the light of Divine Revelation — or in the light of the Law of Nature — or in the light of the political and municipal institutions of the countries where it exists. Considered in this last aspect — there ought to be no dispute concerning it, and there can be none fairly, in this country, except in a single point of view — namely, its existence in the national territory, which we will speak of separately. For, undeniably, each State has the complete and exclusive right, to determine concerning it as a strictly domestic institution; and, undeniably, neither any other State, nor the government which is common to all the States, has any power to interfere with it, or concerning it, in any State. And this is not only matter of constitutional obligation on one side, and uncontrolled right on the other; but the plainest dictates of prudence, and the clearest obligations of morality, impose upon the States, and the general government, the duty of a simple, sincere, and faithful observance of all that is implied, as well as all that is expressed, in these restrictions. Massachusetts has no right, of any kind, to assail slavery in South Carolina, — nor has South Carolina any right of any sort to encourage the introduction of slavery into Massachusetts: and any attempt on the part of the General Government, directly or indirectly, to favour any such endeavour on the part of either of them, is a foolish and wicked perversion of its own nature. Nor is there any plea that can be offered, either by the General Government, or by any State, for departing from this clear line of mutual duty, which is not immoral in itself, and revolutionary in its tendency. Moreover the prompt and cordial performance by all parties, towards each other, of all the mutual duties binding upon them under the Federal Constitution touching every subject, and amongst the rest the subject of slavery, and amongst the duties connected with slavery the rendition of fugitive slaves, of which we will speak separately; besides being every way binding before God and man, is the sure, the wise, and the peaceful way to promote all the interests of all the parties, and to secure the lasting glory and prosperity of the country.

3. When we undertake to determine this, or indeed any question, under what we call the Law of Nature, we encounter the

Digitized by Google

most serious difficulties at every step. What we shall say, therefore, on this topic, must be in subordination to what has just been said under the aspect of our civil and political obligations, and what we shall say presently under the aspect of revealed truth and duty. Besides the statement of the Law of Nature, recorded and reiterated in the Word of God, of which we do not speak at present, there are other — perhaps numerous, but certainly indistinct, and perhaps contradictory utterances of that great and permanent law. At the head of these utterances we may place that which the human reason discloses: next to that, perhaps, the common impulses of the human soul: then, perhaps, the current opinions and beliefs of the human race: and then, which in some respects ought to be held most valid of all — the common and apparently inevitable, if not voluntary state of our race in all ages — as the best concrete expression of its reason, its impulses, and its current belief — and therefore of the Law of its Nature in its present state. If we will reflect carefully on each of these utterances of the Law of Nature touching this vast topic of human servitude, we will perceive how narrow is the foothold they afford to support us in disloyalty towards the civil and political institutions of our country, much less to sustain us in rejecting the revealed will of God. (1.) The *human reason* teaches with clearness, that if there can be such a thing, or such an idea, as *property*, the highest form of it — nay, the very basis of it — is the right which every one has to himself: and just as clearly, that the claim of property by the Law of Nature, on the part of one person in another person, is founded in the rejection of the very foundation of the idea of property, since my right to have another rests on my previous right to myself. On the other hand, human reason teaches us that property in ourself is as capable of being forfeited, limited, or alienated, as any other property. For example, the right of existence is higher than our property in ourself; and it is as absurd to say that I may not part absolutely with the latter, in order to secure the former, as it is to say I may not limit my property in myself, in order to make my existence more endurable, or even more comfortable. And the very nature of human society is such, that the liberty, as well as the life and property of every one, passes by the fact of the existence of

Digitized by Google

society, from its absolute personal form, into a modified form determinable only by the aggregate will — which will *ought* to be determined by the will of God. But as the human race is in rebellion against God — human reason lands the problem very nearly in a paradox. (2.) If we appeal next for guidance to the *common impulses of the human soul*, in order to have this great question of human servitude interpreted, we obtain a response equally vague, but far more vehement than before. Surely it is, and it has always been, the desire of every human being to be free from restraint — the passionate desire of our race to possess what each member of it, in his particular condition, meant by liberty. And the aggregate impulse of the race in that direction, is more powerful and is better regulated to-day than it ever was before, — and the hope of true, and stable, and universal freedom, as the final inheritance of all mankind, may be more rationally cherished, than at any former period. But the wisest men and the freest people know the best — that this personal desire of freedom from restraint is no evidence whatever that restraint is wrong; and that this universal impulse towards what they mean by liberty, totally fails — of itself — in proving that they who cherish it would do aught but mischief, if God were to gratify all their desires. It is one of the most sorrowful aspects of human nature — this consuming impulse towards liberty and equality — this lasting desire of the good and the wise that it might be gratified — this total impossibility of its gratification, except under special conditions of advancement, reached as yet by comparatively small portions of our race. (3.) And now if we turn to the *common opinion and belief of the human race*, as the true expositor of that law of their nature under the light of which the institutions of the most civilized states are to be abolished and the inspired teachings of God are to be silenced; we may take one firm step, and then all is chaos, which thickens as we advance. Assuredly there is a sense of good and of true — and therefore of right and just — universal in our race; and a sense, moreover, that these things apply to, and ought to regulate, all the conditions and relations of man — servitude in all its forms amongst the rest. If there was ever an opinion and belief common to our race, that servitude in its widest sense was contrary to the nature of man; then the

Digitized by Google

race had before it always, in the actual condition of the larger part of it, the clearest proof that the belief was absurd. If there had ever been such a common belief strong enough to form the basis of practical life; then half the race would have immediately perished from want — or universal rapine would have become its habitual condition. The belief has, no doubt, been common to our race in all time, that every one ought to enjoy all the gifts of God, and amongst the rest the inestimable one of personal freedom, so far as was compatible with the circumstances in which God's providence had placed each person — that is, so far as was compatible with the will of the Giver of all good, thus made known to every person. And this belief is true and just. But what is established by it is, that according to the Law of Nature as explained by the spontaneous belief of mankind, servitude in every form may, though of itself indifferent, become right or wrong, good or bad, according to the circumstances of each particular case. And beyond this unquestionable truth — he who will enquire will get no intelligible response. (4.) The last of the four utterances of the Law of Nature which we have specified, is *the actual execution of the law*, as that is exhibited to us in the common state of the human race, in all ages, and in every stage of civilization. Here there is no possibility of mistake. The testimony is as unanimous, as it is frightful and universal. The different races, the different nations, the different tribes, the different families, the different individuals — all, every where, have felt themselves to be naturally impelled to reduce each other into a condition of subjection — and have felt themselves to be naturally permitted, upon a change of fortune, to submit to a state of subjection. Nor is it possible to doubt that the natural and universal conduct of mankind, as clearly proves that men are as thoroughly convinced they ought to be masters, as their conduct could possibly prove they were convinced that they ought not to be slaves. Those conditions of mankind which are alledged to resemble most nearly the condition claimed to be natural to man, are the very conditions in which servitude, in some form or other, is the most spontaneous and complete; and it is in conditions of advanced civilization that the extreme forms of servitude gradually expire — unless some peculiar element in the

Digitized by Google

state of society opposes an insuperable barrier to its extinction. It takes nothing from this boundless testimony, to assert that the dreary conclusion it establishes is contrary to the reason, the impulses, and the beliefs of mankind: for if the assertion were true, it only shows that mankind cannot be, what mankind asserts, desires, and believes it should be. And the more desolate the conviction thus begotten may be, the more are we compelled to look — for the mitigation of human servitude — not to revolution based on our notions of the Law of Nature, but to the wise and temperate amelioration of existing institutions, under the influence of the love of God. And the more all other rules of judgment and conduct fail us, the more ought we to feel obliged to submit ourselves to the guidance of God, in matters which concern us so nearly as these now do. What remains, therefore, is to consider the question of human servitude in the light of divine revelation.

4. It is in the Word of God that this great problem is completely solved. Human servitude, in all its forms, is one of the badges of the fallen condition of the human race; and every incident of it, that aggravates any particular form of it, or that augments the severity of all the forms of it from the very lightest to the very heaviest, is a separate proof that our natural condition is one of sin and misery. And whatever revolt there may be in human nature against any form of servitude, is a kind of testimony to the original freedom in which man was created in the image of God, and to the remaining susceptibility of his depraved nature to be restored; while the utter inability of the race to escape this part of its deplorable condition, shows how deeply the grounds and reasons of that condition are laid in its nature. A fallen race, lying under the wrath of God and the condemnation of his holy law — but having his promise of deliverance even in this life and of immortal blessedness in a better life to come — is making its way, in this condition of probation, through the ages and across the earth. The accumulated experience of the entire existence of the race, and the uniform course of divine providence, and the explicit declarations of God's Word, show us in the clearest manner, that the career of such a race, in such a state, and yet under such a probation, must necessarily exhibit

Digitized by Google

much that is, so to speak, unavoidably *incident* to such a case, in some respects alleviating, and in some respects aggravating its ordinary, average condition. War is inevitable; sometimes in its result glorious and blessed, sometimes frightful in all its issues; but war, so far from being of itself, and to all who engage in it either just or sinful, is often atrocious, and often amongst the highest duties of mankind. Sickness is the product of God's just sentence of death upon our sinful race, and is of itself a temporal evil covering the whole earth; yet it is often made an unspeakable blessing, and no one ventures to say is of itself sinful. Sorrow and affliction are brought on us in innumerable forms, and from every quarter, and often by means of our truest, and noblest, and wisest impulses; — in every instance they are incidents of sin, direct or remote, but perhaps not in one instance of a million of the sin of him who suffers. Poverty, and its consequent, suffering, is of itself one of the direst and most universal calamities of mankind; and yet it is the parent of many of our highest virtues and attainments — and so far from being sinful of itself, is the subject of many of the most tender and urgent provisions both of the law of God and the Gospel of Christ. It is to this great class of *incidents* of the actual condition of our race, that human servitude in all its forms belongs. Existing, like all we have named, and multitudes besides, because our condition is just what it is — a condition of sin and misery in a state of probation; wrought out inevitably, in some form or other, in the bosom of such a condition; modified indefinitely, by every circumstance that affects any considerable portion of the race; but utterly incapable of being permanently and universally abolished, while our race continues in a state of sin and misery, attended with probation. It seems to us as absurd to call the relation of master and servant (in any form of servitude) sinful of itself, or to expect the relation to cease upon earth; as it is to call the relation between a sick man and a well one, an afflicted man and a happy man, a rich man and a poor one, sinful of itself, or expect either of them to come to an end. And this, it seems to us, is the simple, the rational, and the scriptural account of human servitude in all its possible aspects, and in its essential nature in the sight of God.

5. If we acknowledge the sacred Scriptures to be the divine

Digitized by Google

rule of our faith and our practice, there ought to be an end to all extreme opinions, and all violent proceedings, on this entire subject. From the days of Abraham, to the death of the last inspired Apostle, there is one uniform doctrine, one uniform practice, one unchanging aspect of the whole matter — presented by God for the guidance of mankind. Throughout the total revelation which God has made to man — throughout the immense period embracing the dispensations of Abraham, of Moses, and of Christ, — human servitude, Abrahamic, Jewish, Christian, and heathen — and the heathen aspect of it, such as was presented in every nation of antiquity, Asiatic, African and European, down to and after the period of universal dominion by the Romans; we have this immense subject exhibited to us, in all its possible bearings, by God himself. Never, in a single instance, is it represented to us as a thing good in itself: never, in a single instance, as a thing sinful in itself: always as a thing actually existing, always to be expected, allowed by God, considered and treated in his law, regulated by his providence, wholly indifferent as concerning his grace, and to enter into our final account to him, both as we may be masters and as we may be servants, in the light of our faithful discharge or our wicked neglect of our duties to each other in that relation. As masters, the measure of our authority is the measure of our guilt, if we neglect the duties binding on us, or abuse the power we possess: so that the slavery which exists amongst us, carries this responsibility to a height which, to all thoughtful Christian persons, gives the institution one of its heaviest burdens. To consider the relation, on the side of the master, one merely of profit to himself, is to forfeit at once every justification for its continuance; while, on the other hand, to rob the relation wholly of that aspect, can be founded only on the notion that all servitude is sinful, or else on some fanatical idea of justice or charity, which if rendered practical would put an end to society, by putting an end to all motive for any one to obtain any sort of service from another. That every form of servitude ought to be ameliorated continually, even if we are sure it can never be abolished, is as clear as that poverty should be alleviated though we know it can never be prevented, or that sickness should be relieved, though it is certain it will recur forever. Clear as may be the

Digitized by Google

justification of every form of servitude so far as the mere question of *sin* is concerned — and perfect as may be the right to persist in the extreme form of it, so far as the civil power is concerned — there are a thousand considerations, personal and public, moral and political, which may so bear upon individuals and communities, as to make it their clear duty, under given circumstances, to put an end to the hereditary slavery which exists amongst us, or under given circumstances to make it improper to attempt it, or impossible to accomplish it. It is absurd, therefore, if not monstrous, to contend that vast regions of our country are morally bound to the last extremity and as their chief duty, to labour for the more secure establishment and the more effectual perpetuation of negro slavery; and equally so to array public opinion, and to direct political parties, in other vast portions of the country, to the repression or the destruction of it, on any pretext at all, much less any connected with its moral nature. We have already shown that a faithful observance of our constitutional obligations would put an end to all such opinions and practices; and that there is no justification for any of the principles on which they rest, or the proceedings to which they lead, to be found in natural law. And now it seems clear, that the only infallible rule of conduct, God's blessed Word, condemns in the most positive manner, all the pretexts concerning negro slavery, whether at the North or the South, upon which the public mind has been lashed into madness. Slavery is an institution, which revolutions neither perpetuate nor abolish, except under conditions wholly accidental. And if the anarchical spirit, whose seditious career we have traced, finally triumphs and this nation is destroyed — the real problem to be afterwards worked out will be, the ultimate dominion of the White race, or of a mixed race essentially African, over the cotton region of this continent. Is the inaugurating of that problem, worth the ruin of this great nation?

IV. 1. In attempting to develop the topic which remains, we are fully aware of the difficulties of the task. Both at the North and at the South, there are great parties thoroughly organized and acting in precisely opposite directions as to opinion, but one direction as effective as the other toward the common object of their labors — namely, the tearing of the nation to pieces. They

Digitized by Google

who agree in nothing else, agree in the common desire for that result, which involves our national ruin. In the meantime, the immense popular masses at the North which have only partially cöoperated with the organized party bent on destruction, or have fallen into minorities openly resisting that party — are neither organized in fact, nor of one accord amongst themselves, except upon the single point, that they are suddenly awakened to the extreme peril of the situation, and are rapidly settling into a resolute purpose to avert the danger, if it is still possible. In the whole South, the condition of affairs is similar, but more perilous. The disruption of the Democratic party at Charleston and at Baltimore, is susceptible of but three possible interpretations: it was an act of mere passion — or it was an act of deep intention, designed to produce exactly what has followed — or it was an act looking to the reconstruction of that party and to new endeavors for its permanent triumph as a national party. Recent events tend to show, that the disruption was made in the fixed sense of the second of these three possible interpretations; or at any rate, in the contemplation, and perfect preparation of many leading men to take that alternative, even if they are not chargeable with having intentionally procured it. What occurred was, that the cotton growing South suddenly awoke to a consciousness, that a great and perfectly organized party in her bosom, was precipitating state after state into secession; while in every seceding state — even in South Carolina — masses of the people, stunned by the suddenness and vehemence and thorough organization of the movement, were borne along by it, or made resistance only on collateral points, or remained in dissatisfied silence as the storm swept over them. And in all the remaining slave states, state after state became suddenly the theatre of a concerted agitation propagated originally from South Carolina, and tending everywhere to the same violent result, by the same seditious proceedings, in the venerable names of state sovereignty and constitutional power. In these latter states, the resistance on the part of the community to this revolutionary fanaticism, was more in accordance with what became a free people; and whatever the issue may be, the most of them, possibly every one of them, will reach it with a decorum, a gravity, and a public decency inseparable even in death itself

Digitized by Google

from all true greatness, on all great occasions. But these great popular masses throughout the fifteen slave states — embracing all men who were not ready to rush into immediate secession, and embracing, therefore, the immense majority of the people in that half of the nation — were taken by surprise — cut up into three mutually hostile political parties — disorganized by an infinite diversity of opinion — and destitute for the moment of great leaders to whom they could turn with a common consent. Rapidly, and by a movement almost spontaneous, public opinion, overborne for the moment in the six seceding states, and trembling in the balance in several other states, appears to us to be consolidating in the greater number and the most powerful of those states, in a determinate manner, and upon fixed points. In them there is none of that frantic hostility to the union which has been ostentatiously manifested in other places; but on the contrary, an avowed attachment to the union, and a declared purpose to maintain it, if it can be done consistently with their security, their honor, and their rights. In them, there is no disposition to contend for extreme rights, or to demand conditions which in changed circumstances they would not grant themselves, much less to fly to arms by way of preliminary menace, or to look to foreign nations for aid in the execution of any designs present or future; but on the contrary, there is an upright and an outspoken desire to adjust all existing troubles, and if possible to secure the future, upon terms of perfect equity and equality, such as ought to satisfy true men, and such as true men ought spontaneously to grant. Now it is not to confirmed Abolitionists of the North, nor is it to confirmed Secessionists of the South, that any suggestions of peace need be made, or any terms of honorable composition need be propounded, which look to the preservation of a country which they do not profess to love, and the salvation of institutions which they own they abhor. But it is to the great, true, and faithful people of the glorious American Nation that must not be destroyed, no matter of what sovereign state they may be citizens, and no matter how much they may now appear to be scattered and disorganized; that suggestions of peace, and justice, and fraternity, looking to endless and boundless glory and prosperity, may be offered, with a good hope through God, that they may enter into the mass of

Digitized by Google

human thought, and be felt according to the wisdom that may be in them.

2. Let it be observed, that the free states and the slave states occupy in some respects totally different positions, relatively to the difficulties about slavery, and to the ground on which those difficulties are to be adjusted. With the North, the whole affair is a sentiment — an opinion. With the South, it is an affair of life and death. The North has not one dollar of estate at stake — the South has four thousand millions of dollars invested in slaves. The North has not one dollar of income directly dependent on slavery — the South has an annual income of two hundred and fifty millions dependent directly on slave labour. Moreover, there are no negro slaves among the nineteen millions of people in the eighteen free states — so that all questions of a national aspect tending to influence slavery, are perfectly void of force as to the interior peace, quiet, and security, of all these eighteen states; whereas the fifteen slave states have four millions of slaves dispersed through their eight millions of white people, and every national question that can, in any of its bearings, either agitate or quiet this vast slave population, is of itself a question, between different nations, of war or peace. Still further, the institution of slavery has no necessary bearing whatever, upon the social, economical, personal or political condition of any state or individual at the North; whereas it is thoroughly interwoven with every fibre of society at the South — and as an institution is so pervading in its effects wherever it exists, that a community long trained in the forms of life connected with it, does not incur the change involved in its destruction, except under some most powerful impulse. And again, this nation was once a nation composed exclusively of slave states — and if in the progress of events the greater part of the states become free states — every consideration of decency and good faith obliges those thus changing their condition to be more and more, instead of less and less, observant of the duties and even the proprieties they owe to those who remain in the condition once common to all. And, to suggest nothing more, the preponderating power of the free states in the Union, added to the unscrupulous and disloyal principles avowed and propagated, to a greater or less extent, in every one of them

Digitized by Google

during the last thirty years; obliges the North, by every consideration of prudence, of equity, and of magnanimity, to concede to the South all that the spirit of their mutual engagements require, instead of striving to rob her of every security which is not expressed in the narrowest letter of the law. So clear is this controlling aspect of the subject, and so deeply does it enter into the convictions of all just men, that, on the one hand, the whole feeling of loyalty to the Union in the South, is connected with an abiding confidence that the North will act as becomes her in this emergency; and on the other hand, with an unshaken purpose, in the Union or out of it, to vindicate the security, the equality, and the rights, of slave States. It is upon these two points — can the South rely upon the North — and can the South maintain her vital interests in Union — that public opinion in the slave States which have not seceded, is struggling at this moment. For our own part, thoroughly convinced that both of those questions ought to be answered in the affirmative, we must not disguise that the thousands of loyal and patriotic men who have reached an opposite conclusion, and under it have been precipitated, by the force of a trained and long organized conspiracy, unto fatal proceedings; are able to render reasons for their want of confidence, to which coming ages will say, the North ought to have given earlier and more considerate heed. It is idle to attempt here, a statement of particular aggressions, upon a case so large, so long continued, so aggravating, and so palpable. If there is one sentiment perfectly cordial, and perfectly unanimous throughout the fifteen slave States, it is that they have just cause of complaint; a sentiment in which it is extremely probable, that the actual majority of the entire North would to some extent concur. Nay, the very form of any amicable settlement that can ever be made, reveals the true nature of the case — as every possible statement of it must show.

3. There are two points upon which the South has made up its mind, and which are decisive, one way or the other, of the whole matter; and upon which the course which the North may take, will either arrest the farther spread of the secession pestilence, and under firm and temperate treatment, as we have before shown, will probably bring back the seceding States; or will probably throw the whole nation into a state of political convulsion, the

Digitized by Google

end of which no man can conjecture, and no living man will see. These two points relate, 1. To the fair and complete execution of the provisions of the Federal Constitution, made expressly in favor of property in slaves — and most especially the provision for the rendition of fugitive slaves: 2. To the recognition of the perfect equality of the slave States with the free States, under the Federal Constitution, in all things — and most especially in the matter of Federal Territories. We will briefly treat of each of these points separately. And as it appears to us very clear that adequate power exists under the Federal Constitution to settle both points in a fair, complete, and satisfactory manner — we will not enter upon the discussion of any of the proposed changes in that instrument. There are also several incidental questions, such as slavery in the District of Columbia, the migration of slaves from one slave State to another, and the like, which we shall not discuss; since, as we doubt not, the settlement of the real question will draw after it the settlement of the rest; and a refusal to settle them renders all discussion of the others idle.

4. If any one will compare the unquestionable right of the owners of slaves, secured by the Federal Constitution, to have them delivered to them in the States to which they may escape, with what has occured during many past years with reference to the fair and sincere enforcement of this right, in any Northern State where its enforcement has been attempted, — or with the average aggregate conduct of the whole North upon the subject; he will be struck with astonishment, in proportion as he gets a complete idea of what the border slave States have suffered, and of the demoralized condition of opinion at the North on the whole subject, and of the utter wickedness of the organized robbery which has been systematically carried on. Mark — the Constitution of the nation expressly requires the rendition of slaves when they escape. Then observe, that along the border common to Ohio and Kentucky, slaves have been systematically enticed from their owners, by organized societies in Ohio, and carried off by arrangements so extensive, so complete, and so effectual, that along the entire border between those States, two or three counties deep, slavery is totally insecure in Kentucky. Along the frontier of

Digitized by Google

all the other border slave States, a similar system of organized plunder has been in active operation. To what extent the system penetrates the interior regions of the slave States, it is difficult to say; but it is known that emissaries from the North have systematically pervaded the entire South, in every imaginable disguise, schoolmaster, pedler, agent, quack, preacher, labourer — every thing — making known to the slaves the routes and methods of escape, and instilling into their minds principles that result in house-burning, poisoning, murder, and rape, if escape is impossible. What success has attended these diabolical proceedings, with regard to the whole number of slaves stolen, we have no better means of knowing than the published statement of journals that advocate the robbery: and after allowing for much boasting on their part, prompted by very obvious reasons, the number can hardly be set lower than a yearly average of ten thousand slaves — worth little short of ten millions of dollars — for some years past. Nor must it be forgotten, that although large sums of money are contributed by fanatics throughout the North, to the yearly support of these operations, yet the immediate agents of the work make it very profitable. We, and many hundred persons, have personal knowledge of a case which occurred a few years ago in Kentucky, in which between fifty and sixty negro men were attempted to be run off at one time, from Lexington and the surrounding region; in which the fee of the white organizer and leader of the company varied, according to the success of the negroes in stealing, from twenty-five to one hundred and fifty dollars, each. In that case the party was surprised when near the Ohio River, and the slaves recovered; and the white man is now in the Kentucky Penitentiary — instead of being lynched, as he would have been any where but in one of the finest communities in the world. Now let it be further observed, that this state of horrible perfidy, though notorious at the North, instead of awaking the universal horror of the community, finds the fundamental principles which underlie it, gradually penetrating in all directions; widely influential journals advocating them; supporters of them sitting in many State Legislatures, and in both Houses of Congress; political parties impregnated with them; the laws of many States changed so as to give them

Digitized by Google

security; the current literature deeply imbued with them; and to crown all, the ministers of religion, to the extent almost of whole sects and denominations, making them the chief themes of their instruction from the pulpit. We do not enumerate the election of Mr. Lincoln as the climax, and final triumph of these principles: on the contrary, it is clear to us that his nomination for the Presidency is to be accounted evidence of a rëaction against them: and we know of little in the modern history of parties, braver, or more manly, than his unflinching and reiterated declarations, that the South is entitled to an effective law for the rendition of fugitive slaves, and to its effective execution.

5. That is precisely what the whole South demands. Planted on the Constitution — loyal to it and to the country — the evidence of the wrongs she has endured written on the whole face of society North and South, Mr. Lincoln himself has long ago spoken the brave and true word; the South is entitled to an effective law, and to its effective execution, whereby these outrages shall be put down forever. The time to discuss the propriety of putting such a clause in the Federal Constitution, terminated seventy years ago. The time to plead conscientious scruples for breach of faith founded on the alleged immorality of property in slaves, will come after it is shown that a nation can exist — much less that a free people can tranquilly sustain a common government, for the sake of enabling one half to plunder and degrade the other half. One of the worst symptoms of the case is manifested in the indirect manner in which many Northern States have endeavoured to defeat the execution of public law by unfriendly legislation, directed in some instances against their own citizens, in some against citizens of the South, and in some against both; and in, not only an apparent popular approval of such laws, and the most stolid indifference to the matter on the part of those who did not approve them, but even in their careful and well-considered defense by some of the ablest and best men in the North, as being without serious objection in principle. That is, all the people in Massachusetts being both citizens of that State and citizens of the United States, and there being nobody there to act in either capacity, except those who must act in both; what follows under this new political morality, and what is attempted under the pre-

Digitized by Google

text of religious scruples is — that the people of Massachusetts as citizens of the United States acknowledge the obligation resting on them under the Federal Constitution for the rendition of fugitive slaves in Massachusetts; and at the same moment as citizens of the State, they pass laws refusing the use of their prisons and making it criminal for their officers or even their citizens to assist, and contrive remedies whereby the owner who seeks to recover his slave may be arrested as a trespasser, or even imprisoned as a felon. It is an exceedingly palpable instance, on a large scale, of what resources were possessed by those fortunate and unscrupulous gentlemen of a past age, who were princes and bishops at the same time. In point of morals, such pretexts are simply scandalous. In private life, no man who resorts to them can be held to be a gentleman — or in pecuniary transactions, can be considered honest. In public life, such attempts are chargeable with the folly and wickedness of begetting conflicts of civil and political duties in mere wantonness — or with being, as we have before shown they are, the organized results of that seditious spirit of anarchy which is destroying our country, and which a better public sentiment must crush wherever it exists, before society can be safe in any part of it. The people of the free States, wherever and in so far as they have been seduced into such legislation, owe to public morality, to their own character, and to their highest interests, not less than to their constitutional obligations as citizens of the United States, and the mutual relations of the States to each other under our noble institutions; to erase at once all State enactments that cast obloquy on their own national obligations, or look towards the dishonor or the obstruction of the just and unquestionable claims of others upon them. And we rejoice with all our heart at the indication in so many portions of the North, that what is right will be promptly done in this matter; and by this means, one of the steps indispensable to the permanent maintainance of our institutions be firmly taken, and the friends of the Union every where, but especially in the South, have a noble vindication of their resolute confidence that the nation was still sound at heart.

6. The other point of the two which the whole nation perceives to be fundamental, relates to the equality of the States in the

Digitized by Google

Union, and especially as that bears upon the question of slavery in the Federal Territories, as we have already stated. The great idea of all our institutions, though complex, is perfectly clear. We constitute one nation, whose people, however, are divided into many sovereign States. We have no nation but as we have these States; and we have no States but as they make this nation; and our people are citizens both of the nation and of some particular State — and strictly speaking, to be one involves the other. The fundamental principle of our liberty is the sovereignty, not of governments, but of society itself — the people; and the deepest foundation of this sovereignty of the people, is their right to change, to order, and to interpret, their political and civil institutions, by voting; to do this as separate States where the matter relates *exclusively* to the particular State — to do it in concert where it relates to the nation. In the exercise of this sovereign power the people of this nation have made all their constitutions — the very oldest of which now existing is the Federal Constitution. And the broad distinction between that Constitution made for the nation, which by its nature and its terms is supreme over all in its proper sphere, and the Constitutions made for the States respectively, is simply this; that by the former no powers are conferred on the General Government created by it except such as are expressly enumerated and such as are incidental and necessary thereto; and that by the latter all powers residing in society are conferred on the State Governments created by them, except such as are expressly withheld by Bills of Right, or some similar device. We do not mean that these results are inherent and inevitable; but we mean that these are the facts — the great and wise things actually accomplished by our ancestors. In the balancing of the powers of the Federal and State Governments, and in defining and ordering their mutual spheres and extent, lies that wide debatable ground over which statesmen have fought their battles, and organized parties. Amongst these battles none have been more hotly fought, or more perilous to the country, than the one which has been waged over this question of Slavery in the Federal Territories. What we propose, is not to enter into a history of these difficulties — nor to discuss the soundness of any of the conflicting interpretations of the Constitution, upon which the extreme claims

Digitized by Google

of hostile parties or sections rest; but to accept the actual and notorious posture of the whole affair — and having pointed out, in the nature of our system of government, the ground and the character of the real difficulty, to state the principles on which alone, as it appears to us, the integrity of the Union between slave States and free States can be preserved.

7. There are three possible results to the matter, namely: all the Territories may become free States, or all may become slave States, or some may become one, and some may become the other. No one who has a grain of common sense, can suppose it to be possible for either of the first two results to occur, by any peaceful means, or that the general government can throw its influence systematically in favour of either of them, without breaking up the confederacy — or that extensive combinations of States on either side to secure either result, can terminate otherwise than in war. It follows, therefore, that the practical enforcement of the dogma on which Mr. Lincoln comes into power, namely, that there shall be no more slavery in the Territories, is impossible otherwise than by means of the dissolution of the Union, and the subsequent conquest of one portion of the country by the other. But Mr. Lincoln and his party, if they are insane enough to push their dogma to that terrible issue, will — to say nothing of their other perils — probably find themselves arrested, as soon as they show that they are in earnest, by a counter revolution at the North, which will crush the diabolical conspiracy. Admitting that the Congress of the United States has absolute power over the National Territories — and admitting that the Northern States had the permanent control of both Houses of Congress; we have not the least idea, that a congress and a national administration in this, or any other free country, would encounter the peril, and heap on themselves the degradation of attempting to rob numerous States and many millions of people, all subject to the same government, and all portions of the same nation with themselves, of their total share in an imperial inheritance. Such ideas may be made effectual in the organization of parties, and may assume prominence in popular movements; but when it becomes necessary to give them legal form and validity, to enforce them at the point of the bayonet, to risk counter-revolution in support of them, to

Digitized by Google

establish them upon the ruins of society, and cover either the triumph or the failure of the attempt with the detestation of mankind, their evasion, in some way or other, is one of those uncontrollable necessities of responsible power, before which human passions bow in reverent awe. In like manner, the opposite extreme opinion and claim, is in its nature equally incapable of being realized. Admitting it to be true, that by the Constitution of the United States, every Federal Territory is dedicated to slavery, until on becoming a State, the people abolish it by a sovereign act; and admitting that the Supreme Court has the power to establish, beyond reversal, this sense of the Constitution, and that it has done so in a case regularly before it, and demanding for its decision the settlement of this point; still the practical enforcement of the thing, is both morally and politically impossible. We have not the least idea, that a congress composed exclusively of Southern men, could be gathered by popular election, that would entertain a proposition to rob free States weaker than themselves, of their share of a common inheritance, upon any plea that can be imagined; we do not believe the majority of any slave State would enforce such a proposition; we do not believe that any Southern gentleman would execute such a scheme. Moreover, the political impossibility is complete; and in the actual state of the country as presented by the relative number and power of the free and slave States, and as exhibited by the state of opinion everywhere — the notion of establishing slavery in all the national Territories as of constitutional right, has about the same practical value as the notion of securing all those Territories for slavery, by secession. Now, let it be borne in mind, that we have taken these claims and the demands on the one side and the other, as being founded on truths that are undeniable, and rights that are unquestionable; and have pointed out the impossibility of any just, practical, or peaceful result, in the direction indicated on either side. How immeasurably is that conclusion strengthened, when it is considered that there is not a truth asserted, a principle laid down, or a claim advanced on either side, that is not vehemently repudiated by about half the population of the nation! Well may we assert the complete impossibility both of excluding slavery from all the Territories, and of establishing it in them all; and de-

Digitized by Google

nounce the wickedness of all parties who persist in such endeavors. Those Territories, if the nation survives, must necessarily be, and ought to be, partly slave and partly free. Political necessity demands it, public justice requires it, all true statesmanship points to that result, the undisturbed force of events would terminate in that issue, and all attempts to prevent it are founded in considerations forbidden alike by wisdom, by equity, and by patriotism; and will end in crime, and misery, and dishonour, precisely in the degree that they are successful. If the country shall be destroyed, the chief importance of the questions on which our ruin is brought about, will afterwards be, that all men may see how scandalous were the pretexts upon which the noblest product of human civilization was made desolate.

8. The national domain not embraced by the boundaries of any existing State, amounts to one and a half, or two millions of square miles; an area much greater than that covered by all the States lying between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mississippi River; not much less, perhaps, than the area covered by all the present States. That the people of the larger and more numerous free States should combine to exclude the people of the weaker and less numerous slave States, from the enjoyment of the whole of this immense inheritance, is an outrage so preposterous, that one is the less astonished that it should react in a counter combination to establish slavery in the whole of it; and while the pretext of conscientious scruples for seizing all was the natural, because the only one, however ignoble, which the strong could use — the counter resort of the weaker party was also natural, and the only one they could make but war, namely, extreme constitutional right, countenanced by their construction of a political judgment of the Supreme Court. In effect, as there are but three possible solutions of the case, as has just been shown, so there are but three possible methods in which the case can be solved. One is by an equitable partition of the common inheritance, founded on the mutual recognition by the parties of the undeniable fact that it is a common property: a second is, for the owners of the inheritance to determine to fight out their opposite claims in each particular Territory — somewhat after the manner of the Kansas affair: the third is, to dissolve the Union, and fight out the opposing claims

Digitized by Google

afterwards, leaving the Territories like every thing else, in a state of anarchy, useless to either party. It is indeed conceivable that after dissolving the Union, men might recover their senses, and be capable, as alien enemies to each other, of acting with a degree of mutual forbearance and justice, which if practiced when they were united by the most sacred bonds, would have kept them friends forever. The probability of such a miracle, every one will determine for himself; as well as the probability that the future inhabitants of the vast region thrown away by the nation in its disgraceful paroxysms, will put faith enough in such miracles to respect any partition of them amongst the fragments of a disbanded confederacy. It is in vain that we would evade the sacred duties which press us, and from whose performance there is no escape that does not at the same moment brand us with infamy, and hurry us towards destruction. There is but one possible result that is just and right — and there is but one possible way of reaching that result that is either sure, fair, or peaceful: but that result, and that way of reaching it, are perfectly obvious — and when once recognized and pursued, they remove whatever difficulty the fair and complete execution of the duty to restore fugitive slaves leaves to be removed. It is upon these two points, as we have tried in all fairness to show, that the nation is bound and obliged to set herself right — that the *people* are required to make their majestic voice audible above the clamor of factions, and that all good men are called of God, by word and by deed, to rebuke on every side the phrenzy of the hour.

9. The particular mode in which this recognition of the common right of all the States in the national Territories, should be made; and the particular way and extent to which practical efficacy shall, at the moment, be given to that recognition; do not appear to us to be matters of very high importance in themselves, or matters which it is necessary that we should discuss here. An effectual law, and its effectual execution, concerning the rendition of fugitive slaves; a sincere recognition of the common right of all the States in the national domain, and the mutual abandonment by the North and the South of all claim and attempt to make all the Territories either free or slave: it is upon these points that a good understanding, will settle all the rest — and that a refusal to

Digitized by Google

come to such an understanding, will throw upon those so acting the whole responsibility of all that may follow. The foregone conclusions of political parties, and the previous committals of public men, are utterly insignificant in any true appreciation of the interests now at stake. The propounding of particular theories, or of special lines of policy, or of lists of propositions, or any thing of the sort — by State Legislatures, by resolutions in Congress, by Conventions of the people, or in any other way — where the design or the effect is to embarrass or to obstruct the indispensable settlement, is either a great weakness, or a covert attempt to prevent any settlement. The demand of either party to have a division of the Territories that is grossly unequal, is that far unjust, and a manifestation of the same spirit of claiming all, which has already wrought so much mischief. And with a million or two of square miles of national domain, not yet embraced in any State, with a country large enough to contain fifty or a hundred times its present population — and with instant difficulties which have already produced the most terrible calamities, and whose early settlement may be indispensable to the prevention of universal revolution; the purpose to make that settlement depend upon an explicit agreement concerning the disposition we will hereafter make of foreign states, which we may possibly conquer or purchase at some future day; can be considered nothing else than a purpose of preventing the possibility of any settlement. Beyond all doubt, if the free States consider that the main use of our Constitutional Union and our continued national existence, is the extinction of negro slavery on this continent; or if the slave States consider that the chief value of those incalculable advantages, lies in the use of them for the indefinite extension of slavery; the knell of our destiny is struck — and our glory, our felicity, and our triumph are as a tale that has been told.

V. 1. We have said, on a previous page, that the revolution in the seceding States would not stop where it now is, and that the course it would hereafter take, depended upon causes in some degree appreciable now; of which causes we enumerated those which appeared to us most important in the production of such results as would restore those States to their former position in the nation. Amongst them, the conduct of the Federal government towards

Digitized by Google

the seceding States — according as it might be firm and yet temperate, or as it might be vacillating and timid, was enumerated as a decided element of the future. No one can doubt that this is true, or fail to experience great anxiety on the subject. We feel no disposition to speak confidently about proceedings of the general government not yet adequately explained; nor, under any circumstances, to judge the President harshly. We consider Mr. Buchanan to be situated just in that manner, that if he saves his country, posterity will forgive him much, and place his name high on the roll of history; but that if, either by his own fault, or by the fatal temper of the times, his administration is made the term of his country's grand career, he must be classed with the greatest victims of misfortune. Few have presided at obsequies that ought to have been so illustrious — and that threaten to be so ignominious. Apparently the sport of a Cabinet divided into factions, of which one was irresolute, another neither loyal to him nor to the country, and the isolated members without authority; the use made of the national administration seems to have been to promote the interest of the leaders of sedition; until the President found himself with no alternative but to sacrifice alike his official duty and his personal honour, or at a most perilous moment, to reconstruct his Cabinet on the basis of one or two faithful and able men, the remnant of his old advisers. There may be some ground for difference of opinion as to the probable result, if the same conduct had been pursued by the administration from the beginning, as has been since the reconstruction of the Cabinet. Nothing short of complete success, rendered only more difficult by his own previous conduct, can now avert from the President, the stern condemnation of posterity. And the secession party, prompt, diligent, and sagacious, after securing from Mr. Buchanan the utterance of such opinions, and the acquiescence in such proceedings, as rendered their first organized movements safe from interruption; and after treating all national rights that stood in the way of their subsequent movements as mere nullities, and all national property in their reach as lawful plunder; are now diligently engaged in propagating the sentiment, that all attempts of the nation even to expire with decency, much less to defend its dignity, its honour, its authority,

Digitized by Google

its military posts, or its property, should be esteemed outrages on sovereign States — and be condemned as acts of useless folly that can lead only to bloodshed; seeing that the premeditated work is done, and all composition is impossible. At the same critical moment, a signal change manifests itself in the bosom of the party in the North, which resists all fair settlement, and yet dreads popular revolution there. As long as threats of violence were particularly empty and insulting, they were hurled at the South. Now, when their disloyal hopes point in another direction, the method they take to avert the coming reaction which may save the country, is to unite in vehement protests against what they are pleased to designate as *coercion*. If the nation, first deluded and then disgraced, can be paralyzed — and the whole South driven into secession — the extreme party at the North, and the extreme party at the South, each gains its special ends; and the mass of the people every where, and especially in the great Central States, may, at their leisure, wake to the reality of a situation fatal and detestable to them — which it would have been far easier for them to have prevented, than it will be to correct. In short, it is to deter the national government from every act which can even tend to restore the supremacy of the Constitution, and the integrity of the nation, that the cry against what they call coercion, is substituted for the cry against what they called oppression, in the first stages of the revolt.

2. It is deplorable, in every stage and act of this sad drama, how an almost preternatural ingenuity of error has trifled with the noblest impulses of the people, and with the simplest truths which support all our institutions. Let the dominant party in South Carolina start with the political falsehood, that the people of that State are not citizens of the United States, except through the constitution and government of that State; and let the National Administration start with the corresponding political falsehood, that the supreme law of the land cannot be enforced towards the people of South Carolina, contrary to the wishes and acts of this dominant party; and let both parties concur in the additional political falsehood, that the ruin of society is better than the risk of collision with any body in enforcing the laws: then, of course, nullification, secession, sedition, revolution, anarchy —

Digitized by Google

are inevitable products of the organization of society, and public order, and regulated liberty, and the security of property and life become more and more impossible as the organization of society becomes more and more perfect. We pointed out, on a previous page — when exposing the perfidy of the pretext resorted to in justifying the conduct of dominant parties in some of the free States, touching the rendition of fugitive slaves — the simple and obvious refutation, founded in the double citizenship of the people of the United States; and here the refutation is just as clear, and is founded on the same truth. By the express terms, as well as by the very nature of the Federal Constitution, a secession ordinance in the South is as totally void as a personal liberty law in the North possibly can be. The Federal Government has no more need to deal with the South Carolina convention, in executing the post office laws, the revenue laws, or any other laws — than it has to deal with the Massachusetts Legislature in executing the fugitive slave law; and there was no more legal necessity, nor any more logical consistency, in diatribes about lack of power *to coerce a State*, in one case than the other. There was no need, nor any power, to *coerce a State*, in either case; but in both cases the need was urgent, and the power was complete, to execute the Laws of the United States upon *every citizen of the United States*, whatever relation he might happen to occupy towards any one of the States; and to enforce those laws against all wrong doers. Nor is there any consideration arising out of the nature or the form of the opposition, that may be made to the execution of the supreme law, which can go farther than to address itself to the sound discretion of the national government, in the way of determining the most proper and effectual, and at the same time the least arbitrary, perilous, and destructive method of overcoming the resistance that is made. If the President, in the exercise of this discretion, allows millions of dollars worth of national property in buildings, in cash, in munitions of war, to be seized and held by citizens of the United States in avowed revolt against the general government; if he permits them to take forcible possession of the national fortresses, and hold them in armed hostility to the nation; if he permits the officers and soldiers of the army of the United States, to be taken prisoners of

Digitized by Google

war, and treated by hostile commanders as captured enemies; if he permits armies to be organized, munitions of war to be collected, batteries to be directed against the national fortresses; if he permits the flag of the nation to be torn down from the public edifices and fortresses, and hostile flags to be planted on them — nay, permits that proud emblem of our national unity and force to be fired on with impunity, when it covers an armed force of the nation; if he allows the mail to be broken open and the correspondence of the government itself to be tampered with; the foreign commerce of the country to be interrupted and the revenue from it seized; the internal commerce to be menaced by batteries erected under State authority on our great water courses; if, to add no more, he permits ambassadors from secession conventions and assemblies to menace him with war in the capital of the nation, and conspirators plotting the military occupation of the Federal City, to go unpunished: it really appears to us that the most nervous secessionist might consider the question of coercion, as being about as offensive to the President as to himself. Every man who has any remaining loyalty to the nation, or any hope or desire for the restoration of the seceding States to the confederacy; must see that what is meant by the outcry against coercion is in the interest of secession, and that what is meant is in effect, that the Federal government must be terrified or seduced into complete cöoperation with the revolution, which it was its most binding duty to have used all its power and influence to prevent.

3. We believe it is the desire of the American people that the present revolution should be brought to such a conclusion that the seceding States shall all be restored to their position in the nation; and that to this end such a settlement of existing difficulties shall be made, as will effectually and peacefully secure this result. In order to that, it is impossible for the nation to permit anything to be done by the general government, which will take for granted that the state of exaggerated and disloyal opinion either in the extreme North or the extreme South, is irrevocably fixed as a final and sovereign expression. On the contrary, what the nation must take for granted, as the basis of every hope of peaceful success. is that a revolution in opinion must take place in both

Digitized by Google

quarters, in view of the imminent peril of our position. But beyond all doubt, every thing that can strengthen the hands of the party now dominant, either at the extreme North or the extreme South — must weaken every hope of any revolution in opinion — every hope of a solution at once peaceful and successful. Nothing could be so fatal as the conviction in the mind of loyal citizens, both in the extreme North and the extreme South, that the nation does not sympathise with them, and will abandon them. It is, therefore, sheer folly to weaken the posture of the general government towards the secession movement. The duties of that government, are perfectly clear as to their nature — no matter how difficult they may be as to the mode of their performance. The nation has no alternative, for the moment, but to abide the firm and sincere performance of those duties, — meantime striving for a settlement of the whole difficulty. If the seceding States follow up their past outrages by rushing into war with the nation, no matter on what pretext, that will only prove that the pestilence has already gone beyond the reach of peaceful remedies. On the other hand, let it be taken for granted that the nation cannot be saved — and that a peaceful separation, if that be possible, is the best hope of all parties. Even in that case, and with a view to that result, the position of the general government towards the seceding States should be one of forbearance and moderation indeed, but of unalterable firmness. The nation has an interest in the manner of this supposed separation, hardly inferior to its interest in preventing any separation: nor is the interest of the States that may go out, less permanent and fundamental in the right ordering of that great, and as we think terrible result, than any they may suppose they have in founding a new empire. That this particular constitutional government should fail, is dreadful enough; but we owe it to ourselves, to the glorious cause of constitutional government, and indeed to the human race, that we should not establish by our downfall the imbecility of republican freedom; but, on the contrary, that the very wreck of our institutions should exhibit the principles of constitutional liberty — in contrast with every aspect of anarchy — and in all their unalterable force and beauty. Let our ruin be the thousandth proof of the violence of human passions, and the instability of human

Digitized by Google

hopes: let it not be a damning evidence against constitutional government. To us nothing appears more certain, than that looking to either result, the nation has no necessity more imperative, as means to any endurable result, than that the Federal Government — instead of shrinking from its true position on the one hand, or resorting to needless violence on the other — should accept its true mission as the representative of the nation, and so to a great extent master of the situation, and pilot the ark in which such transcendent treasures are embarked, courageously amidst the howling waters. God will bring it to the right haven: for the prayers of many hundreds of thousands of his children — lie yet unanswered before his face.

4. It is from a single point of view that we have conducted this exposition, and it is unto one single result, that we have directed it. The point of view is that of one steadily beholding the imminent and deadly peril of his country—nay, its ruin, already in some degree accomplished, and hastening to be complete; and the single result developed, is the salvation of the country — the *whole* country. Many topics have, therefore, been passed in silence, which, from any other point of view, or in expounding any other result, would have required careful treatment; and many other topics eminently pertinent here, have been omitted, because we have already discussed them on a recent occasion.* It is of the last importance, that we should not be deceived by appearances, or misled either by our hopes or our terrors. The voice that can alone silence the storm that is raging around us — the hand that is alone competent to grasp and to crush every element of disorder — that voice has not yet spoken, that hand has not yet put forth its strength: it is the voice and the hand of this *great nation*. It is time for it to speak — time for it to act. If we may dare to trust all the lessons of the past, it will be true to itself — true to every one who is faithful to it. In that case we are safe; though we may suffer much and long before the end is reached. Our civili-

* See "*Discourse of* Dr. Robert J. Breckenridge. *Delivered at Lexington, Ky., January 4th*, 1861; *on the Day of National Humiliation.*" It has been widely published in the Newspapers, both secular and religious, and in pamphlet form by *Hull & Brother*, Louisville, Ky.; *Faran & McLean*, Cincinnati, Ohio; *Woods*, Baltimore, Md.; and perhaps in other places by other persons.

Digitized by Google

zation, in its present form, is the growth of nearly a century — the growth of two centuries and a half on this continent — the growth of all preceding ages in the old world, before its best inhabitants came hither, to construct society afresh out of all the treasures of the past. The gigantic oaks of the forest are not planted more deeply — the everlasting mountains have not a surer foundation — than our American Civilization. Let the nation stir itself as a giant, waking from his slumber. Let the voice of God be heard amongst us, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder. Let us not hold our peace, — let us not rest, till the peril is overpassed, that we should be termed Forsaken and our land be termed Desolate — nor till our country be as a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and as a royal diadem in the hand of our God!

* *
*

Art. V. — *Immortality of the Soul.*

Phædo Platonis: Recensuit, Prolegomenis et Commentariis instruxit G. Stallbaum. Editio tertia. Gothæ, MDCCCL.

The Phædo of Plato is unquestionably one of the most important remains of classical Antiquity. The nature of the subject which this Dialogue discusses, the character of the chief speaker, and the time of its origin, all unite to invest it with deep interest. The question of the Patriarch, "If a man die, shall he live again?" is the expression of a felt desire for knowledge which has actuated every thinking man, alike among savage and civilized nations. The very conditions of our being suggest this interrogation; for the future must engage our thought, and the constant recurrence of bodily dissolution gives point to the inquiry whether our existence is bounded by the goal of visible mortality. Accordingly we find this subject agitated by the most profound thinkers the world has seen, who have brought the aid of their best powers to discover a solution to the question, which must be

Digitized by Google

answered in order to give rest to a justifiable curiosity. At the head of thinkers we do not hesitate to place Socrates, whose sentiments his almost equally celebrated pupil has given us. While other men may have possessed more accomplished minds, and thus have been enabled to deliver their opinions more systematically, there has never been any uninspired man whose doctrines have exerted such a pervading influence on the cultivated nations of the earth as the Athenian Sage. We are, therefore, justified in expecting the best results of the human mind, on a subject confessedly of the highest importance. Still further; the time when this Dialogue was uttered, was well adapted by its surroundings to excite the mind to the most vigorous efforts. Socrates is in the midst of his intimate friends, at a juncture of the greatest solemnity, and the conversation is directed to a subject befitting the occasion, and invested with great personal interest, whether we consider the duty which the master owed his scholars in his last lesson of wisdom, or their love for him whom they expected to see no more.

The result justifies the expectation; for the common voice of succeeding ages has admitted this to be the most complete and thorough vindication of the soul's Immortality that unaided human reason has ever achieved. All that strength of mind, earnestness, and ingenuity, incited by the deepest interest, could effect, has been done; so that we may well say, here, if any where, is the arena wherein are brought forth the strong arguments: and if the conclusion be not established, this is because of its impossibility from the nature of the subject. We grant even more. It is the storehouse from which has been drawn the material for every argument worth the name, that subsequent writers have employed, to prove by independent reasoning that we shall exist in another life. However disguised their attempts, still by examination, we find that the substance of their arguments consists only in changes rung upon those first developed by Plato, from the last conversation which his Master held.

A production then of such importance deserves careful consideration; and it will be our effort to give it a fair examination: granting full credit to all that it really proves. Nor is it improper to say that we came to this treatise prepossessed with the be-

Digitized by Google

lief that it did, as generally conceded by those who put confidence in speculations concerning matters of faith, really establish the soul's Immortality. So that it was our wish to find the reasoning conclusive; and thus prejudice at least was in favor of the position of our author.

When the friends of Socrates visit him in the morning preceding his execution, the conversation begins by some remarks touching the right which a man has to take his own life, which the philosopher opposes on the ground that we are subject to the disposal of the gods, and therefore should not leave the post they assign us; for that would be to exhibit pusillanimity, as not being able to meet the ills of life, and disobedience to our masters who have placed us here. But though this be true, it is, nevertheless, the real business of life to prepare for death, and philosophy is nothing else than a constant meditation how to die. For this reason all who seek to be guided aright, should endeavor without ceasing to separate the soul as much as possible from the body, by striving against appetites and passions which have a perpetual tendency to lead us astray. The more we are freed from the influence of our bodies the more pure we become, and the object to be striven for is entire deliverance from the corporeal nature; so that we may be able to view all things as they really are by the soul itself, without the intervention of any medium whose only tendency is to confuse and pervert. * Here we find much to admire, much that is worthy of a Christian philosophy, but is defective in that it considers the body only as an impediment, while in fact a rational view of man ought to take in his whole nature as composed of the two principles. We can here detect some of the Parsee system of two antagonistic elements, lurking under the garb of Socratic speculation; for the body is looked upon as essentially corrupting in its nature, and the spirit pure. Christianity accepts both parts of our being as necessary elements in man; both alike corrupt, but both to be purified and made partakers of a state of perfection. As Socrates speaks of the complete separation of the soul and body at death, this gives rise to the observation by one of his auditors, that the prevailing opinion is that both perish alike and are no more. This brings the subject fairly up, and

* 60 B.—68 B.

Digitized by Google

it is admitted to be an opportune time for its discussion. * Let us now examine the leading arguments in their order.

I. The first is drawn from the common tradition that souls exist in Hades, and are produced again from the dead. This is the argument from contraries, by which it is attempted to be shown that one extreme or opposite is naturally followed by its contrary. In support of this, the general law of nature is referred to, that one state is succeeded by its opposite. Day follows night. Expansion is succeeded by contraction. The frosts and gloom of winter, when all is chained under icy fetters, are the precursors of the warmth of spring, in whose genial rays the flowers bloom, and Nature smiles in her robe of loveliness. Still other examples are adduced, such as greatness being produced from smallness; strength, from weakness; the being awake, from sleep. By this method of inference Socrates says we prove that souls exist in Hades, and are produced from the dead, since life is the counterpart or contrary of death. † But if we look closely into this argument it is defective in many respects. For first: It is clearly a *petitio principii;* because if the soul does continue to exist in the unseen world, then it does not die, and of course lives; which is the very fact to be proved. But in order for this to be a legitimate argument, the soul must die that it may come to life again. For if the body alone dies, all that can be inferred according to this method of sequence, is that *it* must come to life again; but there is no reference whatever to the future existence of the spirit. So that this reasoning is vicious; because from the death of the one the life of the other is deduced, instead of its own, which ought to be the consequence resulting from the premises.

Again: This argument is untenable according to the ancient maxim, *Ex nihilo et nihil fit*; for here would be something produced without any cause; or, what is still more illogical, by a cause working in a direction contrary to its production. The little cannot produce the great, because its nature is to be little. Cold cannot produce heat, because its tendency is in a diametrically opposite direction. So also of darkness and light. But let us apply this principle a little further. If contraries produce

* 69 B.—70 C. † 70 C.—72 D.

Digitized by Google

their opposites, then vice must beget virtue; sin produce holiness; corruption generate purity; which is not only absurd and false, but entirely subversive of our moral character. In the examples adduced by Socrates there certainly cannot be the order of causation; but at most, immediate succession. Even in the case of sleep, which, both in the language of poetry, and also to the scrutiny of reason, seems most nearly allied to death, there is no more than sequence between it and waking: both being states caused by the physical necessities of our nature. In the case of grain which is sown, (of which example the Apostle, enlightened by the Revelation of God, makes such beautiful application,) if we consult reason merely, there can be nothing proven to establish a future life. For there is an essential difference between the two cases. In the example of death, there is no evidence whatever of any life remaining, but on the contrary the most convincing proofs that no vitality is there; while in the grain of corn planted there is a visible living germ. If we make the cases parallel, the argument from analogy is against the Socratic position; for, if we destroy the germ of the grain so that there is no more life than in the dead body, we know assuredly that no plant will spring forth. But if it be said, Nay, but the soul, though it corresponds with the living principle in the plant, has disappeared and still lives, we then affirm that reason does not teach us this; and if it be assumed, then that is taking for granted the very thing to be proved.

Once more: We observe that death is here considered merely as a result of natural laws, while in truth it is an event contrary to nature, and inflicted as a special punishment for transgression; so that whatever we might infer from an observation of the physical world, we cannot reasonably apply our conclusions to a case contrary to the natural order of things. Revelation teaches us the cause of death, and gives us the blessed assurance that this "last enemy shall be destroyed;" yet this precious truth never was reached by the wisdom of man, but is made known by direct communication from God.

II. The second argument employed by Socrates is that deduced from reminiscence. By the association of ideas, when one of a pair of notions which have been previously viewed conjointly,

Digitized by Google

is presented, we are reminded of the other by a power of the mind natural to us. For example, when we see a garment belonging to a friend, or a picture representing his features, we are at once reminded of the possessor or original. Moreover, we are led by suggestion from the known and visible to the unknown and invisible. Thus we have certain ideas of magnitude, beauty, equality, etc., which are suggested to us by seeing things which possess these qualities in some degree, and have their proper nature because of their participation in these ideas. So when we see beautiful objects we are at once led to think of the abstract idea of the Beautiful. Yet we have never seen any such thing in this life as abstract beauty or equality. However, just as in the case of the picture of our friend, which by association with him at some previous time, causes the spontaneous remembrance of this person again, so the abstract notions or realities of things are brought to our minds by material objects which have been seen in conjunction with them, or arouse them by relative suggestion. So we must have seen these entities in a previous state of being; from whence it follows, according to this reasoning, our souls must have had an existence in a state prior to the present. *

Here it is necessary to observe that this whole argument rests upon the doctrine of Ideas as developed in the Socratic dialogues. For, it is maintained that abstract notions have a real existence, that Ideas are eternal, and the exemplars after which all visible forms are created. This doctrine is now exploded, and held by no metaphysician of the present day. True, we possess susceptibilities, sometimes improperly called innate ideas, which are natural to the mind; but it requires the presentation of phenomena before they are awakened into action. This internal power is so far only a counterpart of the external, in the production of these ideas; and all the Universals of the Platonic School, are the product of our power of abstraction and generalization. But the argument is lame in this respect also, that it has not the testimony of consciousness to accompany it; without which, we can accept no mental datum. In those cases where reminiscence holds good, we are fully conscious, when by the presentation of one object an-

* 72 D.—77 A.

Digitized by Google

other is suggested, that we have seen the two together before; otherwise the one could not recall the other. But in the case of universals, our consciousness does not tell us that we have seen them in conjunction with a particular individual, or even that we have ever known such an entity at all. Now, as personal identity cannot be conceived of as existing in a rational creature without consciousness, and as we have no knowledge of our living in a previous state, a contradiction arises in saying that our souls had a being before we were born, unless together with the ideas which we possessed, we had likewise the consciousness of our own existence. Nor will it do to affirm that all learning is the mere recollection of what we knew previously; for we are constantly acquiring information wholly new to us, such as facts of history; however true it be that much of our knowledge is suggested by that which we have already gained.

Even if it were true that universals were acquired in a previous state, that would only prove that our souls existed before we were born, not that they will still live after our death.* This objection is mooted in the Dialogue, and is met by reference to the preceding argument, whose inconclusiveness we have attempted to show. Again, admitting that the soul existed in a previous state, then we are led into the doctrine of transmigration, which only removes the difficulty without meeting it. For, though the soul had been born many times and it survived the deaths of the numerous bodies it had inhabited, this does not prove its immortality; for it may pass through any number of Avatars and yet perish at last. Unless it be eternal it must have had a beginning; and it cannot be eternal and yet finite. Hence, being finite, and having a beginning, it may reasonably have an end; for that which begins to exist may, for any thing in its own nature to the contrary, cease to exist; and nothing but the declaration of God can establish the contrary view.

III. A third argument is drawn from the nature of the soul as being uncompounded.† It has always been a notion of philosophers that the ultimate particles of matter, (the Monads of Leibnitz,) are indestructible. Their definition includes this idea; for did they ad-

* 77. † 78 A.—80 A.

Digitized by Google

mit a change of form or nature they would not be ultimate. According to this theory, therefore, if the soul can be shown to possess this character, the doctrine in question is claimed as proven. But it is no more than fair to admit that this assumption of the simple or uncompounded nature of the soul is gratuitous. Socrates does not prove it; but taking it for granted, as all have done who since borrowed his arguments, proceeds to found his third proof thereon. But to look closely at this subject, what real evidence have we of its conclusiveness? Does man act with singleness of purpose? Is his mind always free from distraction? Are there never contrary purposes so nearly balancing his mind that he with difficulty decides? Uncertainty of action and vacillation of character are the common bane of the species. So that an examination of the mind itself does not disclose a satisfactory proof of its simplicity. True, there is such a thing as personal identity; but what is a more vexed question than wherein this consists? Consciousness testifies to the fact that we possess it throughout our lives, yet we materially change in many respects. The same mind may possess more or less knowledge; it may increase in vigor and activity, all which increments or diminutions are truly parts of our being, and go to make up its character. The same man may have new avenues of information opened up to his soul; and different persons have various degrees of mental power; in all which cases it is not absolutely simple, else it could receive no addition nor suffer any diminution. The body acts as much like a unit as the mind. All its parts move in concerted action, they are members of one whole. By a beautiful figure the Church is compared in its oneness to the body; showing that its different members are not to be considered in their separate capacity, but as a unit, because actuated by a single purpose. Why then should the soul be assumed as uncompounded in order to prove its immortality? The truth is, we know nothing about this matter; and the conclusions drawn from any assumptions arbitrarily made, cannot but be uncertain. But if we admit the assumption, it will prove equally the immortality of brutes; for there is the same evidence, so far as we can know, that their spirits are as much uncompounded as our own. Again; the soul cannot any more be simple in its constitution, than the ultimate particles of matter of which man's body is composed.

Digitized by Google

If they were eternal, yet their existing in human form depends on a certain composition, and their action likewise on their union to a spirit. Is it not equally probable that the soul, whether simple or compound, depends on the organ for its existence as a soul? But it may be said: Nay, but the soul can act independently of any bodily organ; it can act on itself. How do we know this? Surely consciousness denies any example except in connection with the bodily nature. The union may be, for aught we know, and to all appearances is, the indispensable condition to mental action. So that we are driven to the extremity of admitting that though the soul were simple, it is no more so than the ultimate particles of matter of which the body is composed; and though it may exist, yet its being as a soul may depend wholly upon its union with matter. Consequently, at death it may cease to be, just as the corporeal man loses its identity, and become, as regards its personality, non-existent.

Our author recurs again to the doctrine of Universal Ideas as distinct, eternal, invisible, and indissoluble existences; and maintains that the mind by separating from contact with the body can grasp these, and by comprehending them shows its similarity to them! * But no argument can be more conclusive than its premises; consequently this is untenable. For besides the fact that these universals are no longer admitted, we can know but in part; and hence could not comprehend them, which would be necessary, according to the positions assumed, to be similar. Besides, we hold that knowledge of an object does not make the knowing subject similar in its attributes; for then would our acquaintance with God necessarily cause us to be like him.

In the course of this part of the subject we are told of the earnest efforts of good men to free themselves as much as possible from the corrupting influences of their bodies, with the hope that when they die they will be pure and happy, separated from all that is debasing, and therefore fit for the society of the gods. This desire and hope of a future state are powerful incentives to cause men to reason themselves into the belief of its existence. Yet this is a very weak argument; for nothing is more common

* 80 D.

Digitized by Google

than mere desire leading persons to accept as true the most monstrous absurdities. Addison, in his Cato, expresses the common feeling:

> It must be so! Plato thou reasonest well;
> Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
> This longing after immortality?

And Addison's reasoning on this subject is little more than the developing of the notions above expressed. But if our hopes and desires were sufficient reasons for the truth of a doctrine, then truly we would have but little difficulty in persuading ourselves of its reality; for what we greatly wish, we easily believe. But is the expectation of future existence no real ground for believing it? Shall the anticipations which we make, the hopes which we cherish, be no evidence of their fulfillment? In themselves they certainly are not, and this can be seen at once if we will contemplate the subject dispassionately. For there is no necessary connection between mere desire that a thing shall take place and its occurrence. Without an adequate cause no effect can follow; and truly our hope of living in a future state is no more reason that we will, than our wish to prolong our days on earth is a proof of the fact. In the latter, men are constantly disappointed; and in the nature of the case there is quite as little reason to infer the former. However, it is maintained that man does not accomplish his destiny on earth; that he merely prepares himself for a higher sphere of action; and therefore it would argue an imperfection inconsistent with the government of an all-wise God, if we should perish utterly, and all the preparation be lost. This argument is, however, more specious than real. It seems to ignore the fact open to the observation of all, that we live in a world of imperfection, and assumes from this imperfection and disorder that there must needs be a state of complete harmony. Disguise the fact as it may be, even the heathen cannot but see that the present is a state of misery; and conclusive reasoning, destitute of the light of revelation or tradition, would either project this condition of things into the world to come, or expect utter annihilation. For what is more common than to see preparation for the employments of this life suddenly frustrated by misfortune or death? How few dreams of youth are realized! How many well concerted plans

Digitized by Google

of ambition prove abortive! Many are the unions formed in this life, and which we are taught to believe can only be enjoyed here, which are destroyed before they do more than give a taste of the happiness reasonably looked for from them. The mother leaves her infant child which never can be compensated for the loss; the child dies in infancy, and the world loses all that might naturally be expected from its life. So that from the numberless examples, where we cannot but feel certain that no theatre will be given for the exercise of those powers and affections which are here cut short, because their action belongs to this life, we would far more rationally expect that no future existence is in store for us. Again, there are myriads of cases in the irrational world and among the lower orders of organized beings, where nature does not appear to complete her work. For example, animals perish by starvation and innumerable other causes, where their life and its enjoyments are just begun, and where their death can be of no apparent use to their fellows. Of the countless seeds which possess the germs of life, only a moiety vegetate, and still smaller numbers grow to perfection. In a word, Nature seems to be imperfect; and hence this analogy, so far from leading us to expect a future state wherein to realize all hopes and fulfill the destinies begun here, would rather prove the contrary. Revelation makes this all clear; for it explains how this imperfection arose, and how it is to be remedied; but to the unassisted human reason there is no light to dispel the darkness which gathers around untimely death and disappointed hope.

Two objections are here interposed by some of the auditors.* One is, that the soul is nothing but harmony, depending on the nice arrangement of the several parts, like that in a musical instrument which is effected by a proper adjustment of the materials. This is answered by the argument to prove the prëexistence of the soul; from which it would follow that it is not dependent upon the body. Moreover, there are affections in the soul, such as virtue and vice, existing at the same time, which is inconsistent with its being harmony; for then would one be more harmonized than another, which is inadmissible; because by this reasoning one soul

* 85 C.—86 D.

Digitized by Google

would be more a soul than another, which is absurd. The doctrine of prëexistence has already been disposed of, and the existence of opposite moral affections in the mind to prove that it is not harmony, is equally fatal to the view that it is a simple principle. A second objection advanced is, that although the soul may have existed before the body, and may last longer, yet this is no evidence that it will not finally wear out.* This brings up the whole subject squarely again; showing distinctly that the preceding arguments had not been satisfactory. It is also clear from the tenor of the Dialogue at this point, that the faith of the auditors in the conclusiveness of the preceding proofs was shaken, and they trembled for the safety of their Master's position.† Socrates therefore again addresses himself to the subject, and adduces the proof upon which he evidently lays the most stress, and which is accepted as convincing by his auditors.

IV. The fourth argument asserts that contraries cannot cöexist contemporaneously in the same subject: adducing proofs from the nature of general ideas and the relations of numbers.‡ This is confessedly a difficult part of the subject to comprehend, both from the abstruseness of the reasoning, and the recondite meaning attached to the terms employed. But we will attempt by a careful examination to elucidate it, and weigh the proofs with candor. Admitting that there are general ideas, and that every particular object possesses its proper nature by participation in the qualities of its universal, therefore it is held to be impossible that any two of a contrary character should cöexist; since the one must exclude the other. Littleness and greatness, heat and cold, odd and even, belonging to contrary universals cannot possibly be present in the same subject. But is this the case? In regard to greatness and smallness, cold and heat, they are merely relative terms; and, according to any criteria we may fix can assuredly cöexist. Ice at 32° Fah. is cold, yet it may be —50°; and platina at a white heat may be made still hotter; and the difference of the temperatures show that both principles of heat and cold may be present. The Pythagorean notion in regard to the powers and relations of numbers, is but imperfectly, if at all, understood by

* 87 A.–88 C. † 88 C.—E. ‡ 95 B.—105 A.

Digitized by Google

moderns; and hence it is with hesitancy that we venture to examine the argument based upon the connection of the even and the odd. But if we comprehend the meaning it is this: That *τὸ περιττὸν*, or the odd, and *τὸ ἄρτιον*, the even, cannot cöexist; but when one approaches, the other must recede. But it is clear that we may take two numbers that are prime to each other, the one containing oddity, and the other evenness, yet they cöexist in another number which equals their sum; or also in their product. But if it be said that the one number or nature cannot become the other, then we have only a truism. For it is impossible that one individual can become identical with another; for that would imply a transference of individuality which is an absurdity. However, by a metamorphosis, one object may take the place of another and be called by its name. So of all the contraries enumerated by Socrates, they may change and take each others' places; and this is all that is required to prove the insufficiency of the argument. For, granted that life and death are contrary, and that the soul is life, does it therefore follow that it cannot undergo some change and die? Life, it is true, cannot ever become death; for the former is an existence, and the latter an act or change; but this does not prevent one yielding to the influence of the other. And truly, in the bodily dissolution there is at least a change wrought in the manner of the soul's action, and we are not warranted in saying that this does not also extend to its being. And, besides, if there is no change in the soul, then it is absolute and eternal; never having been born, never dying, never affected by contact with matter, and always acting in precisely the same manner. Here, again, in assuming that the soul is life, and therefore does not admit the approach of death, the thing to be proven is taken for granted. Let us, however, try the principle of contraries by some examples and see whether it holds good. In the case of chemical elements of opposite natures, the very difference makes them unite with the greater activity. So also, the more intense the opposite states of electricity, in the same proportion do they tend to form a union. And besides, the soul most assuredly admits contraries within itself, as virtue and vice. The Christian in this life is neither wholly virtuous nor vicious; so that these two principles, diametrically opposite, admit each

Digitized by Google

other. Again; a very wicked man may become a good one; vice is then destroyed and virtue assumes its place. The beauty of youth is succeeded by the wrinkles and deformity of age; the beauty is thus destroyed. The germ of a plant may perish; life is here absorbed by death. Life exists as clearly in plants and animals as in men, yet no one supposes that dissolution in them merely sends away, but not actually destroys, the living principle. So that the logical consequences of the premises assumed do not justify the conclusion; neither do the deductions of experience favor it; and we are compelled to take leave of the formal part of this celebrated argument with the conviction that the case is not proven. Every candid inquirer is compelled at least to adopt the language of one of the auditors: "In consequence of the magnitude of our subject, and the humble opinion I hold of human weakness, I am compelled still to entertain incredulity in the argument." *

Socrates afterwards makes additional remarks on the ceremonies of religion, and instances the voice of tradition in defense of his positions. He maintains that the institutions of worship depend chiefly upon the notion of rewards and punishments in a future life. Now how far this idea did prevail, is not very well understood; for the opinions are so contradictory. It is declared in the beginning of the Dialogue, that the common opinion is that the soul is dissipated and destroyed at death. Many similar examples might be adduced, but we will refer only to the Idyls of Moschus,† where it is declared that there will be no awakening from the sleep of death. The responses from classical authors on this subject are as various and contradictory as those of the oracle at Delphi; and even if the opinion prevailed universally, this would not prove its truth, or strengthen the logic of the argument by which it is defended. Doubtless the popular belief depended far more on tradition than the arguments of philosophy; but it has not been our purpose to invalidate the former, but to examine carefully the force of the several positions by which human reason, in its highest representative, Socrates, attempted to establish on a rational basis the truth of this belief. That traditions were re-

* 107 C. sub fin.

† Dirge on Bion, 44–46.

Digitized by Google

ceived from the patriarchs is certain, from the resemblance between the mythology and the narrations of Holy Writ; such, for example, as the parallel between Isaac and Iphigenia; and the histories of Samson and Hercules. Besides, it is nearly certain that the learned men of Greece, in their numerous journeys to Egypt and the East, would meet with the Old Testament. This would account far more satisfactorily for the wide-spread popular notions on this subject, than the speculations of the philosophers. For, besides their abstruseness, which would prevent them from being understood by the multitude, they had comparatively little influence on those who uttered them. Even Socrates himself says, at the conclusion of the Apology: "But now it is time to depart — for me to death, for you to live; yet which of us will come to a better fate none but God knows." *

It seems to be clear then that the Immortality of the Soul was not proved by Socrates; and we further hold that if neither he nor any of the ancient philosophers, who all used much the same line of argumentation, did establish its truth, then there is no likelihood that human reason can do it. But we go so far as to say that the thing is not capable, from the nature of the case, to be proven. For it requires us to prove that for which we have no data to reason from. The nature of the soul is wholly unknown. It may be simple, or it may be compound. Death may change its nature just as much as it does the body; or even wholly annihilate it. We can follow the dying man down to the river of death, but we cannot cross with him; and "no traveller returns from that bourne" to tell us of "the undiscovered country." To a man destitute of all revelation, dependent entirely upon his own reason and observation, the spectacle of death would unquestionably appear as the termination of existence. The body of his friend is all that is left to him, and its speedy dissolution would soon compel him, from an instinct of nature, to bury his dead out of his sight. This would be the final act, as far as the senses or intellect could discover. It has been well said, "As there was no antecedent probability before death took place among men, that it would occur; so when it was realized,

* 42 A.

Digitized by Google

there was no antecedent probability that any other life would follow."

But it has been claimed that analogies drawn from the natural world clearly teach this doctrine. Analogy, in its proper sphere, is a valuable aid to probable reasoning; but is valid only to the extent that the cases compared are similar. Here, however, there is no known correspondence. For all examples stop short before they reach a point from which a comparison can be instituted. The condition of things beyond the grave are to mortal eye involved in perfect mystery. But did any plant or animal, after passing through death, revive and live again, then there would be room for analogy. Such is not the case to our knowledge, but quite the reverse: wherefore, if this method of proof be employed at all, it must have a damaging effect. But it is maintained that the idea of a moral government requires a future state in order to mete out the justice not dispensed here. However, we look at this question influenced by our ideas of retributive justice and perfect administration, gleaned from revelation; and we cannot think of this subject at all without being affected by this knowledge. The same may be said with proper qualification of all the heathen who had some of the same light from tradition. Yet when we consider the universal prevalence of injustice; the triumph of might over right; the enormous and unavoidable amount of suffering in sentient nature; if we project the past into the future, which, when destitute of light from heaven, is all we can do, we can see no reason to expect a future state for dispensing justice; since there is no likelihood that it will be done. Better, indeed, that there be no future at all than for a state of misery to be renewed; and past experience could give us no other hope. Nor is it clear that reason alone would teach us that we are under such moral government. If the preponderance of vice and cruelty is any proof of the character of a Ruler in his dominion, then, truly, the condition of a world lying in sin would rather suggest the contrary view. We must not be misunderstood here. Man, as enlightened from above, reasons more correctly; but without any such supernatural knowledge, would, we fully believe, either look for no future at all; or, if he did, expect it with apprehension of evil.

Digitized by Google

If these things be so, where is the great use to us in betaking ourselves to the responses of natural reason to show that we shall live after death? Surely the evidences which have been adduced by the most powerful intellects are neither conclusive in proof of the fact, nor were they satisfactory to those who employed them. Shall the man, then, who has the more sure word of prophecy, as a lamp shining in a dark place, forsake this light and return to grope in the darkness of heathenism? Nothing can be more absurd than this procedure in its results; for whatever their wisdom taught them concerning a future state, the heathen lived as though not recognizing it. What can be a greater exhibition of folly than for Christians to employ the resources of heathenism to prove that which has already been demonstrated? There is no fact more clearly taught in Scripture, and one on which greater stress is laid, or more momentous issues depend, than the resurrection of the dead. If this be not proven all revelation is a myth. This issue is accepted by the Apostle; *If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not.* But, say some, If we thus summarily reject the use of reason in establishing the doctrines of religion, we at once alienate those who might otherwise be brought within the sphere of Gospel influence. But we do not reject reason in any case which lies within its sphere. However, as has been shown, the truth in question could never be established by reason, and hence, could only be known by direct revelation; and the experience of ages confirms this assertion. Nay, even the fact that any truth was revealed shows that it could not otherwise be discovered. Future life is constantly spoken of in the Word of God as a subject of direct revelation, and that cannot be revealed which is already known. Again, the disposition which makes men fly from the teachings of Holy Writ, and betake themselves to reason, is such that it cannot be satisfied by any proof which can be offered; so that the difficulty is not in the lack of sufficient evidence, but an unwillingness to believe that which is clear. Now, if we believe in the Word of God we must

Digitized by Google

accept its teachings as independent dicta, requiring no proof. If we do not, then abandon it altogether. The real question to be settled in that case is the credibility of Revelation. But the day for discussing this has well nigh passed. Every inch of the ground has been the theatre of a hard fought battle, and the infidel has been beaten in every encounter; so that the Christian now occupies the high vantage of eternal truth; and as long as he remains in this position he is secure. But if he abandons his stronghold, and attempts, single-handed, to establish that which man never yet succeeded in doing, he acts unwisely by the attempt, and loses all the moral strength of his cause by his evident distrust. All that can possibly be gained is a probability; and the reasoning by which this is arrived at, so long and perplexing, that it has no real influence on men, except in fostering a spirit of vain self-confidence that renders them still more averse to the Gospel. If there be any candid seekers after truth who are in perplexity, let them look around themselves for evidence of the credibility of Revelation. The Christian religion is itself, in its establishment and growth, the most conclusive evidence. It testifies for itself that it is divine, and reflects the character of its great Original in every lineament.

The revealed Word enables us now to read the testimony of Nature; and so far as this has been made to show that the latter accords with the former, it is all well enough. This is only showing that the Word of God interprets that which beside would be a mystery; for now being interrogated by its Master, Nature returns the voice of recognition. This is done by Butler satisfactorily. But this is very different from the attempt at independent demonstration. The one shows that Nature accords with Revelation; the other ignores what God has said, and tries to establish on better grounds that which is declared by eternal truth. With this we have no patience, no matter where and by whom employed; for it misapprehends the true position of the Christian, and fills weak minds with anxiety lest the truths thus advocated rest on no better evidence.

The Word then must be honored by a cordial acceptation and fearless exposition. It is the Christian's weapon; simple, yet powerful and unanswerable; sufficient to cast down every strong-

Digitized by Google

hold of infidelity, and accompanied by the Divine Spirit, to subdue the most determined unbelief. God will have his truth honored as the instrument of bringing men to the light; and thus it is, while the most labored efforts and powerful logic fall stillborn, or at best amuse, the simple declaration of the Word by the plain, earnest-minded Christian, will prove more than a match for the hardest heart. Instead then of ringing changes on the argument for the soul's immortality which are as old as Socrates, he takes for his weapon the Sword of the Spirit. Instead of winnowing the chaff of heathenism in quest of the wretched grains upon which it hungered and died, he comes to the storehouse of God and is satisfied. He sees that the susceptible minds of true philosophers longed for more light from Heaven than they possessed, and is moved with pity as he views them staggering like blind men in the uncertain twilight of Nature. From this obscurity he gladly escapes; acknowledging with thankfulness his own superior ground of confidence. No longer does darkness throw its pall over the loved one who is consigned to the tomb; for even before light has departed in the west, the east is gilded by the beams of approaching day; and fearlessly the believer himself enters the dark valley, leaning on the arm of *our Saviour, Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.*

C.

Digitized by Google

Art. VI. — *Ulphilas.*

Die Heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Bundes in Gothischer Sprache.

Mit Gegenüberstehendem Griechischem und Lateinischem Texte, Anmerkungen, Wörterbuch, Sprachlehre, und Geschichtlicher Einleitung von H. F. Massmann. Stuttgart. Verlag von S. G. Liesching. 1857.

No. I.

As an introduction to the history of the translation of the Scriptures into Gothic by Ulphilas, we propose to give, in the present number, a brief notice of the Goths and their language.

The tribes which overran and subjugated the Roman empire were denominated *Goths* — a name with which we associate rudeness and barbarity. Hence Goth has come to be used as a term of reproach. The Goths were doubtless rude and uncultivated; but in every moral quality they surpassed the refined nations that they conquered. Their blood still flows in the Germanic tribes, among which is found most of the learning, wealth, and power of the world.

The Goths were a branch of the great Indo-European family of nations, and spread irregularly towards the north of Europe, and at different periods, and in different regions, came in contact with the more civilized nations of the south. They were known to these nations by the name of Getæ or Scythæ. Though some writers seem to use the terms Scythæ and Getæ as distinct, yet it has long been admitted that they are the same ethnical name. Georgius Syncellus says, that "the Scythians are also designated Goths in their own language, and that passing the Ister, they depopulated the Roman empire in the time of Decius." Photius, on the testimony of Philostorgius, states, "that Urphilas, bishop of the Goths, otherwise called Ulphilas, in his time brought much people with him into the Roman empire, of the Scythians beyond the Ister, whom the ancients indeed called *Getæ*, but the moderns, *Gothi*." Gibbon, who paid much attention to this subject, observes, that Zozimus, and the Greeks, give the name of Scythians to those whom Jornandes and the Latin writers constantly represent as Goths.

Digitized by Google

Jornandes, professing to derive his authority from the traditions of the Goths, makes them of Scandinavian descent. The Goths inhabited Scandinavia, but it was not their original habitation. Under different local names they occupied originally the whole of the districts, which extend from the north-east of Irân to the borders of Thrace. Stephanus describes them as a nation anciently inhabiting the district within the Palus Mæotis.

A term is frequently prefixed to the ethnical designation Getæ, or Gothi, to distinguish the particular tribe, or nation; as, *Mœso-Gothi*, *Visi-Gothi*, *Ostro-Gothi*. The *Mœso-Gothi* were the Goths of Mœsia, which extended from the confluence of the Save and the Danube to the Euxine, including the countries now called Bosnia, Servia, and Lower Bulgaria. The *Visi-Gothi*, *Vese-Gothæ*, or *Wisi-Gothi*, had their name from their western situation, *wese* signifying the west. The *Ostro-Gothi*, or *Austro-Gothi*, were the Goths of the east. The exact geographical boundaries of these tribes it is not necessary to delineate.

The Gothic language, according to Bopp, is the link between the Sanscrit and the modern Teutonic dialects. "I think,' says that great philologist, "I am reading Sanscrit, when I am reading Ulphilas."

The oldest form of the Gothic language is the Mœso-Gothi, which is the most ancient of all written Germanic idioms. It was into this idiom that the Bible was translated by Ulphilas. The Gothic is not a separate dialect of the Germanic family, but the Low German itself in its primitive forms, and hence of great importance to the German philologist. Though as a national, or written tongue, it has ceased to exist, yet in it are found all the roots and important laws of more recent German idioms. It is the parent of both the Scandinavian and Germanic idioms; at least they are subject to the same linguistic laws, and closely related to it in form and structure.

The Germanic group of languages is divided into the *Low-German* and the *High-German*. The *Low-German*, of which the oldest form is the Gothic, comprises the Icelandic, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Anglo-Saxon, English, Frisian, Dutch, and Platt-Deutsch. The *High-German* differs in forms and laws of euphony from these dialects; and it had an independent existence

Digitized by Google

and a high degree of perfection at a time when the Gothic was still a national tongue.

"Jacob Grimm, who is here, as in all philology, master and highest authority, mentions four characteristic features of the *Low-German* group, which distinguish it from the languages of other nations. The *Ablaut*, or radical change of vowels as it occurs in the inflection of the strong verb; the commutation of sounds according to fixed and permanent rules; the weak noun and the weak verb. Of these the commutation of sounds is the most important principle, as its influence is seen already in those roots which the German idioms have in common with all Indo-European languages, and as it is that feature which gives to them now their peculiar Germanic character. The other three refer only to the mode of expressing certain relations in German proper." *

This commutation consists in the regular change of the mutes by the different members of the same family. So regular and consistent is the change that it constitutes an important philological law. These mutes retain their quality, as labials, dentals, and gutturals; but they pass from tenuis to media, and from media to aspirate. It is only their quantity, then, that is changed; and the law which governs the change is the following: The media of each of the three organs of speech, (labial, dental, and guttural,) passes into the corresponding tenuis, the tenuis into the aspirate, and the aspirate again into the media. This law, in its application to all three orders of mutes, has been indicated by J. Grimm, in the following table:

In Greek, Latin, Sanscrit.		In Gothic.		In Old High-German,
Medial	corresponds to	*Tenuis*	and to	*Aspirate.*
Aspirate	"	*Medial*	"	*Tenuis.*
Tenuis	"	*Aspirate*	"	*Medial.*

Applied to the labials only, this law may be expressed thus:

Latin, Greek, Sanscrit,	B.	F.	P.
Gothic,	P.	B.	F.
Old High German,	F.	P.	B. (V.)

* De Vere's Comparative Philology.

Digitized by Google

EXAMPLES.

Sanscrit.	*Greek.*	*Latin.*	*Gothic.*	*Old High-German.*
pāda-s	πούς, ποδ-ός	pes, ped-is	fotus	vuoz
pūrna	πλέος	plenus	fulls	vol
pitr	πατήρ	pater	fadrein	vatar
upari	ὑπέρ	super	ufar	ubar
bhrātr		frater	brothar	pruoder
bhri	φέρω	fero	baira	piru
tvam	τύ	tu	thu	du
trayas	τρεις	tres	threis	dri
antara	ἕτερος	alter	anthar	andar
danta-m	ὀδόντ-α	dentem	thuntu-s	zand
dvar	θύρα	fores	daur	tor
gnā	γνῶμι	gnosco	kan	chan

As the Gothic has no labial or guttural aspirates, and as the High-German uses *z* instead of the dental aspirate, this law cannot be carried out in all cases; but the anomalies are too few to impair its correctness.

The other characteristic features of the *Low-German* group of languages, enumerated by Jacob Grimm, are the *Ablaut*, the weak declension, and the weak conjugation. The *Ablaut* consists in a radical change of vowels in the inflection of the strong verb, though it is not confined to the verb, but passes through the whole language. For example, in German, *nehmen, nahm, genommen; sterben, starb, gestorben;* and *binden, band, gebunden*: and, in English, most of the so-called irregular verbs. The law of the Ablaut is based upon the fact that, in these languages, *a, i,* and *u,* are the original vowels, and the source of the others.

The weak declension inserts an *n* in the syllable formed by inflexion, or adds it to that syllable, as in the following example:

	Singular.	*Plural.*
N.	han–a,	han–ans,
G.	han–ins,	han–anê,
D.	han–in,	han–am,
A.	han–an,	han–ans,
V.	han–a,	han–ans.

This is distinguished from the strong declension by the fact that the latter adds the syllable, or letter, formed by inflexion, imme-

Digitized by Google

diately to the stem of the noun, without the insertion of a letter to strengthen the termination. e. g:

	Singular.	*Plural.*
N.	fisk–s,	fisk–ôs,
G.	fisk–is,	fisk–ê,
D.	fisk–a,	fisk–am,
A.	fisk,	fisk–ans,
V.	fisk,	fisk–ôs.

The weak conjugation embraces such verbs only as are changed by adding a termination, while the strong conjugation is characterized by the change of the radical vowel in the preterite. e. g:

STRONG CONJUGATION.

PRESENT INDICATIVE.

	1*st Person.*	2*d Person.*	3*d Person.*
Singular,	nas–ja,	nas–jis,	nas–jith,
Dual,	nas–jôs,	nas–jats,	
Plural,	nas–jam,	nas–jith,	nas–jand.

IMPERFECT INDICATIVE.

	1*st Person.*	2*d Person.*	3*d Person.*
Singular,	nas–ida,	nas–idês,	nas–ida,
Dual,		nas–idêduts,	
Plural,	nas–idêdum,	nas–idêduth,	nas–idêdun.

WEAK CONJUGATION.

PRESENT INDICATIVE.

	1*st Person.*	2*d Person.*	3*d Person.*
Singular,	salb–o,	salb–os,	salb--oth,
Dual,		salb–ots,	
Plural,	salb–ôm,	salb–ôth,	salb–ônd.

IMPERFECT INDICATIVE.

	1*st Person.*	2*d Person.*	3*d Person.*
Singular,	salb–ôda.	salb--ôdês,	salb--ôda,
Dual,		salb--ôdêduts,	
Plural,	salb--ôdêdum,	salb--ôdêduth,	salb--ôdêdun.

To this brief outline of the characteristics of the Low German

Digitized by Google

group we will subjoin, as a specimen of the Gothic, the translation of the Lord's Prayer into that language by Ulphilas. Matthew, vi: 9--13.

9. Atta unsar thu ïn himinam, veihnái namô thein.

10. Kvimái thiudinassus theins. Vairthái vilja theins, svê ïn himina jah ana airthái.

11. Hláif unsarana thana sinteinan gif uns himma daga.

12. Jah aflêt uns, thatei skulans sijáima, svasvê jah veis aflêtam thaim skulam unsaráim.

13. Jah ni briggáis uns ïn fráistubnjái, ak láusai uns af thamma ubilin; untê theina ïst thiudangardi jah mahts jah vulthus ïn áivins. Amen.

GRAMMATICAL REMARKS.

Atta signifies father. Striking analogies to it are found in the Basque *Aita*, Tartar *Atai*, Magyar *Atya*, in the Mississippi Indian *Ota*, in the Canadian Indian *Addathy*, and in the Greenland *Atatak*.

Unsar, our. The position of the pronoun and adjective after the substantive is an imitation of the Greek, and not idiomatic German.

Thu in himinam, thou in heaven. The omission of the verb is also an imitation of the Greek. *Himinam* is the dative plural from *himins*. *Veihndi*, *kvimái*, and *vairthai* are in the third person of the present subjunctive, from the verbs *veihan*, to sanctify, *kviman*, to come, and *vairthan*, to be done, (German *werden*, *ent-stehen*, *erscheinen*, *geschehen*, *kommen*.)

The *n* in *veihnai* is inserted for the sake of euphony.

Namo thein, thy name. The pronoun is placed last, in imitation of the Greek.

Thiudinassus theins, thy kingdom. The pronoun placed last, as before, according to the Greek idiom. *Thiudinassus* is from *thiuda*, people, whence comes *Deutsch*, the term by which the Germans designate themselves.

Vilja theins, thy will. German, *wille;* English, *will*. *Svê* corresponds to the German *wie*, as *jah*, equivalent to the Greek *kai*. *Ana*, on, in, or upon. *Airthai* is the dative singular of *airtha*, earth; German *erde;* Anglo-Saxon, *eard*, *eord;* Swedish, *iord;* Greek *ερα*. The same forms are found in the Shemitic

Digitized by Google

languages: e. g. Hebrew, *erets;* Chaldaic, *arta;* Syriac, *arto. Hlaif unsarana*, our bread, the accusative singular of *hlaifs*, bread, and *unsar*, our. Anglo-Saxon, *hläf*, *hlaf*, *laf:* Old Frisian, *läf;* Slavonic, *chleb;* English, *loaf.*

Thana Sinteinan, the always-existing, or ever-continuing. *Thana* is the accusative singular of the article *thai*, the. *Sinteinan* is from *sinteino*, always. The construction of the whole of the fourth petition is modeled after the Greek idiom.

It is unnecessary to extend our analysis. The specimens that have been given are sufficient to show the leading characteristics of the Gothic. With that accomplished, we will conclude the present article.

C. E.

ART. VII. — *Nature and Revelation — in relation to the Origin of our Conception of a God.*

We propose to discuss in this Article, a question upon which the sentiments of thinkers are by no means in unison. As the position which we shall maintain, is one at variance with that held by many wise and good men, we wish to present our thoughts with becoming deference and modesty. Should we at any time be betrayed into expressions savouring of over confidence, we hope that such expressions will be attributed to the glow of argument, and the earnestness of conviction; not to any disposition to disparage the ability of those whose opinions are diverse from our own, or to underrate the strength of the arguments with which they attempt to sustain those opinions.

The question which is to occupy our thoughts, relates to the powers of the human mind, in the state in which man now is, as a fallen and depraved being, to form a system of religious belief, without any aid from a supernatural source. The pertinency of such a discussion at the present time, is apparent from the fact that there are men of talent, learning and influence, who professing to be religious men, utterly deny the fact — some of them even the possibility — of any supernatural revelation. These men influence the course of thought by books written with much ability,

Digitized by Google

exhibiting the polish imparted by high scholarship, and a certain *unction* of religion, marvellous to find in works of such principles and tendency. Nay, more; they control the teachings of one of our Foreign Quarterlies, exhibiting in its various departments a very high order of ability and culture; standing, in these particulars, second perhaps to no similar periodical in the English language.

The assumption upon which these men proceed, an assumption lying at the basis of the Deism of the eighteenth, and the Rationalism of the nineteenth century, is, that man, by the study of his own mental and moral constitution, and a contemplation of the works of nature, could, without any supernatural assistance, deduce therefrom the fundamental truths of religion and morals. And still further, they hold, that in point of fact, this is the way in which men first obtained a knowledge of these fundamental truths. There is a certain diversity of sentiment amongst those who agree on the main points of this system as to the extent to which men may go, in this process. Some admit articles into the creed, as evidently taught by the constitution and course of nature, which others exclude, as having no sufficient ground of belief; a fact in itself, in our judgment, fatal to the whole theory. But all, without exception, who espouse this system at all, claim that the existence of God is one of the truths taught by nature.

This opinion of man's ability to learn a system of religion from nature, independently of all supernatural interference, would exert a less baleful influence in the world, and be altogether less worthy of our present consideration, were it not for the sanction it has received from Christian Divines, and Philosophers of the highest name. These, in the contests which they have waged with Atheism, have used those arguments which, to men already in possession of an idea of one supreme, infinite, and eternal Spirit, Nature furnishes, in strength and number sufficient to convict the Atheist of inexcusable folly: but in pursuing with ardour the retreating forces of Atheism, they expose the flank of the Christian host to an enemy more dangerous, because more plausible and more numerous than the defeated foe. They are strenuous asserters of a "Natural Theology." And by Natural Theology they do not mean simply a body of truths in harmony with the constitution of

Digitized by Google

the universe — or in support of which strong and cogent, and even conclusive, arguments may be drawn from the course of nature and the structure of the human being. This is all that the argument against the Atheist requires. But they go further, and claim that the truths of Natural Theology are not merely accordant with the teachings of nature, and susceptible of being proved by arguments drawn from that source; but that man could originate, nay that man has, in some instances, for himself, originated a system of religious belief, comprehending the existence of One Supreme, Eternal, Infinite, Spiritual, Being, without any aid, direct or indirect, from a supernatural Revelation; but by a simple contemplation of the works of nature alone. Such being the course of argument pursued by the Christian Philosopher when opposing the onset of the Atheist, he finds that his own arguments are turned, with all the force of an *argumentum ad hominem*, against himself, when, in opposition to the hosts of Rationalism, he asserts the need of a supernatural Revelation.

We would not detract an iota from the argument drawn from nature, in proof of the existence of God. We freely grant that it is conclusive. But we deny that man destitute of all previous knowledge of a God ever did construct, or ever could have constructed, the argument. To invent arguments by which a truth already known may be proved, is one thing; to discover an unknown truth, a vastly different thing. A school-boy can demonstrate the forty-seventh proposition of Euclid: to discover it, required the genius of a Pythagoras. Men who have already obtained the idea of a God, can perceive proofs of his existence on every side. But suppose that idea obliterated; suppose all knowledge derived from supernatural revelation effaced: Would these proofs have been perceived? Would their significancy have been understood? Would a system of natural religion ever have been constructed? Here we take issue with the old fashioned Deist, the modern Rationalist, and those Christian Philosophers, who, agreeing with the opponents of revelation on this point, maintain the sufficiency of natural reason to discover the fundamental doctrines of religion. We hold that the first knowledge which man obtained of the existence of God, of His attributes, and of his own relation to Him, he obtained by revelation; that man by his degeneracy and in-

Digitized by Google

disposition of heart to the knowledge and service of God, was lapsing into idolatry, when God was pleased to perpetuate the knowledge of Himself, and the method of gaining His favour, by the selection of a single nation, to which He gave by extraordinary Revelation a system of laws and institutions, most peculiar in themselves, and intended to preserve this nation a separate and peculiar nation, as also to be typical of truths intended to be revealed more fully and clearly in future times; that, finally, God having at sundry times and in divers manners spoken unto the fathers by the prophets, did in the last days speak unto men through his Son, by whom life and immortality were brought to light; who is himself "God manifest in the flesh;" of whom and by whom it is declared: "No man knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him!" Thus we believe the origin of man's knowledge of God was due to a supernatural revelation; the perpetuation of that knowledge to an extraordinary revelation; the completion and perfection of that knowledge to a most wonderful and gracious, and wholly supernatural, revelation. Nevertheless, it is admitted, that in the intervals between these successive manifestations of Himself, and in regions to which the first and second of them did not extend, "God left not Himself without witness;" but that man, both in the works of creation and providence, and in the mental, moral, and physical structure of his own being, had abundant evidence of the existence, power and goodness of God, had he been willing to use the light he had. In other words, the whole course of nature furnished abundant and conclusive confirmation of that original Revelation, made to the first pair, and repeated to the second progenitor of the human race, Noah, that God is, and is a rewarder of all them that diligently seek Him. Whatever then may be the logical order in which science requires natural and supernatural theology to be arrayed historically, and as a matter of fact, revealed religion was first in the order of time.

We bespeak the patient attention of our readers to a discussion of the prominent arguments of those who have embraced the opposite opinion, before setting forth the positive grounds upon which our own is based.

One of the arguments commonly used to prove that man, with-

Digitized by Google

out Revelation, can attain to a knowledge of God, is founded on the alledged universality of the belief in a God. The argument is a very plain and simple one, and may be thus stated: All men have some idea of a God. But all men have not Revelation. Therefore, without Revelation men may obtain an idea of God.

In order to the conclusiveness of this argument, there are two points that must be established: 1st. That the major proposition, that all men have some idea of God, is true. And, if this be made out, 2d. That this idea is not derived from Revelation. On the first point it is needless to say any thing more, at present, than this: its truth is seriously doubted, and requires proof before it can be admitted as an argument. But waiving this now, or admitting for the sake of the argument that all men have an idea of a Supreme Being; still, it is essential to the validity of the argument, that those who adduce it prove that this idea was not obtained, originally, from supernatural Revelation. Can this be established? Has any attempt been made to establish it? Is not the contrary both the most reasonable supposition in itself, and that in support of which most convincing testimony may be adduced? We will return to this point in our positive argument. In the mean time, as we address ourselves to those who admit both the possibility and the fact of a divine Revelation, it is sufficient for us to observe that on the very day of Adam's creation, there was a supernatural communication from God to him: [Gen. i: 28 29, and ii: 16, 17] that these communications were continued to him and others throughout the antediluvian period: that to Noah and his sons, both before and after the flood, direct revelations were made; that with them a covenant was entered into by God himself, and a visible token of that covenant agreed upon; and that of the three sons of Noah "was the whole earth overspread." [Gen. ix: 19.] Would it be at all strange, therefore, if there should be found amongst every people, some traces of the knowledge of a Supreme Being, thus revealed to the progenitors of the race? If the voice of Nature were hushed; if all the regularity of her works were changed into the wildest confusion; if no wise and skillful adaptations or benevolent contrivances were perceptible throughout the whole range of created things; if every sound were agony, every sight a petrifying spectacle; if, in a word, every

Digitized by Google

trace of God's handiwork were obliterated, would it be strange, if throughout the earth there could not be found a nation, tribe, or individual, without the idea of a God? Would not the great and momentous fact of the existence of One Supreme, Infinite, and Eternal Being, whose favour was to be propitiated, and whose displeasure shunned, be likely to be communicated from father to son, from one generation to another, in all their subsequent wanderings and dispersions? Would not the very appearance of the rainbow, a striking and altogether unique object, which their philosophy did not enable them to resolve into a purely natural phenomenon, be, to the primitive races of men, a most powerful means of perpetuating the knowledge of Him who had expressly declared it to be the token of his covenant? Thus may the widely diffused idea of a God be satisfactorily accounted for, without the assumption of man's ability, in the use of his natural reason alone, to make the sublime deduction. That idea is the trace of a primitive revelation. Precisely in the same way have other facts, of far less interest, been handed down by tradition. What is the Golden Age of the poets, but a tradition of the purity and happiness of Paradise before the Fall? What the idea of a progressive degeneracy from the Age of gold to one of silver, then of brass, and at last of iron, but the sad history of the fall and corruption of the human race? In nearly every land are found traditions of a Deluge, which destroyed the human race, traditions which must have taken their origin from the history of Noah, and been perpetuated among his descendants in all their wide dispersion. Admitting, therefore, all that is claimed for the universal diffusion of the notion of a God, we are still left to determine the origin of this conception. We are still to inquire whether it is originated by the mind for itself, from a consideration of the works of Nature, or is to be traced back to an original revelation.

Another of the arguments used to show that man without revelation can attain to a knowledge of God is drawn from the declarations of the Sacred Scriptures. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmanent sheweth his handiwork." [Psalm xix: 1.] "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are

Digitized by Google

without excuse." [Rom. i: 20.] We are not conscious of holding any opinion at variance with the doctrine of these passages. We have already admitted that on every page of the volume of Nature, there are stamped, indelibly, the characters of Divinity. We have further admitted that, benighted and ignorant as the natural man is, and alienated as he is from the life of God through the ignorance that is in him, because of the blindness of his heart, still, in his actual posture, with reference to a Divine Revelation originally given, man may and ought to trace, in the works of God, the evidences of that Supreme power and divinity by which they were made and are still sustained; and if he fail to do so, he is wholly inexcusable. Such we understand to be the teaching of the passages cited. They speak of man just as he is found. Their aim is not speculative, but practical. The object of the Apostle Paul is not to prove that the heathen would have been inexcusable, in a certain imagined state of case, wholly unlike the reality: but to show that, in their actual circumstances, they were without excuse. He does not consider the case of human beings, cut off from all sources of traditionary knowledge, placed in the midst of the Creation of God, and left to interpret, as best they might, the mysteries around and within them, without any guide but the darkened understanding and blinded heart which is their natural heritage. But he considers the case of men, who had a traditionary knowledge of God, and in addition, a discovery of His perfections in the works of His hands. It is of these latter — men really found at Rome, whither this epistle was first sent, and elsewhere — that he affirms "they are without excuse." This was all that his argument required. This is all that we can admit he affirms. It may be true that a human being, exposed in infancy, and having no intercourse with mankind, a mere Orson of the woods, is inexcusable for not discovering the perfections, and adoring the majesty, of Him whose eternal power and Godhead are clearly seen in the things that are made. But this is not Paul's doctrine here. Still less is it his doctrine, that such an one would actually discover the existence and perfections of the only living and true God.

Perhaps the most effective argument employed to show that supernatural revelation is unnecessary to communicate to man a

Digitized by Google

knowledge of the Supreme Being, is that drawn from the existence of the works of Nature, and the evidences of contrivance and design manifest therein. The whole argument, in both its branches, may be thus stated —

There can be no effect without an adequate cause:
But the material universe is an effect:
Therefore it must have had a cause.

Now as the first, in a long series of causes, must have been itself uncaused, or self-existent, it matters not how far back we carry the process, we must, at last, arrive at the First Cause or God, the self-existent Creator.

Take the other branch of the same general argument:
Wherever we trace marks of contrivance or design, we know there must have been an intelligent designer:
But throughout all nature, marks of design are manifest:
Therefore, Nature is the work of an intelligent designer.

And this again leads us up to the knowledge of a Wise, Omnipotent, Benevolent Being, the Creator of all things.

This is the substance of the argument exhibited by Natural Theology. The principle on which it proceeds is axiomatic. It admits of an endless induction of instances, in which the wise adaptations of means to ends, the benevolent adjustments of Nature in all her departments are manifest. We feel its force; we admit the overwhelming conclusiveness of the answer to every effort made to evade its crushing weight. It is utterly unanswerable. Is the question, then, settled against us? Must we abandon, as untenable, the position hitherto maintained? Not at all. What does the argument prove? It proves that God exists. But what is the point which it is adduced now to prove? That man, without other revelation than that made by Nature, could discover this great truth. These propositions are far from being identical. An argument, perfectly conclusive in establishing the one, may be wholly destitute of convincing force when adduced in support of the other. They who maintain the originality of Natural Religion, must advance one step farther before they can avail themselves of this argument. It is incumbent upon them to show that men, without the assistance of Revelation, would ever have thought of the argument. This we deny. Were it not for ideas

Digitized by Google

derived from an original revelation, entering essentiallly into the argument, it could never have been constructed.

Take the first statement of the argument. It is granted that every rational mind will assent to the proposition, that every effect must have an adequate cause. This is a first truth in moral reasoning. It requires no proof. But not so the minor proposition. That the material universe is an effect, produced by the operation of an independent cause, is not an axiom. It requires proof. How many men can prove it, in this nineteenth century? How many of these could have established this truth, had no light of revelation ever illuminated their minds? What says History in answer? What is the testimony of the Word of God? Those whose investigations of antiquity best entitle them to be heard upon this point, declare, with great unanimity, that the idea of Creation, as the word is now commonly employed — the production of something out of nothing — was absolutely unknown in all the schools of ancient philosophy. Widely different as were their notions respecting other matters, in this one thing they were well nigh all agreed, that matter is eternal. If eternal, then must it be self-existent, and wholly independent, as much so as God himself; so that, where this view prevails, men could no more infer the existence of God from the existence of matter, than they could demonstrate the existence of matter from the existence of God. We admit that some, though not all, nor those of highest name, called in the agency of a formative Principle, which reduced to order and harmony the chaotic elements. Others, however, maintained the eternal existence of the universe, in the form in which we find it. Others still, but they are of later date, hold that the present condition of the universe is the result of a process of "development" in accordance with certain primordial laws. The bearing which these historical facts have upon our discussion is this: If human reason, in its highest exercise, cannot discover the fact of a Creation, it cannot ascertain that the universe is an effect; and therefore the very basis of the argument is destroyed, which attempts to prove that men, by the force of unaided reason, can infer from the existence of the universe that there is, distinct from it, a Being who called it into existence. If unenlightened reason denies a Creation, it cannot lead to a

Digitized by Google

Creator. If it refuses to recognise the universe as an effect, it cannot ascend to the idea of a Great First Cause.

If the idea of Creation be not an idea originating in the human mind, in the exercise of its unaided faculties, as the history of human thought, and the severest scrutiny and analysis of the mind would appear to teach; it becomes a matter of interest to know what is the origin of that idea. Originally it is not a matter of knowledge, but of faith: we do not believe in Creation because we know it to be true; but we know it to be true because we believe. We reach it not by a process of ratiocination; but we accept it on testimony which completely satisfies our intelligence. Such we understand to be the plain teaching of the Apostle. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." [Heb. xi: 3.] The very nature of faith implies a communication *ab extra* to the mind. The framing of the worlds therefore, the making of the visible from the invisible, is matter of faith, and was communicated to man by a divine revelation. Without such revelation, there could have been no such faith. Without such faith there could have been no such understanding amongst men. The whole force of the argument therefore, from the existence of the universe to the existence of God as its Creator, is absolutely dependent on ideas which revelation imparts, and which without revelation could never have been discovered.

Our reply to the other, and more imposing, form of the argument — that founded on the contrivance, the wise adaptation of means to ends, the innumerable beneficent adjustments everywhere manifest in Nature — is in substance the same as that just given to the argument in its other form. When once the idea of a Creator, Ruler, and Moral Governor has been communicated to the mind, it is easy, comparatively, to show how every portion of the universe is in harmony with this idea, and furnishes abundant proof of its truth. But would the idea of a God as Creator, Ruler, and Moral Governor have spontaneously suggested itself to even thoughtful men, who had no other guide but reason, no higher teacher than Nature? It is imperative upon those who answer in the affirmative to show that the argument from final

Digitized by Google

causes could have been constructed; that the fundamental ideas on which it rests could have been known; had a supernatural revelation never been made to man. This, we may safely assume, never can be done, from the fact that no successful attempt has hitherto been made. But we go a step further. We think it possible to prove a negative. We think it susceptible of proof that not all the order, harmony, and innumerable marks of design, which are apparent to us in Nature, would have originated, in minds destitute of supernatural teaching, the idea of a God. Our reasons for this opinion are, 1st, the undeniable fact that God was at one time known to the whole human family by direct revelation: and 2nd, that notwithstanding the traditions spread among all people from this source, the knowledge of God had disappeared from the minds of an overwhelming majority of mankind. So far from originating the knowledge of the true God, the boasted light of Nature did not even preserve that knowledge once communicated from a higher source. Let us consider the actual condition of all the nations where a succession of Divine Revelations was not kept up:

1st. The schools of ancient philosophy, as we have seen, denied the possibility of Creation. *Ex nihilo nil fit* was a received maxim, which no one presumed to question. Since they acknowledged no Creation, they could believe in no Creator.

2d. The universally received notion of these schools, that matter is eternal, involves conclusions no less sweeping. If eternal, it must be self-existent; that is, it must have the reason of its existence in itself. If matter has the reason of its existence in itself, it is independent of any being. Then whatever qualities or properties we find belonging to it, must be due to some inherent force or energy; for to attribute the properties of an eternally existing independent substance to the operation of some external power upon it, is a contradiction. Such a declaration affirms and denies independent existence, in the same breath. What, in this view, becomes of the argument from final causes? Where is the proof of a Ruler and Governor of the universe? Could the existence of one independent, self-existent being, be inferred from the qualities or properties belonging to another?

3d. The almost universal prevalence of polytheism is a further

Digitized by Google

illustration of the imbecility of human reason when speculating upon the causes of those appearances which are presented in the works of Nature. If there be more Gods than one, no one can be supreme, else he infringes upon the province of some other; no one can be infinite, for two or more infinite essences is an inconceivable absurdity; no one can be omnipotent, for every where the power of one would be hemmed in, and limited by that of another: in a word, in a system of polytheism, there can be no true and proper conception of a God at all.

Here, then, is the position on which we mainly rely: Mankind, in the absence of supernatural teaching, would more readily conceive the various parts of Nature to be gods, than rise to the conception of an Infinite, Eternal, Spiritual Being, as the Creator and Ruler of Nature. We grant that man's dependent nature, and that conscience within, the feeblest motions of which bear testimony to the existence of a moral system, will prompt to the worship of something as a god. How far this feeling of dependence, and the stirrings of man's moral nature, are due to some straggling rays of light from the primeval revelation, we do not now inquire, and it were perhaps difficult, if not impossible, to determine. But grant that man, from a felt necessity of his nature, will seek some object of religious worship, we hold that he will be more likely to deify some part of Nature herself, than "ascend through Nature, up to Nature's God."

Is not this position confirmed by the history of religion among all nations, where God has not made repeated manifestations of Himself? This deification and worship of Nature has prevailed in all ages, and in various forms, from the grossest Fetichism to the most subtle and refined Pantheism. We find three prevailing forms of Nature worship, all admitting of various subdivisions. 1st The worship of the visible. Under this form we note Sabæanism, or the worship of the sun, moon, and the host of heaven, which prevailed extensively, and formed the prevalent religion of ancient Chaldæa, Arabia, and Persia. Traces of this form of idolatry were also found in ancient Egypt, and, if we can trust Cæsar's account, amongst the rude German tribes of his day. [De bello Gal. B. vi: cap. 21.] Here also belongs the worship of images made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and

Digitized by Google

creeping things, so common among the heathen of all times, and countries. And under the same head we range the worship of animals, of insects, of vegetable products prevalent in Egypt; and also the reverence paid to the rudest stick, or stone, which constitutes the Fetichism of the African savage. In all these, the worship of visible Nature is the principle.

We may as well anticipate a possible objection here. It may be supposed that these natural objects which the heathen worship, are regarded as the representatives merely of some unseen Divinity, which is the real object of worship, and of which the outward object is only the symbol. This may be true in a few instances. But it still remains to be shown that where this symbolism exists, the object symbolized is the true and living God. This we apprehend will prove a somewhat difficult task. Nor is this all. The explanation, at best, extends only to the philosophers and priests. They alone receive the esoteric explanation of the rites practiced. The poor untaught Hindoo — whose eye is as clear to perceive the beautiful order and wise contrivances apparent in Nature, and who, if she alone demonstrated the existence of God, would have as clear a knowledge of Him as the haughtiest philosopher or priest that ever read the Shaster — has not an idea of a God beyond the horrid image before which he bows, or the mighty Ganges to whose relentless current he commits his aged parents or his helpless offspring.

2d. Another form of Nature worship consists in a personification of her various objects, agencies and powers. Under this division falls the system of Roman and Greek Mythology, the gods of which are indisputably mere personifications of Nature herself. This is evident from the names they bear, the attributes they possess, and from the acknowledgment of those who had opportunities of understanding the system thoroughly. (*a*) As a specimen — and we can give only a few, in order that the idea may be clearly presented — by the common mythology the first of the gods, and the parent of them all, was Chaos. From Chaos sprang Nyx or Nox — Night: from Nyx, Hemera or Dies — Day. The Ge or Gaia of the Greeks, which is the same as the Tellus or Terra of the Romans, is likewise a daughter of Chaos.* But

* It is curious to observe how traditions from a primeval Revelation may be traced even in the heathen theogonies. First Chaos, then Night, after-

Digitized by Google

without noting the relation of one god to another, we will merely give the names of some of them, manifestly identifying them with natural objects. Thus we have Uranos—Cœlus or Heaven; Saturnus, the same as Chronos or Time; Oceanus, or the water surrounding the whole earth: "the parent of the gods" (Homer); "the parent of three thousand rivers," (Hesiod): The rivers themselves were gods. The Xanthus was no mean antagonist of Achilles on the plains of Troy; the "Uxorious Tiber" avenged the wrongs of the weeping Ilia. Moreover we find Hupnos—Somnus, Sleep—"twin brother of Death"—"king of all gods and men:" Helios—Sol, the Sun-god; and Eos or Aurora, the harbinger of the Sun. Other names could be cited, but these will be sufficient to show the principle which pervades this entire system.

(*b*) In other cases where the very names of the gods do not designate the natural objects personified by them, the attributes and qualities ascribed to them by the poets, who follow the popular belief, enable us to determine those objects; from which it is manifest the system is a homogeneous one, being throughout an apotheosis of Nature. The kingdom of Saturn was divided between his three sons, Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto. Pluto is also called Hades, Dis, Orcus, and Tartarus. These terms are descriptive of the nether world, as Neptune is of the sea, and Jupiter of the æther, or upper air. This application of the names, Pluto and Neptune, is so clear as to require no proof. That Jupiter is the personification of the upper air is apparent from many places in the classics: of all which, let the "*Sub Jove frigido*" of Horace, the "*Pater Omnipotens Æther*" of Virgil, and the "*Vernus Jupiter*" of Juvenal, for the present, suffice. Indeed it was an ancient opinion that the distribution of the universe among Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto, the Earth being common to all three, had reference to the four elementary principles, Earth, Air, Water, and Fire. Jupiter representing the air, we can understand the Homeric epithets "cloud impelling," "thunder rejoicing," "far resounding," and "cloud collecting:" we have also an explanation of the fact that the eagle and the thunder-bolts are represented as

---

wards Day. So Hesiod. "And the earth was *without form and void;* and *darkness* was upon the face of the deep .... And God said let there be *light,* and there was light." Thus Moses.

Digitized by Google

his constant attendants. As Jupiter is the only God in the system in whose behalf any plausible claim can be urged to the character of supreme dominion and almighty power, it may be well to remember that he had a beginning—he is a son of Time. But this is not all: he had also an end! In Crete his tomb was shown, with the inscription, *Ωδε μεγας κευται Ζαν*, "here lies great Jupiter!" There are such various and inconsistent accounts of his exploits, that it is supposed that the poets, with their usual license, attribute to some creature of their own imagination, the actions of many distinguished men. The primitive notion, that he is a personification of the upper air, is too well established to be subverted.

So, if it were needful, we might go on, and identify Juno with the Air, Ceres with Corn, Bacchus with Wine, Mars with War, Apollo with the Sun, Diana with the Moon, Minerva with Wisdom, Venus with Beauty, Cupid, offspring of beauty, with Love, and many other gods, with other natural objects or qualities; but already perhaps, the fact is so plain that further illustration would be tedious.

(*c*) With the citation of an authority or two, we close this topic. Plato in his Cratylus derives the very word which the Greeks use for gods, *θεος*, from the verb *θεω*, "to run," assigning as a reason for this etymology, that the first gods were the sun, moon and stars, which seemed to run in regular courses round the earth. Seneca asks, "What else is nature than God?" adding. "God and nature are no more different things, than Annaeus and Seneca." Even Cudworth admits that all the gods of this system save one, were either "dead men" or "the greater parts of the visible mundane system or corporeal world," or "mere accidents or affections of substances," or "ethereal and aerial animals invisible, called Dæmons, Genii, and Lares," or beings "assigned to particular provinces, places, offices and functions;" but he is sorely puzzled to select the one who will answer his own prescribed conditions of Deity: "infinite goodness, with fecundity; infinite knowledge and wisdom; infinite active and perceptive powers; necessarily existing; and not only the framer of the world, but also the cause of all things." *

* Intellectual System, B. 1, chap. iv: sec. 13.

Digitized by Google

3. Another form of Nature worship possessing peculiar attractions for speculative minds in all ages, is Pantheism. This consists in the identification of God with Nature. We find traces of this system in the philosophy of the East, in the earliest ages. Thence it spread to Greece, and was a favourite tenet in more than one of her schools. From Greece it passed into Italy, and distinct avowals of the doctrine are found both in the philosophers and poets of Rome. In the history of modern philosophy, it was revived by Spinoza, and it forms the conclusion to which the theories of many popular and influential thinkers in Germany, in England, in France, and in certain quarters amongst ourselves, inevitably lead. We simply state these facts: we cannot afford the space to adduce quotations, either in proof or for illustration. And the conclusion which we draw from the whole discussion is, that since men, contemplating the works of Nature, and prompted by the moral nature within them, have, even with the light of a supernatural Revelation shedding its rays directly or indirectly upon them, offered direct worship either to the visible objects around them, or to mere personifications and allegorical representations of the various parts, agencies, and powers of Nature, or have identified God with the universe, as a sort of soul, or universal principle, pervading all its parts, without personality or consciousness; it is an inference wholly unauthorized by history or reason, that even all the marks of design in Nature will infallibly lead men, without revelation, to the knowledge of an intelligent Creator.

And in this connection, better perhaps than in any other, we may notice the distinction attempted to be drawn between the vulgar or popular belief, and the views of the philosophers of Paganism. Suppose the Herculean labour accomplished, and the truth made chiefly apparent that the philosophers held to a system of Monotheism, and that the truth of God's unity of essence was a part of the esoteric system taught to the initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries. We think neither of these assumptions are proven. But grant the fact to be so, it still remains to be shown, before any effective use can be made of these assumed facts: 1st, that the philosophers were not indebted to revelation for their superior insight. Now when we remember the extensive diffusion of ideas

Digitized by Google

transmitted by tradition; the long extended journeys of these philosophers and wise men in search of truth; their curious and inquisitive turn of mind; and the fact that God had given to one people the true knowledge of himself; that this was a people of most striking peculiarities, and therefore likely to be an object of peculiar interest; that they had been wisely planted by God, on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, in the highway of commerce, in the centre of the most noted nations of the earth, it will be very difficult to convince a reflecting inquirer, that no ray of Divine truth lighted up the darkness of heathen philosophy, and gave to a Plato or a Socrates whatever of superiority they possessed over the masses of their countrymen. And 2d, that the unity of the Divine Nature which some of the philosophers do certainly teach, is not a unity resulting from the adoption of the system of Pantheism. We have taken the pains to examine the arguments of one of the ablest and most learned, of those who insist that all the gods of the Pantheon were but one God, exhibiting himself variously; and it is our deliberate conviction, that the ground of unity, as set forth in the various citations made, is the identity of Nature and Deity. We have no difficulty in understanding that men may hold that there is one God, when they maintain that every thing is God. Then

> "All are but parts of ONE stupendous WHOLE
> Whose body Nature is, and God the soul."

But there is very little to choose between Pantheism and Atheism. Perhaps the more correct statement would be that Atheism and Pantheism are identical. We, therefore, reiterate our conclusion, that men, in the absence of supernatural teaching, will more naturally regard the various objects of Nature as God, than from the beauty, order, and harmony thereof, rise to the conception of an invisible, personal, self-conscious, and intelligent Being, if they had no idea of such a Being from another source.

Having thus replied to the more common, and more plausible objections which might be urged against our view, the way is now open for the presentation of some considerations going to show that supernatural revelation is indispensable to the knowledge of God.

Digitized by Google

We desire, first, to suggest, rather than positively assert, an argument springing from the very nature of the conception of a God, considered in relation to the human faculties, and the universe, so far as our minds are capable of comprehending it. The doctrine of innate ideas has long been exploded. The idea of a God is not born with us. Either it was communicated to the human family by a supernatural revelation, or it is deduced by man's own reason, from the phenomena of the universe. What then is comprehended in this idea? God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being and attributes. In the conclusion, then, of this high deduction, if man originates for himself the idea of God, we find the idea of Infinity, Spirituality, Immutability, Omnipotence, &c. But the works of Nature, cognizable by the human faculties, are finite; the same is true of the faculties themselves: how then can finite faculties, exercising their utmost powers on a finite universe, ascend to the idea of the Infinite? We believe in God, because he has told us what he is. We know that he exists, and that he possesses the attributes that enter into our conception of a God, because we believe. But could we by searching find him out? Is it not true that "the world by wisdom knew not God?" Does not the whole history of the human mind, even in its highest development, show its imbecility when dealing with ideas of God, eternity, and infinity? Do we not, of necessity, believe, on subjects of this sort, far more than we can comprehend? Does not our faith, of necessity, leave our logic far behind? It may be said that man's religious nature, the aspirations of his soul within him, will lead him to the knowledge of God. To this the brief but conclusive answer is, that this prompting of our nature has, in the absence of Divine teaching, been completely satisfied by deifying the objects of Nature around.

Leaving the region of speculation, however, let us come to matters of fact, so far as they bear on the question before us. We maintain that the religious history of the race amply sustains the doctrine of the indispensable necessity of revelation to a knowledge of God.

What is our own experience with reference to this idea? What the result of our observation? Examining our minds, we are conscious of the conception of a God. What is the origin of this

Digitized by Google

conception? It was not born with us. Did we then arrive at it by a profound argument from effect to cause, founded on what we had observed of the constitution and course of Nature? All will answer No. It was communicated to our minds by the teaching of others. It is traceable not to Nature, but to a kinder, gentler, teacher. As soon as the infant powers are capable of receiving it, a mother's tenderness, and a mother's watchful love and care, imparts an idea of the great God and Maker of all. As soon as the lips can lisp the words, we are taught to approach "Our Father who is in heaven." Trace the matter up, and try and ascertain the origin of this great truth, and we find that one generation was taught by another, and that by a preceding, until we reach the times when God, by direct revelation, made himself known to the parents of the race.

If we inquire of History respecting the origin of this great truth, her very silence is eloquence itself. She has immortalized in her pages the name of no one as the discoverer. Many a name she celebrates as the author of some discovery or invention, by many of which men have become the benefactors of their kind. Why is it that she has been so churlish in her treatment of him, who, as the author of this sublime discovery, merits more regard than all others whose names are on the scroll of fame? Who cried εὕρηκα, εὕρηκα, when this truth first burst upon his mind! Who sacrificed hecatombs in gratitude for the discovery? The truth is "I have found it," has never been said of the fact of the Divine existence, simply because it is a discovery which was never made by human reason. Socrates laid no claim to the discovery of the truths he taught, but only to repeat and enforce truths well known before. And how imperfect and inadequate were his conceptions! It is only in Christian countries, that complete systems of Natural Theology are constructed. It is only by plagiarizing the truths received originally by Revelation, that Rationalism can construct systems of belief, in which Revelation is dispensed with as unnecessary. The claim for human Reason, of the power to discover the truths of Natural Religion, has no historical basis on which to rest. It is not true then, historically, as a modern philosopher in dogmatic style asserts, that, "all revealed religion rests upon the pedestal of natural religion." * Systems of natu-

Digitized by Google

ral religion are only possible to man, as enjoying the light of an original revelation.

Another most important fact we desire to call attention to, as connecting itself with the historical view of this matter. We maintain that every form of religion which has prevailed in the world, exhibits internal proof of its origin in an original revelation. This appears from two circumstances. 1st. The theory which we oppose teaches that men may arrive at the knowledge of a God by contemplating the marks of design and contrivance as exhibited in the works of Nature. Of necessity, we are told, they will be led from a view of these works to infer the existence of Him who made and rules over all. If this be true; if such be the origin of man's conception of a God, what are the attributes and characteristics which will be prominent in the idea of a God, discovered by this process? From the works of Nature, man infers a Creator necessary to call them into existence. From the order and harmony of the universe, he infers a Ruler, guiding and controlling the works which he has made. Here then, if the theory be sound, are the primary ideas which men have of God. He is known as Creator and Governor. If every other relation of God to the world were veiled in obscurity, or utterly unknown, these, at least, will stand out in bold relief. But if we turn to history, we find that these are precisely the characters utterly denied to their gods, by far the greatest number of the nations left in some measure to themselves. The fact of a Creation is, by the most ancient and most enlightened schools of philosophy, utterly denied. Of course they never attribute to their gods the character of creators. And with respect to the power which controls and directs the events of time, this is not to be sought among their gods: but either all is supposed to be left to chance, or else the course of events is governed by the influence of a dark, and gloomy, and mysterious Fate, whose decrees not even the gods can set aside. Since then the very ideas which Nature would teach concerning God, are wanting in the heathen conception of his character, we conclude that this is not the process by which they arrived at their conceptions.

2d. Again, we argue that the notions of a God diffused among the heathen nations were not derived by human reason from a con-

Digitized by Google

templation of Nature, not only from the absence of certain attributes which, if such were the origin of the conception, would be the most prominent, but also from the presence of certain other ideas, which it is inconceivable that nature could teach, and which could be taught by revelation alone. Of this character is the idea of an atonement by sacrifice, which is found in greater or less clearness, wherever there is an idea of a God. This is a doctrine which by no possibility could originate with man. The most extravagant eulogist of natural religion never pretended that this doctrine formed part of it. To human reason, the slaying of an innocent animal would appear in the light of a new crime, instead of being an atonement for past sins. It is a doctrine of revelation, that without shedding of blood is no remission. The blood, then, of every sacrificial victim; the smoke that ascends from every altar, is proof conclusive that where there is an idea of a God, that idea was derived originally from revelation.

There seems to be wanting but one thing more to render the proof of our proposition complete: that is, that an experiment be actually made, and that the inability of man's reason to arrive at a knowledge of the divine existence, be in accordance with the facts developed by that experiment. But this, from the nature of the case, is well nigh impossible. There are, however, certain facts, which, to a candid mind, will be scarcely less conclusive:

1st. Is not the circumstance that men have, in all countries where the influence of Revelation is not continual, to so great an extent lost the knowledge of the true God which all alike once enjoyed, ample proof that the light of Nature alone is not sufficient to originate the idea in minds wholly destitute of it. If all the marks of creative power and wisdom manifest in the universe, be not sufficient to keep alive in the minds of men the memory of a truth once known; how unreasonable is it to suppose that they are sufficient to impart a knowledge of the truth at first! Strange, indeed, were the prodigy, if men could forget a truth like this, although unceasingly exposed to all those influences by which that truth was originally imparted. It is no sufficient answer to this suggestion to alledge the depravity of the human heart, and the blindness of the natural understanding. These, we admit, have much to do with the ignorance of God so prevalent in the world.

Digitized by Google

"As they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind." But does it not occur to the objector, that these same causes have been in operation since the Fall of man, and are as insuperable a difficulty in the way of depraved man's making the discovery originally, as they are a satisfactory explanation of the manner in which the knowledge of God, once imparted by revelation, has been so generally lost?

2d. There are men who have been exposed to all the influences from Nature, who have had all the sources of knowledge imparted by her opened up to them; and yet the idea of a God has never entered their minds. "Besides the Atheists, taken notice of amongst the ancients, and left branded upon the records of history, hath not navigation discovered, in these latter ages, whole nations at the bay of Soldania, in Brazil, in Boranday, and in the Carribbee Islands, &c., amongst whom there was to be found no notion of a God, no religion?" * "Several tribes have been discovered in America, which have no idea whatever of a Supreme Being, and no rites of religious worship. . . . . Some rude tribes have not in their language any name for the Deity, nor have the most accurate observers been able to discover any practice or institution which seemed to imply that they recognized his authority, or were solicitous to obtain his favour." †

We have in vain endeavoured, in the haste of preparing this article, to procure a copy of Moffat's account of his residence for twenty-three years as a missionary in Africa. Without pretending to give his language, therefore, we can state merely the substance of his remarks upon this same topic. He asserts that the people with whom he came in contact, during the period of his protracted residence on that continent, had no idea of a God or of the soul's immortality; and that they laughed at him when he mentioned to them what appeared such a manifest absurdity. The statement was made in our hearing, some years ago, by a missionary of our Church among the Sioux Indians, that they had no idea of a God previous to the arrival of the Whites in this country; that they had not even a word in their language by which to designate a God when the idea was communicated; and that the

* Locke, Human Understanding, B. 1, Chapter 4, Sec. 8.

† Robertson, History of America, vol i, p. 209.

Digitized by Google

word translated "Great Spirit," was invented to express the new idea communicated to them by the Europeans. The Chinese language would seem to be in the same predicament; else why the disagreement and asperities among those who render the Scriptures into that tongue, respecting the appropriate term to employ in designating the Supreme Being? At all events, it seems to be clear that there have been tribes of men without the idea of a God.

Doubt has been expressed as to the reliability of these statements: nor is it strange that it should be so. Not only do they subvert the argument from general consent, the inconclusiveness of which, on other grounds, we have already shown, and which is now seen to be utterly destitute of foundation; but they wholly destroy the force of every argument that can be adduced in opposition to our theory, by showing conclusively that the opposite theory must be unsound. That any nation of men could exist without a knowledge of God, if his existence were discoverable from the works of Nature, is wholly impossible. There is no speech nor language where her voice is not heard. It is not strange, therefore, that men should be loth to admit the reality of facts so utterly subversive of a favourite hypothesis. But men who, in their closets, form theories as to what ought to be, are not to be trusted in opposition to the statements of calm, intelligent, and truthful witnesses, who, with no pet hypothesis to sustain, simply give us the results of a long and carefully conducted investigation, in circumstances the most favourable for eliciting the truth.

3d. The uniform testimony of those who have had opportunities for learning the state of knowledge, as to religious matters, of Deaf Mutes, previous to instruction, gives additional support to our position. Some years ago, in an Eastern journal, a deaf mute published an account of his own state, before instruction. We make an extract. "I had," said he, "no conception of a Supreme Being; none of the immortality of the soul; and no knowledge of the origin of the world, nor of a future state. I am sure that if you were to enquire, you could not find a single instance in which a person born deaf, has formed an idea of a Supreme Intelligence from a view of the works of Nature." To the same

Digitized by Google

purport the North British Review — "Experience furnishes no instance in which a deaf mute, having nothing but the language of signs at his command, had ever attained to any distinct notion of a future world, of his own moral accountability, of man's ultimate destiny, or even of a Supreme Being." (Feb. 1847.)

There is but one way in which it is possible to evade the force of this testimony. It may be said that since these persons are destitute of one of the senses by which the works of Nature are perceived, and are thus cut off from one entire class of sensations, they are incompetent witnesses in the case. The objection has some plausibility, but this is all. No system of psychology, known to us, maintains that to the sense of hearing we are indebted for a knowledge of the existence of the material universe. Neither is it by means of it, that we trace the marks of order, design, and adaptation throughout Nature's works. But on that existence, and these marks, is founded the supposed power in Nature to originate the idea of a God. If any one at any time, has imagined that the idea of God is derived from Nature through the sense of hearing, he may have some excuse, however absurd his position, for urging this objection. Is it not an established truth, that the loss of one sense renders the others more acute? Are not deaf mutes then fully competent to perceive the proof which Nature presents, through the avenue of the senses? Have they not, as others, a moral nature within — the law written on the heart? Why then the utter vacuity of their minds, as to religious ideas? The answer forces itself upon the convictions of the candid inquirer. They have no advantage from tradition, or oral teaching, from which their misfortune cuts them off. They are thrown entirely upon Nature as a teacher; and the result of the experiment is, that their minds, as to any idea of a God, is a perfect blank.

4. To this mass of testimony might be added the case of persons cut off from infancy from any intercourse with mankind; instances of which, well authenticated, are found in standard authors. In every such case, however fully the volume of Nature had been spread open before them, no idea of a God had entered their mind. But our space forbids more than this passing allusion to these instances. We submit the case as it stands. We have attempted to

Digitized by Google

show that the hypothesis of man's ability to construct a system of Natural Religion, independently of ideas derived from Divine Revelation, is unsupported by any conclusive arguments; that it is contradicted by experience, and by the history and character of every religious system; and that it stands in hopeless antagonism to numerous well authenticated facts. The hypothesis, therefore, we must reject; and we are forced, with a constantly growing conviction, to the conclusion, mortifying indeed to the pride of human reason, that supernatural revelation is absolutely indispensable to the knowledge of even the first, and fundamental truth of Natural Religion. †. †.

ART. VIII. — *Divine Sovereignty, manifested in Divine Predestination, is the only security for the Use and Success of Means.*

Why do men so dislike, and so revile, the doctrine of predestination? Is it because they have examined it well and thoroughly, and therefore understand it well and thoroughly; or is it because they have neither examined it nor understand it; that they denounce it with such hearty bitterness, and hold it up to the universal scorn of mankind? We ourselves have no fancy for a doctrine worthy of such odium. If predestination be all that its enemies say it is, then we have not, any more than anybody else, the slightest motive to take up this rewardless burden, and bear it to our injury and our shame. We do not wish to endure any volunteer infamy, nor to suffer in the cause of doctrines hideous, appalling, and ruinous to the denominational prosperity of all people believing them. But we have a few things to say in accordance with the heading of this article, which will show, as we trust, that all this denunciation of predestination is the sheerest misunderstanding and misrepresentation of this whole matter, as found in the creeds and upon the lips of its advocates and defenders.

And first of all, it may be asserted that the atonement, like all the other acts of God, was and is the result of divine and eternal predestination. And further still, it may be stated, that all the results of the atonement, in all their extent, and in all their vari-

Digitized by Google

ety, and in all their endless duration, are purely and efficiently and forever from this same source. There is no reason, there is no efficient cause, outside of the divine purpose, why the atonement should have a successful issue. Without this purpose of God, ever moving with efficacious power and never-failing success, the atonement would have been a failure, and a blot and an eternal dishonor upon the character of the great Jehovah. But that stupendous work of divine mercy is not suspended for its success upon any thing short of God's eternal and efficacious purpose. "He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the glory of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." Isaiah liii: 10, 11. No power of men or devils can turn aside or defeat the fulfillment of this language. The triune God will see the results of the atonement, and be satisfied. The work will be complete to the utmost jot and tittle, and therefore the satisfaction perfect and eternal. And it will be so for no other reason than that God holds the whole affair in his own hands, and will rule it all and complete it it all by and according to his infinitely wise, omnipotent, and eternal purpose. If there be any one failure, in any one place or period of the world; if God has "visited the gentiles and failed *to take out of them* a people for his name;" if Christ "has redeemed us *out of* every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;" if that "great multitude *out of* all nations, which no man could number;" — if all these do not correspond to the very utmost of extent, and to the very utmost of duration, and to the very utmost completion of the divine foreordination, then has the divine government failed, and Christ cannot see the full travail of his soul and be satisfied. Let him believe this who can. The day of judgment will be an exact and eternal expression of the designs and results of the atonement. For if it be not, then have the designs of God been defeated, his intelligence has been outwitted, and his power successfully contested. From all this it is manifest and irresistible, that the atonement owes its existence, and its entire success in, and among, and over all people, to the eternal exactitude, definiteness, and compass of sovereign foreordination or predestination.

This same doctrine is also taught by all those prophetic Scrip-

Digitized by Google

tures which relate to the power, the spread, and certain triumph of the Gospel. These predictions, so absolute and so numerous, can be made upon no other ground than the divine and eternal purpose to accomplish them. Just as the prophecies relating to Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre and Egypt, were but manifestations of the divine purposes in regard to those cities and countries, so the predictions, relative to the present and future power and success of the Gospel, are but a preceding manifestation of God's will, purpose, or predestination concerning it. All prophecy is full of, and is a proof of predestination.

The divine sovereignty, in the use and success of means, is also taught in all those passages which attribute salvation to God's will and good pleasure. "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Luke xii: 32. All the benefits of this kingdom is a predestinated gift, the good pleasure of God. The adoption of children through Jesus Christ is according to the good pleasure of his will. Ephesians i: 5. Not according to worth, merit, or deeds, but according to that good pleasure which works all things after a wise and predestinated plan. But if the making of men Christians, be an act of God's mere good pleasure, certain and unfrustrable, then the means to this end are equally certain and unfrustrable.

That there is no hope whatever for the use and success of means, except in the divine and sovereign intention to render them definitely and certainly efficacious, is irresistibly implied in all those passages which wholly deny that salvation is of man. "Born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John i: 13. "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." 2 Timothy i: 9. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us." Titus iii: 5. Now all this salvation, so wholly denied to be of man, and so wholly asserted to be of God, was given us by a predestination of mercy in Christ Jesus, before the world began. And if so, the means by which all this is accomplished must be equally predestinated, both as to fact and effect. Means are only wise as they are appointed of God, and they are only effectual as

Digitized by Google

they are rendered so by His eternal and merciful intention. Whatever He does is but the manifestation of what He designed to do from all eternity; and wherever and to whatever extent means become effectual, it is but the manifestation of a purpose existing from of old, from everlasting. As, therefore, the atonement itself depended upon and resulted from an eternal purpose, so likewise its end and object depend wholly upon the same invincible and infallible power. And as the making, and completion of the atonement could not be defeated, nor in any way nor by any power turned aside, so all the means by which its intentions are to be fulfilled are equally certain of present and ultimate success.

And as neither earth nor hell could prevent the atonement from being made, so neither earth nor hell can prevent the preaching of the Gospel from being successful. "The kings of the earth may set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his Anointed," and against his Gospel, but "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure." Psalm ii: 2, 4, 5. But without the sovereign and eternal purpose of God to be with his ministerial servants, and to give divine efficiency and certainty to their labors, who could hope for anything beyond laboring in vain and spending his strength for naught? Upon any other ground than a divinely predestinated success, the work of the Apostles and all their true ministerial successors was, and is, and will continue to be, the most preposterous undertaking ever devised or attempted by man. And the only thing which can fully and fairly and forever relieve it from such a charge, and elevate it to the loftiness of supreme wisdom, is the wondrous success which God has given it. But that success is the exact measure of the predestination concerning it. "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto it is sent." Isaiah lv: 11. This reveals the divine purpose in regard to the divine word. It sets the preaching of the Gospel in the light of hope, and supports it by the energy of faith. It sets all defeats and all enemies at defiance. Hope, courage, and confidence spring up, before such an unfolding of

Digitized by Google

the divine intentions in regard to all true ministerial labors. The burden of this revelation is certainty, absolute certainty, to the very utmost extent and to the very minutest exactitude; and this is the secret and inspiring power of all true ministerial toils, energy, perseverance, and efficiency. And just as this predestinated certainty animates the heart of the Church and the ministry, so will their zeal become steady, their fidelity true, and their activity more evident and more ardent. And what we have said in regard to the atonement and the preaching of the Gospel, is equally true in regard to all the other means of grace. Their efficiency depends wholly upon the sovereign appointment of God.

And now, for a moment, let us inquire what the atonement, what Revelation, what the ministry, and what all the other means of grace would be worth, were it not for their predestinated efficiency and object. We assert, in the light of Scripture and in the confirmation of all human experience, that they would be utterly and forever worthless, a mere manifestation of folly, weakness, and discomfiture. They would be a failure and a defeat, an annihilating reflection upon the whole character of God. And if the success of these divine appointments is to depend upon anything outside of, and independent of, God's everlasting intention concerning them, then their universal failure is just as certain, as every other agent is incompetent to the production of such an effect. The Church of God is a certainty; and its successes among the nations of the earth are a certainty; but upon what grounds? Is it upon the ground of self-efficiency, ministerial efficiency, water efficiency, or divine efficiency? The ministry is a means, and water is an emblem, and both stand in their appropriate place; but all saving efficiency is of God. Means are powers; but they are only instrumental powers. But God himself is a power which operates directly and efficiently upon the soul. He opens men's understanding, that they understand the Scriptures. He opens the heart of the people, and then they attend to the things spoken by the ministry. He prepares the heart, and then the Gospel becomes instrumentally the power of God unto salvation. He opens men's eyes, and then they see wondrous things in the divine law. He does not change the light, nor modify the light, nor in any way alter the natural condition

Digitized by Google

of the light. He opens the eyes; and then, and not till then, does the light produce its appropriate effect. The efficient and the instrumental cause must go together, the one preparing the way for the other. The seeing eye and the existing light are essential to the existence of vision. But all this, with all its results in time and eternity, springs from a purpose whose age can only be expressed by eternity.

And, surely, whatever objections may be brought against Calvinism, this cannot be one of them. The evangelical Arminian is obliged to take refuge in this stronghold of our faith. He, too, in spite of all theories, looks to the divine purpose, to support him in his trials and crown the labors of his ministry. But it is alone the sovereign and eternal predestination of God, which provides all the means of salvation, and secures to them an infallible success. H——s.

Art. IX. — CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. — *Evenings with the Doctrines.* By Nehemiah Adams, D. D. Author of "Friends of Christ," "Christ a Friend," "Communion Sabbath," etc., etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1861. Pp. 415.

In an introductory note to this volume, we are told, "These pages contain the substance of familiar lectures delivered in the Lecture Room of the Essex Street Church, Boston, on successive Tuesday evenings, in the winter of 1858–9." The author is already favorably known to the religious public by his previous publications, and is *justly* esteemed, as we believe, a conservative man in both opinion and practice; holding fast the form of sound words as delivered in the symbols of the fathers, and mildly, but firmly, refusing to follow the lead of scheming demagogues, or crack-brained moralists and philanthropists. These lectures will not disappoint his friends, and — what is far more important — they will serve the cause of truth. We hope they will find many readers in the latitude of Boston.

The title, at least a part of it, wakes a sympathetic chord in

Digitized by Google

our hearts: *Evenings with the* DOCTRINES. Yes, here we have them — the fundamental *doctrines* of evangelical, saving religion. It is refreshing to run the eye over the table of contents: God; Man; the Trinity; the Deity of Christ; the Deity of the Holy Spirit: Atonement; Election; Regeneration; Perseverance, etc.; in all seventeen discourses, making up a volume of more than four hundred pages. We have read with some degree of care the three on Atonement, and the two immediately following — one on Election, the other on Regeneration. While the writer carefully avoids a dry scholastic method of treatment, he is very far from avoiding sharp and distinct statements of Christian doctrine: and while he adopts, as most suitable to his purpose, a familiar, earnest, practical, biblical method of handling these high themes, he by no means fails to state and to meet with fairness and candor the objections urged by opposers of the truth, and especially those current in his own locality. There is no attempt at concealment; no blinking and dodging of knotty points; no fear of being set down as an old-fashioned Calvinist. While the Bible, in its obvious meaning, is everywhere appealed to as the decisive authority, the views of Turretin, Owen, Andrew Fuller, and other eminent Calvinistic divines, are quoted or referred to with undisguised respect. And what is far more significant of the cast of his theology, the expression of his own opinions, both formally and informally, is frequently made in the very terms of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism. In confirmation of these remarks, we make two quotations; the first from the second lecture on Atonement, page 218:

"Pardon and justification are not synonymous. A prisoner pardoned is not thereby 'justified.' One is 'justified' whom the law pronounces 'not guilty.' 'Who shall *lay any thing to the charge* of God's elect? It is God that *justifieth*.' 'Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and *accepteth us as righteous* in his sight.' — This act of justifying us, in addition to pardon, is among the wonders of redemption. Again; there is no transfer of character from Christ to us; nor from us as sinners to Christ when suffering for us; but an *imputation* — not an *infusion* — of merit and demerit. Again; while the Atonement shows the benevolence of God, promotes holiness, and does many things connected with moral

Digitized by Google

government, none of these things are the primary object of atonement. That object is, *To satisfy divine justice.* Let no human philosophy make us lose sight of this essential object of the Saviour's death."

The italics are the author's. The second quotation is from the lecture on Regeneration, pp. 281–2:

"With divine simplicity, fearless of the metaphysicians, Paul says, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.' God works in us 'to will;' He makes us 'will;' He makes us willing; He works in us to will, and we, at the same time, work out our salvation. *There are some who profess that they can explain this: it is generally most clear to some who are fresh from their academical studies; as they advance in knowledge, however, some of them happily conclude that it is best to show the sovereignty of God in conversion, and the conscious freedom of man, and to leave the manner of their cooperation where the Saviour cautioned Nicodemus to leave the infinite mystery.* Until we know the nature of the Spirit's operation in the soul, we cannot assert that it is inconsistent with the perfect responsibility of man. The simple duty of man is to repent and believe on Christ. Doing this, (by the operation of the Holy Spirit, for it is the gift of God,) a mysterious divine work is done in the soul by the Holy Spirit, which constitutes Regeneration. Repentance is not regeneration; faith is not regeneration; they 'accompany and flow from regeneration.' There is a work of the Spirit in the nature of the soul, and not merely among the volitions; something is done which causes those volitions to be otherwise than they are by nature."

In this instance the italics are ours. The sixteenth lecture, the Intermediate State, is an elaborate discussion extending through nearly fifty pages. After criticizing the insensibility theory, (lately revived and advocated by Archbishop Whately, in his "View of the Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State,") and what may be called the Hades theory, the author propounds his own, in words very familiar to most of our readers:

"The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves until the resurrection."

There may be views presented in this volume, to which we could not subscribe; but judging from what we have read, we consider it an orthodox and a very valuable contribution to the

Digitized by Google

best class of our popular religious literature. It is admirably adapted to the wants of cultivated and inquiring minds. We are persuaded it would be a good thing were more *evenings* spent with the *doctrines* in the lecture room. A more symmetrical religious experience would be developed thereby; a more manly, vigorous, and stable piety be secured to the churches. Let other pastors take a hint from what Dr. Adams has done so well.

---

2. *The Gospel according to Matthew:* — Explained by JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, New York: Charles Scribner, 1861.

The Christian public, particularly the Presbyterian portion of it, has scarcely recovered from the shock experienced at the death of the distinguished man whose last days were devoted to the preparation of this work, but who did not survive long enough to complete it. He was cut down in the midst of his days and of his greatest usefulness to the church at large, and we have no man to fill the void. Those most competent to judge of the value of his labors, mourn *their* loss (not *his*), the most. Endowed with gifts and graces accorded to few, and bringing to his task the aids of a scholarship the most diversified and extensive, the most minute and accurate, and at the same time the most comprehensive, he applied his great powers and his great acquirements to the *explanation* of God's holy Word. And in reading his explanations, we are seldom disappointed. There is a most grateful absence of that weariness that settles down on one like a huge nightmare, as we turn over and over the pages of some tedious and shallow commentators, with barely energy enough left at last to cry out in vexation of spirit, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" On the contrary, we shall not soon forget the delightful exhilaration of spirits experienced on reading for the first time Dr. Alexander's Acts of the Apostles and Mark. But while truly thankful for what has been done, we shall always regret that Dr. Alexander did not carry out his original plan as set forth in the preface to the Acts of the Apostles, and prepare his

Digitized by Google

expositions exclusively "with a view to the peculiar wants of ministers and students."

This work, as has been intimated already, is incomplete, so far at least as the last twelve chapters of Matthew are concerned. Of them we have only an analysis; no detailed exposition. The sudden death of the lamented author has deprived us of an Introduction, also; which would, no doubt, have been as instructive and as suggestive as the one prefixed to his Mark. We have not the time now, neither is this the place, to enter upon an extended criticism. At a future day this may be attempted. Nothing more is needed, to call attention to this volume, than to repeat the title, with the name of the author: *The Gospel of Matthew: Explained by* JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER.

---

3. — *Thoughts on Preaching.* By JAMES W. ALEXANDER, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner.

THE contents of a large part of this volume, as indicated by the title, are fragmentary — mere jottings, indeed, from the Note-book of the lamented Author. With reference to this part of the volume, the editor tells us in his Preface:

"It had long been the cherished wish of Dr. Alexander to prepare a volume on Homiletics, for the use of young ministers and students; and with this object in view, he was in the habit of jotting down in his private journals, in the form of paragraphs, such thoughts as occurred to him on the subject. In one of his later journals I find the following entry: 'If the Lord should spare me below, it will be well for me some day to look over all my dailies, and collect what I have written from time to time on Ministerial Work. It is already enough for a volume. It might do good when I am gone.' But Death defeated his plans. To carry out his purpose as far as is now possible, I have collected these paragraphs; and print them, just as they occur in his journals, without any attempt to arrange them in the order of subjects."

Additional to these Thoughts, are two or three elaborate Articles of the Author, from the *Repertory*, and the series of "Letters

Digitized by Google

to Young Ministers" originally published in the *Presbyterian.* Taken altogether, we regard this as the best work on Homiletics extant. Perhaps in no department of ecclesiastical literature is there so great a want, as in that which relates to the sublimest of all arts — the art of Preaching. The Professors in our Seminaries can find nothing in this department which they can use as a text-book, or even as furnishing a general outline of a course of instruction. And so glaring are the deficiencies and the faults of most of our existing treatises on Homiletics, that many have been induced to question, if not absolutely to condemn all attempts to treat of Preaching as an Art. The work of Vinet, with all its acknowledged excellencies, is intensely French — French in its modes of thought and its adaptations. The work of Porter, which is perhaps more frequently in the hands of our young ministry than any other, fails in many and most important particulars, to meet the real exigencies of the subject. And none with which we are acquainted meets the precise wants of the existing ministry in the Presbyterian Church of the United States. These Thoughts — all of them fragments of pure gold, many of them most precious gems — are invaluable, because of their precise adaptations to the necessities of our ministry in this age and in this country. No small part of the interest and the value of this volume is found in its frequent references to the experiments and experiences of the Author, in that Art of which he was an acknowledged master. He seems to have encountered in detail all the difficulties which await the young Preacher, and to have given us the results of his own experiments as to the best methods of surmounting them. Withal there is a point, a simplicity, a freshness about the whole which makes it a most fascinating as well as instructive volume.

Two things are worthy of special notice: the article on Expository Preaching, published originally we believe in the Repertory — an article which we would rejoice to see in the hands of every Preacher; and the thoughts on the Method of Sermonizing — particularly the mischievous habit of constructing the sermon upon a skeleton previously and precisely framed. What has the living to do with the dead, or why should living thoughts be compressed within dead moulds? Why compel the sermon to adjust itself

Digitized by Google

to the skeleton — a thing apart from itself — instead of letting both, the whole living organism, grow together?

We commend the following two paragraphs to special notice:

"1. *Mode of making a brief.* I follow a brief penned at my table during a short interval. I made it thus: mere catch-words — took a general thought to start with, let the next come of itself, then the next, and so on without effort. It served well. The thing to be noted is, that in a few moments, by letting the mind flow and not interfering with the flow, one may jot down materials for a long discourse. It was not merely *heads*, these are barren, they are disconnected; it was concatenation, it was *genesis*. I consider this a little new; but Nevins shows me something like it, for Sabbath lectures: I have done too much in the way of naked skeleton. I wish I could embody my thoughts in a formula; try it thus: 1. Write rapid sketch, the faster the better. 2. In first draught, omit all partition, and do not force your mind to method. 3. Let thought generate thought. 4. Do not dwell on particulars; leave all amplifications for the pulpit. 5. Keep the mind in a glow. 6. Come to it with a full mind. 7. Forget all care of language. 8. Forget all previous cramming, research, quotation and study.

2. *Sermonizing.* I have just finished a sermon on Isaiah lix, ult. I am not pleased. I was hampered throughout by a preconcerted *skeleton*. Thus it worked. Things would arise in my mind and flow into my pen just at the right place, but I could not use them because they *belonged to another head*. The result was, the articulation was broken, the flow was interrupted, the work became a mosaic. I perceive my father was right when he advised me to write my first draught *currente calamo*, without any plan, with absolute *abandon*; giving free scope in every direction whenever a vein was struck, and reserving the particulars for the copy."

Digitized by Google

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

[Books and other Publications designed for notice in this work, should, if practicable, be sent directly to the "Danville Review," Danville, Ky.; or if sent to the publisher, RICHARD H. COLLINS, 25 West Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, will reach their destination.]

Evenings with the Doctrines. By Nehemiah Adams, D. D., Author of "Friends of Christ," "Christ a Friend," "Communion Sabbath," etc., etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1861. 12mo. pp. 415.

The Gospel according to Matthew. Explained by Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner. 12mo. 1861.

Thoughts on Preaching. By James W. Alexander, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner. 12mo. 1861.

Sermons for the New Life. By Horace Bushnell. Seventh edition. New York: Charles Scribner. 12mo. 1861.

The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records stated anew. By George Rawlinson, M. A. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1861.

A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges. By James Hadley, Professor in Yale College. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 12mo. 1861.

Plato's Apology and Crito. With Notes by W. S. Tyler, Professor of Greek in Amherst College. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1860.

Rickey, Mallory & Co.'s Catalogue Raisonné: A General and Classified List of the most important works in nearly every department of Literature and Science, published in the United States and England; with a Bibliographical Introduction. Cincinnati: Rickey & Carroll. 12mo. pp. 259. 1861.

Rhetorical Praxis: The Principles of Rhetoric exemplified and applied in copious Exercises for Systematic Practice, chiefly in the Development of the Thought. For use in Schools and Colleges. By Henry N. Day, Author of "Elements of the Art of Rhetoric," and the "Art of Elocution." Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, Keys & Co. 12mo. pp. 309. 1860.

History of the United Netherlands: From the Death of William the Silent, to the Synod of Dort; with a full view of the English-Dutch Struggle against Spain, and of the Origin and Destruction of the Spanish Armada. By John Lothrop Motley, LL. D., D. C. L., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, Author of "The Rise of the Dutch Republic." New York: Harper & Brothers. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1861. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 532, 563.

Logic in Theology; and other Essays. By Isaac Taylor. With a Sketch of the Life of the Author, and a Catalogue of his Writings. New York: William Gowans. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 297.

Notes on New Testament Literature and Ecclesiastical History. By Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner. 1861. 12mo. pp. 319.

Digitized by Google

WHEELER & WILSON'S

SEWING MACHINES,

NOW, AS EVER, IN THE ASCENDANT.

PRICES JUST REDUCED.

Sewing-Machine Awards by the American Institute, N. Y., 1859-60.



We would ask the earnest and candid attention of the public, and *especially* of that public more immediately represented by the DANVILLE REVIEW, to the following discriminating award of the intelligent Committee on Sewing-Machines of the American Institute:

The Machines are arranged according to the stitch made, and the purpose to which the machine is to be applied, in four classes—First, Second, Third and Fourth; a classification indicating the order of importance and usefulness

Class First includes the Shuttle or Lock-Stitch Machine for family use, and for manufactures in the same range of purpose and material. The Committee assign to this class the highest rank on account of the *elasticity, permanence, beauty,* and *general desirableness of the stitching when done and the wide range of its application.* At the *head* of this class they place the Wheeler & Wilson Machine, *the uniform award* for *this* Machine wherever it has been exhibited in competition in all parts of the country.

Class Second includes the Shuttle or Lock-Stitch Machines for heavy manufacturing purposes.

Class Third includes the *Double Thread Chain-Stitch* Machines. The Committee object to the stitch made by these, as it requires more thread than any other stitch, and leaves a ridge projecting from one side of the seam, which, in the Committee's opinion, must usually impair the durability of the seam, and the value and durability of the garments, or other manufactures put together with it, though *some of the machines* making this stitch can be used very well for the plain *line embroidering purposes*, and for garments that it may be desirable to alter, as the stitch may be *raveled* in the same manner as *knitting-work*. "At the head of this class the Committee place the Grover & Baker Machine."

Class Fourth includes the *Single Thread Chain-Stitch* Machines. The Committee consider the *tendency* of this stitch to ravel to be an objection so serious that they refuse to recommend the machine, making for it no reward or premium.

THE WHEELER & WILSON MACHINE

Still continues to hold the relative position given it by this award, which is sustained by more than one hundred COUNTY, STATE and UNITED STATES awards, and by all of the leading religious and secular journals of the country, together with the array of the most intelligent and influential clergymen, ladies, gentlemen, manufacturers, and professional seamstresses in all parts of the United States, Europe, British America, West Indies, Central and South America, Turkey, India, China, and Japan.

Awarded the highest premium at the UNITED STATES FAIRS of 1858, 1859, and 1860.

The stitch is *alike on both sides*, leaving no CHAIN or RIDGE on the under side.

The sworn report to Mr. Howe, to whom all Sewing-Machines pay a license, shows for 1859, that

Wheeler & Wilson sold	21,305	Machines.
I. M. Singer & Co	10,953	"
Grover & Baker	10,280	"

☞ All Machines warranted three years.

WM. SUMNER & CO., AGENTS,

Pike's Opera House, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Digitized by Google

THE

Danville Quarterly Review.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION BY WHICH THIS PERIODICAL IS CONDUCTED:

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,
EDWARD P. HUMPHREY,
STEPHEN YERKES,
JOSEPH T. SMITH,
} Professors in Danville Theological Seminary.

JAMES MATTHEWS,
JACOB COOPER,
} Professors in Center College, Danville, Ky.

ROBERT W. LANDIS, Pastor, Somerset, Kentucky.
JOHN M. WORRALL, " Covington, Kentucky.
ROBERT L. BRECK, " New Albany, Indiana.

☞ Original articles or letters in reference to matter for publication in the Review, should be addressed to DANVILLE REVIEW, Danville, Kentucky, or to some member of the Association.

The DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW will be issued regularly in the first week of the months of March, June, September, and December, and contain 176 pages a number.

TERMS:

For one copy, one year, payable in advance	$3 00
For one copy, two years, if paid strictly in advance	5 00
For four copies, one year, if paid strictly in advance	10 00
For five copies, one year, payable in advance, (the sender to receive the fifth copy for his trouble,)	12 00
For one copy of any single number, by mail, prepaid	80
For ten copies of any single number, by mail, prepaid	6 00
To Missionaries, if paid in advance, one copy per year	2 00

Remittances for the work, by mail, will be at the Publisher's risk, if in registered letters. Subscribers are requested to remit by mail, as it gives them the least trouble, and the money is received more promptly. Large amounts should be sent by check or draft.

This being a Quarterly Periodical, the postage, when paid by subscribers quarterly in advance, is THREE AND A HALF CENTS on each number, or FOURTEEN CENTS for the year, to all parts of the United States.

Remittances, and other letters on business, should be addressed to

RICHARD H. COLLINS,
Publisher Danville Review,
25 WEST FOURTH ST., CINCINNATI.

ADVANCE SHEETS.

A large edition of Art. IV, by Rev. Dr. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, on "*Our Country—its Peril—its Deliverance,*" was issued as Advance Sheets, in pamphlet form. A few remain unsold, and will be sent, post-paid, for 15 cents each, or eight for $1.

Digitized by Google

TERMS, THREE DOLLARS A YEAR, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

THE

DANVILLE QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

EDITED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

JUNE, 1861.

Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.—2 TIM. I: 10

DANVILLE, KY., AND CINCINNATI, OHIO:
PUBLISHED BY
RICHARD H. COLLINS, 25 WEST FOURTH STREET, CINCINNATI,
AND SOLD BY
CROSBY, NICHOLS & CO., BOSTON; ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK; WM. S. & ALFRED MARTIEN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT S. DAVIS, PITTSBURGH; JOHN D. THORPE, ROBERT CLARKE & CO., GEO. S. BLANCHARD, AND RICKEY & CARROLL, CINCINNATI; A. DAVIDSON, LOUISVILLE; KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; WM. G. HOLMES, CHICAGO.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1861, by
RICHARD H. COLLINS,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

☞ Postage, to all parts of the U. S., when paid Quarterly in advance, 3½ cents on each number, or 14 cents for a year

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF No. II.

PAGE

ART. I.—THE CLAIM OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG TO DIVINE REVELATION, 177

ART. II.—THE NATURE AND IMPORT OF A CHRISTIAN PROFESSION, - 230

ART. III.—ULFILAS, - - - - - - - - - - - - 248

ART. IV.—CUBA, FROM A RECENT VIEW, - - - - - - - 260

ART. V.—STATE OF THE COUNTRY, - - - - - - - - 292

DISCOURSE OF DR. R. J. BRECKINRIDGE, delivered on the day of National Humiliation, Jan. 4, 1861, at Lexington, Ky., 319

ART. VI.—BIBLIOGRAPHY, - - - - - - - - - - 342

ART. VII.—CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - - - - - - 349

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED, - - - - - - - 364

Stereotyped at the
FRANKLIN TYPE AND STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY,
Cincinnati, O.

Printed by
MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.,
Cincinnati, O.

Digitized by Google

1862 May 16.
Gift of
Rev. J. D. Thane
Cincinnati, Ohio.

DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. II.

JUNE, 1861.

ART. I. — *The claim of Emanuel Swedenborg to Divine Illumination considered.*

§ 1. *The Subject stated.*

When a confessedly upright and intelligent mind comes calmly and seriously before the public with a deliberate and reiterated asseveration of the truthfulness of certain matters, which he on his own personal knowledge alleges to be matters of actual occurrence; and which, if conceded to be true, must in the very nature of the case involve some of the highest interests of humanity; and freely offers to the scrutiny of all men the evidence on which the allegation of their truthfulness is based; it is not wisdom, but folly, and mental imbecility, which would endeavor to ignore such a claim upon our respectful consideration by turning aside from the proffered issue to an issue that is plainly false. If we choose to turn from and to disregard the whole affair, we are certainly at liberty to do so. But to profess to announce a decision on the subject without examination, and without any intelligent reference to the proffered evidence, is both to act irrationally, and to merit the contempt of all reasonable and good men. Prov. xviii·: 13. And it is easy to see that the course which many have pursued in such cases, would, if logically followed to its legitimate results, wholly unsettle the basis of history, and arrest the advance of science itself.

Digitized by Google

Emanuel Swedenborg* was a truly learned, exemplary, and serious man. In all his public relations he was highly respected; and in his private and social, greatly admired and beloved. More than a century ago† he came before the world with the frank and serious announcement that the Lord had appeared to him, and commissioned him to announce certain important truths to mankind: and (like the Apostle to the Gentiles, after the Lord had appeared to him,) to the performance of the duties of this mission he gave all his powers and energies during the whole of his subsequent life: resigning also his public trusts and employments, in order to devote himself more fully to the work. Neither fame, nor pecuniary emolument, could have been his aim; for his works, with the exception of the last, were published without his name; he never realized nor sought to realize a farthing from the sale of his numerous productions; and though keenly sensitive to reproach and ridicule, he fully anticipated the treatment which his claim to divine illumination would receive from his fellow men. He, moreover, so far from attempting any evasion or concealment, freely and frankly and repeatedly announced the evidence on which he based his claim to be a divinely illuminated teacher. And no man ever has more fully and directly than he, in his multitudinous writings, insisted on the principle that *God never requires faith without evidence.* Such are the facts, and such the issue, freely and fairly presented by himself. And it is humiliating to think how this issue has been met by many who assume the position of intelligent antagonists to his claim. Instead of meeting the question fairly, by a scrutiny of the proffered evidence, and of the asserted truths which he announced; they, while admitting that the subject was entitled to a thorough examination and discussion, have contented themselves with mere declamation; or expressions of contempt, and denunciation of the whole matter; or they have started side issues and have raised questions as to the truthfulness, morality, and sanity of a mind as well-balanced, as sincere, as pure, and as intelligent, to say the very least, as any that have thus ventured to assail him. But why is this? And why should such a claim, thus set forth

* Born in Stockholm, Jan. 29, 1688. Died in London, March 29, 1772.

† He mentions the year 1743 as the date of this commission.

Digitized by Google

by such a man, be thus treated? Could not the Jews have thus treated the claim of Paul? And is there any inherent and *à priori* impossibility in the supposition that God should, at any time, raise up, endow, and send forth under divine attestations, a messenger to announce His will to mankind? If such impossibility exists, it certainly has not been demonstrated by those who have thus assumed it as a first truth in antagonism to Swedenborg; and to ask that it be taken for granted in the discussion of an alleged fact or claim, whose very existence would infer the opposite, is to ask that the respondent concede the falsity of his alleged fact, as a preliminary to the discussion of the question of its truth, — a request which is not at all remarkable for its modesty. Until these gentlemen, therefore, consent to favor the world with their demonstration, it is obvious that the only proper question on the subject-matter before us, is in reference to the validity of the claim asserted by Swedenborg; and, on his behalf, by his numerous and respectable followers; — a question which can be intelligently determined only by a fair and proper investigation of the evidence adduced in support of that claim. No other issue need be raised *in limine*.

So far as the present writer is concerned, and in order that his position in relation to the enquiry may be at the outset rightly understood, he would here remark that in point of intellectual ability, literary attainment, and purity of life, he cheerfully concedes to Swedenborg all that is claimed for him by his intelligent admirers. Morell, in his *History of Modern Philosophy*,* has only awarded him the tribute of just praise; and we have no disposition to deny that he was "one of the sublimest geniuses that ever adorned the annals of science." † We come to the investigation of his claim, therefore, not only with a grateful sense of obligation for his admirable contributions to science; and with a free concession of purity of motive on his part: but with humble and earnest prayer to the Father of lights, that no improper or selfish motive may actuate or influence us herein; and that we may so treat the matter as to bring joy to us, instead of sorrow

* Carter's edition, pp. 202–206. New York. 1848.

† Professor Bush, p. iii. of Introduction to the *Swedenborg Library*. New York. 1846.

Digitized by Google

and regret in the future stages of our being. Truths are involved in the discussion which respect directly and practically the whole of man's position in relation to God and his claims; and which, by consequence, intimately bear upon our weal or wo in the world to come. If the followers of Swedenborg are in error, they are in ruinous and fatal error; and with a zeal almost without a parallel, they are laboring to disseminate their errors through the world. But if they entertain the truth, their antagonists must, in the very necessity of the case, be guilty of rejecting it to their own eternal undoing. As these things are mutually conceded, compromise is out of the question: and in joining issue, we shall be as unwilling to ask for quarter as we shall be to grant it.

We may safely say, without a particle of exaggeration, that never since the commencement of the present century have there been, either in or out of the Church, more persistent efforts than the followers of Swedenborg have been and still are making for the propagation of their views. Considering the fewness of his disciples, their efforts in England, and on the Continent, and in our own land, to accomplish this end, almost surpass belief. No efforts are spared; and the pecuniary sacrifices involved and cheerfully met, evince a zeal which is truly remarkable, and which has been attended with marked results; while the asserted identity of the system with Spiritism (or Spiritualism) has invested the subject with a new interest. These things evince that the time has arrived for a thorough discussion of the topic announced in the heading of this article; and we are assured that such a discussion of it will be both timely and proper.

§ 2. *The Views entertained of Swedenborg and his Mission by his Followers.*

In the investigation of this subject, it is proper at the outset to present the reader with a brief but comprehensive view of the sentiments entertained by the followers of Swedenborg respecting the divinity of his mission. And as this cannot be done better than in the masterly delineation of Professor Bush, we shall cite from him the following passage bearing on the subject:

"Now we would fain have this matter viewed in its appropriate

Digitized by Google

light, and then let every one judge for himself, whether he can rationally attribute such a body of doctrine and revelation to a merely human origin. You will observe that an entirely *new* dispensation was to be announced and ushered in, and we can form some adequate idea of what would be requisite in order to accomplish such an august result. A complete change was to be wrought in men's ideas of sacred things. All the old and long established forms of thought on religious themes were to be remodelled, and yet the inspired Word was to remain as ever the grand depositary of Divine truth and the criterion of all doctrine. The oldness of the letter was to be preserved in perfect consistency with a developed newness of spirit. How could this be, unless a deeper and more interior meaning were developed from it; and how, again, could this be done, unless an underlying law were discovered which should redeem the interpretation from the charge of being arbitrary and fanciful? And here it is that we encounter the grand problem to be solved. How is this law of interpretation to be discovered? Where shall the intellect be found competent to elicit from the written revelation, a sense which shall be the basis of a *new* dispensation — an order of things answering to the high strains of prophecy bearing upon the glory of the Lord's coming kingdom? We say, without hesitation, that such a discovery would be to human wit or wisdom simply impossible. *

Such, then, is the nature of the claim of this extraordinary man, as understood and insisted on by his followers. The assumption is both clearly and definitely announced. A new dispensation has been proclaimed and ushered in by Swedenborg, the design of which is to effect a complete revolution in the ideas of sacred things as heretofore entertained by the Church of God. All previous forms of thought on religious themes were to be remodelled; and a deeper and more interior meaning to be developed from the Word of God. In other words — *Swedenborg was directly commissioned by the Lord Jehovah to usher in a new dispensation which should supersede all previous dispensations: and to furnish mankind with the key to the right interpretation of the Scriptures.*

Now it needs no words to show that the man, who should deliberately advance a claim like this, and insist on its recognition by

* New Church Miscellanies, p. 320. New York. 1855.

Digitized by Google

his fellow men under the most awful sanctions, can have no right to expect any favor to be shown to him until he shall have in some way sufficiently justified the demand thus made upon their attention and belief. One only of the following alternatives can remain to him: 1. He must, on the ground of adequate evidence, sustain the claim; in which case he may expect ultimately to receive the gratitude and coöperation of the wise and good; or, (if he fail thus to sustain the claim,) he may expect to be regarded, 2. As an intentional deceiver and hypocrite; or, 3. As a dupe either of his own imagination, or of some malignant influence, which has deluded and led him astray. These things appear to be obvious, and do not need to be further insisted on. Let us, therefore, proceed in the next place to consider:

§ 3. *The claim of Swedenborg to Divine Illumination, as stated and presented by himself.*

He frequently, and in the most direct and earnest manner, asserts this claim. For example, in his letter to Dr. Oetinger, (dated Stockholm, Sept. 23, 1766,) he thus speaks:

"*I can sacredly and solemnly declare, that the Lord himself has been seen of me, and that he has sent me to do what I do, and for such purpose has opened the interior part of my soul, which is my spirit, so that I can see what is in the spiritual world, and those that are therein:* and this privilege has now been continued to me for twenty-two years. But in the present state of infidelity, can the most solemn oath make such a thing credible, or to be believed by any? Yet such as have received true Christian light and understanding, will be convinced of the truth contained in my writings, which are particularly evident in my *Revelations Revealed.* Who, indeed, has hitherto known any thing of consideration of the true spiritual sense and meaning of the Word of God, the spiritual world, or of heaven and hell, the nature or the life of man, and the true state of souls after the decease of the body? Is it to be supposed that these and other things of a like consequence are to be eternally hidden from Christians? That many very important particulars relating to them are at this day revealed for the first time, is done in regard to the New Jerusalem, and for the sake of the new Church," &c. *

* See "Documents concerning the Life and Character of the Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg." These Documents were collected and edited with great care, (in

Digitized by Google

He repeats the announcement likewise, in his letter to a Mr. Hartley, (London, 1769,) and says:

'I have been called to a holy office by the Lord himself, who most graciously manifested himself in person to me, his servant, in the year 1743; when he opened my sight to the view of the spiritual world, and granted me the privilege of conversing with spirits and angels, which I enjoy to this day. From that time I began to print and publish various *arcana* that have been seen by me, or revealed to me; as respecting heaven and hell, the state of man after death, the true worship of God, the spiritual sense of the Word"; &c.

And in a letter to the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, (Amsterdam, 1771,) he, after remarking that the Lord our Saviour foretold that he would come again into the world and establish here a new Church, adds:

"But as he cannot come again into the world in person, it was necessary that he should do it by means of a man who should not only receive the doctrine of this new Church in his understanding, but also publish it by printing; and as the Lord had prepared me for this office from my infancy, he has manifested himself to me in person before me, his servant, and sent me to fill it. This took place in the year 1743."

Also in his letter to the King of Sweden, (Stockholm, May 10, 1770,) he says:

"I have already informed your Majesty, and beseech you to recall it to mind, that the Lord our Saviour manifested himself to me in a sensible personal appearance; that he has commanded me to write what has been already done, and what I have still to do." &c.

"I have already declared this more than once to your Majesty, in the presence of all the royal family, when they were graciously pleased to invite me to their table, with five senators, and several other persons; this was the only subject discoursed of during the repast." "I

the German language,) by Dr. J. F. I. Tafel, of Tubingen. They were then translated, and with some modifications and additions, reëdited by a Mr. Smithson, of England: and finally they were reissued, with considerable additions, by Prof. Bush, in New York, 1847. They were collected as materials for a biography of Swedenborg, but as Dr. Tafel remarks, they, "when properly arranged, form a complete body of information" respecting him. We shall refer to them frequently in the course of this essay.

Digitized by Google

have declared the same in England, Holland, Germany, Denmark, and at Paris, to kings, princes." &c. "When my writings are read with attention and cool reflection, (in which many things are to be met with as hitherto unknown,) it is easy enough to conclude that I could not come to such knowledge, but by a real vision, and by conversing with those who are in the spiritual world."

And he adds, that:

"If any doubt still remain, I am ready to testify with the most solemn oath that can be offered in this matter, that I have said nothing but essential and real truth, without any mixture of deception."

He likewise constantly reiterates the same assertion in other phraseology; e. g., in a letter to the aforesaid Landgrave, (Amsterdam, July 15, 1771,) "I have been introduced by the Lord into the spiritual world." And to Mr. Venator, (July 13, 1771); and on many other occasions. *

In the American edition of the "Documents," however, the circumstances of this frequently asserted revelation are not detailed; though in the German edition, by his devoted follower, Dr. Tafel, they are given in detail from and *Memoiren* of Mr. Robsahm. † Mr. Robsahm, a director of the Bank of Stockholm, was an intimate friend of Swedenborg, and collected, shortly after his decease, a number of anecdotes of his life at home, and published them in a pamphlet. The circumstances of the aforesaid revelation, as stated to him by Swedenborg, are as follows:

"I was in London, and one day dined rather late by myself, at a boarding house, where I kept a room in which, at pleasure, I could prosecute the study of the natural sciences. I was hungry, and ate with great appetite. At the end of the meal, I remarked that a vapor, as it were, clouded my sight, and the walls of my chamber appeared covered with frightful creeping things, such as serpents, toads, and the like. I was filled with astonishment, but retained the full use of my perception and thoughts. The darkness attained its height, and soon passed away. I then perceived a man sitting in the corner of my chamber. As I thought myself entirely alone, I was greatly terrified; when he spoke and said, 'Eat not so much.' The cloud once more

* Documents, pp. 88, 56, 71, 72, 87, 145, 149, 168.

† Tafel's Leben Swedenborg, pp. 8-10.

Digitized by Google

came over my sight, and when it passed away, I found myself alone in the chamber. This unexpected event hastened my return home. I did not mention the subject to the people of the house, but reflected upon it much, and believed it to have been the effect of accidental causes, or to have arisen from my physical state, at the time. I went home; but in the following night, the same man appeared to me again. He said, 'I am God, the Lord, the Creator and Redeemer of the world. I have chosen thee to lay before men the spiritual sense of the Word. I will teach thee what thou art to write.' On that same night, were open to my perception the heavens and the hells, where I saw many persons of my acquaintance, of all conditions. From that day forth, I gave up all mere worldly learning, and labored only in spiritual things, according to what the Lord commanded me to write. Daily he opened the eyes of my spirit to see what was done in the other world, and gave me, in a state of full wakefulness, to converse with angels and spirits."

The pretended rejection of this narrative by several of the modern followers of Swedenborg, is purely an *ex post facto* procedure; and simply arises from the fact that it is not precisely the thing which they would desire as the corner-stone of their new church superstructure. They would like something less exceptionable, — something which would better correspond with the demands of enlightened reason, in a matter to which they profess to attach such transcendent importance. But in this they cannot be gratified. The narrative is as we have given it; and nothing which they can now do can make it different from what it is. The testimony of Mr. Robsahm cannot be impeached by them.

§ 4. *Swedenborg announces likewise that he was instructed by the Lord in the Natural Sciences.*

The Divine Illumination asserted in the foregoing passages has relation only to theology. Swedenborg, however, makes the same assertion also in relation to his claim as a teacher of natural science; stating that he was first introduced by the Lord into the natural sciences, and thus prepared, from the year 1710–1744, when heaven was opened to him. In a letter to Dr. Oetinger, (Stockholm, Nov. 11, 1766,) he speaks on this subject as follows:

"*Why from a philosopher have I been chosen to this office?* Unto which I give for answer: to the end that the spiritual knowledge,

Digitized by Google

which is revealed at this day, might be reasonably learned, and naturally understood; because spiritual truths answer to natural ones, inasmuch as these originate and flow from them, and serve as a foundation for the former. That what is spiritual is similar unto and corresponds with what is human or natural, or belonging to the terrestrial world, may be seen in the treatise on *Heaven and Hell*, 87–115. I WAS ON THIS ACCOUNT, BY THE LORD, FIRST INTRODUCED INTO THE NATURAL SCIENCES, and thus prepared from the year 1710–1744, when heaven was opened unto me." *

It will be observed that the language here employed is parallel to that which he employs in relation to his introduction by the Lord into the spiritual world: "I have been introduced by the Lord into the spiritual world." † And by consequence his scientific teachings are as truly the result of a special Divine Illumination as his theological. They must therefore stand or fall together. For he asserts in similar and equally unambiguous terms, that he was endowed by the same Divine Power, and in the same divine method, to teach both, it would seem, from his earliest youth. ‡ This, however, is claimed for him substantially by his followers.. And in support of it they boast that before Herschell discovered the seventh primary planet, (which was in 1781,) Swedenborg had, in his *De Cultu et Amore Dei*, (published in 1745,) announced its existence: and also in his *Principia Rerum Naturalium*, in 1734. They likewise claim for him, on the same ground, many other important scientific discoveries.

§ 5. *Evidence adduced by the followers of Swedenborg in support of his claim to a special Divine Illumination and Mission.*

Such then is the claim of this remarkable man, as presented by himself and his followers. And we shall next proceed to the evidence on which they profess to rely in support of it. As that which is referred to in the previous section relates only to his scientific illumination and mission, we shall omit further reference to it at present, and confine our remarks to the evidence advanced on behalf of his illumination and mission, as a theological teacher, in the year 1743.

* Documents, p. 155.

† See Ibid, pp. 56, 87, 145, 169, &c. ‡ Ibid, p. 180.

Digitized by Google

At the outset, it is important to observe, that neither Swedenborg nor his followers directly appeal to the Bible in this matter. That is, no one of them pretends to point out any direct prophecy therein, (as in the case of John the Baptist, for instance,) in which Swedenborg and his mission are specifically referred to. Swedenborg, indeed, assumes that *Christ* "*cannot come again into the world in person*," and that, therefore, "it was necessary he should do it by means of a man." But if we should even allow this, the proof would still be wanting that Swedenborg himself was the man selected for that mission. It is a high claim; and, as we have seen, he assumes it boldly; and even seems to intimate pretty strongly his own idea of the matter, by constantly denominating Bishop Filenius, (whom he regarded as betraying him after saluting him with a kiss,) Judas Iscariot.* But all this is of no more value *to the argument*, than the assumption of that remarkable man and great philosopher MANES, who maintained that he was the Paraclete spoken of by Christ, who, by his teachings, was to make plain all the recondite truths of the Bible, and so instruct and build up the kingdom of Light on the earth. †

* Documents, p. 70.

† The views of MANES, on this subject, are thus presented by Mosheim: "When he (Christ) had accomplished his mission, he returned to his residence in the sun, having directed his Apostles to diffuse his religion among mankind. These ambassadors of Christ, although they did immense good to men, and greatly weakened the empire of the Prince of darkness, yet did not make known that full and perfect wisdom which is necessary for the souls that long for salvation; for Christ did not impart to them the full knowledge of the truth. But as he was departing, he promised to send forth in due time a greater and more holy Apostle, whom he named the *Paraclete;* who should add to his precepts such things as men at that time were not able to receive and digest, and should dissipate all errors in regard to divine things. That *Paraclete* came, in the person of *Manes* the Persian; and he, by command of Christ, expounded clearly and perfectly, and without figures and enigmas, the whole way of salvation for toiling and suffering souls." *History of Christianity*, Cent. III., sec. 47. And yet it is not to be supposed that Manes wished to be regarded as the Holy Spirit personally: or to have his followers believe that the entire Holy Spirit had descended into him: for he entertained no such idea. He makes a clear distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete, obviously regarding the Paraclete as a man endowed with, or preëminently taught by, the Holy Spirit. And then, moreover, he never calls himself by the name of the Holy Spirit; but on the contrary, prays for its illumination. "*Pietas vero Spiritus Sancti intima vestri pectoris adaperiat, ut ipsis oculis videatis animas vestras.*"

Digitized by Google

We have always been puzzled to understand on what principle Swedenborg, (and his followers after him,) require faith in the divinity of his mission, on the mere strength of his reiterated statement that he was divinely illuminated. Even the Son of God, who is Truth itself, said, in relation to this very point, "*If I* [alone] *bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.*" John v: 31. And surely no one will pretend that the teachings of Swedenborg appeal so much more strongly to the moral nature and consciousness of man, than do the teachings of our blessed Lord, that divine and public attestation to the truth of his mission was not equally necessary. But even should the blasphemous supposition be assumed by his followers, we are fully warranted, by the foregoing statement of our Saviour, to insist, as a necessary condition to faith in the mission of Swedenborg, that the divine attestation be produced in its favor; irrespective of any asserted moral excellence of the doctrines taught by him. To bear witness of one's self, means, according to this language of Christ, to announce one's self to be a divinely appointed teacher, without any adequate attestation from God; as, for example, the false prophets did. Had Christ done this, he, according to his own statement, would have been unworthy of credit; God never sending any prophet or teacher to men, without sufficient testimonials to justify, on the part of man, a rational reception of him as such.* Were it not so, there would, of course, be no ground on which to admonish his followers to beware of false prophets and false Christs; and no available ground on which they could heed the admonition. And hence, when, on another occasion, as he was referring to the nature and object of his mission, the Pharisees endeavored to refute him by reference to the aforesaid principle, he shows them, that though he did bear testimony of himself, yet this did not conflict with the principle, *for the Father also bore testimony concerning him.* John viii: 12–18. The same idea is plain also from Matt. xxvi: 64, and John x: 24, 25. And in this connection, Jesus often appeals to the miraculous attestations of the Father. And how could this be otherwise, since God never requires faith without adequate evidence!

In estimating the evidence proffered in behalf of the divine

* See Whitby *in loco.*

Digitized by Google

illumination of Swedenborg, both the Bible and his own testimony are, therefore, to be left out of the account. The Bible nowhere speaks of him prophetically; or announces that he should introduce a new dispensation — as above remarked. And as to his own testimony in the matter, it is of no weight whatever, if found unsupported by a clear divine attestation. What, then, is the evidence which is pleaded by his followers in support of it?

§ 6. *Positive evidence proffered by the followers of Swedenborg in favor of his Divine Illumination.*

In support of the truth of the forecited solemn and repeated asseveration of Swedenborg that the Lord appeared to him, &c.,* it is pleaded that *he was gifted with supernatural powers.*

1. *Inspiration has been claimed for him.*† This however is, we believe, no longer insisted on; and by some of his modern followers is most emphatically denied.

2. *The gift of prophecy has likewise been claimed for him.*

(1.) He predicted that a fire would happen in Stockholm in 1759.‡

(2.) And that he would live until he had published the *True Christian Religion.* ||

(3.) And that Captain Hodson, with whom he once sailed to Stockholm, should have a remarkably short voyage.§

* In respect to *the date* of this asserted revelation, respecting which no one would suppose there could be any difficulty in fixing it, there is no little uncertainty. Swedenborg sometimes refers to it as occurring in 1743, and at other times in 1744. While the editors of the "*Documents,*" pp. 31, 32, think that "there seems some reason to doubt whether the date" ought not to be "1745 instead of 1743." The *reasons* on which they intimate this are certainly somewhat portentous, when viewed in connection with the claim itself.

† See the letter of Mr. Thomas Hartley, A. M., prefixed to Mr. Cowles' translation of the *Vera Christiana Religio*, the last of Swedenborg's publications. This Mr. Hartley (who with Mr. Cowles reconciled it to conscience and moral integrity to remain in the Church of England, living upon its revenues, after they had become avowed followers of Swedenborg) is often confounded by both the advocates and opponents of the New Church with the celebrated Dr. David Hartley who died in 1757. Mr. T. Hartley wrote a short treatise on *Enthusiasm* (about A. D. 1757 or 8,) which may be perused with advantage. This was some years before he embraced Swedenborgianism.

‡ Documents, p. 69. But compare this prophetic gift with what is stated, as an exercise of it, on p. 127, ibid. || Ibid. p. 75. § Ibid. p. 78.

Digitized by Google

But admitting these facts to have occurred just as related, they furnish no evidence of *Divine* illumination; as we shall fully show hereafter. Compare 1 Sam. xxviii.

3. Miraculous powers were also claimed for him.* His editors now assure us however that "*he made no claim to the performance of miracles.*"†

4. The admitted facts relating to and proving the reality of his intercourse with the spiritual world are likewise referred to in proof of his divine illumination. In reference to this point Mr. Robsahm remarks as follows: "With respect to this highly gifted man's visions and communications with the spiritual world, in a frequent visible intercourse with angels and other spirits, they are so well known and attested, both in this and other countries, that sincere and well-informed minds will no longer doubt of their reality." ‡ In considering these alleged facts we shall attempt no philosophical explanation. We are willing for the argument's sake to admit them to be facts, and likewise to admit all that can be inferred from them as such, to-wit: that he had some kind of intercourse with the invisible world. The position, however, which is thoughtlessly maintained by some of his followers, that such intercourse was unknown until Swedenborg, is simply preposterous. In fact it is contradicted by their own statements; || and in the celebrated *Antidote to Atheism*, by the learned Dr. Henry More, (to refer to no other of the numerous works relating to this subject,) any number of facts, no less remarkable and equally well attested with those relating to Swedenborg, may be found, refuting this notion.

Three facts of this nature are prominently brought forward by the followers of Swedenborg, (and repeatedly referred to by himself,) as verifying the reality of his intercourse with the spiritual world. They are the following:

(1.) The great fire in Stockholm in September, 1759, was on the very day and hour of its occurrence accurately described by Swedenborg in Gottenburg, nearly three hundred miles distant. The Philosopher Kant thoroughly examined into the matter, and

---

* Documents, p. 109.
† Ibid. p. 74.
‡ Ibid. pp. 92, 93.
|| Ibid. pp. 117–119, 129.

Digitized by Google

without hesitation admits that the evidence in support of its truth, cannot be gainsayed.* And we do not see indeed how it can be set aside.

(2.) The second instance relates to the Countess de Marteville, and is as follows: The Count, her husband, (who was ambassador from Holland to Stockholm,) having died suddenly, a shopkeeper demanded of her the payment of a bill *for some articles of drapery*, which she was sure her husband had paid; but being unable to find the shopkeeper's receipt, she was advised to consult with Swedenborg, and did so; and in the course of a few days he informed her, that the Count, her husband, having obtained the receipt at a time when he was in his cabinet, reading a certain article in Bayle's Dictionary, had put the receipt in the book to mark the place where he left off; his attention having been suddenly called to some other matter. Upon this the Countess looked for the receipt, and found it at the page designated.†

This story is variously narrated. Mr. Robsahm, in his memoir of Swedenborg, says that he inquired of him respecting it, and that Swedenborg replied that the lady had been to him and related her trouble; upon which he promised that if he met her husband in the spiritual world he would inquire of him about the matter. "This soon happened," said Swedenborg, "and M. Marteville told me that he would himself go to his house on the following night to see after the receipt. *I received no other answer for the lady, and I have taken no other part in the matter; but I have heard that the widow spoke to her husband in a dream, and he told her where to find the missing document in his private bureau.*"‡

The second husband of the Countess, in narrating the matter, states that the sum of money referred to was 25,000 Dutch guilders, (rather a high price for "*some articles of drapery!*") and adds:

"Eight days after (the demand was presented to the Countess) the Count himself appeared to her in a dream, and mentioned to her a

* Ibid. pp. 100, 101, 227. Kant, however, erroneously dates the occurrence of the fire in 1756.

† Documents p. 94. ‡ Ibid. 95, 96.

Digitized by Google

private place in his English cabinet, where she would find not only the receipt, but also a hair-pin set with twenty brilliants, which had been given up as lost. This happened about two o'clock in the morning. Full of joy, my wife arose and found them in the place designated. She returned again to rest, and slept till nine o'clock. *About eleven, the Baron Swedenborg was announced.* His first remark before my wife had time to speak, was, that he had, during the preceding night, seen several spirits, and among others M. Von Marteville. He had wished to converse with him, but M. Von Marteville excused himself on the ground that he must go to discover to his wife something of importance: he then departed out of the society in which he had been a year, and would ascend to one far happier. *This is the true statement of the affair in which my wife was concerned, as well with respect to the receipt as with the Baron Swedenborg.*" *

Mr. Provo gives the following relation of it, from Swedenborg:

"He (Swedenborg) also related the affair of the Countess de Marteville, from whose husband's information, after his decease, he told her where a receipt for a sum of money lay, where she found it; for which she wished to make Swedenborg a handsome present, but he refused it." †

The account by M. Robsahm, (which he says is "*confirmed*" by Count Hôpken, and the wife of Swedenborg's gardener,) states that —

"After the decease of M. de Marteville, *certain people* came to demand a debt of his widow, of a considerable sum of money, that they said was due to them by her deceased husband; this she knew was not a just demand, because she was certain it had been paid during his life time, yet could not tell where the acquittance was put. In her trouble she applied to Swedenborg, who informed her the next day where it was, telling her that he had spoken with her deceased husband, who related to him where he had put this acquittance, and that she would find it in the particular place he described. The acquittance was found in the place Swedenborg had named. This account was universally known, both at court and in Stockholm, and every one related it according to his information." ‡

Such is the story; and from these conflicting statements one

* Documents, pp. 96, 100.

† Ibid. p. 78.

‡ Documents, p. 74. See also pp. 227, 228.

Digitized by Google

hardly knows what to believe in relation to it. It is left in uncertainty whether, previous to her dream, the Countess actually did call upon Swedenborg. The account given by her husband leaves the impression that she did not. It is uncertain, also, whether her deceased husband had any conversation with Swedenborg on the subject of the acquittance. It seems certain, from Swedenborg's own account, that he was not requested by the spirit of her husband to designate the place; and that he did not do it; and that after the interview with the spirit, he never called on the widow, or had anything further to do in the matter. Other strange discrepancies will strike the careful reader; it is not our purpose to dwell upon them. We are willing to concede, *for the sake of the argument*, that Swedenborg had intercourse with one in the spirit world, whom he believed to be the spirit of M. Marteville: (he previously had had no acquaintance with him.) More than this cannot be logically concluded from the premises.

(3.) The last of these alleged facts is that concerning the Queen of Sweden, Louisa Ulrika, (a sister of Frederick II., King of Prussia,) who was married to Adolphus Frederick, King of Sweden. This princess, in order to test the truth of Swedenborg's assertion that he had open and continual communication with the world of spirits, commissioned him to procure certain information from her deceased brother, the Prince of Prussia, who died in 1758, in the 36th year of his age. Swedenborg soon after waited upon her majesty, at the palace, and brought her the information she required. She was greatly astonished, and declared to those present, that nobody but her brother and herself could possibly have known the information in question. Such is the story. There is a sufficient degree of variety in its details, as presented by the witnesses whose testimony is adduced in confirmation; * but there can be but little rational ground for questioning the truth of the general statement as presented above.

Such then are the facts in the case. Swedenborg often referred to them as evidence of the truth of his claim to be a divinely illumined teacher; and his followers still do the same; † though

* Documents, pp. 225, 58, 59, 77, 78, 94, 97, 101, 182, 229.

† Ibid, pp. 102, 103, 105, and many other places. See also Prof. Bush's *Reply to Dr. Woods*, pp. 187–193, and also *Statement of Reasons*, p. 108, in which he

Digitized by Google

they are far less peremptory on the subject than formerly. In fact, the leading cue of the more modern advocates of the New Church, is studiously to undervalue miracles and prophecy as attestations of a divine revelation. Whether they mean by this to exalt the teachings of Swedenborg above the Gospel, (in attestation of whose divinity God gave these divine seals,) must be left for the reader to decide. It is certain that they were claimed on behalf of Swedenborg, by, at least, a goodly number of his followers, as long as they could be with even the appearance of decency; and that they were found to be of but little importance only when they were found to be wanting to the case in hand. Nor is there a solitary fact of all that have been adduced, which (admitting them all to be true) furnishes the slightest degree of evidence of *divine* illumination. They prove only, what we are willing to concede to Swedenborg, *a supernatural illumination*: using the term *supernatural* not in the sense of *miraculous*, however, but simply in the sense of *exceeding the known powers or resources of nature.* That is, *Swedenborg did communicate with the unseen and spiritual world.* We shall have more to offer on this topic hereafter. And we shall now proceed to sum up the *moral evidence alleged by his followers in support of his claim.*

The New Church, having no formal divine attestations to plead on behalf of the mission of Swedenborg, endeavour to make the most of what they call the moral evidence in favor of it. But what they mean exactly by this, is rather hard to understand. Sometimes they speak of the system "meeting the requirements of man's moral nature," and "sustaining an appeal to human consciousness;" but leave it quite in the dark whether they mean his philosophy, or his theology, or both combined. But we shall proceed to cite what they plead on this behalf, and leave it to the community to decide whether we have misunderstood, or correctly apprehended, their argument.

Professor Bush, who states the position of the New Church on this subject more clearly than any of its writers with whom we are acquainted, after remarking that New Churchmen "hold that

attempts to invest the aforesaid facts with a miraculous character, in the very face of a thousand, equally conclusive and equally well-attested, instances, to each and to all of which he imperiously refuses to admit the claim of miracle.

Digitized by Google

Swedenborg thought and wrote under a divine guidance," and stating that a new interpretation was to be given to the Word of God, proceeds as follows:

"How could this be unless a deeper and more interior meaning were developed from it; and how again could this be done, unless an underlying law were discovered which should redeem the interpretation from the charge of arbitrary and fanciful? And here it is that we encounter the grand problem to be solved. How is this law of interpretation to be discovered? Where shall the intellect be found competent to elicit from the written revelation *a sense which shall be the basis of a new dispensation* — an order of things answering to the high strains of prophecy bearing upon the glory of the Lord's coming kingdom? We say, without hesitation, that such a discovery would be, *to human wit or wisdom*, simply impossible. To be convinced of this, we have but to remind ourselves of what the law actually is, that is, the law of the relation of the spiritual and natural worlds — the former as the world of causes, the latter as the world of effects. We can appreciate it now that it is made known, and can see how utterly it would have transcended the utmost reach of man's unaided powers. How was the mystery of the spiritual world to be laid open except by a species of translation thither on the part of the revealer. An actual intromission into that sphere of existence was imperatively requisite, if its sublime arcana were to be developed, and that, too, not merely to blazon its momentous facts and phenomena, but more especially to bring back from that unexplored region the key to the internal sense of the Word. *This accordingly forms a prominent feature of the function which Swedenborg claims for himself, as a divinely commissioned messenger from heaven.*"

And then after quoting largely from his writings, to illustrate and confirm these statements, Prof. Bush adds:

"The especial point of consideration here is, the antecedent improbability of such a stupendous claim being made, by a sensible man, in the face of all that prejudice and incredulity which it would be sure to encounter." &c. *

There is a number of mere assumptions here, on which we might dwell, relating to a rule of interpretation; the relation of the spiritual and natural worlds; and the existence of a necessity

* New Church Miscellanies, pp. 320–323. New York. 1855.

Digitized by Google

for our knowing more of the spiritual world than is made known by Christ and his Apostles in the New Testament: but we shall let these things pass for the present. And we are, moreover, willing to admit, for the argument's sake, that the disclosures of Swedenborg, in relation to the spiritual world, transcend "*the wit or wisdom*" of man in the present world. And what then? Will any man in his senses pretend to deduce from such premises a *logical* conclusion that *therefore* Swedenborg was *divinely* illuminated? Will any man pretend to do this with the teachings of Swedenborg and his followers open to their inspection? Let us see.

In all the voluminous writings of these men, there is no one thing more clearly and repeatedly announced than that the spiritual world contains multitudes of mighty and malignant spirits, whose constant aim is to deceive and lead to ruin and death the family of man. See H. and H. 249, 493, 553; A. E. 1182; A. C. 1380, 1967 to 1969, 5863, and innumerable other places. And many facts illustrating this are given in a little work by a New Churchman,* which deserve the serious consideration of all who regard Swedenborg's teachings as divine. A single passage is, however, all that we need quote from it. The ingenious author, in describing how men in this world may be brought under the influence of such spirits, observes:

"There are various ways in which the barrier that separates the natural from the spiritual world may be broken down within us. It may be by some strong excitement, *or by irregularity, or excess;* or it may be by physical disease, *or by profound and long-continued meditation upon the things of religion; or through a strong and continued desire for spiritual intercourse, and a corresponding effort of the will to attain it;* or it may be by some more trivial cause," &c. †

And on the next page he quotes with approbation Dr. Stilling as saying:

"It is necessary to be *extremely cautious, and not regard everything as a divine communication or revelation,*" *because* "*vain and foolish*

* "Open intercourse with the spiritual world, its dangers," &c., by B. F. Barrett. Boston. 1845.

† Ibid, p. 10.

Digitized by Google

spirits frequently interfere on these occasions, and seek to deceive and mislead the seer."

And Swedenborg is quoted likewise as saying:

"*Nearly the whole world of spirits is fanatical, and seeks nothing else but to teach and lead — striving even to possess the bodies of men.**

And in further illustration of the fact see the instances specified in a work of J. Root† in which some very remarkable ones are given in detail. While even "so good, pious and wise a man as the venerable Clowes," (one of the founders of the New Church,) is mentioned as "deceived for a short time" by "the delusive and subtle adversary who can so transform himself into an angel of light." ‡

The reader, in perusing the "various ways" above enumerated, cannot but be forcibly reminded of the manner in which Swedenborg, was at the outset of his "spiritual illumination," (as quoted on a preceding page,) brought into connection with the world of spirits. He had been long meditating on the very subject referred to, and desiring to penetrate the mysteries of the invisible world; and at the very time when the revelation began, had been indulging his sensual appetite to excess; and now in view of all the above cited admissions, and of the claim which he has put forth as a divinely illumined teacher, we demand the proof that he himself was really under the guidance and illumination of the Lord. Admitting that his disclosures may transcend the wit or wisdom of mortals, where is the evidence of *divine* illumination? Why may he not have been deceived by those mighty and malignant spirits referred to, in order that he might become their facile instrument of deceiving and ruining the souls of men? Others have been thus deceived, and why may not he have been? To ask that we recognize him as a divine teacher under such circumstances, is to trifle with the human intellect, and practically to reject all the demands of enlightened reason, and all sense of personal moral responsibility.

Swedenborg therefore concedes the existence of powerful and

* Barrett's "Open Intercourse," p. 40.

† Horrors of Delirium Tremens. New York. 1844.

‡ Open Intercourse, &c., pp. 38, 39.

Digitized by Google

malignant spirits in the invisible world, whose great aim and sole employment are to endeavor to lead mankind astray from the truth; and also that their power of deception is inconceivable; and, moreover, that under certain circumstances they obtain access to the "*interiors* of men." And as a remarkable illustration in point, Professor Bush has given at length the case of Andrew Jackson Davis,* and in relation to it cheerfully concedes that it is a case "where a *supernatural* knowledge is displayed on subjects of which he was *previously ignorant*, and which *can only be explained on the ground of the influx of spirits into his mind.* This circumstance (continues the Professor) renders his state a remarkable illustration, or demonstration rather, of the truth of Swedenborg's disclosures; *and how vastly is the evidence of this heightened, when we find him unconsciously reproducing Swedenborg's own philosophy, and making long verbal quotations from his works — works of which he had never read a solitary page!*" † This certainly is explicit, and to the point. And yet in another work (the joint production of Prof. Bush, and B. F. Barrett ‡) it is distinctly asserted that the author, (that is, A. J. Davis,) "is guilty of the singular inconsistency of differing *toto cœlo* from Swedenborg, not only upon points of minor importance, but upon those which Swedenborg regards as *fundamental* in his theology — upon the existence of a hell in another world, upon the nature of sin, the need of regeneration, the divinity of the Lord, and the divinity and sanctity of the Word." ‖ And by referring to Davis' book itself, § we find him speaking largely of Swedenborg; expressing a high degree of sympathy with him; inculcating large portions of his teachings; and yet maintaining that he committed many errors; and that "his writings do not unfold a germ of spiritual truth" in the Bible; and also that Swedenborg's illumination was the same as his own.¶ In the works of Cahagnet, also, ** Swedenborg repeatedly appears, through the *medium*, and

* Mesmer and Swedenborg, by Prof. Bush. Appendix A. New York. 1847.

† Ibid. Preface, page x.

‡ Davis' Revelations Revealed. New York. 1847. ‖ Ibid. page 29.

§ The Principles of Nature. Her Divine Revelations, and a Voice to Mankind. New York. 1847. ¶ Ibid. p. 403, 588–9, 675, &c., &c.

** See The Celestial Telegraph, or Secrets of the Life to Come. New York, 1851.

Digitized by Google

confesses that he taught many mistakes and falsehoods in his writings, while on earth.

It is in view of such facts that we find our aforesaid authors (Messrs Bush and Barrett,) remarking as follows: "It is a truth, therefore, which cannot be too deeply impressed on the minds of all, that a communication *is not necessarily true, because it is made in a supernatural or preternatural manner.* Inasmuch as there are both good and evil spirits in the other world," &c., "Swedenborg declares that evil spirits can at times not only 'assume the appearance of angels of light,' (A. R. 839,) but 'are able to discourse so wisely, that an angel could scarce discourse more wisely.' Ath. Creed, 65." See Davis' R. R., p. 26.

These things being so, the question returns: On what principle are we to determine that Swedenborg himself was not thus deceived? His own assertion proves nothing. His visions prove nothing. These things may have been satisfactory evidence to himself; but, unsupported by divine attestation, they are not rational evidence to any one else. And God never requires faith without evidence. Hence, as above stated, the Son of God himself says: "If I do not the works of my Father, BELIEVE ME NOT. *But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works:*" John, x: 37, 38. The followers of Swedenborg, for obvious reasons, studiously endeavor to undervalue such attestations of a divine commission as above remarked; but, while professing to reverence the Word of God, how durst they do this, with such emphatic announcements directly against them? The use of miracles is perfectly obvious; and that use is recognized by Christ and his Apostles, and by God under all dispensations. And when any new doctrine professes to come to us from the unseen world, respect to the rational nature which God has given us demands that such new doctrine be established by new proofs. And when any man comes to us, announcing such a doctrine as divinely revealed, justice to our position as rational creatures requires of us that we demand the proof of his assertion. And hence the propriety and conclusiveness of the aforesaid appeal, which Jesus makes in proof of the divinity of his mission. And with these facts in view, it is impertinent for New Churchmen to raise, as they do, the side issues—in relation to the assumed inappropriate-

Digitized by Google

ness of such proof, and whether the Devil himself cannot perform miracles. The question is not whether he can perform them; or whether our idea of their use is right or wrong; but whether God ever introduced a new dispensation without such attestations? and, by consequence, whether we have not the right to demand them in any and every asserted dispensation of the kind?

We demand, then, the evidence in proof of the assertion that Swedenborg was divinely illuminated to become the instructor of mankind. And we demand it the more emphatically, because both he and his followers have undertaken to affirm that such guilt must attach to the rejection of his claim, and teachings, as may result in our eternal undoing in the world to come.

§ 7. *Illustration of the point in question, furnished by the case of Manes.*

Our position in relation to this matter in no way requires that we explain how or whence Swedenborg obtained his so-called disclosures. This task we respectfully beg leave to commit to his disciples. All we ask, is plain and tangible evidence that he was divinely instructed — that he was not the dupe, as others have been, (A. J. Davis, for example,) of those cunning and malignant spirits who seek to lead away from Christ and salvation the perishing souls of men. It matters not, therefore, where he obtained these asserted disclosures, so long as he furnishes no proof that he obtained them from God. But lest we should be misunderstood, we will briefly illustrate our position by reference to an instance, in many respects, very similar to that of Swedenborg, and which occured many centuries ago.

MANES, or MANICHÆUS, who flourished about A. D. 250–280, was a native of Persia, and a man of uncommon genius, eloquence and boldness, and richly endowed with all the qualities adapted to impress the popular mind. He was of a very venerable aspect, and of a mind inexhaustibly fertile; was educated in the schools of the Magi, and was master of all the arts and learning which the Persians of those times regarded as constituting human wisdom.* On becoming acquainted with the books of the

* No less a man than Bausobre honors him not only with the splendid appellation of a *philosopher*, but of a philosopher who reasons well. While Mosheim styles him "this prodigy of a man."

Digitized by Google

Christians, and perceiving that, in some respects, they coincided with his philosophy, and, in other respects, disagreed therewith, he formed the design of combining them; correcting and enlarging the one by the other; and then of inculcating a new system of religion, compounded of the two. In effecting this, he first averred that Jesus Christ left his statement of the way of salvation imperfect; and then ventured to declare himself to be a divinely taught messenger of the Lord himself. Some accused him of insanity; but his insanity, as Mosheim remarks, was not such as to prevent his digesting his system very well, and distinctly seeing how it could be assailed, and how defended. He often referred to his divine visions, as he called them, and proclaimed himself divinely commissioned to reform the corrupted religion of the Christians, and restore it to its original perfection. He showed a book, which he stated was divinely dictated to him, and sought to obtrude it upon mankind; he presented it to the king of Persia, calling it "divine and heavenly." In point of divine revelations, he placed himself far above the Apostles, and asserted that much greater wisdom was divinely imparted to him than to them; and when he speaks of himself as an Apostle, he intends thereby that he is one whom Christ had sent to mankind, partly, to perfect his religion, and partly, to free it from stains and corruptions. He made no pretensions to miracles; but simply bid men believe, that he was a messenger from God. And the doubting, and such as asked for evidence, he pressed with this single argument: that Jesus had promised the Paraclete (that is, as he explains it, a *man taught by the Holy Spirit*,) to perfect what he had begun, and to acquaint men with what was lacking in his system. "Since Christ left the world," said he, "until I came, no one adequate to this office has appeared; no one before me has explained what Christ left unexplained — the origin of the world, the cause of all evils, &c.; but I have explained all these hitherto unknown things. Therefore, I am the Paraclete, whom Christ directed his followers to expect." In fact, his pretensions mainly rested on this argument: He who explains the unexplained topics of Christ's religion, said the Manichees, is the Paraclete promised by Christ; but Manes does this; therefore, he is the Paraclete and Apostle of Christ. Hence he professed to

Digitized by Google

announce such things as the men, in our Saviour's time, were not able to receive and digest, and to dissipate all errors in regard to divine things; expounding clearly and perfectly, and without figures and enigmas, the whole way of salvation for toiling and suffering souls.

Among other things he taught — that God is, as it were, "an immense sun; consisting wholly of the purest light, much more subtle than our light, wonderfully diffused through his whole realm;"— that heaven, wherein God supplies the place of the sun, was like our earth, and is composed of the same elements as our world, though purer and nobler; and what the sun is in our world, God is in the world of light. Such was a portion of his philosophy. In theology, he taught — that neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit existed anterior to this our world; — that man consists of a body and two souls; the one animal, sentient, and concupiscent; the other, which possesses reason, and is alone immortal, is a particle of celestial light; — and that Christ came down to men, *first*, to destroy the kingdom of the Prince of darkness; (that is, to withdraw men from the worship of the evil Principle, and his captains and fellow warriors, and draw them to the worship and religion of the true God;) and, *secondly*, to teach them in what ways the evil soul, together with the body in which it resides, should be overcome and subdued; so that the good mind may be purged from all its contagion, and gradually become fitted and prepared for a return to the world of light whence it came. He taught, moreover, that the entire purgation of souls cannot be effected in the body; — but that those which have occasionally succumbed and given the reins to the evil soul, must, when released from the body, undergo a lustration; while the body, which they left on the earth, being composed of evil matter, returns to its original state, and will never be resuscitated. And, finally, (for we cannot enlarge further on the subject,) he converted the Mosaic account of Adam's transgression into an allegory.*

* For an excellent account of MANES, and one on which I have drawn freely in the above delineation (preferring to do so rather than to encumber my pages with the pedantry of original quotations,) see Mosheim's *Historical Commentaries*, Century III., Section 39 to 56, (well translated by Dr. James Murdoch.) New York. 1852.

Digitized by Google

Now we do not adduce these remarkable points of resemblance between the systems of Manes and Swedenborg in order to dwell upon them here, but merely with the view of presenting in the light of a forcible illustration, the question already urged above. Manes eschewed the performance of miracles; but pleaded his visions, his unfolding of the previously hidden meaning of the Word of God, and his philosophy, (which was then regarded as correct,) as evidences that Christ had sent him on his alleged mission. And myriads, too, in many parts of the world received him in the very character he claimed; and among them were not a few of the ablest, most gifted, and eloquent men of the age. But in view of all the aforesaid particulars, we would ask: Was the community, at the time referred to, under any obligation to assent to the claims of this venerable and wonderful man? And we would press the inquiry upon the advocates of the claims of Swedenborg in our own day. Manes appealed to his so-called divine visions and illuminations, his philosophy, and the promise of Christ to send the Paraclete; claimed, likewise, to furnish the true principles of interpreting the Word; and pleaded, moreover, that miracles were not necessary in order to substantiate the truth and reality of his mission. Was, then, the community under any obligation to assent to his claim, and to receive him as the illumined messenger of Christ? If not, (and all New Churchmen will say with us that they were not,) then on what ground is it required of men now that they should assent to a similar claim of Emanuel Swedenborg?

It is obvious, therefore, that if we not only grant the aforesaid statement of Swedenborg, but accept his explanation of it that the Lord really appeared to him, while no adequate evidence is furnished to sustain the statement, we must in this instance *believe without evidence* — a thing which God never requires. Nor is this all. For, if we do this — while it is certain, at the same time, that he may have been deceived and imposed upon by a false and malignant spirit — we not only give countenance to the claim of any who may be visited with similar appearances or visions, (and how many are there in this day who profess to be!) and who regard them as divine; but we put it effectually out of our power to detect and expose the deception into which they are fallen?

Digitized by Google

§ 8. *Illustration from the case of Constantine the Great.*

A well known and remarkable instance which occurred in early times may serve to illustrate this one point. Constantine declares that once, when at the head of his army, he saw at midday a cross in the heavens, on which the words *EN TOYTΩ NIKA* or HAC VINCE, were inscribed. He knew not their meaning, (as Swedenborg knew not the import of his first vision,) but declares that on the following night the Saviour appeared to him and explained what was intended thereby; informing him what sort of a military standard he should use in his battles; and how the shields of the troops should be decorated with the same sign. Eusebius declares that the Emperor not only averred most solemnly that he actually saw the cross, but confirmed the assertion by an oath; (a procedure which Swedenborg also was fully willing to imitate.) And who can doubt that the Emperor, an old man and a Christian, calling God to witness the truth of his avowal,* really had persuaded himself of the truth of what he affirmed? It seems hard to charge him with intentional deception and falsehood; and this too, when under oath! And yet can any one, in the absence of all adequate evidence, believe that the Lord Jesus, the Prince of Peace, whose mission to earth was one of mercy and of good will to men, should thus appear to one who was at the time *a pagan;* and instead of reclaiming him from idolatry and imparting to him the truth, merely inform him what sort of military standards his army should carry, and what sort of decorations their shields should bear? No! neither the exalted position, nor the venerable age (for he continued to repeat the affirmation till the end of life;) nor the solemn oath of this great man, can induce us to believe any thing of the kind. We doubt not, however, that he believed it himself; but we are not permitted to make his belief the criterion of ours. (See Rom. xiv: 12.) We have not a doubt that he was utterly deceived in the matter, though we may not be able to explain precisely how. And is there any thing unreasonable in such a position? We think not.

* Mosheim, ut supra. Century IV. Section 7.

Digitized by Google

§ 9. *The proffered evidence in support of the claim of Swedenborg considered.*

There are two kinds of evidence which we are entitled to expect, in forming an estimate of any such claim as that of Swedenborg; for God has ever had respect to the moral and intellectual nature of man, by furnishing him with such evidence, at the time of introducing every dispensation which his word has proclaimed. This evidence is either of an external character, consisting of miracles or prophecy, and appealing to man's intellectual powers; or it is internal, and appears in the adaptation of the truths revealed to his moral nature. And as both species are found bearing the most decided testimony to the truth and divinity of the Gospel, it is certainly not unreasonable — but reasonable, in the highest degree — to expect that any subsequent revelation (as the teachings of Swedenborg purport to be,) should have, at least, an equal certification of its divinity. But is this the fact with respect to the "New Church?" It is true that its earlier advocates asserted the "*inspiration*" of Swedenborg, and insisted that his mission was attested by the gifts of prophecy and miracles; and it is true that, on these grounds, his claims were then admitted by them; but this position is, if we mistake not, now abandoned by most of his intelligent followers, for the sufficient reason that it has utterly failed to endure a rational investigation. Swedenborg himself is represented as saying, "I have no miracles to offer *as proof*, and if I had, they would be unavailing, in the lack of internal evidence."* And Professor Bush, while he says, in antagonism to this, that "the testimony of miracles can be unequivocally established in support of his claims," † (though he is very

* Swedenborg Library, Introduction, p. vii.

† This certainly is a *modest* assertion for a *disciple* of Swedenborg! especially as Swedenborg himself pointedly avers that "at this day *no signs or miracles will be given*, because they compel only an external belief, but do not convince the internal." *Letter to Dr. Oetinger*, Documents, p. 154. We should like to know, however, in view of this assertion of the Baron, whether miracles in our Saviour's time compelled only an external assent. If they did, and if such assent is of no consequence, as he here intimates, why were they introduced? If they did not, and if such assent is of use, on what principle is it that he here speaks as he does? And in either case, why are not the reasons given why they were then of use, and at the present time of no use? It is

Digitized by Google

chary of pretending to adduce anything of the kind,) yet, in the clearest and most satisfactory manner, announces the position of himself and brethren in the following terms:

"At the same time, we would have it distinctly understood that we ground our credence in his claims on the *internal evidence* of the truth of his revelations in themselves considered." *

Although, as a sort of *à priori* succedaneum, in case the evidence referred to should not after all be found as sufficient as as would be desirable, he throws down the following:

"Granting that Swedenborg himself was deluded, how is it that he has been enabled to inoculate with his delusion, if so grossly palpable as many affirm, intellects as keenly perceptive of logical sophistries, and as vigilantly on their guard against the magic of enthusiasm, as those of the men who sit in judgment upon them? *Without at present affirming whether the system is true or false, I say that here is a problem to be solved, and that it is due to the interests of Truth that it should be solved.*" †

But if in this passage Professor Bush had only substituted the name of Manes (or even of A. J. Davis,) for that of Swedenborg, he might have had the pleasure of solving the problem for himself, before he submitted it to the world. And there was reason for his doing so; inasmuch, as for every single instance of the "*keen and logical intellects*" referred to, a thousand, or ten thousand, equally keen and logical, and incomparably more learned, were numbered among the followers of Manes.

As the evidence pleaded on behalf of the reality of Swedenborg's illumination, and of the divinity of his mission, is *internal*, and not external, what do his followers refer to as furnishing the required proof? Prof. Bush, after admitting that the theology of Swedenborg is in direct antagonism to various articles of the current creeds of Christendom; and that the accusation of a lax morality has often been charged upon the doctrines of the New Church; thus proceeds to state the question in hand:

---

asking rather too much to require that we accept of Swedenborg's mere *dictum*, in such a matter, as a sufficient reason, in the absence of all adequate evidence. Conf. also, Bush's Reply to Emerson, p. 8.

* Ibid, pp. iv, v, xv. † Ibid, p. iv.

Digitized by Google

"In reply to this, we submit, that one great question — independent of all others, and paramount to all others — imperatively demands to be settled at the threshold of every inquiry in regard to the *doctrinal* character of his developments: Was the privilege accorded to Swedenborg of intromission into the spiritual world? — Did he converse with spirits and angels? — Was he immediately instructed by the Lord himself? This, we repeat, is the question of questions in regard to his claims, which is to be definitely settled in the outset, and that too upon its own merits, or by its own appropriate evidence." *

And then, after referring to the various efforts to solve the enquiry by reference to *mania*, demoniac influence, &c., he adds, that the receivers of the doctrines of Swedenborg "contend that every such hypothesis is contradicted equally by the personal history of the man, and by all the known characters of disordered intellect. They, therefore, most strenuously protest against the invidious array of objectionable features of *doctrine*, while no attempt is made to confute, on solid grounds, the evidence of the *disclosures*." †

It is rare that we find, in the statement of a question, a sophistry more unblushing than this. The question whether Swedenborg conversed with spirits and angels, or gained intromission into the spiritual world, differs *toto cœlo* from the question whe-

* Ibid, p. vii. "Intromission into the spiritual world," is, according to Swedenborg, "*only the opening of an interior consciousness.*"

† Ibid. This *protest* of Professor Bush is rather ludicrous, in view of the summary method by which he disposes of the claims of A. J. Davis, as above stated; and even of those of Jacob Behmen ("the dreaming delusions of Jacob Behmen," Ibid, p. iii.) although Dr. Oetinger, a correspondent of Swedenborg, and one of his warmest friends and admirers, teaches *that Behmen was a worthy compeer of Swedenborg in the work of making known the will of God to men.* After referring to Swedenborg's mission, he immediately adds: "Jacob Behmen *appeared also*, some time ago, but as he was not informed, as he himself states, in the sciences, therefore God has raised up Swedenborg, who is mightily conversant with the sciences, and who, from his youth up," &c. *Documents*, p. 151. And yet we are informed on p. 192, and in many other places, that what Swedenborg "wrote from 1745 to 1771, *was the result of an especial spiritual illumination*, and not the deductions of natural philosophy." If all this be so, it is certainly hard to tell what Swedenborg's science had to do with his illumination, and *vice versa;* or why poor Behmen could not have been sufficiently illuminated, as the Apostles were not men of science; or why Professor Bush should dispose of his claims in the summary manner aforesaid. Behmen was born in 1575, and died in 1624.

Digitized by Google

ther he was "immediately instructed by the Lord himself." And yet, by a dextrous changing of the terms, Professor Bush has presented them as one question; or, at least, as equivalent: and this, too, in direct view of all the facts which he not only concedes, but asserts, respecting A. J. Davis, and many others who gained "intromission into the spiritual world." What would his reply have been to any one, who, in presenting such a claim on behalf of Davis, should, for instance, represent a converse with spirits, or an intromission into the world of spirits, as equivalent to being "immediately instructed by the Lord himself?" He has asserted the difference, and we, too, assert it. And is it a fair and honorable procedure, therefore, in presenting the issue in relation to Swedenborg, to represent the questions as equivalent? We admit that Swedenborg held intercourse with the invisible world, just as Dr. Hare,* and Davis, and thousands of other such claimants have done; but we deny, emphatically, that in any of these instances there exists the slightest reason to believe that the individual was "immediately instructed by the Lord himself."

The *internal* evidence pleaded on behalf of the claim of Swedenborg, arranges itself in two classes, the *philosophical*, and the *theological*. We shall briefly attend to each.

1. The *philosophical*. "They insist," says Professor Bush, referring to the followers of Swedenborg, "that some rational explanation shall be given of the *immense amount of philosophical truth* embraced in his disclosures, if indeed this truth is, at the same time, mixed up with such a mass of falsehood and error in the doctrines, when yet the doctrines come through the medium of the disclosures." † But why do they insist on this, when it is admitted that Swedenborg's philosophy is so fully asserted by A. J. Davis, ‡ at the same time that it is maintained that there is, in his teachings, and connected with that philosophy, any number of falsehoods, both in science and theology? The only issue presented by the question, is fairly met by this instance, and why,

* See "Experimental Investigation of the Spirit Manifestations," by Robert Hare, M. D. New York. 1855. pp. 16, 33, &c., &c.

† Swedenborg Library. Introd. pp. vii, viii.

‡ See Davis' book, pp. 403, 463, 504, 515, 521–523, 542–551, 587–589, 639, 672–676, &c.

Digitized by Google

therefore, is the issue again insisted upon, while the instance remains undisposed of? The false spirits, who, according to the "New Church," imparted the aforesaid philosophy to A. J. Davis, could, indisputably, have imparted the same to Swedenborg, likewise — as is plain to every one. But let us now proceed to consider —

§ 10. *The argument in favor of his claim, deduced from his Philosophy.*

And now, as to the philosophical argument, we shall endeavor to make the reader acquainted with the position which it assumes, and he can then have little difficulty in judging of its force and conclusiveness. The *divine* illumination, which is claimed for Swedenborg, and to which reference is constantly made, took place, according to his own unvarying statement, in 1743, or not later than 1744: though some of his followers, as above remarked, in order to avoid the absurdity of assigning a divine origin to his philosophy, contend that he must have been mistaken in the date, and that the illumination referred to must have taken place as late as 1745. At all events, however, it is affirmed by his followers that, "from this period, Swedenborg entirely forsook the pursuit of science, *nor does he once allude, in his works on theology, to his former scientific labors:*" * which, however, is not exactly true. For in his own Index to the *Arcana*, and under the word *cause*, he does refer to his treatise *De cultu et amore Dei*, which is No. 4 of his philosophical treatises.

Let it be carefully noted then, at the outset, *that his philosophy preceded his theology; and that* HIS THEOLOGY IS BUILT UPON HIS PHILOSOPHY; and not *vice versa*. He developed his system of philosophy first, from scientific investigation, and antecedent to 1745; for in this year he published his last philosophical work. That this representation is correct, is conceded — first, by himself. He insists upon the harmony of his philosophy and theology, (which, however, is denied by certain of his followers,)† when he asserts so unequivocally, in his aforesaid letter to Dr. Oetinger (Stockholm, Nov. 11, 1766,) that he "was *by the Lord* first in-

* Sketch of Swedenborg, &c. Boston. 1842.

† Documents, pp. 31, 32, note.

Digitized by Google

troduced into *the natural sciences*, and thus prepared from the year 1710–1744, when heaven was opened unto me." And, of course, if the same Lord introduced him into both, the conclusion must be obvious to every one. The same thing is asserted by him when he so repeatedly avers in relation to his works, "every thing which I have written is true." * And he plainly intimates the same, when, in a letter to Dr. Beyer, he declares that even from his fourth to his tenth year he "often *revealed things* in his discourse, which filled his parents with astonishment, and made them declare, at times, that *certainly* the angels spoke through my mouth." † It is asserted, likewise, by his most intelligent friends and admirers. For example, Sandel, in his Eulogium, after referring to his philosophy, adds: "But he went further; HE WISHED TO COMBINE HIS SYSTEM WITH RELIGION, *and to this object he almost entirely devoted himself, from the time of the publication of his Opera Philisophica et Mineralia.*" This *wish* was obviously "*father to the thought.*" Then, in reference to his theological writings, Sandel further remarks that, as far as he was able to judge from a slight inspection of them,—

"They confirm the idea I had previously formed of his system. He explains in them, *according to the laws of the system that he had adopted*, things both visible and invisible; from the former he draws conclusions respecting the latter; he represents to himself, in conformity with the world in which we live, another and entirely spiritual world, in which, as in this, he admits of degrees of perfection, an increase without end in the faculties of the inhabitants, a similarity and agreement of tastes and occupations, of conveniences and inconveniences, of pleasures and of pains. STRONGLY IMPRESSED WITH THESE IDEAS, HE ENDEAVORED, IN EXAMINING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, TO COMBINE THEM WITH HIS PHILOSOPHICAL PRINCIPLES." And again: "Swedenborg was not satisfied with the usual attainments of the learned; *he wished to pass the barriers which are opposed to man's acquirements by the imperfection of his state*, especially while the soul is tied to its frail partner, the body." ‡

* Documents, p. 72, and in many other instances. † Ibid. p. 130.

‡ Documents, pp. 31, 33–35. A statement or two in these beautiful passages is somewhat truculently called in question by Dr. Tafel; whose shallow and conceited criticisms evince a disposition to deny their accuracy; but yet associated with an apprehension that it might not be entirely safe for him to do so.

Digitized by Google

The same averment is made by his intimate friend, Count Von Hôpken:

"Throughout his life, his soul was occupied with sublime thoughts and speculations. . . . He was a natural philosopher, yet on the Cartesian principles. . . . I imagine this science (anatomy,) and his meditations on the effects of the soul upon our curiously constructed body, *did, by degrees, lead him from the material to the spiritual.*" And again: "In whatever he relates of the spiritual world, and the other progressions in the angelic heaven, there appears, as I think, an analogy and resemblance of the gradations which God has established in the world, and in which no variations or exceptions are admitted: insomuch that *Swedenborg has taken the same road by which we proceed from the visible to the invisible, from things known to things unknown,* from several collected facts to one fundamental truth before unknown to us; in like manner as, in arithmetic, we are led from known numbers, to those we seek." *

Matthias Claudius repeats substantially the same idea; † and Professor Görres likewise.‡ But we omit their statements in order to adduce the following from one of Swedenborg's most fervent and intelligent admirers, Mr. J. J. G. Wilkinson:

"From the beginning he perceived that there was an order in nature. This enabled him to pursue his own studies with a view to order. He ascended from the theory of earthly substances to the theory of the atmospheres, and from both to the theory of cosmogony, and came gradually to man as the crowning object of nature. He brought the order of the macrocosm to illustrate the order of the microcosm. *His dominant end, which he never lost sight of for a moment,* was spiritual and moral, which preserved his mind alive in a long course of physical studies, and empowered him to see life and substance in the otherwise dead machinery of the creation." ||

The learned and candid Morell likewise adds his testimony, as follows:

"Having gone through the regions of philosophy, Swedenborg came to the confines of the province of spirit itself. Often, he tells us, had

* Documents, pp. 50, 52. The Swedenborgian editors of this work likewise endorse these representations; for, referring to the testimony of Hôpken, they say: "*The above testimony must surely be allowed to carry the greatest weight, both as it refers to the character of Swedenborg himself, and of his writings,*" &c., p. 56.

† Ibid. p. 180. ‡ Ibid. p. 192. || Ibid. p. 209.

Digitized by Google

he searched for some light upon the nature of the soul, but as often had been disappointed; until, at length he got upon the right track, and entered the sacred chamber. To gaze upon the soul by the senses, was manifestly impossible; but was it not possible to reason up from the material to the immaterial, and from the facts of the one, to see into the nature of the other? The validity of such a process was grounded upon the doctrine of degrees."

"Accordingly all nature by these degrees, ascends from the lowest to the highest, and descends from the highest to the lowest; *so that by the aid of these philosophical formula, we can study the spiritual world by means of the knowledge we possess of the material.*"

"Wrapt in his own deep reveries, Swedenborg could not resist the idea that God, by a special act of his providence, had brought the scenery of the spiritual world, and the relations of spiritual truth, before his own mental vision, and within the sphere of his intellection," &c.*

We could cite other authorities in support of the same position, from the ranks of his immediate followers, of the present age; but we doubt not the foregoing will be deemed sufficient.

In whatever way, therefore, the asserted divine illumination of Swedenborg, whether the earlier or the later, may be explained, it is perfectly obvious from the abundant testimony of himself, and of his most intimate and intelligent friends, that the illumination, whatever it be, was the result of his speculations and philosophy. In fact, is not this practically conceded by his followers now, who so constantly obtrude upon our notice his scientific attainments? Of what use were they, if God directly taught him? John and the other Apostles were taught without any such scientific training.

How, then, in view of all these facts, does the philosophy of Swedenborg evince the divinity of his mission? Why is not the argument stated clearly, and cogently, and logically? There is

* Morell's Historical View of Philosophy. New York. 1848. pp. 202–206. See also Documents, pp. 218 to 224, which contain some preposterous remarks on the above. The editors of this work *modestly assume* to understand Swedenborg better than his most learned and intimate friends, and his warmest and most appreciative admirers. This, however, can never be conceded them, at least in regard to his *philosophy*, whatever we may be willing to allow in respect to his theology.

Digitized by Google

not a particle of such evidence belonging to his philosophy, any more than there is to that of Jacob Behmen, his actual forerunner; or to that of A. J. Davis himself. Davis was a young man, of pure and unimpeached character; eminently illiterate, and wholly unacquainted, as Prof. Bush affirms, with any of the writings of Swedenborg. Behmen, too, was quite illiterate; and yet these men have, each of them, disclosed a system of philosophy, which is, on essential points, so like that of the Swedish seer, that even his own friends are unable to portray the difference. And why, then, should we accord to Swedenborg the claim of a divinely taught philosophy, and refuse it to them? Will our antagonists please to answer the question?

The condition of the philosophical argument, therefore, on behalf of the claim of Swedenborg, is susceptible of being stated within a narrow compass. He, at the outset, explained the spiritual by the help of the natural. But the soul truly illuminated and instructed by the Lord, pursues a different course — the course which is sanctioned no less by enlightened reason, than by revelation. Instead of attempting to draw down God, and the things of the life to come, to the crude conceptions of an earth-born philosophy, it takes hold upon the things revealed, and seeks to elevate our thoughts and conceptions to their level; and to explain the natural by the light of the spiritual and revealed.* The course of Swedenborg was the opposite of this. Hence, though he published his philosophy first, his subsequent spiritual discourses are found to accord therewith in general; and are, as above shown, maintained by his friends to do so. †

§ 11. *The Argument from his Theology.*

As, therefore, there neither is nor can be any internal evidence,

* See Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, Book II. Works, vol. i: p. 34.

† Let it not be supposed that we deny that there is an existing harmony between the moral and physical, and the material and spiritual, in the universe. But whether there is or is not such harmony existing, is not the question, though our antagonists endeavor to raise this side-issue, and represent it as the point in dispute. Such a harmony or "correspondence" *may exist;* but if it do, the legitimate method of discovering it is not precisely that of Plato, of Origen, of Manes, or of Swedenborg. Bacon has pointed it out in a passage to which the above marginal note refers, and which we would beg leave to commend to the careful consideration of the followers of Swedenborg.

Digitized by Google

or evidence of any kind, proving his philosophy to be divine, or the result of a *divine* illumination, is there any to sustain the similar claim which is put forth on behalf of his theology?

The *chief* proof of the divine mission of Swedenborg appears, in the view of his followers, to be derived from the theology which he inculcates. This is apparent by their constant references to the subject. * And here, too, Swedenborg mainly, if not altogether, rests his claim. † The internal evidence of the truthfulness of his disclosures in theology — the response which it is said they meet with, in human consciousness, and in the very interiors of our being, especially when candor and unbiased reason are permitted to operate, or when the subject is considered from the high stand-point of a regenerated nature — is, and must be, both sufficient and convincing. Granting, for the sake of the argument, this assumption, the question must, at least partially, involve the subject of hermeneutics. This, however, we shall not enter upon, for it is unnecessary. But the other issues which it involves we shall proceed to consider.

It is affirmed, for instance, and it is the great and constant plea of his followers, that Swedenborg, in his theology, has furnished correct and particular information respecting the spiritual world, and the future condition of man. But he brings no practicable or available light to those who humbly and earnestly receive the Scripture testimony on this subject. They realize no need of his visions and lucubrations; for to them the Gospel brings life and immortality fully and sufficiently to light. They find in that revelation, far better expressed, and far more clearly taught, all that they need to know of God, and of themselves; of their position in the present world, and of their prospects in the world to come. They feel the need of nothing further, to answer all the demands of their moral and intellectual nature; or to furnish incentives to duty, both in relation to God and to their fellow men. They are therein taught that there is a hell and a heaven; that Christ has died to save man from the curse of the law, and from the pollu-

* Bush's New Church Miscellanies, pp. 320–368; and Reply to Dr. Woods, p. 79; and Letters to a Trinitarian, Preface.

† See T. C. R., 132, 133, 581, 582, 779, 781; and A. E., 1285, 8945; also Documents, *ut supra*, pp. 38, 56, 65, 71, 72, 87, 145, 152, 168, 169.

Digitized by Google

tion and all the consequences of sin; that salvation is freely offered to all men; and that the finally impenitent will be forever damned, and the truly penitent eternally saved.

§ 12. *The Argument illustrated by the case of Manes.*

Swedenborg, it is true, like that singularly acute and learned philosopher Manes, or Manichæus, professes to go much further; and, like him, to teach that heaven and the spiritual world is like the earth in its appearance and scenery, only immeasurably larger and more glorious; * and that God is in that world what the sun is in this, and is, as it were, an immense sun; † that there was no trinity in God in any sense, anterior to the creation of the world; and that neither the Son nor Holy Spirit were then in existence; ‡ that man has two souls, one of divine origin, and the other concupiscent and groveling, and derived from matter; § that there is, at least, for many souls, a probation and purification beyond the present life, some being delivered from hell itself; || that the material body of Christ never arose from the dead, and that he arose only spiritually; ** and, to omit other points, that God is in the human form; and that heaven itself presents the appearance of a "GRAND MAN." ††

He, moreover, undertakes, as that philosopher also did before him, to describe what the happiness of heaven consists in; and to

* See A. E. 405, 1206. Ath. Creed, 94. A. C. 4, 1540, 3213 to 3226, 8891.

† See "Canons of the New Church," Chapter iv. A. E. 944, 1196. H. and H. 116–140. *Concerning Div. Wisd.* 12.

‡ "Before the world was created there was no Trinity in God." "The Trinity of God came into being after the world was created, and actually in the fullness of time, and then in God incarnate, who is the Lord, the Saviour Jesus Christ." "That the Trinity of God neither did nor could exist before the Creation of the world." &c. *Canons.*

§ See "Heavenly Doctrines of New Jerusalem," 16–34; and also Bush's Letters to a Trinitarian, Letter ix; and the *Anglo-American New Church Repository* for January, 1851, p. 37.

|| See H. and H. 491–518; and S. D. 218, 228, 3489.

** See A. C. 978, 1713, 1745, 2159, 2574; Doct. of the Lord, 35; *Bush's Letters to a Trinitarian*, pp. 105, 106, 140, 144; *Noble's Appeal*, pp. 118, 119. 140, 141.

†† I do not find that Manes affirms directly that God is in the human form, or that heaven has the appearance of a "*Grand Man.*" He held, however, that God has twelve members equally bright and splendid; which, taken in connection with the twelve Zodiacal signs, and their supposed influence upon the

Digitized by Google

show how the wicked, in the world to come, eat the fruit of their own doings. But the Bible recognizes the existence of no necessity for such specific particularity. It announces, with sufficient clearness and fullness, all that is necessary to be known respecting the character and attributes of God; and respecting the great truths of eschatology; and leaves them to operate upon the human will and reason with all their impressive reality. We are assured that God will make good, to the very letter, all his declarations; nor can we realise the existence of any necessity for being specifically informed *how* he will do so. Nothing, therefore, is gained to theology, for any available purpose, even should it be granted that Swedenborg's communications respecting the future world may be true. And such being the fact, we are unable to recognize in these disclosures, even allowing them to be preternatural, any evidence of their divinity, inasmuch as we cannot for a moment admit that God would endow and employ a messenger to announce matters that are not only contrary to his revealed will, but also of no practical importance to man.

The formal *doctrines* of his system are also insisted on as affording such evidence. And Professor Bush, in a late treatise, has specifically enumerated them.* They are in relation to the Trinity, Atonement, Regeneration, and the relation of Charity and Faith in the economy of salvation. On this matter, however, it is sufficient here to remark that as the views which he advances on all these subjects were indisputably entertained by others, centuries ago, the mere fact of his adopting them can, of course, furnish no satisfactory proof of the divinity of his mission. For if these views carry with them the seal of a divine origin, the divinely appointed mission for imparting them dates far anterior to Swedenborg.

---

twelve members of the human body, as then classified, seems to shadow forth, at least, a similar idea.

There are, of course, other points on which there is no agreement; for the philosophy of Swedenborg is immeasurably in advance of that of Manes. The above points, however, are all that need be here specified in the way of illustration.

* New Church Miscellanies, pp. 324–346. I merely refer to the Professor's treatise as being the latest on this subject. The same topics are also learnedly treated in his Reply to Dr. Woods.

Digitized by Google

It is needless, however, to protract this argument. We shall, therefore, proceed briefly to consider the whole question in the light of a plain and obvious illustration, and leave it with the reader to decide how much weight should justly be awarded to a claim of divine illumination, set up on such grounds as these.

§ 13. *Illustration of the Argument from the case of the Shakers.* More than a century and a half ago, * a few individuals, professing spiritual enlightenment, went over from France into England, and taught the doctrines which they professed to have received by divine illumination, and visions and communications of angels and spirits. As one result of their labors, some forty years later, † a small number, professing to be led by the Divine Spirit, were induced to unite themselves into a society near Manchester, under the ministry of James and Jane Wardley; and boldly testified that the second appearance of Christ was at hand; and that the Church was rising in her full and transcendent glory, which would effect the final downfall of Antichrist. They affirmed that the work of the great day of God was then commencing, and would increase until every promise of God should be fulfilled. They continued "to increase in light and power," ‡ with occasional additions to their number, till about the year 1770, when "by a special manifestation of divine light, the present testimony of salvation and eternal life was fully revealed to *Ann Lee*, § and by her to the Society." This remarkable woman, as destitute of education as A. J. Davis himself, and equally unacquainted with the writings of Swedenborg, commenced a mission of teaching and reforming, which her followers aver was begun by divine illumination, and attested by the divine seal of prophecy, if not of miracle. She had "repeated visions of the Lord, and held intercourse with the unseen and invisible world;" and through life evinced a patience, and faith and charity, and a zeal and an industry in promoting the welfare of man, which are unusual even in the

* About 1706. See "A Summary View of the Millennial Church," p. 4. Albany. 1823.

† About 1747. See ibid. ‡ Ibid. pp. 4, 5. I employ their own words.

§ She was born in Manchester, England, in 1736, and died in New Lebanon, New York, Sept. 8, 1784.

Digitized by Google

present day. And as the result of her asserted illumination, she announced, in direct antagonism to the prevalent orthodox or evangelical doctrine, a system of theology which, in all its leading or fundamental features, is precisely what Swedenborg himself has announced. Any man can satisfy himself of the entire accuracy of this representation, who will examine and compare the two systems. I say, in all their *leading* features — for there exist also some strong points of antagonism; as, for example, in the views which the systems present of scortatory love and marriage. They differ, likewise, in the views they express of the nature of God; but the points of coincidence may be summed up as follows:

"Mother Ann" and her followers teach:

1. That "the creation and order of the natural world is a figure of that which is spiritual." *

2. That there is a probationary state, or a state of purification for the soul, beyond the present life. †

3. The progressive increase of the work of God demands an entirely new dispensation in the present day, and hence that the Millennial day has now commenced, and, though yet in its beginning, is an increasing work. The Kingdom of Christ is now established, &c., &c. ‡

4. The old Church, previous to 1735, has utterly apostatized and perished, and hence the necessity of a new revelation. Those "who expect to find the order and power of the primitive Church solely by the revelation given in that day, will, in the event, most certainly be disappointed." "And certain it is, that if the predictions of Christ, on this subject, have ever been fulfilled, then there was a time when he had no true Church on earth. This period may easily be ascertained by an impartial examination of ecclesiastical history," &c., &c. Hence, the work of building up and establishing the Church "could not be effected till Christ made his second appearance," &c. And they mention it as "a remarkable circumstance, that Ann Lee was born the very

* Millennial Church, part III, chap. iii, pp. 116–120.

† Ibid. Part IV, chap. v., pp. 171–173. This doctrine, they inform us, was not only explicitly and clearly taught by Mother Ann, but has been fully confirmed to the Society by many visions and divine revelations. p. 173.

‡ Ibid. Chap. vi. pp. 173–183.

Digitized by Google

next year, viz.: 1736." They also aver that from 1747 there was a gradual increase of light and power "till the establishment of the MILLENIAL CHURCH, *or second gospel temple*, in the year 1792, which then became the habitation of souls in true gospel order." *

5. The second coming of Christ is not the appearance of the same personal Being, but a manifestation of the same spirit. And as the first appearing of Christ, to take upon himself human nature, and declare his mission, was in the flesh; so his second appearing, for the redemption of his people, must be in the Spirit. The old Church advocate knows not what is meant by the "new heavens and new earth;" and he always inclines to put a natural construction on those prophetic descriptions in the sacred writings, which relate to the second coming of Christ, and to the day of judgment. Hence the ideas of personality and locality in contemplating that event; and hence the opinion of his coming in the natural clouds of the atmosphere, and operating upon the natural elements. He has actually come *as a thief*, in the time of such extensive spiritual darkness, &c. †

6. The second manifestation of Christ, not instantly universal, but gradual and progressive, like the rising sun. ‡

7. *Regeneration.* Christ was born into a fallen nature with all its propensities. This nature he received through the medium of his natural birth, of the Virgin Mary; therefore, he necessarily had a progressive travail out of it. Hence it is evident that the work of regeneration first commenced in him. The new birth was not even taught before Christ was manifested in the flesh, in the person of Jesus; and Jesus having been the first who travailed in the regeneration, and received the spiritual birth, he was the first to teach it to others. ||

8. *Heaven and Hell.* The opinion which generally prevails in relation to the spiritual world, seems to be confined to the idea of merely a heaven and hell, at a great distance from this world, and that there is no other place for the habitation of souls. These erroneous ideas evidently proceed from the want of spiritual light and the prejudice of education.

---

* Millennial Church. Chap. vii., pp. 184–194.

† Ibid. Part V., chap. i. & ii., pp. 195–207.

‡ Ibid. Caption of chapter iii., p. 207. || Ibid. Chap. v. p. 228.

Digitized by Google

"The connection between the temporal and spiritual world, is like that of soul and body. Man, being composed of the natural elements, is the offspring of the world in its highest degree of perfection; the spiritual and temporal parts being united in him, he comes forth with a soul and body, and thereby shows the order from whence he proceeded. When a soul leaves the body, being still a living and conscious being, it moves in the elements of the spiritual world, while the body, being dead, soon dissolves and mingles again with the elements of the temporal world.

"The distance between God and men, and between heaven and hell, is not measured by space, as we measure distance on earth. The fullness of Heaven itself, is a state of perfect separation from all evil, and contains the highest perfection of order, glory, and happiness. Hell, in its fullness, is a state of entire separation from all good, and the source of all evil, disorder and confusion; and hence, it forms a situation of the most awful and excessive horror and misery. *Between these two, there is an infinity of different states and situations of souls, both in the body and out of it,* each containing different degrees of good or evil, according to their good or evil works. And hence it is, that, as the soul is the real acting principle in man;" &c. "His nearness to hell is measured by the proportion of evil which exists and reigns in him; his nearness to heaven, by" &c.*

Their views of faith, justification, obedience, and charity, might also be presented in illustration; this, however, would be drawing out the scheme to too great a length. We, therefore, shall advert to but two topics more.

9. The *Resurrection.* There is no such thing as a resurrection of the body. The passages of Scripture which announce the doctrine, speak of the resurrection of the soul; and have no reference to the natural body, except as a figure. The great object and design of the resurrection, is to raise souls out of their natural, fallen, and depraved state, into a spiritual and heavenly state.†

The resurrection of the natural body of man, is strongly argued from the supposed resurrection of the natural body of Christ, which is thought to be established beyond dispute, by the fact

* Millennial Church, pp. 171–173, 225–227.

† Ibid. Part VI., chap. v., pp. 302, seq. Comp. A. C. 4527, 5078.

Digitized by Google

that it was not found in the sepulchre where it was laid. The resurrection of Jesus Christ was a spiritual resurrection.*

10. *The Day of Judgment* is inseparably connected with the Resurrection. We view it as a work which has already commenced; a work which we ourselves have seen and felt, &c. Its work is to separate between the principles of good and evil, and to convince souls of their ungodliness; and to render impartial justice to all souls, &c. It has now commenced, and God has begun to judge the nations of the earth. It will be gradual and progressive, but certain and effectual; and will continue till a full and final separation shall be made between good and evil.†

The foregoing statements we have made in their own language chiefly. It is not in place here to expose their multitudinous errors. This is not our design in presenting them. Nor is it necessary that we adduce the points of antagonism between their system, and that of Swedenborg.‡ The design must be sufficiently apparent to the reader.

After I had completed the foregoing abstract, I met with the following remarkable admission, in a letter to Prof. Bush, from Dr. Roehrig, published in the New Church Repository for 1853, page 467. It speaks for itself, and fully illustrates and confirms our argument. It will be perceived, however, that the writer of the letter is, from some cause or other, profoundly silent on the subject of Manes and his theology; and that the teachings of Swedenborg are his sole rule for deciding upon the claims, truthfulness, &c., of all other systems:

"When I was still in Paris I had begun a thorough research, not

---

* Millennial Church, p. 307, seq. In treating this subject they employ the very speculations of Manes and Swedenborg to sustain them. See Mosheim's Comment., Century III., Sect. 47; and Conf. A. C. 1745, 2159, 2574, 2649, 3212, 3318, 3086, 6866, 10829; and Doctrine of the Lord, 35.

† Ibid. pp. 318–818. Conf. A. C. 900, 2117–2122.

‡ There are quite obvious antagonisms between the systems. For example, they come to a direct issue upon the subject of worldly pleasure and "*conjugial*" delights. See pp. 129–168, 224–235, on this subject, compared with Swedenborg's views on Conjugial Love. Or, see Professor Bush's *Statement of Reasons*, p. 125; and his *Reply to Dr. Woods*, pp. 176–237. On these points, however, both Manes and Mother Ann are in direct antagonism to Swedenborg.

Digitized by Google

only in the comparative theology of the Heathen's religions, but also of the systems of the various Christian denominations of ancient and modern times. My especial object in doing so, was, to discover the greatest possible amount of *confirmatory proofs or analogies* for the truth of the New Church doctrines. Thus I studied the religious doctrines of the Samosatians, Hieracites, Ejacetes, Encratites, Cocceians, etc., etc., and in the creed of one of those sects I found this, in that of another I found again another, point conform to our own belief. This *partial conformity* with Swedenborg's statements most evidently shows that those sects have *had real communications with the spiritual world, though not of the same truthful character as those accorded to Swedenborg himself.* And, indeed, with the one we find the belief that the Word has an interior spiritual sense; with another we meet with the belief of the figurative sense of the six days of creation (Hieracites;) with others, resurrection in a spiritual body; one God implying Trinity; God in a human form, etc., etc. As to the modern sects, I need only to adduce one example out of many others. In the "Summary View of the Millennial Church" (Shakers), many interesting coincidences with New Church spiritual views are to be found. However far I may be from recognizing the soundness of the reasonings set forth in their leading works, such as the "Testimony of Christ's Second Appearing," "Dunlavy's Manifesto," etc., yet, I must say, nevertheless, that, in the book alluded to ("A Summary View"), we meet with many striking evidences of a species of spiritual communications bearing quite a close resemblance to those which we read in Swedenborg. As a New Churchman I am indeed constrained to reject, as widely errant from truth, many of their distinguishing tenets, particularly those relating to celibacy, to Christ's second appearing in the person of Ann Lee, to their mode of worship, etc., yet this does not prevent me from acknowledging in the following points a most marked affinity with New Church doctrines: 1. No three persons in the Godhead; but a divine duality of power and wisdom. 2. No resurrection of the natural body. 3. No heaven and hell as material places. 4. No transfer of the guilt of the first transgressor. 5. No value in Faith without Charity and good works. 6. No vicarious Atonement, or Imputation. 7. The constant influx of good and bad spirits. 8. A certain spiritually representative or figurative character in all the productions of nature and human industry.

"The coincidences under these heads are striking, and it is much to be regretted that they cannot in their minds, be eliminated from the

Digitized by Google

theologic errors with which they are mixed up. Let us hope that eventually they may be."

The question, then, in view of these things, is a very plain one: Was Ann Lee divinely taught, as she claimed to be, to impart this system of doctrine to man? *She taught these asserted truths, and whence were they obtained?* If they are not evidence of divine illumination in her case, how can they be such in the case of Swedenborg? They were not obtained from Swedenborg as already remarked; and from what source were they derived? Should it be affirmed, however, by the New Church, that she obtained them from Swedenborg, (though there is direct evidence to the contrary,) and that, therefore, her claims to divine illumination were mere imposture; it is very easy to evince, on precisely the same principle, that Swedenborg obtained these same doctrines from persons who had previously taught them,* and that, therefore, his claim to divine illumination was imposture. †

---

* We ought, perhaps, however, to make an exception in favor of one or more; which though previously taught by others, do really appear, in Swedenborg's case, to be the result of labored philosophical elaboration. He had adopted the great Cartesian principle, that the universe depends upon the productive power of God, as much for its continued existence and operation, as it did for its first existence; in other words, that continual preservation differs not from continual creation; — a sentiment which Origen had advanced, and upon which Spinoza subsequently erected his imposing superstructure of Pantheism. But the acute and mighty intellect of the Swedish Seer (whom a fallen archangel might exult to triumph over,) grasped this great principle fully and firmly; and carried it in its applications, not only far beyond the ken of Des Cartes, but beyond the Serbonian bog in which Spinoza and his modern disciples have become hopelessly swamped; and far out of the reach also of that Atheism and Pantheism which have heretofore sought to fly to it for shelter.

† "With regard to a change of principles, we can assure our readers that there was not *a single principle of faith* ever advanced by *Mother Ann and the first Elders*, of which we have any knowledge, *but is still maintained by the Society without any variation whatever.*" *Millen. Church.* Preface, p. x. "The great principles of the Gospel, revived and brought to light by Mother Ann, and the succeeding witnesses, comprise the whole law of Christ, manifested in this day of his second appearing." Ibid. p. 245.

These "first Elders" were William Lee (brother of Mother Ann) † 1784, James Whittaker, † 1787, John Hocknell, † 1799. The *next* generation began, if I mistake not, with Joseph Meacham, concerning whose life or death I have not been able to learn any thing

Digitized by Google

Was, then, Ann Lee's mission a true one? She claims it on the same ground that Swedenborg claims his own mission to be such; and it has the very same marks of "*truth*" in its teachings. They were cotemporary; and yet though both alike equally commissioned, knew nothing of each other. Yet they taught the same theology, and each became the founder of a new and respectable religious sect; the one naming itself "*The New Jerusalem Church*," and the other adopting the sobriquet of "*The Millennial Church.*" But neither recognizes the claims of the other, notwithstanding all their agreement in doctrine; on the contrary, they manifestly entertain, towards each other's claims, about the same degree of charity and good will as was anciently entertained for each other by the Jews and Samaritans.

If, then, the mission of Swedenborg is to be admitted on theological grounds to be divine, why should not the mission of Mother Ann be, on similar grounds, likewise received? But both cannot be admitted, for there is, on various important points, a direct antagonism between them. The evidence on theological grounds, however, appears to be as conclusive in one case as in the other. And, consequently, if it is insufficient for Mother Ann, it is insufficient also for Swedenborg. That is, his claim to divine illumination, on theological grounds, is simply absurd. In the exercise of an enlightened reason, it cannot for a moment be seriously entertained.

§ 14. *Conclusion.*

There is one point on which we have not thought it necessary to dwell, but which is frequently presented and insisted on as an evidence of the divine illumination of Swedenborg — and that is the *nature* of his disclosures in relation to the spiritual world: and an appeal is made to human consciousness as authenticating their truthfulness and accuracy. We have not thought it necessary to discuss this portion of the argument in support of his claim, because the manner in which human consciousness is expected to verify such extraordinary disclosures, in the absence of all direct and positive knowledge on the subject, has not yet been pointed out. And because, in the absence of such an exposé, an assumption of such a character is an instance of bald impertinence.*

* Human consciousness is thus asserted to be in antagonism to our most

Digitized by Google

There is, therefore, not a particle of rational ground on which to base the claim of Swedenborg to divine illumination; and, consequently, on which to credit his repeated asseveration that the Lord had revealed himself to him, commanding him to write and publish; and that all and every thing which he has written and published is true. The facts alleged, and to which reference is above made, may be admitted to sustain the position that he had intercourse with the spiritual world. But this, on his own principles, can only evidence a supernatural or preternatural illumination, and not one that is divine: — a species of illumination which facts, equally striking and as well attested, prove to exist in other cases, associated, too, with most glaring and monstrous errors and delusions, and with the grossest forms of infidelity. And neither can the slightest evidence of the Divine seal be discovered, either in his philosophy or theology. The proof of all this is before the reader, and to his decision we now submit the question.

There is, however, in this connection, one consideration which is much insisted on by the New Church, and which it would be unfair and improper to pass without notice. It is contended that any attempt to solve "the problem of Swedenborg's claim," by referring his illumination to spiritual delusion, or to any thing short of what he himself declares to be its true source and origin, is fraught with difficulty and absurdity far greater than any which can arise from the admission that his own statements and impressions on the subject are accurate. And, in support of this, we are told that it is inconceivable and preposterous to suppose that any hostile and malignant spirit who sought to delude the Seer, and through him to deceive and lead to ruin the human race, would ever have imparted through him so much that is admitted to be true; and such views of the necessity of holiness on the part of man; and of the consequences of sin in the future stages of our being. And that as such things can only operate benefi-

cherished belief respecting God, and Christ, and the resurrection, and the judgment to come, and many other deeply important truths of revelation. And then, moreover, how is human consciousness to verify the doctrine of correspondences; the denial of the resurrection of the body; the assertion that heaven is in the form of a Grand Man; and a thousand other asserted disclosures which are utterly, in the very nature of the case, beyond its reach?

Digitized by Google

cially upon man, it cannot without manifest absurdity be supposed that they were derived from any but a good source; and if so, their source can be ultimately traced only to God.

Such is the argument. I have stated it much more forcibly and logically than I have found it to exist in their writings, for I wish to do no injustice to the conception itself. It is the very focus in which are made to converge all the rays of the preceding arguments; and it is claimed to present an alternative or dilemma to the rejectors of the mission of Swedenborg, which, if fairly and properly considered, must lead to the frank admission of his claim. * But is this even so? Let reason and common sense decide.

Is poison, when surreptitiously administered with the view of destroying life, ever administered alone? Is acknowledged error or falsehood ever propounded in its naked deformity for the reception of men? What is the universal testimony of facts in relation to these matters? Consult the history of any acknowledged heresiarch — consider, for example, the case of Manes, of Mother Ann, of A. J. Davis, of Dr. Hare; and whatever origin may be assigned to the views they inculcate, do we not find associated with their admitted errors, mistakes or falsehoods, many deeply important and practical truths? Human cunning has always, in seeking to delude and deceive, proceeded on this principle; and to such operation mainly is to be attributed whatever success has attended its efforts. These things are all well known and every where acknowledged. And now, on the supposition that one of those powerful and malignant spirits, of whom Swedenborg speaks so largely, and who are ever on the watch to deceive and ruin mankind, should succeed in obtaining a human instrument adapted to his purpose, is it not obvious that he would, in the same manner as above stated, aim to secure his end, and associate a large proportion of truth, (beautiful, perhaps, and captivating to the soul,) with the error which it was his main object to inculcate? Suppose, for instance, that his aim were to induce our sinful and perishing race to neglect the salvation proffered to us by God, through his dear Son, and which is only to be secured by an earnest and sincere reliance on his atoning sacrifice for sin;

* See Prof. Bush's *Reply to Emerson;* and *Introduction to the Swedenborg Library.*

Digitized by Google

and by application to him as the only Mediator between God and men — the only Intercessor and Advocate whose pleadings can avail on our behalf; it is obvious that, could his aim in this respect be secured, every thing which he sought would, in effect, be substantially secured. What, then, should hinder him from accompanying such an effort and such an aim with the disclosure of any amount of new and captivating truths? Such truths could not neutralize the deadly poison when received into the system; and of course, therefore, the more of them the better. He could safely, and in perfect consistency with his ultimate aim, not only unfold to our vision all that he knew of the glories of heaven and of the state of the blessed; and of hell, and the condition of the lost; and might describe far more fully than had been previously done to men, the condition of the human soul immediately subsequent to death; but also inculcate any amount of practical doctrine, charity, love, and what not. For what could any or all of these things avail, so long as the soul is willing to neglect, practically, the great and only Physician, "who came to seek and to save that which was lost." Let him but succeed in inducing the soul to believe that there is no Mediator between God and men; that there is no Intercessor or High Priest at the right hand of the throne of God; and that we are not to plead in prayer that mercy may be granted us *for Christ's sake*;* and so lead us to re-

* "The invocation of blessings *for Christ's sake* is utterly unknown in the New Church, because we cannot by possibility so separate the Father from the Son as to render such language appropriate to the subject." Bush's *New Church Miscellanies*, p. 325. The same is, in the fullest manner, asserted also by Swedenborg himself. In a letter to Dr. Menander, Archbishop of Sweden, he says "It is an error to address God the Father, and to supplicate him *to have mercy for the sake of his Son*, and to send his Holy Spirit; this mode of worship and of supplication is directly contrary to the truth, for the truth teaches us to address the Lord alone, in whom dwelleth the Father, and through whom only the Father can be approached and worshiped. Moreover, the common mode of supplicating the Father for the sake of the Son, involves a clear and distinct idea of *three gods*, and gives rise to the belief that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three separate and distinct divine beings." *Documents*, p. 165. The same objections, of course, apply to the other doctrines above referred to; and hence we find that the New Church "recognizes no Mediator between God and men; nor any High Priest or Intercessor at God's right hand." See A. C. 2250. The reader who would compare the foregoing views with the Word of God, can consult the following along with other passages: Eph. iv: 32, Luke xi: 13, John vii:

Digitized by Google

ject the counsel of God against ourselves, and the only name given under heaven amongst men whereby we must be saved: then, so far as the receivers of his doctrine are concerned, he has neutralized the very object of Jesus in coming to redeem and save. Admitting, therefore, that Swedenborg's philosophy, and psychology, and theology, contain many important truths — the admission meets not the requirements of the case. Manes, and "Mother Ann," and A. J. Davis, and Dr. Hare, and others, have all taught many truths, as all must admit. But what does the admission amount to? Just nothing. It bears not in either case upon the true issue.

And then further: In Swedenborg's case, it is more apparent than in either of the others, that he, by excess, and by the long indulgence of a disposition to pry into the unknown and invisible, had brought himself into that condition, which, according to the express averments of his followers (above referred to,) is best adapted to bring man into association with those malignant spirits who are ever on the watch to deceive. He brought himself, therefore, within the sphere of their influence and power; and why then may they not have deceived him? What was to hinder their making him believe that the Lord revealed himself to him; opened to him the spiritual world, and commissioned him to teach and publish all that he has both taught and published; and even in his dying moments to endorse it all, with all its inconsistencies, errors and irreconcilable contradictions? *

37–39, Rom. viii: 34, Mark xvi: 19, Col. iii: 1, 1 Tim. ii: 5, Heb. i: 3, 13, and vii: 25, and viii: 1, and ix: 24, and x: 12, and xii: 2, 1 Pet iii: 22, 1 John ii: 1, Rev. iii: 5, and v: 13, and xiv: 1, 13.

* The Rev. B. F. Barrett, (to whom we have already several times referred,) in a letter to the New York *Christian Inquirer* of Feb. 21, 1857, thus adverts to this subject:

"In declarations of this sort did Swedenborg persist till the close of his natural life. The excellent Swedish clergyman who visited him just before his death, and when he knew that his course on earth was nearly finished, urged him in a most solemn manner, if he had written anything concerning the other world that was untrue, "now to publish the truth to the world, and recant either the whole or a part of what he had advanced, since he had now nothing more to expect from the world, which he was so soon about to leave forever. Upon hearing these words from me," continues the clergyman, "Swedenborg raised himself half upright in his bed, and placing his sound hand upon his breast,

Digitized by Google

Let it be further remembered, that no issue is here raised respecting the sincerity and veracity of Swedenborg; though this is frequently, by his followers, represented as the only issue. We have no doubt that Swedenborg really and truly believed that the Lord had appeared to him, and directed him to do what he did. He believed that he was *divinely* illuminated, BUT HE WAS DECEIVED. His wish was "father to the thought;" nor has he furnished a particle of proof in favor of his claim to any such illumination. That he was preternaturally illuminated, we do not deny. But in the absence of all proof in his support, and with a vast array of evidence against the truth of his claim, *we do utterly deny that Swedenborg's teachings are from God!* We utterly deny the validity of his claim to any heavenly illumination. And here, for the present, we leave the matter.

L.

---

said with zeal and emphasis, 'As true as you see me before you, so true is every thing that I have written, and I could have said more had I been permitted. When you come into eternity, you will see all things as I have stated and described them, and we shall have much to discourse about them with each other.'"

"Now, these solemn and oft-repeated asseverations of our Seer were either true or false. Either he did see and converse with angels and spirits, as he declares, or he did not. If what he asserts be untrue, then must he have been either insane or a most villanous impostor, or self-deceived. No other alternative seems left us."

Digitized by Google

ART. II. — *The Nature and Import of a Christian Profession.*

The human mind tends to oscillate between extremes; when unsettled, inclines to swing off to the point furthest possible from that it leaves, which is not unfrequently one of equal or greater error. The discovery of unsoundness in the foundations of any belief, which removes one danger, is succeeded by another; that, all else but the necessity of escape lost sight of, the tenability of intermediate grounds will not be considered, and there will be no pause in the retreat until the remotest, and perhaps a more fatal, point is reached. In the weak or ill-balanced mind this tendency is strongest. It is this tendency developed beyond its ordinary strength, more than anything else, that makes the distinctive character of minds which we are accustomed to regard as constitutionally erratic. They stand only in extremes. They are like a shuttle, which under one impulse given it does not stop until it strikes the opposite end of the batton, and by a similar impulse shoots back to the place from which it started. Hence, great revolutions or reformations require strong and well-balanced minds to conduct them successfully, and always involve some danger of a sacrifice of truth in the opposite direction.

What we have remarked, is illustrated in almost every department of human thought or speculation in which it is possible for men to differ — in metaphysical science, and in whatever is theoretic in politics, medicine and the physical sciences; but is most observable in that department in which its effects are most to be deplored — that is, in theological investigation and religious faith. This is owing, perhaps, to the very importance of truth here, and the correspondingly great dread of error, which gives more than the ordinary energy to the natural impulse to fly precipitately from discovered danger — an energy which too frequently carries far beyond the point of safety. It may seem paradoxical, yet it must be admitted to be a truth, that nearly every great and gross error that prevails in any religious society of much extent, had its beginning in a germ of truth, or is but a violent and intemperate protest against an opposite error. May we not find a proof and illustration of this statement, in the different extreme

Digitized by Google

views among professed Christians concerning the nature of the Sacraments? In the strong dissent entered against the Papal superstitions of Transubstantiation and Sacramental Regeneration, many Protestant Christians — not so much in their standards, as in their preaching and in the popular faith — have reached an extreme which very nearly divests the sacraments of all their peculiar character, and robs themselves of the comfort and real benefits they were evidently designed to give; by reducing them down, the one to a mere form for a profession of Christianity, the other to a mere expression of grateful remembrance of the sufferings of our Lord, or a form for the renewed confession of him. Now, whilst without faith and the accompanying dispositions which these ordinances demand, they are utterly empty; and, therefore, the Papal doctrine of their saving efficacy is false and deadly; yet is it not true that with faith, they are seals in a covenant transaction, which confirm and make infallibly sure to us all the benefits they represent; and that they are channels through which grace is actually conveyed to the souls of God's believing people? But this is not the extent of the illustration. The tendency we are noting appears further, in the reäction from this Protestant extreme, of emptying the sacraments of almost all their real benefits, in the return of a portion of nominally Protestant Christians to the nearly identical Papal error of Baptismal Regeneration. Baptism, with a determinative emphasis upon the external of it, and regeneration are so connected under the teachings of this backward reformation, as to make it next to impossible for the popular mind to apprehend them otherwise than as cause and effect, if indeed it be not designed to have them so regarded. Here we have traced the oscillation forth and back between two extremes.

These observations have been made under the apprehension that some of the views we shall present, might not be quite approved by all our readers, and in the belief that the suggestion of this important source of error in religious opinion, might discover to such as have not been at pains to settle definitely their own views in relation to the subject, the existence and origin of error in themselves. There may be some, who, in their extreme care to discountenance dangerous heresies which it has been necessary

Digitized by Google

for them to resist, have been betrayed on to grounds that cannot be upheld by the Scriptures; who are better prepared to entertain views different from their own, by being put somewhat upon search for the effects in themselves, of the tendency to which we have directed attention.

Whilst all who have made a Christian profession must be interested in the discussion of its import, there are four classes of persons who may be considered as specially needing to have clear and well defined views on the subject: 1. Ministers of the Gospel, who have to instruct serious, inquiring minds, in the duty and nature of a profession of religion; who should have special care to impose no conditions to the enjoyment of the privileges of the Church, which our Lord has not plainly ordained. 2. Ruling Elders, who with the pastor, in session, control the entrance of the Church; who should seek to understand clearly what they are to expect and to demand in applicants for admission. 3. Thoughtful persons who are considering the duty of coming out from the world and taking a public stand as Christians; who may be decided upon this duty, or be relieved of embarrassing difficulty by correcting their views of the nature of the step. 4. Church members who are desiring to be released from their Christian profession; as also sessions which may have to deal with such cases. It is upon what we hold a Christian profession to be, depends the answer to the question whether there can be any release from it. If it be one thing, and that one thing what it is held to be in the loose notions of many persons, then release, in a certain state of case, is not only lawful, but is a simple act of justice. But if it be another thing, it seems to us there is no power in the Church to grant release.

Of the obligation and necessity of a Christian confession, the words of our Lord in the 10th chapter of Matthew, are conclusive: "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven: But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." It is evident, upon the first and most superficial view, and upon the last and most careful examination that can be made of these words, that they announce a condition of salvation in all ordinary cases indispensa-

Digitized by Google

ble. Our Lord's acknowledgment before the Father is equivalent to salvation; his denial there, is equivalent to rejection and exclusion from heaven. That, therefore, upon which he rests this his act of confession or denial, must be regarded as an indispensable condition of salvation, to those who labor under no disability of complying with it. Nothing can be plainer than this. There is no art that can take this meaning off these words. It were folly to attempt to evade a truth uttered with such plainness by the Author of salvation himself. We are to inquire what this confession is: First, as to *form*. This may be ascertained by reference to the terms of salvation, as announced by our Lord and his Apostles in other places.

The first passage we notice is our Lord's commission to the Apostles at parting, in the 16th chapter of Mark: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth *and is baptized*, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." In this statement we have, as terms of salvation, an inward exercise and an outward act — the latter presupposing and manifesting the former. Faith is to be followed by the use of the symbol which attests and displays it; and baptism is joined with faith in the requisition which is to be made of Gospel hearers everywhere. Baptism is not put into the reversed statement, because no one will be baptized who does not at least profess to believe, and because unbelief is in itself a sufficient ground of condemnation; refusal of baptism, therefore, was not necessary to be added, and the statement might properly stop with unbelief. The condition of salvation which our Lord here makes is evidently, then, the same as that in Matthew, *a manifested faith in him*, a faith *displayed to men;* with the additional information in this place, that the manifestation required is through the ordinance of the Church appointed for this purpose.

The next passage we will notice is in the 2d chapter of Acts, where Peter follows his Master closely in stating the terms of salvation. To the multitude conscience-stricken under his preaching, and inquiring "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" he replied, "Repent, *and be baptized* every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Here again we have

Digitized by Google

an inward exercise, followed by, and attested and published through, a symbol; and again baptism is a condition of saving grace. To these statements may be added the fact of the baptism of all who received Christ under the preaching of the Apostles, as showing by their practice, the uniform teaching of the Apostles in relation to this subject.

The words of our Lord and those of the Apostle Paul in the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians, will give further assistance in reaching the end of this inquiry. The Lord at the institution of the Supper, delivered the injunction: "Do this in remembrance of me;" and the Apostle has added: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." The death of Christ as a propitiatory offering for sin, is the great central truth in the Gospel — that to which faith in him has particular reference. If there is any thing of him to be confessed, it is this. Now, he has instituted an ordinance, with which he has connected a command of observance, the design of which is to make an exhibition of the faith of those who receive him, in the virtue and power of his death, and to seal their interest in it. This, therefore, we could not reasonably suppose not included in that confession of him before men, which is the condition of his recognition and acknowledgment before his Father in heaven.

It is plain, then, from this comparison, that when our Lord says, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven; but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven;" that he speaks of a public acknowledgment of him in ways which he should indicate; which he has now appointed in the ordinances of his Church: — in Baptism, which is the sign and seal of regeneration and engrafting into him by his Spirit; and in his Supper, which is the profession of the faith of his people in his redemptory sufferings, and the seal of their interest in them.

Is this, then, the startling conclusion you reach, some may be ready to say — that an open profession of Christ, connection with the Church, baptism and participation in the sacramental supper are necessary to salvation — so that all without these must be disowned of Christ and perish? Such, with but little change, we are bound to say, is the conclusion to which we have been con-

Digitized by Google

ducted by the Word of God, and to which we have aimed to conduct our readers — that salvation is ordinarily limited to the Church, and out of it there is no ordinary possibility of being saved; * that those who have the Gospel preached to them, or are acquainted with it, and are in circumstances to comply with these requisitions, cannot reasonably hope for salvation out of the Church. Nothing different from this, it seems to us, can be taught by the ministers of Christ. They are not at liberty to change or hold back an issue made so distinctly by him. If any object to this, their objections lie not against the preaching of it, but against his ordination. Has he not said it with more distinctness and emphasis than we can give to it? Can any thing be more emphatic than his language preserved by Matthew? Can any thing be plainer than the statement of the terms of salvation he gave to the Apostles, and the ministry after them, to bear throughout the world? And, with reflection, it must be seen that no other conclusion than this can be reached. Has the Lord Jesus appointed the Church, and the sacramental ordinances he has connected with it, to be indifferent things, to be dispensed with at pleasure? Does he lay commands upon men, and design to save them without obedience? Would he connect salvation with a church in the different ages of time, if men could as well be saved without it? Why should we be exhorted to cleave to our Christian profession, even unto death — and why might not martyrs have easily escaped torture and death, by a concealment or renunciation of their faith — if an open confession of him be not indispensable? Will he bestow salvation upon those who spurn from them his own appointed symbols of it? Will he, can he, without falsifying his word, own in heaven as his, those who on earth refuse to be called by his name, and will not be marshaled among his people? No other conclusion is possible. We are not permitted to say less to those sitting under our ministry, blessed with the privilege of hearing the Gospel preached, and with the opportunity of obeying it. They alone who confess Christ before men, in the ways he has ordained, can expect a confession by him before his Father in heaven.

But is it still objected that this doctrine seems harsh and

* Confession of Faith, chap. xxv: Sec. II.

Digitized by Google

severe, and attaches too much importance to externals in religion? Where is the harshness? The Son of God stooped from heaven to earth, and even to death itself, to qualify himself to be a Saviour, to acquire the right to save; he has published the offers of salvation, upon terms easy to be understood, and both possible and easy of compliance; we, as his ministers, convey those offers, and make known those terms to men; is there harshness in the ordination, or in our preaching it, that if they reject they cannot receive?

It is a sufficient reply to the objection that we attach too much importance to externals in religion, that we attach only what our Lord has most plainly attached. We must be at pains to disclaim the idea that a mere connection with the Church will save, or that the sacramental water and bread and wine act like a charm in removing the defilement of sin and renewing the temper of the mind. It is, of course, from no such estimate of the saving properties of these externals, that they are to be insisted upon as necessary; but as the exponents and manifestations of faith, and as the divinely appointed tests of an obedient and filial spirit. It is because by refusing to enlist under the banner of Christ, men reveal their opposition to him and leave themselves among his enemies; because by rejecting the sacramental symbols of his grace, they exhibit disobedience and show themselves averse from his grace. It is for these reasons the Scriptures hold, and we in expounding them are bound to bring out plainly, that these things cannot be voluntarily dispensed with.

A popular objection may here be answered in a somewhat popular way. Was not the penitent thief, crucified with our Lord, saved without connection with the visible Church? The baptismal water was never poured upon his head, the sacramental bread and wine were never placed to his lips; yet from the dying Lord he received an assurance, such as no other mortal before or since ever received, of immediate entrance upon the blessedness of heaven. And our dying friends and our beloved dead, who, though late, have yet at last penitently sought mercy in Christ, and have departed with hope in his abounding grace, how are we to be comforted for them if this be a condition of salvation?

The case of the dying thief is easily shown to be exceptional,

Digitized by Google

and relieved of difficulty, by the simple observation that it occurred before the general publication of our Saviour's commands in relation to confession of him, and before the Christian Church and its sacraments were fully inaugurated. It was further exceptional in the impossibility of a formal compliance, even if the duty of a sacramental confession of Christ had been established and known to him. But it is a case even of positive use in illustrating that spirit of confession, where the sacramental form is impossible, which is the attendant of true faith, and which our Lord demands. What a confession was that, when he acknowledged Jesus as Lord of earth and heaven — even when he saw him dying, and when the faith of his stoutest-hearted disciples was shaken! It was not in his power to make any other; but this is sufficient to show that if the display of grace to him was wonderful, his faith was also wonderful. Can it be believed that, if he could have been released from the cross and restored to liberty, he would have refused to make any kind of confession believed to be demanded by his Lord? So it is our privilege now, standing at the bedside of the dying sinner, to encourage him to look to the Saviour of sinners, and to assure him of his grace if he only believe — though it be impossible, or judged by others inexpedient, for him to make a confession of Christ in the sacraments of the Church; yet a disposition that would lead to a cheerful and public acknowledgment of his Saviour in the ways he has appointed, if the disabilities were removed, must be held to be an indispensable evidence of true faith. Even in these cases, which involve one of the most delicate and difficult of a pastor's duties — where the sacraments, when requested by persons drawing nigh to death, have to be withheld for fear of encouraging a reliance upon mere ordinances, or are rendered impossible by the condition of the persons — even in these cases, the minds of the sick or dying are not to be taken off the sacraments by detraction of these divine institutions, but by proper explanations of their nature, or of the duty of the person as affected by their circumstances.

This much we have ascertained of the confession which the Lord Jesus requires, that it is to be open and public, and is to embrace a submission to and acknowledgment of him in the or-

Digitized by Google

dinances of his Church. It is to confess him by becoming his people, enlisting under his banner, wearing his livery, and eating at his table. This he requires, with pain, on refusal or voluntary failure, of being disowned of him before his Father in heaven. Under the Mosaic dispensation, when the high priest went into the holy of holies on the great day of atonement, to make an offering and intercession for the people, he bore the names of the twelve tribes of Israel inscribed upon his breastplate, that they might have a special remembrance before the Lord. Our High Priest has entered into the holy of holies, and now stands in heaven with the names of all his people upon his breast. The names of none who refuse to own him are there. There is no remembrance or mention of them there. And when at last he shall count over his own with the Father — when his confession will open the door of heaven, and his denial will unlock the door of hell — the names of none such will be recognized in the count.

It is worthy to be considered by those who are called to preach the gospel, whether they make this issue with their hearers as distinctly and squarely as the utterances of our Lord seem to demand; whether there is not in respect to this a relaxation of his own conditions of salvation; whether the sacraments of the Church can be set down among non-essentials, or any voluntary omission of them be allowed to consist with grace and salvation; whether the act of embracing Christ in any ordinary case can be admitted to be complete until it is sealed with his own appointed seals; whether the heresy which asserts the efficacy of the sacraments as saving ordinances, has not had an influence to cause them to be undervalued and disparaged as ordinances for the expression of faith in Christ, as for the communication of grace to true believers. It is of importance for practical effect in preaching, that duty be taught and pressed in its proper connection, and that we press with earnestness those things that lie clearly within the power of men. There are very many important truths which must be taught with a view to indoctrination and preparation for duty, but with which duty does not directly connect. Thus the necessity of regeneration is a vital truth which must be preached; but we cannot exhort men to get a new heart as we would direct them to go and get a new hat or a new coat. Now what reason

Digitized by Google

is there in pressing duty at points where helpless inability stares men in the face, and where exhortations may only serve to bewilder, and yet relaxing the demands of our Saviour for that which is clearly within their power? Men cannot make themselves new hearts, but they can make a confession of Christ; why should the one be held to be a necessity and the other a very nearly indifferent thing? Our Lord's commission to his ministers exhibits the divine wisdom which they are to imitate, in locating duty at the points where the responsibility of men in relation to the gospel begins — that is, in believing and confessing.

We are now to enquire what a Christian profession is as to *expression*; what it is persons profess, declare or say, in standing up to make themselves known as Christians, in receiving baptism, and in sitting at the Lord's table. To bring the point out distinctly and give the discussion the most practical shape, we will pursue the enquiry with a case before us, which is one familiar in pastoral experience. It is that of a serious enquirer, whose state of mind, as relates to all the preceding concerning the obligation and necessity of a sacramental confession of Christ, may be expressed in these words: I admit the correctness and unavoidable truth of the construction you have placed upon the Saviour's utterances. I am bound to concede, that salvation for those who know the gospel and labor under no providential disability of compliance, is limited to the Church. I feel that the condition is just and reasonable; they should be willing to confess Christ before men, in any way he has ordained, who desire to be confessed by him in heaven. I trust I feel no opposition or repugnance in my heart to this reasonable condition. I am sure I earnestly desire both to be a Christian, and to be able to profess myself such. I long and I pray to be made fit to make this profession, and to enter into the Church. But there is a change of heart necessary before this step, which I fear I have not, without which by making a profession I would perjure myself and increase my present guilt. How can I consistently and honestly take this step?

Here is brought out the misconception of the significance of a Christian confession, which we wish particularly to expose. Is it true that in coming out from the world and standing up before

Digitized by Google

men to make ourselves known as Christians, or in sitting at the Lord's table among his professed people, we profess a faith in our own subjective state — that we believe a change we call regeneration has taken place within us? Have the many thousands in the Church of Christ given their solemn public asseveration of their regenerate state, either as the whole or as a part of their profession? Or is there an intelligent believer, however precious the hope and consolation he has in Christ, who would be willing to stand up and, with all the solemnity of an oath, affirm that he has been born of the spirit of God, or would accept or retain a standing in any society, dependent upon his ability to make this affirmation? Is the mere opinion of ourselves of so much importance, either to the world or to ourselves, as to be worthy of or to justify so solemn a profession? Do the Scriptures any where require this, as a condition of salvation, or of the enjoyment of the privileges of the Church?

It is plain, upon examination of the Scriptures, that the object of the faith published in a Christian profession, is out of us, and not in us — not our own subjective state, but Christ, the Lord, the Redeemer. This appears in our Lord's words in Matthew: "Whosoever shall confess me before men" — not himself as the subject of a change of heart, or his own regeneration, but *me* — "him will I confess also, before my Father which is in heaven." Paul says, in the 10th chapter of Romans — and this he calls the word of faith, or essence of the doctrine he preached: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth *the Lord Jesus*, and shalt believe in thine heart *that God hath raised him from the dead*, thou shalt be saved." The Lord Jesus, — Jesus in all that he claimed to be, in all the offices he fills for salvation, and the reality and divine power of his resurrection — this the Apostle makes the substance of confession. Philip said to the eunuch: "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest be baptized." The eunuch replied: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" and immediately he was baptized. This was the confession upon which he was baptized. And this is the uniform teaching of the Scriptures as to the object of faith.

What we confess, then, in coming into the Church, is Christ; what we publish is our faith in him. The publication made by

Digitized by Google

all who were baptized by the Apostles, was of their faith. They believed and were baptized. Faith, including obedience, is made the substance of the profession in baptism by our standards, in all the places where the subject is treated. * Faith is the defining distinction of the Church as a society. The true Church consists of true believers; the visible Church of professed believers, and their children. Faith constitutes a Christian and the community of Christians. Like precious faith † is the fellowship of the Gospel, the family bond in the house of the Lord. ‡ Believers, it is said in the account of the progress of the early Church, were the more added unto the Lord. || Timothy was exhorted by Paul, to be an example of the believers. § When the Apostle would distinguish a Christian man from those not Christian, or a Christian relative from others, he uses the qualifying term *believing*, or describes as *one that believeth;* as — believing masters, unbelieving husband, an husband that believeth not, a wife that believeth not, any man or woman that believeth.¶ All men other than Christians are termed unbelievers and unbelieving. Faith makes the broad distinction between the two portions of the race. Unbelief expresses the natural state, and faith the state of grace. ** What men publish in coming into the Church, therefore, is that which constitutes the peculiar distinction of the Church, the ground of the fellowship of God's people, and the bond of union both to them and their common Redeemer; that is, their faith in Christ — and not their regeneration.

The most ardent friend of evangelical truth, now, need not be alarmed lest the doctrine of regeneration be sacrificed in the attempt to establish this view of a Christian profession, or lest we reduce the profession to the expression of a bare intellectual belief in Christ, such as any man who is not an infidel might make. Nothing can be needed beyond the fact that we accept the standards of the Church in their obvious sense, to give assurance that we hold with all possible zeal to the truth — that the Holy Spirit

* Confession of Faith, chap. xxviii. sec. v. Larger Catechism, Answer 166. Shorter Catechism, Ans. 95. † 2 Peter i: 1.

‡ Eph. iii: 15, 17. || Acts v: 14. § 1 Tim. iv: 12.

¶ 1 Tim. vi: 12. 1 Cor. vii: 12, 13. 1 Tim. v: 16. 1 Cor. xiv: 24.

** Rom. xi: 32. Mark xvi: 16.

Digitized by Google

must renew our wretched natures to fit us for the service of God and for heaven, and to the necessity of spirituality and engagedness of the heart in all true religion. But it is important to define with great clearness the precise significance of a profession of religion as it is called, in order that we may remove one of the most formidable difficulties from the way of serious-minded hearers of the Gospel. And it is imperative on us that we exclude every condition of salvation or of the enjoyment of the privileges of the Church, which our Lord has not plainly ordained.

The New Testament Scriptures throughout teach, with clearness and prominence, that regeneration is necessary to salvation. Especially is this announced with great emphasis by our Lord in his discourse with Nicodemus. Our standards, also, require a credible or hopeful evidence of this change, in all applicants before their admission into the Church. But the candidate's certain knowledge or even confident belief that he has experienced this change, is required by neither the Scriptures nor our standards, as necessary to a state of grace, to admission to the sacramental ordinances, or to final salvation. Much less can a solemn public profession of such knowledge, or such confident belief, be demanded of those coming into the Church, as the whole or as part of the confession the Lord Jesus requires. It is the duty of the officers who control the entrance into the Church and the approach to the sealing ordinances — and to this observation we direct the special attention of such — to seek to discover a true Christian experience in relation to this work of the Spirit, in all those whom they receive into the Church; by enquiring into their religious views, knowledge, feelings, purposes and exercises; and to admit none of whose renewal a reasonable and charitable hope cannot be entertained. The fact of the gracious work of the Spirit in the heart of the applicant, they are not to take upon his affirmation, but are to try to find out for themselves. The opinion of none of us concerning ourselves in this matter, perhaps, is worth much; but especially is the mere opinion of the young Christian about his own regeneration, of little value. He may lack the knowledge and skill in the application of Scriptural tests, which are required for determining it. Others of more knowledge and experience can better judge of it than he. An intelligent and practiced

Digitized by Google

physician does not approach his patient to ask him what his disease is; that is for his superior knowledge and skill to find out. He directs his enquiries so as to elicit symptoms, and then makes his own diagnosis. The patient tells him he feels weakness of limbs, numbness in his arms, lassitude, depression of spirits, pain and confusion of head; the tongue is found to be white, and the pulse quick and small; he may then tell the patient that he has Typhus Fever. In somewhat similar manner a session — who, if at all qualified for their place, must know more of the marks of true conversion than the candidate — should seek the evidences, and not his opinion, of his regenerate state. They should examine him in relation to the decisive features of Christian character; after which their opinion of his state may be more reliable than any he can give.

Still further, whilst the evidences of regeneration are required in the applicant for admission to the communion of the Church, the chief of those evidences is faith. The Apostle John says: "He that believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." It is precisely because faith is the exercise of a regenerate heart, and that one in which obedience and all holy affections have their spring — which, therefore, is both conclusive and inclusive of all else belonging to a regenerate soul — that it alone, in the Scriptures, defines and describes a Christian. That, therefore, which the officers of the Church are specially to seek to find out, in order to judge of the candidate's fitness for the Church — and this, perhaps, is the only form in which the enquiry can be Scripturally pursued — is whether he has a true faith in Christ. If he has such a faith, he is born of God. To enquire whether he has such a faith, is to enquire whether he is born of the Spirit. To suppose a bench of Christian elders satisfied of a candidate's faith and not satisfied of his regeneration, is to suppose them as weak and ignorant as the babe in Christ who may be before them — believing, conscious of faith, yet distrustful of his experience of the renewing influence of the Spirit; and in the very same error from which we seek to remove him; nay, in error grosser and more obstinate, since he has a natural diffidence, from his deep sense of personal unworthiness, in drawing the legitimate conclusion — more easily drawn for others — from his own faith concerning his

Digitized by Google

own state. It would be an ignorance in them of the very letter of the Scripture just quoted. The enquiry for faith, then, being essentially equivalent to that for regeneration, all the various tests given in the Scriptures may be used for determining it. The session are to try to find out from the candidate before them, whether he has the correct views which true faith requires — of his need of a Saviour, of the way in which he is to be saved, of what Christ is and what he has done; whether he has the affections which faith compels — repentance of sin, and love for Christ, for his people and for spiritual things; whether Christ is both properly apprehended and trustfully embraced, which is the essence of faith; whether there is wrought in the heart the disposition to obedience which accompanies true faith.

But now, though faith is the fruit of the Spirit and the conclusive evidence in itself of regenerating grace, the profession of these two things — faith and new birth — is by no means identical. The knowledge of the two is of different kinds. The one is a conscious act of the soul which may be confidently published. The other is a judgment, an inference from the Word of God and this experience. When we ask a man whether he has faith in Jesus Christ, he can reply confidently, I know that I believe. If we ask him whether he is regenerate, we ask him for an opinion, which it may be difficult for him to give. He may lack the knowledge of the Scriptures which is necessary to a reliable judgment, or find great difficulty in applying his theoretical knowledge to himself, when it involves a judgment which seems to him so high and so inconsistent with his great unworthiness. And the Scriptures seem to require modesty in pronouncing upon our own state — that we shall be very bold in confessing Christ, but very modest in professing concerning ourselves. We are commanded to rejoice with fear. It is certainly an imperfection, either of knowledge or of faith, to lack assurance of a regenerate state and of final salvation; yet it is plain that a genuine faith may exist without it — that even when assurance is possessed it is to be modestly entertained — and that it is faith in Christ, and not such assurance concerning ourselves, we are required to publish.

We will now state briefly, as we apprehend it, the precise sig-

Digitized by Google

nificance of a Christian profession. It is not a profession of our own subjective state, as being regenerate or born anew. We cannot require young Christians to come out and make a solemn asseveration of this kind, which were of so little worth if they could make it, and which the most experienced believer might hesitate to make. That which is to be published is something much higher and more important, and yet is a matter of far more definite knowledge. A Christian profession is a confession of Christ; a publication of faith in him, a faith whose object is out of and not in us. It is a faith not merely speculative or historical, or limited to a single fact or a portion of the facts concerning Christ. It is a faith confessed with the lips from the heart, * and which embraces all the work and offices of Christ. It is such a belief on him as a divine and appointed Saviour, as works repentance for sins, love for his person, dependence upon his atonement and mediation, reliance upon his grace to sanctify and to save, submission to his authority and obedience to his commands. The publication of this faith is in the form of a covenant with Christ, of which the sacraments of the Church are the signs and seals. The believer engages himself to the Saviour — to trust, love and obedience — to accept his perfect salvation, and to live and die in his service. The language of the heart in the transaction is expressed in one of our hymns: —

To this dear covenant of thy word,
I set my worthless name;
I seal the engagement to my Lord,
And make my humble claim.

Thy light, and strength, and pardoning grace,
And glory shall be mine;
My life and soul, my heart and flesh,
And all my powers are thine.

This is a far more valuable expression from the young Christian, than any affirmation of his regeneration, and, we hold, is the true expression in a Christian profession.

The views which we have presented — which we believe are in

* Rom. x: 9.

Digitized by Google

agreement with the Scriptures, with our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and with the older standard writers of the Reformed Church — we submit first to our brethren in the ministry and eldership. If the import of a profession of religion were set forth as we have endeavored to present it — particularly as involving no affirmation, one way or the other, of the person making it, concerning his regeneration — thus relieving him of the painful diffidence and trouble of conscience on this score; would not many who are discouraged by this difficulty meeting them at the very threshold, be led to the serious consideration of their whole duty in relation to a Christian life? And would there not be many more applicants for admission into our Churches, who would make useful and exemplary members? If this view were entertained by our sessions, and kept before them in their examinations of candidates, would not those examinations be rendered more discriminating, and far less of a terror to those desiring to come into the communion of the Church? And, especially, can we, without imposing conditions to the enjoyment of the privileges of the Church which our Lord has not ordained, demand more, of those seeking admission from us, than a credible profession of faith in him?

If there should be among the readers of these pages, any serious persons enquiring into their duty in respect to taking a public stand as Christians, we commend to their careful consideration the views that have been presented. It will be found, we think, that a profession of religion, while solemn in its nature and obligations, is yet not the unreasonable, dreadful and appalling thing that they may have conceived it to be. There is in it no terrible deposition upon oath to a fact about which they cannot but have misgivings, of the regeneration of their hearts by the Spirit of God. If they have faith in the divine Saviour and can affirm that, they should not longer keep back from the sacramental ordinances in which it is professed, and by which it is strengthened. If they feel that their faith is small and weak, they may know that it is not the strength but the kind of faith the Saviour requires. A bruised reed he will not break. See the frail and slender reed on the river bank; a stone thrown with inadvertence from the hand of a boy will prostrate it. Such, al-

Digitized by Google

ready bruised and ready to fall, is the emblem of the weakness of a faith he will accept and cherish. If they have any faith, any warming of heart towards him, any trust in him, let them not be afraid that he will reject them. Let them not be afraid to approach him in the ordinances he has appointed for the manifestation and support of his people.

The views presented have, also, an important bearing on the question of the power of the Church to release from a Christian profession. The answer to the question turns upon what a Christian profession is decided to be. If it be a profession of regeneration, then the person who makes it, if he is afterwards satisfied that he was mistaken and is yet unregenerate, can come back to the Church and reasonably demand that his name be canceled from its roll. But if it be a publication of faith in Christ and a covenant with him, it is not in the power of a Church to decide that his faith was wrong — that Jesus is not the divine Saviour — or to annul his engagement with the Lord. It is a step he must take upon his own responsibility. The development of this argument, however, does not come within the bounds which were in the outstart proposed for this discussion. The bearing of the discussion upon the question is barely noted, for the consideration of any who may have it as a practical question before them.

R. L. B.

Digitized by Google

Art. III. — *Ulfilas.*

Ulfilas. Die Heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Bundes in Gothischer Sprache. Mit Gegenüberstehendem Griechischem und Lateinischem Texte, Anmerkungen, Wörterbuch, Sprachlehre, und Geschichtlicher Einleitung von H. F. Massmann. Stuttgart. Verlag von S. G. Liesching. 1857.

No. II.

The Goths, as we attempted to show in a previous article, belonged to the great Germanic family of nations. Christianity was first introduced among them by Christian captives, taken in their wars against the Roman empire, during the third century. Among these captives were persons of the clerical order, whose dignified appearance, exemplary walk, and active charity made a deep and abiding impression upon the rude and susceptible sons of the North. These missionary captives continued among the Goths and labored for the diffusion of Christianity among them. To such an extent were their labors successful that Socrates mentions, among the bishops who subscribed the decisions of the Nicene Council, a certain Theophilus, bishop of the Goths.

Among the Christian families carried away captive by the Goths were the ancestors of Ulphilas. According to Philostorgius, a Cappadocian, they were taken from Sadagothia, or Sadagolthina, a village in the vicinity of the city of Parnassus, in Cappadocia. From this country Basil of Cæsarea says that the Goths received the first seeds of Christianity, a statement rendered probable by the union of the Gothic with the Cappadocian Churches, at a later period.

The name of Ulphilas, though he was of Roman origin, is German, which may be easily accounted for by the long residence of his ancestors among the Goths. It is variously written Ulphilas, Ulfilas, Wulfila, and evidently corresponds to the modern German name Wolf.

Concerning the date of his birth historians are not agreed. According to Philostorgius he was employed in negotiations with the emperor Constantius, who had a high respect for him, and

Digitized by Google

called him the Moses of his time. This historian places the whole period of Ulphilas' labors, within the reign of Constantine; but this is contradicted by the statements of other Church-historians. These contradictory statements Neander thinks may be brought into agreement by assuming that Ulphilas lived to a very old age. He supposes that he began his labors, as a bishop among the Goths, as early as the time of Constantine; and then to reconcile the conflicting testimony of historians he conjectures that he may have exercised the functions of the episcopal office during a period of fifty years. This conjecture, however, does not accord with the statement of a manuscript, preserved in Paris, which, from the character in which it is written, is believed to belong to the second half of the fourth century. This manuscript, or rather a note inserted in it by Auxentius of Dorostoros, a Gothic bishop, expressly states that Ulphilas died in Constantinople, in A. D. 388, in the seventieth year of his life. This would fix the date of his birth in A. D. 318, — more than half a century after his ancestors had been carried away captives by the Goths. If he died in the year specified in this manuscript, and if, according to the conjecture of Neander, he exercised the functions of the episcopal office during a period of fifty years, then he must have been ordained to that office when he was twenty years of age, a supposition which is very improbable. Amidst such conflicting testimony it is difficult to determine the exact date of his birth. Enough has been determined, however, to warrant us in asserting that the whole of his life upon earth was confined to the fourth century. During that century he was born, he lived, labored and died.

Little is known of Ulphilas before his consecration to the office of bishop. He early became a teacher or reader among his people, the Goths of Mœsia. How long he continued his labors in that capacity is not known with certainty. Massmann, following the authority of Auxentius of Dorostoros, in regard to the date of Ulphilas' birth, states, in his introduction to the edition that heads our article, that he was consecrated bishop of his people, in A. D. 348, in the thirtieth year of his age. This would fix his elevation to the episcopate in the reign of Constantius, the son of Constantine, a date at variance with the authority of

Digitized by Google

Philostorgius. But this Church-historian, being an Arian, had an interest in antedating the time of Ulphilas' consecration, in order to make it appear that the latter was an Arian from the first.

Immediately after his consecration Ulphilas entered with great zeal and success upon his episcopal duties among his countrymen. Many of them were converted to Christianity, among whom was Frithigern, the friend of the Romans. He labored successfully, also, among the people of Athanaric, the Gothic chief, who made war against the emperor Valens. This haughty Goth disdained the yoke of both the empire and the Gospel, and excited a persecution against his Christian countrymen, many of whom, both men and women, suffered martyrdom. Ulphilas, who was held in high esteem by the Imperial court, at Constantinople, appeared twice before it, in behalf of the distressed Goths, who implored the protection of Valens, who received the suppliants into the Roman territories. Under their bishop, as a leader, these Goths crossed the Danube, entered Mœsia, and settled at the foot of Hæmus. Among the ravines and valleys of this mountain range they found pastures for their flocks and herds; and here their descendants, in later times, were known under the appellation of *Gothi Minores*. In this region Ulphilas spent thirty-three years of his episcopate, having spent the first seven north of the Danube.

It does not fall in with the design of this article to enter into the details of the life and labors of this man. The chief object in view is to give an account of his great work, the translation of the Bible into Gothic. Previous to this it may, however, be proper to say something about his religious belief, inasmuch as he has been accused of Arianism. Gibbon says:

"Whatever might be the early sentiments of Ulphilas, his connections with the empire and the Church were formed during the reign of Arianism. The apostle of the Goths subscribed the creed of Rimini; professed with freedom, and perhaps with sincerity, that the *Son* was not equal or consubstantial to the *Father*; communicated these errors to the clergy and people; and infected the Barbaric world with a heresy, which the great Theodosius proscribed and extinguished among the Romans."

Digitized by Google

It is probable that Ulphilas was, at first, an adherent of the Nicene creed; for he followed the teaching of the Gothic bishop Theophilus, who had been one of the signers of that creed. But, according to Socrates, he subscribed the Arian creed, drawn up at Constantinople, in the year 360, under the emperor Constantius. The same Church-historian relates that many Goths, of the tribe to which Ulphilas belonged, were induced, by the assistance and support which the emperor Valens afforded to them, to embrace Christianity, but at the same time, also, to espouse the Arian doctrine then prevailing in the Roman empire. Sozomenus substantially agrees with Socrates. So does Theodoret, who says that the Goths maintained the true faith until the time of the emperor Valens, when the Arian bishop at court, Eudoxius, represented to them that agreement in religious doctrine would cement the union between them and the Romans. The whole dispute between the Arians and the orthodox was represented as a matter of trifling importance; and by fair speeches and presents Ulphilas was prevailed upon to give his assent to the Arian creed.

Some are of the opinion that Ulphilas and the Goths did not become Arians in the full sense of that term, but that they inclined to semi-Arianism, since they would not say that the Son is a *creature*, though they held communion with those who maintained that heresy.

But let Ulphilas speak for himself. His creed, which, according to Massmann, was originally written in Gothic, has been transmitted to us in Latin by Auxentius. Massmann translates the Latin of Auxentius into German, of which the following is an exact copy:

"Ich, Wulfila, Bischof und Bekenner, habe alle Zeit so geglaubt und bekenne diesen allein wahren Glauben vor meinem Gott und Herrn:

"Ich glaube an einen einigen ungebornen und unsichtbaren (oder untheilbaren) Gott, *Vater*, und an seinen eingebornen *Sohn*, unsern Herrn und Gott, den Schöpfer alles Geschöpfes, dem Keiner gleich ist sondern der Gott ist Aller, auch über die Unsrigen; und an den Heiligen *Geist*, die Kraft, welche erleuchtet und heiligt (wie Christus zur Belehrung zu den Aposteln sagt: 'Sieh, Ich werde die Verheissung meines Vaters zu Euch senden; Ihr aber weilet in der Stadt Jerusalem, bis Ihr anziehen werdet die Kraft aus der Höhe'[Luc. xxiv: 49]; desglei-

Digitized by Google

chen, 'Und Ihr werdet empfangen die Kraft, welche Euch überkommen wird, den heiligen Geist' [Ap. Gesch. i: 8]) der selbst weder Gott noch Herr, sondern ein Diener Christi und dem Sohne in Allem untergeben und gehorsam ist, wie der Sohn in Allem untergeben und gehorsam ist Gott dem Vater, der immerdar heilig ist . . . . . durch Christum Jesum und den heiligen Geist. Amen!" *

This creed Ulphilas, according to the testimony of Auxentius, taught uniformly during the forty years of his episcopate. It contains no allusion to the dispute about *homoousios* and *homoiousios* — a dispute familiar to the inmates of both huts and palaces, throughout the Greek empire. Perhaps the rude Goths were incapable of appreciating the refined and subtile distinctions of the Greeks; but however that may have been, it is probable that Ulphilas did not wish to acknowledge himself a disciple of either the *Homoousians* or *Homoiousians*. He considered both, according to Auxentius, "detestable, godless dividers of the one everlasting Church, perverters of Holy Scripture, as much to be considered un- and anti-Christian as the sects of Manicheans, Marcionites, Montanists, Paulinians, Sabellians, Patripassians and Donatists." It has been already stated that he signed the creed drawn up at Constantinople, in 360, as a kind of Henoticon. The Churches seemed to be reconciled, but disturbances soon broke out afresh. Hence probably arose the indignation of Ulphilas against both parties, which he very freely expressed in his Gothic vernacular. Judging from the creed just given, Ulphilas doubtless was attached to a middle system, which allowed the greatest affinity possible between the Father and the Son, short of unity of essence.

* "I, Wulfila, bishop and confessor, have always thus believed, and I acknowledge this only true faith before my God and Lord: I believe in one only unborn and invisible (or indivisible) God, and in his only begotten Son, our Lord and God, the Creator of every creature, to whom no one is equal, but he is God of all, also over ours; and in the Holy Ghost, the power, which enlightens and sanctifies, (as Christ in his instruction to the Apostles says: "Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high," [Luke xxiv: 49]; likewise, "and ye shall receive power which shall come upon you, the Holy Ghost," [Acts i: 8]) who is himself neither God nor Lord, but a servant of Christ and subject and obedient to the Son, in every thing, as the Son is subject and obedient, in every thing, to God the Father, who is ever holy . . . . . through Christ Jesus and the Holy Ghost. Amen!"

Digitized by Google

It may be asked whether the charge of Arianism against Ulphilas meets with any support from his translation of the Bible. As the doctrines of Arianism are based more upon the interpretation than the mere form of passages, there is little opportunity for their appearance in a translation which adheres with any degree of fidelity to the original. One place, however, has been pointed out, in which the bias of the translator's mind may be noticed. It is Phil. ii: 6, which he renders: "Saei in guthaskáunein visands ni vulva rahnida visan, sik galeikô gutha" — who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be *like* [instead of *equal to*] God. 1 Tim iii: 16 is translated: "Jah unsahtaba mikils ïst gagudeins runa, saei gabairhtiths varth in leika," &c. — and without controversy great is the mystery of godliness, *who* [instead of *God*] was manifest in the flesh, &c. But as many critics are undecided respecting the true reading of this passage, it is the part of charity, apart from other evidence of his Arianism, to give Ulphilas the benefit of their doubt. *

Having alluded to the great work of Ulphilas — his translation of the Bible into Gothic — we will conclude the present article with a brief account of it. This translation is an interesting monument of the primitive German language, and of those stormy times when the Roman Empire was falling to pieces. Its readings, moreover, have formed a portion of the apparatus of Biblical criticism since the time of Mill.

The precise period when this version was finished, cannot be determined. All we know is that it was made by Ulphilas, whose life extended from A. D. 318 to A. D. 388. Consequently, during that period — probably the latter half of it — the Holy Scriptures were rendered into Gothic. Some are of the opinion that the Gothic language, at this period, had no Alphabet, and that Ulphilas invented one as the necessary beginning of his work. It is known, however, that the Goths, before the time of Ulphilas, had Runic characters, which consist almost exclusively of such lines as can be easily engraven on stone or carved on

* Massmann says, it is known that Macedonius, during the reign of the emperor Anastasius, changed ὁς into θεὸς (ὁς . $\overline{\Theta\varsigma}$); but he does not give his authority. "Locum sæpe inspeximus, sed fugit aciem veritas." Editor Codex Alexandrinus.

Digitized by Google

wood. These Runic characters were originally sixteen in number, entirely different from the Greek and Shemitic letters, and bore but a very equivocal resemblance to the Roman. Some of these characters were transferred into the so-called Gothic Alphabet formed by Ulphilas. Acting upon the elective principle, he appropriated two or three letters from the Roman Alphabet, but the greatest number he took from the Greek. The Gothic Alphabet, therefore, consists of Runic, Roman, and Gothic characters, and contains, according to some, twenty-four letters; according to others, among whom is Gesenius, twenty-six; but Massmann, in his Gothic Grammar, gives twenty-seven, including two numerical characters. Such is the composition of the Alphabet, which Ulphilas formed for the preservation of the Word of God in the Gothic tongue.

The Church-historians, Socrates and Sozomenus, say, in general terms, that Ulphilas translated the Holy Scriptures into Gothic; whilst Philostorgius and Isidorus expressly assert that he omitted the books of Kings, from a fear that their warlike narratives would exert a pernicious influence upon the minds of his countrymen, who were too much addicted to warlike pursuits. Their creed, moreover, before their conversion to Christianity, had taught them that the souls of heroes slain in battle would inhabit Walhalla, the palace of immortality, where they would feast sumptuously in the halls of Odin. Apprehensive that the effects of their heathen education would continue after their conversion, the prudent bishop deemed it expedient to debar them from access to those portions of Scripture that speak of war, so that their minds might be the more perfectly weaned from their heathen associations. That he acted faithfully with the Word of God in this, no one, who believes the Scriptures to be of divine authority, will affirm. His omission of these books, if true, evinced a rationalistic method of treating the Sacred Oracles, which, in modern times, is too common among the Teutonic race. Massmann, however, seems to receive the testimony of Philostorgius and Isidorus with some degree of reserve; and as the translation, in the condition in which it has come down to us, is fragmentary, containing only small portions of the books of the Old Testament, the question of the omission of the books of Kings cannot be positively determined.

Digitized by Google

It would be more important to determine, if we were able, whether he translated the Acts of the Apostles, Revelation, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, especially as the latter has never been in good odor with the Arians. No fragments of these books are found in his version in its present condition. This fact, however, does not afford positive proof that they were not translated — for the Epistles of Peter, James, John and Jude are also entirely wanting.

The portions of this venerable version that remain to us are a few fragments of the five books of Moses, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Habakkuk, Malachi, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Romans, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First Thessalonians, Second Thessalonians, First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. Some of these fragments are very short. For instance, of Proverbs we have only the twenty-first and twenty-second verses of the twenty-fifth chapter; and of Job but a single verse. The most complete books are the four Gospels, Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First and Second Thessalonians, and the Epistles of Paul to Timothy. Some of these contain nearly all that we have in our version. It is a matter of regret that any part should be wanting. Inferior though it be to other versions in the department of Textual criticism, yet to the philologist and Biblical scholar it possesses great interest.

The basis of this version is the Greek, though some passages may be pointed out, in which Latin influence is manifest. The translator imitates Greek constructions, and in his rendering of compound words, as well as in his mistakes, he shows that he had the Greek text before him.

Appended to Massmann's edition of this translation are a few fragments of the *Skeireins*, or exposition of the Gospel of John, which the editor attributes to Ulphilas. In this exposition the doctrines of Sabellius and Marcellus are called *afgudôn haifst* [a godless contention,] which confirms the testimony of Auxentius, already quoted, that Ulphilas contended during his whole life against separatists and errorists, and left behind him many

Digitized by Google

treatises and expositions for the use of the pious, for the edification of Christians. It is not certain whether these were originally written in Gothic, or whether they were translated from the Greek. The construction of the sentences, the occurrence of the anacoluthon, and certain passages, prove, at least, a free use of Greek writers, especially of the Arian Theodorus of Heraclea, and Ammonius.

The existence of the Gothic version of the Scriptures became known, in modern times, in the latter half of the sixteenth century. The first knowledge was obtained, in the year 1563, of the *Codex Argenteus*, in a correspondence between Conrad Gesner, a physician in Zurich, and Achilles P. Gasser, of the same profession in Augsburg. Gesner had received, from John William Reiffenstein of Stolberg, the Gothic Alphabet, together with some specimens of that language; and George Cassander, who died at Cologne in 1566, had sent him others, obtained, doubtless, from the same source. It was these that he mentioned in his letters to his friend in Augsburg.

Goropius Becanus published, in 1569, in his *Origines Antwerpianæ*, the Pater Noster and some other pieces in Gothic. These were copied, according to his statement, from a very old manuscript in the library of the monastery of Werden on the Ruhr, and put into his hands by Maximilian Morillon, a brother of Antony Morillon, the Secretary of Cardinal de Granvelle. Soon after this, Arnold Mercator transcribed some other verses from the same manuscript. In this manner the existence of a Gothic version of the Scriptures was brought to light at the time already mentioned. *

This manuscript is generally believed to be the same as that in the library of the University of Upsala, in Sweden, and is designated the *Codex Argenteus*, on account of the silver letters in which it is written. Its age is a matter of dispute. Some are of the opinion that it was written for a Gothic king in the sixth century. This opinion may have originated from the fact that it is written on purple vellum, and in letters of silver. Such

* As Cologne, Stolberg and Werden are in the same vicinity, Reiffenstein and Cassander doubtless received the specimens that they sent to Gesner, either directly or indirectly, from the monastery of Werden.

Digitized by Google

manuscripts were in use during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, as some in Münich, Strasburg, Paris, and Rome, belonging to these centuries, fully prove. But whether they were all written for kings is a question that cannot be solved. Others are of the opinion that it is the original of Ulphilas himself; but this opinion the artistic manner of its execution and the existence of various readings on the margin disprove.

Some may have curiosity to learn how this manuscript was removed from Werden to Upsala. In the first place, it is supposed that it was sent from Werden to Prague for safe-keeping, during the thirty years' war. In the year 1648, near the close of that war, the Swedes took Prague, and among the spoils Count Königsmark sent it to Stockholm. There it remained until the abdication of Queen Christina, when it disappeared from the royal library at Stockholm; and it was afterwards found to be in the Netherlands, in the possession of her librarian Isaac Vossius. It is not necessary to suppose, as some have done, that he came by it dishonestly. It may have been given to him by the Queen. While it was in his hands a copy of it was made by Derrer. Puffendorf, in 1662, gave information to Count Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie that it was in the possession of Vossius, and that nobleman purchased it for the library of the University of Upsala, where it still remains.

"Vossius had previously placed the MS. in the hands of Junius, his uncle, for publication; and in 1665 the text of the Gothic Gospels, so far as contained in this MS., was edited at Dort under his care; it was accompanied by the Anglo-Saxon version, edited by Thomas Marshall. This edition was in Gothic characters cast for the purpose, and for it Junius employed the transcript made by Derrer.

"In 1671, after the codex had returned to Sweden, Stiernhielm published an edition in Roman characters: this was accompanied by Icelandic, Swedish, German, and Latin versions. In the last century Benzel made preparations for a new edition, which was executed after his death by Edward Lye in 1750.

"Thus far the Gothic Gospels alone were known, and that only from the *Codex Argenteus*. This MS. when found consisted of 188 leaves, in quarto size: not only was the text in silver letters, but the beginnings of the sections were in gold. In many parts the book was

Digitized by Google

defective: it seems that when entire it would have consisted of 320 leaves." *

It has been already remarked that the *Codex Argenteus* contains only the four Gospels, and these in a defective condition; bnt some of the defects have been supplied by Mai from the Ambrosian palimpsests, and a few more by Massmann from a Gothic exposition. Still there are many passages wanting.

The mention of palimpsests brings us to the next point in the progress of discovery. In the year 1756, Abbot Knittel discovered in a manuscript at Wolfenbüttel, which was written over with the *Hispal. Origines of Isidorus*, some fragments of the Gothic translation of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. These fragments he read, with the assistance of Jonas Appelblæd of Upsal, and published in 1762.

This small edition of fragments, by Abbot Knittel, together with the *Codex Argenteus*, comprehended all that was known of the version of Ulphilas until 1817. In that year, Cardinal Angelo Mai, librarian of the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana in Milan, while engaged in the search for palimpsest, noticed some Gothic writing under one of the codices, which he found to be portions of the Holy Scriptures. A further search led to the discovery of four other palimpsests. These five Gothic documents Cardinal Mai investigated, with the assistance of Count Carlo Ottavio Castiglione, who was well skilled in Teutonic dialects, and communicated them in part to the public in 1819. Other communications of them were made by Castiglione in 1834, 1835, and 1839, when the publication of them was completed.

The *first* of these palimpsests contains the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, 1st and 2nd Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1st and 2nd Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, together with a fragment of the Gothic Calendar.

The *second* contains the two Epistles to the Corinthians, the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1st and 2nd Thessalonians, and Titus. Some of the deficiences of the preceding manuscript are supplied by this.

The *third* has fragments of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

* Horne's Introduction, vol. IV, page 802. London, 1856.

Digitized by Google

Its discovery was considered peculiarly valuable, as previous to this no portion of the Old Testament in Gothic was known to exist.

The *fourth* consists of a small quarto sheet, containing fragments of the twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seventh chapters of Matthew's Gospel, which are wanting in the *Codex Argenteus.*

The *fifth* contains an account of the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon. Under the later writing some fragments of ancient authors have been discovered, together with a fragment of a Gothic Homily, full of Biblical quotations, which bears the character of a translation from one of the fathers of the Greek Church.

There is one manuscript more, called the Salzburg Manuscript, which supplies some portions of the book of Genesis.

The contents of these manuscripts, including the Skeireins, Massmann has embodied in his edition of Ulphilas' version of the Scriptures into Gothic, published in Stuttgart, in 1857. In this volume the Gothic occupies the left-hand page; and on the other page, in two columns, are the corresponding Greek and Latin. The Greek seems to be such a text as, in the opinion of the editor, Ulphilas had before him when he made his translation; and the Latin is a copy of the Vulgate. The editor has prefixed a valuable historical introduction, in German; and appended a Gothic Lexicon and Grammar, by these means furnishing a complete apparatus for the reading of the Scriptures in Gothic.

The extant fragments of this version, the fragments of the Skeireins, of a Gothic Calendar, and of a homily, are the only specimens of Gothic literature that have come down to us. The *Gothicon* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus — lays sung at court by circus-riders dressed in the garb of Goths — and the inscription on a yard-stick, are not considered genuine. The Gothic version of the Scriptures possesses more interest to the philologist than to the theologian, since it exhibits the oldest forms of the German language. As an aid to Biblical criticism it cannot occupy the high place that belongs to some of the older versions. Hence its chief interest to the Biblical student must be as a monument

Digitized by Google

of the fourth century, and as an exhibition of the kind of text that was used in making the Gothic translation.

On a review of all that remains to us of the version of Ulphilas, we are inclined to the opinion that he undertook and accomplished a translation of all the books of both the Old and New Testament; or at least, if he failed in completing a translation of all, he omitted none on the ground attributed to him by Philostorgius. He fully intended to give to his countrymen the Word of God complete in their own language. This was certainly a great and noble work, one that will ever remain a monument of his piety and zeal. For this work the Christian world will cherish his memory; while, at the same time, every devout and orthodox Christian will regret that the translator of the Scriptures into Gothic has not left us more indubitable evidence of the soundness of his faith. C. E.

Art. IV. — *Cuba, from a Recent View.*

At the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico, forming a great gate to its only outlet, lies the Island of Cuba. Its extreme South-West point is Cape San Antonia, in about 84° 57′, West from Greenwich, and distant from the extreme North-East point of Yucatan about 130 miles. The direction of the Island is thence North-East, until its highest North point reaches within the same distance of Florida, being due South from the South point of Florida, and in latitude 23° 10′ North, thus forming with this side the rocky gate to the entrance of the gulf. It sweeps off thence towards the South-East, until its extreme South-East point reaches latitude 19° 50′ North, and longitude 74° 7′ West, and is distant from Hayti about 40 miles. In this direction it forms, with Hayti and Porto Rico, the gates to the Caribbean sea. The entire length of the Island, following its partially crescent shape, is about 760 miles, and its mean width about 52 miles. Its greatest width is about 127 miles, and its least, which is from Havanna

Digitized by Google

to Batabano on the south coast, about 28 miles: and it has an area of about 43,000 or 44,000 square miles.

By far the largest and most important of the West India Islands, locking on one side our great American Mediterranean, and on the other the Carribbean sea — so near to us, so prolific in its productions, and so strong in its natural and artificial defences — it becomes a place of great interest to our people.

In natural advantages it is hardly surpassed by any part of the world. Its soil is exceedingly fertile and strong; the richest being of a reddish brown color, and in many parts inexhaustible in its depth and strength: adapted to the production of all tropical fruits and plants, and affording fine crops twice a year of many of the cereals. But it seems specially adapted to the growth of Rice, Coffee, Tobacco and Sugar-Cane. This last requires to be replanted but once in twelve years, and we were shown some fields now growing in the Island that have not been renewed for more than twenty years, and the cane still produces well upon them. This, together with the fact that the grinding season for the cane, or as they call it the "sugar season," lasts for six months, makes it one of the finest sugar-growing countries in the world.

Renowned as it is for the production of fine tobacco, it is not every part of the Island that is suited to its growth, nor are the richest valley lands employed for that purpose; but the best tobacco, richest in flavor and of the softest texture, is grown at certain elevations on plateaus near the mountains. But when the proper elevation and exposure are secured, a quality of that coveted narcotic is produced which for richness and delicacy of flavor and texture is nowhere surpassed.

The native growth of its forests is not less valuable and varied in their proportion. Some of the hardest and most durable kinds of timber are found here in rich abundance; so much so, that for more than seventy years Cuba was the nursery of the Spanish fleet, furnishing a large number of the ships of the "Invincible Armada," and ceased to be the grand navy yard for Spain only because it attracted too much labor and capital from the mother country. Among the most valuable woods common in the Island

Digitized by Google

are the Mahogany, Lignum-Vitæ, Ebony, the Lance wood, and what is commonly known as the Havana Cedar. The characteristic tree of the Island to the eye of a stranger is the Palm. Rising with a straight and evenly formed body, without a limb or projection of any sort, from sixty to eighty feet, then having a kind of neck or stem eight or nine feet in length, perfectly green, and from the top of this a series of broad, flat, feather-like branches put out, forming a small but dense and very unique foliage; and rising out of the very summit and centre of this foliage is a long, strait, and pointed shaft. Every where, over cultivated fields, and rising out of the dense forests, this singular tree meets the eye, ever green, and tall, and stately — if not the royal tree, at least the old hidalgo of the forest.

Many writers, especially foreigners, have asserted that the Palm is of no use. This idea naturally grows out of the fact that it seems to bear no fruit, and the wood appears too soft for use. But a more intimate acquaintance with the interior life of the Island would have corrected the mistake. This tree is called the poor man's friend; for with it he builds his entire house — sides, floor, roof and thatching. Every part of it is useful to him. He even feeds his hungry cattle from the seeds that cluster in bunches at the base of the first branches.

But the climate of this favored land is not less attractive than the soil. Lying just within the torrid zone, Cuba enjoys a perpetual summer. And yet it is a summer relieved with pleasant variations, and tempered by regular and copious rains and perpetual breezes. The mean temperature of the hottest months, July and August, is from 83° to 85°, and of the coldest, December and January, about 70°. The thermometer does not often sink so low as 50°, and for many years together was not observed to rise above 89°. These figures have reference to places of medium temperature, and not to the direct rays of the sun.

The rainy season commences usually with May, and lasts till November, during which the rain falls in torrents, almost every day — and yet there are parts of almost every day, when the sun comes out clear and warm, and pouring his direct rays on the moist verdure, gives a wonderful impetus to every species of

Digitized by Google

vegetation. Still, during all this time, the heat and sultriness of the season are relieved by the dense canopy of ever-returning clouds, and by the never-failing winds that blow inward from the sea for half the day and night, and outward the other half. But the most delightful season is from December to May — when the rains have ceased, the atmosphere is clear and dry, and the air balmy and grateful to the senses. In the day time, when the steady gentle breeze is tempering the warm rays of a healthful sun, you may recline under the dense Mango or Almond tree, listen to the sounds of birds of most brilliant hue, and, musing, look away into a sky whose depth of clear blue seems indeed unfathomable; and in your dreamy reverie lose yourself in the pleasing delusion that you have found an earthly Eden. Or stay till the shades of evening come on, and one after another of the stars come out; and as you look up through that clear atmosphere, you seem to approach nearer to those heavenly orbs, or they to come down closer to you; and you look away beyond the first to others, and still others, deep back in the distant recesses of that forest of worlds, and come at last to appreciate, with your unassisted eye, what astronomers have so often told us of the differences of distances, and the almost infinite depths of that space made so glorious by the presence of these worlds of light. It is an atmosphere for rest and dreamy reveries, but by no means conducive to energy, either of thought or action. Hence it is so fine a resort for the brain-weary and exhausted worker, of colder climates; who, in the fierceness and energy of his ceaseless strife — a strife for bread or glory, for duty or honor — has consumed his strength or overtaxed some vital organ.

The general face of the country is sufficiently varied to be very agreeable. A mountain range runs nearly, if not quite, the whole length of the Island, from North-West to South-East, and rises in some places to the height of 8,000 or 8,700 feet; and from this central range spurs put out towards the coast on either side, and give all the variety and beauty of hill and valley — of elevated plateaus and level plains. From this central range of mountains rivers take their rise, and flow down either way towards the ocean; some of them large enough to allow of navi-

Digitized by Google

gation for several miles; one even as much as sixty miles for large vessels.

Some of the scenery formed by these mountains and deep valleys as they approach the sea, is said not to be surpassed by the bold Alpine views in Switzerland, or the magnificent panoramas of the Rhine. Of one of these, the valley of the Yumurí, near the city of Matanzas, we had heard much, even before reaching the Island; and embraced the first opportunity after arriving at that city to visit it. The following is a journal sketch of that excursion, written soon after:

"March 8th. This morning we are off for the most beautiful drive in the vicinity, if not in the Island. Our arrangements being completed under the auspices of attentive friends at the American Hotel, and of Dr. Martin, the very kind and efficient American Consul at Matanzas, we started a little after sunrise, and in the early morning began the rough and difficult ascent of the Cumbre, a crescent mountain that separates between the sea and the valley of the Yumurí.

Our company, composed of ladies and gentlemen, accompanied by the Consul, amounting in all to eleven persons, in four volantes and on five horses, started in fine spirits, each finding something in their own view more beautiful than the rest to which to call the attention of all. As we ascended the mountain we came to a small plateau on our winding road, and paused to take our first view. As we looked back we saw the city we had just left lying in beauty at our feet; away beyond this the high and conspicuous form of an isolated mountain, rising many thousand feet right out of the plain, called, from its peculiar shape as it is seen far at sea by the sailors, the Pan of Matanzas; and at our side the crescent bay, calm in the morning sun as the sleep of childhood; and on its other shore the green fields of sugar cane, and still further behind these the high hills of the Camarioka terminating the view, as their summits seemed to meet the sky. We had advanced but a little distance further, when we turned to the other side of the narrow ridge up which our road was winding, and there in a moment burst upon our view one of the loveliest prospects ever beheld. The valley of the Yumurí, encircled on

Digitized by Google

all sides by high hills — having but a single narrow outlet, through which the Yumurí river flows — is about three miles in diameter, almost circular, and quite level. Its soil is exceedingly fertile, and its whole area under fine cultivation. As we stood on the heights of the Cumbre, one of the hills by which it is enclosed, all this scene lay before us at a glance; the green and luxuriant cane, the fields dotted over with men busy at work, or cattle grazing leisurely on the lawn; here and there a country seat with its cottage quarters surrounding, embowered in groves of Orange, and Lime, and Cocoa trees: and through the whole scene, the little river meandering its way, in the distance like a thread of silver on cloth of emerald velvet; and over all, towering in glory and beauty, the royal Palm; and then around this lovely spot arose an amphitheatre of hills, gradual, grand and regular, as if the fabled gods of antiquity had made this the arena of their celestial sports, and reared these mighty hills for their audience seats.

Turning reluctantly away from this point of view we soon reached the summit of the mountain, and found ourselves on a narrow ridge that separated between the valley we had just left and the ocean. Here we had the beauties of our two last views presented at once. On one side lay the ocean, calm and majestic in the morning sun, and so quiet that it seemed asleep, while a gauzy mist half covered its slumbers. On the other, the beautiful valley, with the hills beyond, piled up against still more distant hills for a back ground. Nothing could surpass the grandeur and loveliness of this scene — mingling in perfect harmony the sublime and the beautiful.

A little further on, the ridge upon which we were riding expands into a fertile plain, sloping down to the shore of the ocean. Here, an American gentleman, Mr. Jenkes, who has resided for more than fifty years in the Island, has his country seat, and cultivates a small *ingenio* or sugar estate; retaining also a grove, and some of the beautiful avenues characteristic of the *cafetal* or coffee estate. His house, large and comfortable, built after the style of Cuban planters, is placed on the very brow of the hill, overlooking ocean, valley and city, almost at a glance. Here we enjoyed a delightful ramble through his grounds, among fruit

Digitized by Google

trees and flower gardens, gathering of either at pleasure; and then returned to the mansion to enjoy a bounteous repast from his generous hospitality, for which our ride had given us a keen relish. Having enjoyed the ride, the scenery and the breakfast, we returned rapidly by another road, which led us through the very centre of the lovely valley — the more rapidly as we saw a rain winding down one of the deep gorges, and threatening to intercept our way. Here we had a nearer view of what had seemed so charming from the hills, and it is enough to say that distance had not lent all the enchantment to the scene.

We passed out by the deep cut through which the river escapes to the bay. Its rocky walls, overhanging or perpendicular, arise on either side two or three hundred feet high; their faces ornamented with immense stalactites of various hues; and far up amongst them could be seen the entrance to a cave. At the base of these cliffs on one side winds the road; on the other flows the river Yumurí, in some places expanding into quiet and beautiful little lakes.

Tradition connects with these scenes the memory of many heroic and bloody deeds. The story of one of these, from which the river and valley take their name, was given us on the spot, and ran thus: — When the Spaniards first came to the Island they found it inhabited by peaceful and confiding Indians, whom they soon began to dispossess of their lands, and to make them slaves to till them. A tribe dwelt in and around this valley. Being attacked by the Spaniards, they sustained several very disastrous battles, and suffering entire defeat, a remnant retreated toward the brow of the mountain where it overlooks the river. Here they paused, and the noble chief of the band addressed his followers thus: "Our home is taken from us, our people are slain, and the stranger is pressing hard upon us to make us slaves. I cannot serve, but "*Yo mori*, I die." And as he spoke, he leaped from the rock, and found a grave in the bosom of his own beautiful river. From his last words the valley and river are named, combining them in one, *Yumurí*.

After looking upon these combined beauties, one can well understand the appropriateness of the names so familiarly given to

Digitized by Google

this Island — such as the "Queen of the Antilles," "The Beautiful Antille," and "The gem of the American seas."

But we must turn from these natural advantages to consider its people, and its social life; for, after all, it is this that gives interest to any country.

Discovered by Columbus in 1492, no permanent settlement was made until 1511. In that year an expedition under Diego Velasquez, sent out by Diego, the son of Columbus, planted a Spanish Colony at Baracoa, near the east end of the Island. Thus discovered and first settled under the Spanish authority, it has been gradually peopled by the peninsular Spanish races; and has always been subject to the Spanish Crown, saving for the space of one year, 1762–3, when it was held as a conquest by the English.

While this statement gives a general idea of the population as being descendants from, and possessing all the peculiarities of, the Spanish people, it does not by any means explain the whole state of the case. The white population of the Island may be divided into three distinct classes: the Creoles, or native Cubans; the Spaniards from old Spain, or peninsulars; and foreigners from other countries in Europe and America. These classes are perfectly distinct, and kept separate by many peculiarities pertaining to each — peculiarities that are cherished and perpetuated both by prejudice, and the spirit of the Government.

Of foreigners from other countries than Spain, it is only since the beginning of the present century, that any have found encouragement to settle on the Island. By a monopoly of commerce granted to native Spaniards only, and by many disabilities imposed on others coming into the country, previous to that time almost all foreigners were excluded. Even now the obstructions to trade, the jealousy of government, and the bigotry of an ignorant Church, put many difficulties in the way of their settlement. Yet the profits of commerce and the advantages of trade present here so tempting an allurement, that many of them — from England and the United States, as well as Germany — adopting the motto of the shrewd and hardy Catalonian, "Five years of privation and a fortune," leave all that's dear behind — even in

Digitized by Google

some instances to the precious principles of faith and truth, imbibed at the sacred altar of a pious home — and pledging a nominal belief in the Roman Catholic religion, and submission to one of the worst of tyrannies ever dignified with the name of government, they become for the time citizens, or at least residents, of Cuba. Of these there are about 6,000 or 7,000 in the Island, of whom about 3,000 are French, who have become far more identified with the Cubans, and much more largely engaged in planting, than the rest. Perhaps 1,000 are English; and 3,000 from the United States, called always there Americans.

The influence of this part of the population is felt more in the circles of trade, and in the life and energy they are able to force into the modes of business and internal transportation, and the improvement of docks and harbors. But in the social world they are hardly felt, because many of them go there without their families; and most prefer to fall into the habits of the people in this regard. As to their relation to the political status of the Island, they always claim to be neutral in sentiment, and the most disinterested in feeling of all persons in the country; and, therefore, the very best possible witnesses from whom to gain information, or obtain an opinion. Many of them are not subjects of the Spanish Government; for while they are there for the specific purpose of acquiring wealth, they retain their citizenship under their own respective governments. And hence they argue that, having no interest in the government, or the political destiny of the Island of Cuba, they are just in the situation to give a disinterested opinion as to what the people desire or what is best for them. Now while there are some noble exceptions — men who are able to pursue even with great energy a business for gain, and yet retain a clear head and honest judgment about political matters, the changes of which might greatly affect their gains — yet the great mass of these witnesses are the most prejudiced of all the men in the Island. They are not natives, and have no deep love of the country; they are not citizens, and cannot be affected with any patriotic sentiments. But their relation to the country is that of five, ten, fifty, or a hundred thousand dollars invested in trade or commerce, the ventures on which are passing through their various stages to maturity. Everything to them depends

Digitized by Google

on maintaining an absolute *statu quo:* any change — any disturbance — or even excitement, may dash the hopes of these gains to the ground, or possibly destroy the capital itself. Therefore, they always want things to be let alone; — and every cry of patriotism, or groan of wretchedness under oppression, is hushed by the everlasting ring of the precious metal. Such men are apt to tell you that Cuba, if not doing well enough, is at least satisfied; and that nothing better can be expected, at any rate for the present. We again repeat, that many noble exceptions are met with; but this is the opinion and the feeling expressed by the mass of this class of the people. But we do not go to Cuba so much to study our own people as those to whom more especially the country belongs; therefore, let us pass to the second class.

The Peninsulars, or Spaniards from Old Spain, are in the highest sense the dominant class. Not that they are more intelligent, or wealthy, or patriotic than the others, but that they are placed in all positions of authority and influence by the government. The Captain General has always been, and must be, from the mother country; not so much by the requirements of law, as by the potent demands of policy. All the officers of the State and army, as well as the navy, are peninsulars; the native Cubans are not allowed even to serve in the ranks of the regular army. All the places of advantage, or monopolies of trade disposable by the government, are in the hands of these men from Old Spain. Of this class there are about 95,000 or 100,000 in the Island. They literally swarm in the public offices, in the courts, at the barracks, and in all places where authority and power can be manifested, or personal emolument secured. They are exceedingly haughty and overbearing in their manner toward the native Cubans or Creoles. They affect to regard them as inferiors — and certainly in many ways make them feel that they are entirely subordinate in all that pertains to personal rights, or political privileges. This conduct is the more marked from the fact that, while acting thus towards the Creoles, they are respectful almost to servility towards foreigners, specially the English and Americans. A slight but significant instance of this difference of conduct fell under our own observation. The fine military bands, belonging to the different corps of the army stationed in and

Digitized by Google

around the cities of Havana and Matanzas, are accustomed in turn to take their stand in the Plaza de Armas, a handsomely ornamented open square in front of the governor's palace, and play for an hour each evening. During this hour, the Plaza is the resort for the beauty, wealth and fashion of the city. The ladies, seated in their elegant vehicles, ride around the square, and the gentlemen crowd its spacious promenades. To protect the band from the encroachments of the crowd a company of soldiers accompany them, and take up their beat beside the hollow square where the musicians are performing. In the course of the hour, several little parties of Cubans had come within the space prescribed by the military, and were hastily ordered back with lowered bayonet. Just then two gentlemen, an American and an Englishman, approached, and not observing the guard, walked almost up to the square of the musicians, and stood observing the performance. The Spanish man in uniform, late so rude and surly to the Creole, now walked quietly round these gentlemen several times, and then, only when the murmurs of the crowd had grown clamorous at the marked distinction, with respectful bow asked that they would retire without the prescribed bounds. These are, of course, the great supporters of Spanish authority in the Island, and from every selfish reason opposed to any appearance of change. They hold, with a willing and earnest grasp, the reins of power over the Cubans, and line the forts and shores against all effort to effect a change from without.

The largest and most interesting class of the white population are the Cubans, or Creoles. They are the descendants of the Spaniards that from time to time have come to settle in the Island; and as, during even centuries, none but Castillians were allowed to come to Cuba, most of these families are descended from that noble and chivalric race of men. Sunken and oppressed as these people are by centuries of humiliation and accumulated acts of tyranny, yet we may even now find many traces of this proud ancestry among the better class of Cubans. Their number is about 425,000; or including the Canary Islanders, who are also of Spanish origin, and have now become a permanent part of the Creole population, this number would be augmented to about 450,000. They are the planters, merchants, and profes-

Digitized by Google

sional men of the Island; or at least are found largely represented in all these departments of business. They seem usually light of heart, and little disturbed by the position of governmental affairs; although if you enter into conversation with them on these topics, you will soon learn that they are by no means insensible to, or satisfied with, the present condition of things. There lingers with them a hope, and even an expectation, of a time when they will see the yoke cast off by which they are now made to serve. We have seen, too, the eye kindle and the breast heave with a transient emotion of heroic patriotism, as some of them have expressed the hope and the conviction that this relief was to be secured by their own awakened courage.

Our acquaintance is much more extended with the domestic life of the Cuban planters, than of those in the cities. In fact, it is among this class that we get at the real life of the Creole, being less modified by contact with foreign influence. Many of the planters do not live on their estates, or at most for only a few months in summer; but have their residences in the cities, or at distant places; and these commit the management of the plantation to an administrator or agent. The effect of this is manifest on the whole estate. The house becomes a mere lodge, at which the owner, or any part of his family, may spend a few days or weeks during their periodic visits to the place; the negroes seem to be more the mere tools of accomplishing so much work, than as part of a great family establishment; the whole place wears the appearance of a manufactory — a great shop to make sugar, rather than the home of a family. But where the family remain on the estate the whole or greater part of the year, making it their home, it becomes an exceedingly attractive place. The houses are built of stone, or of brick stuccoed, and whitened, with some coloring finish above and below of blue or pink: surrounded often on all sides with broad porticoes, and crossed with wide and airy halls; the first floor mostly laid with marble or a very finely finished brick; and the rooms large, with very high ceilings, tall windows and doors, and so constructed as to secure ample ventilation. Altogether, whether for their cool appearance, surrounded with luxuriant shrubbery, or their real comfort when you enter them, these homes of the better class of Cuban planters are very

Digitized by Google

attractive. The hospitality of the planter is as abounding as his home is beautiful. He invites you, when he wishes you to visit him, in a way that makes clear his sincere desire to see you at his house; he meets you at the depot with horse or volante, and servant; or at his door, if you come in your own conveyance; and at once makes you feel the truth of his assurance, that his house and servants are at your disposal. His own personal attention is sufficient to gratify, but never oppressive enough to weary you; and his arrangements for your comfort and enjoyment are unostentatious, but seem always well suited to your tastes, and often make you wonder how he could so well have divined what would be most agreeable to you. The domestic routine of the household has a great sameness. The first greeting of the early morning is a servant with coffee; and then the ride or walk for those of leisure, or the matters of business for those whose duties call them to it — while yet the air is cool, and the freshness of the morning makes your very existence a luxury. At 10 o'clock, the family reünite in the great hall, and after a brief interchange of salutations, surround the table for breakfast. From breakfast to dinner, at 4 o'clock, being the warmest part of the day, none care to stir abroad except from necessity; but employ the time in reading, domestic trifles, writing, or rest. Dinner is the great meal of the day, and yet not differing much from breakfast. They really have two dinners; meats, vegetables, and often fruits and deserts at both meals; the first from 10 to 11 o'clock in the morning; the second from 4 to 6 o'clock in the afternoon. After dinner is the time for riding, driving and visiting. And there is nothing more pleasant than these rides — under a soft afternoon sky, along winding roads hedged on either side by great rows of Aloes, with their sword-like leaves, all armed with sharp claws, and thorny points forbidding approach, and ornamented with that tall queen-like flower rising out of their crimson centres. The air is laden with sweet perfumes, and musical with the chatter of birds of brightest hue as they flit in the neighboring groves. Now we turn from the little rugged highway into broad avenues of lime or orange, of palm or cocoa, and soon come to some stately old mansion, rising in grandeur amid surrounding trees; or alight at the portico of a

Digitized by Google

vine-covered cottage. An hour's social life soon passed in lively conversation; and we are again in the saddle, hastening home by some new and perhaps more romantic path, through this labyrinth of fields and groves and hedges. One thing about the close of day strikes a stranger at once — that is, the absence of any twilight. You start early in the evening on an excursion; and as the sun begins to descend, you calculate that you can easily reach your desired point by the lingering light that remains after he is gone; and so saunter on, watching the changing glories that gather around the setting day; but before you are aware of the change, darkness has dropped her mantle about you while yet your purposed distance is scarcely half accomplished. This disadvantage would be more severely felt, were it not that the brilliancy of the star-light, in the clear atmosphere of this region, goes far to compensate the loss of this beautiful part of the day. The night is cool and delightful, so that recreation is pleasant, and sleep refreshing, and quite comfortable even under a blanket. We are only sorry that in this review of a day of the life of a Cuban family, blessed with a home and climate so attractive, there is no hour set apart for the pure and exalting purpose of worship. No family altar makes sacred the domestic circle, and no voice of prayer lifts these hearts in gratitude and love up to the throne of God. There is a beautiful remnant of what might once have been such an hour. Just at sunset the great plantation bell is rung, slowly and solemnly; and as you are walking in the quiet of the hour, you can hear these bells at the next plantation, and the next, until in the far off distance you catch only the faint sigh of a dying tone breathing its music in the stillness of the evening air. These are the "Vesper bells," and were once observed as the call to prayer by all the inhabitants; and even now, as we stood by one of the more thoughtful and intelligent children of our host, when these bells began to ring, he lifted his hat respectfully from his head and requested us do the same, as he pointed to the bell and said, "the Angel's voice." But it was only momentary, as he resumed his sports when the bell ceased to sound; and the signal seems to be employed now only to call the people from work, or to indicate the time of their evening meal.

Digitized by Google

In reviewing the domestic or social life of the Creoles, it would be impossible not to refer to their amusements. Deprived of all part in the important matters of government, not being allowed even openly to discuss them; destitute of the deep and transforming power of a religious faith; and limited in the means and opportunities of intellectual culture; it is but natural that they give to mere sports much of the time and energy that would be devoted to these more serious concerns of life. Indeed, the government, feeling that the minds of the people must be employed in some manner, and very desirous to direct them from its own affairs, takes no little interest in providing, controlling and keeping up the various kinds of amusement. But even here the insidiousness of that all-pervading power is manifest. Even the sports of this people are so managed as to aid in filling the public coffers, and still more degrading the people. It has often been urged that it matters but little what the amusements of a people are, if they are but happy in them. Yet there are few things that more deeply affect the life, or indicate the character, of a people than these. And well is this power understood and acted upon in this beautiful Island. There is nothing manly or elevating; nothing to develope a national character, or to give strength and energy to the national mind or muscle, in all the Cuban amusements. But, on the contrary, they are trifling, enervating and demoralizing. The two great national sports, the cock-fight and the bull-fight, encouraged and patronized by government, are not only the nurseries of gambling, but a school of cruelty and coarseness, extremely injurious to the better sensibilities of any civilized people. Nor are these left to the vulgar and debased crowd, but all classes are represented there; and the very best men in the country not only give them their countenance and their presence, but many of them pay great attention to the training of chickens and the raising of bulls, for this specific purpose. Many of their religious festivals are turned into feasts and sports; and that, too, of a nature that would suggest any thing but religious ideas. We were particularly struck with this fact, as we arrived at Havana during the time given to the celebration of the Carnaval, a sort of Bacchanal feast that precedes the fast of Lent—a time during which these Roman

Digitized by Google

Catholics give themselves, by permission, to all kinds of excesses preparatory to the self-denying season that is to follow. It professes to be a kind of hilarious taking-leave of the good things of life for a little season, as the signification of the name Carnaval indicates, the meaning of which is "farewell flesh." The excesses into which these people go during this season, which lasts here two weeks, or, at least including two Sundays, surpasses all conception by those who have not seen it. Every restraint of social life seems to be cast off; and all the rules of ordinary decency and even morality abandoned. Crowds gather in the streets until the passage way is blocked up. Little companies — masked and dressed according to some ridiculous fancy, or representing in caricature some particular class or business, and in some instances, emboldened by the license of the time, setting forth the very crimes and debaucheries of a corrupt and hidden life — come and mingle among the throng, and indulge in follies, vagaries, and obscenities, with an unbridled liberty that is enough to shock and disgust every sentiment of intelligence, refinement, or even civilization. Yet we were told that this festival was rather a pleasing thing to the government; and even cherished by the Church. As we walked through this sea of human beings crowding, in all fantastic forms, the grand and beautiful Paseo de Ysabel Segunda, and wondered that people who had even advanced to some good degree of culture could still find pleasure in such things, a gentleman whose acquaintance we had made, a noble specimen of the higher order of Cubans, remarked, as his face was mantled with the blush of feeling, "I am very sorry, sir, for you to see my country thus: it was not always so; there was a time when we kept these festivities in a manner, and with a refinement of taste, that did honor to it, and to our people: but now, sir, it is in this style that it best pleases those who have the power over us, to have it celebrated; for by all these means they are striving to degrade and corrupt the people, that they may the more surely maintain their power over them."

Hitherto in speaking of the social life and population of Cuba, we have only referred to the white people. But there are besides these a vast mass of people in inferior and servile positions; and

Digitized by Google

no one can contemplate the question of Cuban population, or consider the problem of its social life, without embracing these in his view. This mass of population is composed of three distinct classes: the African Negroes, the Chinese laborers or Coolies, and the native-born negroes, and mulattoes. The great mass of slaves in the Island are from Africa, though there are many native-born blacks that are scarcely distinguished by a stranger from the imported negroes.

Slavery has existed in the Island almost from its settlement. The first subjects of the system were the natives found in the country when it was discovered. But the Indians soon melting away under the rigors of a life to which they were wholly unaccustomed, the planters began to cast about for others to take their place. Africans were then introduced and have since formed the great body of the slaves in Cuba. The introduction of this race as slaves commenced in 1524, and the steady stream has not ceased to flow to the present day. Their natural increase has been by no means great; not even what the similarity of the climate of Cuba to their own country might have warranted us in expecting. But the slave trade system has supplied this lack by introducing from 10,000 to 20,000 annually. This slave trade, which is still carried on in utter disregard of treaty stipulations, and in the face of the fleets of three nations set to prevent it, derives its energy from its great profit. Its managers can well afford to bribe a few greedy and corrupt officials, and to lose a cargo occasionally, because they are more than recompensed by the gains on the successful trips. Indeed, the combination to maintain this trade is very intricate and difficult to be detected or broken up. Some noble Spanish families in Old Spain are maintained by it, or have used it to restore their broken fortunes; the high officials of the Island receive large profits from it; and some of the sturdy sailors and snug craft of New England are lucratively employed in its service. The present number of negro slaves is very difficult to determine, from the fact that, there being a tax on each slave, the returns as to their number are never correct. It is estimated that they at present amount to not less than 500,000, some say 700,000, though the official returns put it far below these figures. The condition of these slaves

Digitized by Google

as to intelligence, morality, or social life, is very much inferior to the slaves of our Southern States. Both the fact of their so recent importation, and the utter neglect of any means of social or moral elevation, are sufficient to account for this difference; and the continuation of the causes is most likely to perpetuate the result. In their treatment of the slave in the Island there is manifest this contradiction to what is seen in the States: — there, the government, professedly opposed to slavery, enacts many laws for the benefit of the slave which are utterly disregarded by the people, or taken advantage of so as to avoid their effect; here, the master is inclined to give his slaves many more advantages than the law requires or even admits. We have no hesitancy in saying that, in all that pertains to the comfort or elevation of this race, their condition is vastly more advantageous in the States than in Cuba. In the Island, their food and lodging are poor, in many cases abominable; their clothing in that warm region seems to be of no consideration; their hours of work and rest are badly adjusted, even on the principles of economy, much less on those of humanity or religion; and as to any religious instruction, the thing does not seem to be thought of in practice, although the laws of both Church and State, we were told, made provision for it. One of the largest proprietors in the interior told us very frankly, that one great reason why they did not want to become identified with the United States was, that they did not wish any of the slaves of the States to be brought over there, for it would ruin all their negroes. As these slaves in number are already equal to all the white population in the Island, are increasing very rapidly, and are kept hardly a grade above the condition of the savage in the forest of Africa, an element in the problem of the social condition and future destiny of the Island is presented to the eye of the thoughtful observer, full of interest and of no small importance. How shall it work out? What shall be the future condition of this great herd of unhumanized human beings? Will it bear the weight of many more years of accumulation to its already fearful bulk? Or shall it burst, some day, as the storm from the bosom of the deep black cloud that so often gathers above this Island; and sweep, tornado-like, carrying desolation to those beautiful homes and fertile fields — snatching

Digitized by Google

the land from its possessors, that even now tremble at times as they contemplate the subject? The defences and safeguards against such a result are as good as could be expected, under the anomolous condition of things in which the government is in the hands of one class of people, and the great mass of slaves in those of another; and a casual observer might be led to feel that successful insurrection is impossible. After the unexampled horrors of such a scene in San Domingo, we are ready to pray that it may never be repeated in Cuba; and yet when we remember the slave Toussaint, with his half-savage bands of emancipated negroes, led by black and mulatto officers, such as Christophe and the cruel Dessalines, meeting and successfully resisting even the trained legions of the first Napoleon, we are reminded that it is by no means an impossible event. But we cannot always reason safely from the example of one country to the effect of a like effort in another; and we are very far from desiring to be the prophet of an event every way so full of evil. So we will hope that it may be possible, in the progress of events, and in the looked for renovation of the inner and material life of Cuba, that a way may be found to dispose of this element of its social life for the common good.

In addition to slaves of the African race, there are in the Island about 200,000 free blacks and mulattoes. The facilities and encouragements for procuring freedom have always been sufficient to add pretty rapidly to this class. The spirit of the government, and the tendency of many of the laws are to assist in emancipating the slave. Oppressive as the ruling power is to the white man; and inconsistent as it may appear, to share the profits of bringing into slavery people that they profess to desire to be free, yet the government claims, and in many ways shows the sincerity of its claim, to be, at least, in favor of emancipation, if not opposed to slavery. In fact, it is a remarkable instance of how easily men may deceive themselves where their interest is involved, that the great mass of the people in Cuba profess to be in a sense opposed to slavery. Sitting one morning at breakfast with a gentleman who owned some 250 or 300 slaves, the conversation turned, as it often did with them, on the difficulties arising between

Digitized by Google

the States of our Union. Several of the States had already seceded, and others were threatening to do so. The peculiar turn the conversation had taken, was as to the effect of this division, supposing it should be consummated, on the future relations of Cuba and Cubans to the United States. He admitted that the only apparent hope for the freedom of Cuba was in the assistance that might be offered by the people or government of these States. But in the event of a division, even supposing that either of the parts would be able to render the desired assistance, there arose the question of annexation. Now, said he, we are too far away from the Northern States to form a union with them; and in many respects our natural connection would be with the South. But, he added, our opinions on slavery do not agree with theirs; we are not so strongly in favor of the system as they are. Sitting in the open piazza at our breakfast, we could see out through three or four different openings what was passing in the yard and grounds surrounding the house; and through every opening could be seen the glossy black skin of naked children, or half-clad men and women, all the slaves of the speaker. With this view around us, we only smiled at his anti-slavery protestations. He seemed to understand our feelings, for he at once replied "it may seem strange to you to hear such things amongst so much slavery, but I assure you it is true. We are not such strong advocates for slavery as the people of your Southern States; we have many slaves, but we look to a time when slavery shall come to an end amongst us." However contradictory they may appear in this, yet such is the feeling very widely entertained amongst them.

Thus, the spirit of the government, the sentiment of the people, and the assistance of the priest, have all tended to increase the proportion of the free blacks, until they are now quite a large body, amounting to the proportion of about one free black to three slaves. They collect in the cities and villages, often in idleness and squalid poverty, filling the hovels and alleys; and manifest how wretched is the condition of a people in any country to whom the laws have given personal freedom without a citizen's position, and to whom social equality can never be extended. Many of these, indeed, grow wealthy, and possess slaves of their own; and the government has raised a regiment of them

Digitized by Google

to serve in the army; — yet these are only exceptions to the general rule.

But there is another element being gradually diffused among this Cuban population that begins to attract very considerable attention; viz.: the Coolies, or apprenticed Chinese laborers. Their introduction commenced in 1847; at first only a few were brought over; during the first six years it is said only about 6,000. But the numbers have greatly increased each year since then; until now there must be from 150,000 to 200,000 of them in the Island. This estimate is from two sources of information, for it is extremely difficult to get accurate statistics of these matters; — first, from the opinions of intelligent men familiar with large parts of the Island, and with this business of Coolie importation: secondly, from the numbers that are everywhere met with. They are not only found on the plantations in large numbers, but employed on the railroads, both in their construction, and in running the cars; as drivers of public conveyances; as domestic servants about the towns and cities; and in a vast variety of small business pursuits of their own. They are termed in the transaction, "free Colonists;" but are, for the time of their apprenticeship, in every sense slaves. They are brought over by a company — with whom they have a written agreement as to the manner, time, and terms of their service. By this company they are sold and apprenticed, by a written agreement, copies of which are deposited in the proper public office of the State, and one is kept also by the Coolie. The terms of sale, so far as the company is concerned, are matters of private agreement between them and the purchaser; but the conditions of that sale are — that the Coolie is bound to serve his master in any way he may choose to employ him for eight years; and on the part of the master, that he shall give the Coolie four dollars as a bonus to start with, and then four dollars a month thereafter during the whole time of his service. There are no limitations or provisions in reference to renewing the engagement when the first term of service has ended. What will be the prevailing state of the case as these times of service run out can hardly be determined, as so few of them have yet expired. Many think that the terms of service will be very generally renewed, and thus it will become

Digitized by Google

a modified system of slavery for life. Others are of a different opinion, and think that vast masses of them, soon becoming free, will be thrown undomesticated — for they bring neither wives nor children with them — upon the community, where their influence for good or evil must before long be very deeply felt. There is a law requiring those bringing them, to return them, at the end of their time of service, to their own country. But any one can readily see how vain and ineffectual is such a law, where change of parties, cupidity, and even the desire of the Chinaman himself may all combine to thwart its action. What is to be the final effect of the introduction of this new and singular element into the social life of Cuba none can tell. But when we remember that they are not savages, but civilized people; that they are generally well educated, shrewd and quite intelligent; we cannot for a moment doubt that this effort to enslave the civilized son of the proud Imperial Empire, in the land of the sunny South, under an enfeebled nation of the West, will reäct powerfully on that nation itself; and the time may come when the despised and forsaken-looking Chinaman may wield an influence and power that will make itself felt in every circle of society in the Island.

To take a brief review of the population of Cuba: we have stated that the whole white population amounted to about 560,000. It may be something more than this by the late census, taken during our stay in the Island; but we have as yet been unable to get the published report of that census. The estimated number of the free blacks and mulattoes, say 200,000; of the black slaves about 500,000; and of the Coolies, say 175,000. This would give for the whole population of the Island 1,435,000, which — after the most careful comparison we could make of the conflicting authorities to which we had access, and in the absence of the printed reports of the census taken in March of this year, in which, we are informed, great care has been taken to secure accuracy — we judge to be very nearly correct.

We have frequently, in the course of this article, referred to the government of Cuba; and have already, perhaps, indicated pretty clearly our estimate of it. We will only speak of it further to

Digitized by Google

give some definite idea of its form. The Island has always, except the year that the English held it as a conquest, been a dependency of the Spanish Crown. It has been the most loyal of all the colonies of Spain, never having attempted, in any considerable effort, to throw off the dominion of the mother country. Even when Napoleon had deposed the Bourbons from the throne of Spain herself, and her king was a prisoner in France, this faithful Island rejected all French authority, and remained steadfast in her devotion to the fortunes of the fallen house of the Bourbons. And yet we will venture the assertion that there is not among civilized nations a country ruled by a more absolute despotism than ungrateful or neglectful Spain exercises, by her Captains General, towards this devoted daughter in the American seas. The original management of the Island was by a civil governor, a military commandant, and a chief naval officer, each supreme in his own department, but all subordinate to the authority of the civil chief. The civil governor was then aided in the administration of affairs by a council composed chiefly of Cubans. For a long time also the Island had representatives in the legislative bodies in Spain.

The distance of the colony from the central government, and the general corruption of the Court, gave to designing chiefs great opportunity of oppression in Cuba; and the same causes allowed these men gradually to cut off the direct communication of the people of the Island with the home government. The first effect of this effort was to induce the Spanish Cortes, in 1836, when General Tacon was governor in the Island, to refuse their seats to the deputies from Cuba; and thus was the wealth of agriculture and commerce, and all the social and political interests of the Island, put at the disposal of a tribunal before which Cuba had no voice, except through the corrupted channel of an interested and usurping governor-general. Cut off from a place in the councils of the nation; placed almost helpless under the hand of her governor, Cuba was compelled to suffer; and yet find none to plead her cause before the throne. Before the expiration of the term of office of Governor Tacon, he had almost completed his scheme of cutting off all communication of the Colony with the mother country, except through the executive office; and had

Digitized by Google

assumed so much authority as boldly to write to his king, "You shall never hear the petitions of your American vassals contrary to my pleasure." Very soon all the defences of the rights of the people of the Island fell. The Cuban council of the governor was disbanded, or made up of his own special tools. The offices of civil governor, military commandant, and chief naval officer, had long been combined in one, and given to a military chieftain called "The Captain General." At last the famous Royal Order was issued in 1825, the chief clause of which ran thus: "....It has pleased His Majesty, in conformity with the advice of his council of ministers, to authorize your excellency, fully investing you with the whole extent of power which by the royal ordinances is granted to the governors of besieged towns. In consequence thereof, His Majesty most amply and unrestrictedly authorizes your excellency not only to remove from that Island such persons, holding offices from government or not, whatever their occupation, rank, class, or situation in life may be, whose residence there you may believe prejudicial, or whose public or private conduct may appear suspicious to you....."

This order, issued to meet the exigencies of the time, was by its very terms meant to be temporary. But the power once put into the hands of unscrupulous men, and securing internal tranquillity — albeit, the tranquillity that reigns over the grave of a people's liberty — and making large returns to the king's treasury, it was first prolonged, and then made permanent. And this is now the only constitution of the country. By it the Island has been governed ever since, and is under it to-day. It places the country under a military despotism; and that despotism authorized and encouraged to use its authority as it would do in a besieged town. Under it, execution may follow mere suspicion; and the law of the land is the will and pleasure — it may be, the opinion or even caprice — of a foreign, vicious, and tyrannical military captain.

We do not need to go further in showing how this power has been exercised. Sometimes, indeed, in the hands of wise and good men, it has been made to subserve the best interests of the country; and then, again, it has been used to gratify the basest feelings of a bad chief. It is enough for our purpose, that we

Digitized by Google

know that all that tyranny could desire, or power offer, is lodged by this brief order in the hands of the man sent from Old Spain to rule this beautiful Island; and if he does not exercise it to the full, it is only because the man who is to administer, is sometimes better than the rule under which he is authorized to act.

Education and religion, the two great safeguards of any people, are here, as might be expected, at a low stand. There are a few good schools of a professedly high order in some of the cities; and some institutions in Havana, that take rank as colleges. It is said that a good medical, and perhaps law, education can be procured in some of these. But in the historic, scientific, and practical branches they are behind institutions of a like character elsewhere. But the great lack is in that kind of education that reaches the great mass of the people. The professed objection of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States to our great free school system, is that no religion is taught in the schools; and that the Church has no control over them. In Cuba the objection cannot exist. The Papal Church is the only one allowed in the Island, and she has full sway in matters of instruction. Yet there is not a free school maintained at the public cost in Cuba. According to the most accurate statistics taken some years ago, the latest we could obtain on this subject, there were 99,599 free children, between the ages of five and fifteen, in the Island. Of these only 9,082 were in schools; and of this number 5,825 paid their tuition, and 3,757 were receiving gratuitous education. Of this last number, 550 were supported by a once flourishing benevolent institution called *Sociedad Patrioca* — which society raised its funds by subscriptions from its members, or a special voluntary taxation of those who wished to support it or its objects; 2,111 were educated by local subscriptions or taxes, in the particular community where the schools were maintained; and 1,106 were gratuitously taught by the professors or teachers, through the suggestions of the society, or functionaries whose request amounted almost to a command. Scarcely ten per cent. of the children were then receiving education; four per cent. of whom were taught gratuitously, by special contribu-

Digitized by Google

tions; but not one from the funds of the general treasury. It adds to our regret in considering the position of the people of this Island, when we remember that in various ways they are compelled to pay to the government more than $20,000,000; and yet this government neglects this first and fundamental duty of every State to its people, viz.: to secure for the children an enlightened system of education.

But other modes of instruction and improvement are equally neglected, or rather embarrassed. There is a system of censorship kept up, over books and all the productions of the press. No book is allowed to come into the Island, or be sold among the people, that is prohibited by this authority. No article is published in the newspapers until it is first examined by a local censor, and has received his approbation. So strict and jealous is this watchful eye, that nothing in the slightest degree disagreeable to the government, or officials, can find its way into the papers. A gentleman informed us that, when corresponding for some of the papers on the subject of finance, and with reference to a severe crisis through which the commercial community was passing, his articles were so cut and mangled that they almost failed to convey any thing of his meaning; and yet he had been studiously careful to avoid all allusion that might even be construed as inimical to any position of government. In reference to both these matters, education and general reading, many gentlemen are striving by private means to make up the deficiency to their children. They employ private teachers; and by such avenues as are open to them, they try to get from a distance books that cannot be found at home. Some of them are sending their children to the United States and to Europe for education. Yet, strange as it may appear, the authorities have tried to prevent and discourage this process; and even went so far, at one time, as to pass a law that children should not be sent out of the Island for education. To obviate this difficulty, we were told, parents often got certificates of the necessity of sending their children away for health. And thus the power that ought to have cherished both the intelligence and morality of the people, was pursuing plans that prostrated alike the principles of knowledge and truth, of intelligence and morality.

Digitized by Google

It would at once be anticipated that a people so situated could not maintain a very high standard of religion. There is but one Church allowed in the Island — the Roman Catholic. Its affairs are administered by various bishops, and an archbishop; but they are all in this place subject to the power of the State. Once, the Church of Cuba was wealthy and influential; and often checked the powers of the civil government. But the latter at length began a system of encroachments upon the Church; confiscated much of its property; took away a large part of its patronage; and in many ways curtailed its influence and power. Now, the government has part in the appointment of every bishop and priest; and none can be removed from his position without its authority.

Yet, with all this, no other opinion is permitted — at least to be professed — in the Island; even strangers who come to do business here being compelled to give a kind of assent to the Papal faith. The bishops and priests are mostly, like government officers, from Old Spain; and seem to feel in regard to the Church, much as these officials do in reference to the State, that their great business is to get rich off of the proceeds of the place; and that the interests of the souls of the people are altogether secondary matters. Protestants have so often been accused by Papal writers of misrepresenting their conduct and Church, that we took special pains in our inquiries on these subjects lest we might do them injustice. The first great principle among the clergy of every grade in Cuba seems to be the fee. Their attention to the spiritual interests of the people, or even to the common ordinances of religion, are very indifferent, in some instances really scandalous. The life of the parish priest himself is very far from being exemplary. They take part in the sports of the cock-fight, even on Sundays; and are by no means careful of the reputation of their private lives at home, or when mingling among the people. Some even are found among them who do not scruple to live in open concubinage, supporting as a family the children of such union. We could give the names of places and parties, if it were suitable, to make good these allusions to what, in some instances, it is not proper to put upon this page. As a natural result, the people seem to have lost almost all respect

Digitized by Google

for religion. They seem to regard it as a part of that heavy foreign system by which they are oppressed, and which they are at liberty to hate. The great mass of them have absolutely no faith; they even seem to regard you strangely when you speak of religion as being a matter of belief or feeling. They pay to it the duty they are obliged to, as they pay the tax by which it is supported; and bring about the same kind of feeling to the one performance as to the other. In fact, the people seem to have ceased to go to the churches, or to manifest any personal interest in the subject. We have attended their churches, on Sunday and on Saints' days, and have usually found a few women, children and servants, gathered for a little while to say their prayers, and make their genuflexions, while the priest was singing his mass; but there was no preaching, and no gathering of the people as if they had any personal concern in the matter. We have attended the service in the great Cathedral of Havana, when some fifteen or twenty priests were officiating at once, with music, and grand choir chanting sacred poetry; and turning, have counted the audience for two mornings in succession. They amounted to twelve people, old and young, white and black, one morning; and thirteen, the next. In fact, this is their own complaint, that the people, especially the men, have abandoned the churches. And yet why should they complain? What is there in the empty chanting of mass in the Latin tongue, by a man, however gorgeously robed, in whom the people have no confidence, to draw men to them? How long will it take this infatuated people to learn that the mere mummeries of an antiquated and effete superstition, will not meet the wants of the yearning soul of an immortal man, and cannot hold the heart and the affections when once the people are permitted to see its true character? Christ said, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." If, now, these professed teachers of his religion could only get back to the simple meaning of that expression, they might find the power by which to draw these multitudes that know not God and regard not his law, back to the Church, or rather to the Saviour. But, alas, the priests of this Island are themselves so utterly destitute of this knowledge of the living power of a true Gospel, that they could not sound its silver trumpet.

Digitized by Google

The interest of the people of the United States in this Island is perhaps greater than in any country not a part of our own territory. Its location makes it so — situated as it is at the mouth of the gulf, the great harbor of so much of our commerce. Our way southward lies by its shores, as we pass between it and Yucatan. Our way eastward and northward from a large part of our territory is out by its doors, on the side next to Florida. It so lies in the great pathway to the Isthmus of Panama, that we must pass right by its eastern side, and around its southern point, through the Windward Passage; or only a little lower down to the Mona Passage, under the guard of its sister islands, Hayti and Porto Rico. It is the sentinel of our American seas, and may be made the guardian of all this interchanging commerce. Distant from New Orleans only 600 miles, and from New York only 1,200 or 1,300; lying right in the path between our great Northern and Southern commercial metropolis; and on the highway to our Pacific States, who amongst us can but feel the deep interest that must attach to the condition and destiny of this Island, so near and so important to us!

Our relations to its commerce make it a subject of interest. The exports are sugar, tobacco, coffee, rice, fruits, &c.; but the great staple is sugar. The largest plantations, and the greatest number of them, are now devoted to its culture. Some of these produce from 9,000 to 14,000 boxes each; and a few as much as 18,000 boxes. Each of these boxes contains about 400 lbs. We will take this, the leading article, to represent the rest. From 1853 to 1858 the yearly exports of sugars were from 700,000,000 to 750,000,000 lbs.; and at the same time about half a million hogsheads of molasses. Yet it is said that not more than one-third of the arable land of the Island is under cultivation. The valuation of the yearly exports of Cuba has ranged, since 1850, from $27,000,000 to $32,000,000; and the imports have averaged nearly the same. Yet great restrictions are placed on commerce by the government — as, for instance, in the carrying business. The duties on flour, taken as a leading article, are as follows: from Spain, in Spanish or Cuban vessels, $2.50 per barrel; from other countries in the same vessels $8.50 per barrel, and $9.50 if in foreign vessels. The effect of this is two-fold:

Digitized by Google

first, to favor greatly the Spanish flour — or flour sent from Spain; and so great is this difference, that Americans have found it profitable to ship flour to Spain, repack it in Spanish barrels, and then ship it to Cuba under the Spanish flag. The other effect of this discriminating duty is to make the price of the article very high in the Island, and, hence, greatly to diminish its consumption. There is also a very considerable discrimination in tonnage duties in favor of Spanish vessels. Notwithstanding all these disadvantages, over one-third of the exports are taken in United States' vessels, while only about one-fifth is taken in Spanish, and about one-fourth in English vessels. One-third of all the commerce of the Island is with the United States. But by the prohibitions of this tariff system, the balance of trade is largely against us. The treasury reports of the United States show this balance, from 1851 to 1856, to have been annually about $10,000,000; and in 1857, $30,000,000.

Yet this is not the natural course of trade. The United States send, according to the reports of 1854, only $29,830 worth of flour annually to Cuba; while, by the same reports, Spain sends $2,677,791 worth of the same article. And yet every one must admit that the whole could have been sent more readily and cheaply from the United States than from any other market in the world, except for the disadvantages of a discriminating tariff. And, in fact, the natural course of things is for her productions to come to us, and for the greater part of her supplies to be furnished by us. But such are the burdens that her people must bear; and so great the disadvantages to trade generally, imposed by unwise and arbitrary legislation. But most of all, these facts show what might be the relations of this fertile Island to us, under better auspices, with something of the energy of American industry applied to her resources, and an unshackled commerce between us. The natural advantages of the Island for nourishing and protecting commerce, or aiding naval operations, are very great. It possesses not less than fifty good harbors; and many of them are spacious bays, affording anchorage to the largest men-of-war. It has the timber, and means of keeping up very large navy yards: and could be made the depot of immense and ready supplies. Such are a few of the general advantages

Digitized by Google

that attract our eyes to this Island, so favored by nature, but so marked by the stains of man's degeneracy. As we look at it, we cannot but ask, what will be its future destiny? Will the strength and courage of its people ever rise to the noble act of making it an independent and free country? Is it too much to expect that these people, almost in sight of the shores of a great and free republic, and themselves deeply imbued with liberal sentiments, will some day break the shackles by which they are weighed to the very earth, and proclaim their right to the privileges of men; and show their power to maintain that right? We fear they can never accomplish this for themselves. Forty thousand soldiers watch from lofty batteries every motion of this people; and the great mass of the heavy cannon that frown from the battlements of her strong fortresses *point inward*, towards the city, and the home of the Cuban. Well armed and heavy ships sit on the placid bosom of her most beautiful bays, and keep sentinel over her wealth and commerce. The avarice and selfishness of fifty thousand foreign officers and beneficiaries imposed upon the nation, are set to guard against any tendency of the people to secure possession of themselves. Cuba lies manackled; she cannot free herself. Will Spain release her hold upon her, and open the way for her emancipation? Never, while she can draw from $18,000,000 to $24,000,000 revenue from her wealth; and find so rich a place wherewith to endow so many worthless favorites. Nor will Spain ever consent to sell the Island to the United States for anything like the sum hitherto offered; because her annual income from the Island is nearly equal to most of those offers. And so rich an annuity, to a government so little able to take care of its finances, is always preferable to any present payment.

The only other question arising is, what shall be the course of the people of the United States toward Cuba in these circumstances?

We have always sympathised with the oppressed; we have ever felt for those who desired to escape from tyranny and be free. And if ever there was a case, either from proximity of position, from suffering and helplessness, and from the warm feelings of a people toward ourselves, which would justify an

Digitized by Google

effort for their relief, it is this. But, on the other hand, we started out with two great political maxims that ought not to be abandoned: the first, to be just towar s all nations, as we expected justice towards ourselves; the other, not to interfere in the political concerns of other people. Both of these require that we should not make any effort to take Cuba from the Spanish government by force. She belongs to Spain; and however convenient or valuable to us, we have no right to attempt to dispossess her of her colony contrary to the laws of justice.

On the other hand, any effort of ours to break up the tyranny by which the people of Cuba are oppressed, would be in direct contravention of our constant rule in regard to foreign interference; and would open the way for innumerable exploits of a like character, and involve us in interminable difficulty. Yet this shall not take away our sympathy for, and our deep interest in, that people; nor prevent us from watching carefully the rising events that may bring forth something better for them. For as we trust in the ultimate justice of that Power that rules the destinies of the nations of the earth; and as we look for the progress and triumph of the great principles of truth and human freedom, whatever temporary check they may receive; — so shall we confidently expect the day when Cuba shall be permitted to share these great national blessings; when the Queen of the Antilles shall no more have her beautiful brow dishonored with the bands of servitude, but encircled with the chaplets of truth and peace and virtue; when she shall be able to hold in her own hand the ægis of protection over a people who rejoice in a soil untrodden by the hirelings of despotism, and a nation capable of appreciating and preserving political and religious freedom.

W.

Digitized by Google

Art. V. — *State of the Country.*

I. Civil War. — Influence upon it, of the Idea of the Restoration of the Union.

II. The long and terrible reign of Parties. Majestic Reappearance of the Nation on the scene of Affairs. Great Truths accepted, and to be maintained.

III. Duty of the Nation to loyal citizens in the Seceded States. Their subjection to a Reign of Terror. Alleged unanimity in the Seceded States.

IV. The Seceded *States* may return to the Union — or the Secession *Party* may maintain their Revolt by Arms. The War one of Self-Preservation on the part of the Nation. Not aggressive and against the South — but defensive and against Secessionists. Supposing the Triumph of the Secessionists; insuperable difficulties. Every benefit contemplated by Secession, defeated by the War into which it plunged. Restoration to the Union the true Result.

V. Miscalculations of Secession. Miscarriage, as to a "United South." And as to a "Divided North." And as to the temper, and purpose of the Nation. And as to Expansion, the Slave Trade, Free Trade, Boundless Prosperity, Cotton Monopoly. Secession a frightful and incalculable Mistake.

VI. The Border Slave States. State of Parties in 1860. Sudden and secret Revolution in Virginia. Probable effects, political and military. Western Virginia. Central mountain Route, to the central South. Delaware, Maryland, Missouri. The Original States — the States carved out of them — the Purchased States. Kentucky, her position, peril, temper, purpose.

VII. General Conclusion.

I. Civil War. Influence upon it, of the Idea of the Restoration of the Union.

The American people are in the midst of civil war. That calamity which, in the just and almost universal judgment of mankind, is the direst which can befall nations, has already covered our country with its terrible shadow; and the gloom thickens from day to day, portending a conflict as frightful as it is repulsive — whose issues are, in many respects, hardly less uncertain than they may be vast. Hundreds of thousands of armed

Digitized by Google

men are hastening to slay each other — led by captains many of whom are worthy to command heroes, and provided with every means of mutual destruction which the science and skill of the age can devise. Hundreds of millions of dollars have already been expended in these immense and fatal preparations: and so thoroughly is the most warlike of all races aroused, and so completely are the exigencies of the times held to demand of every man a complete readiness to defend all that he is not willing to surrender, that, at whatever cost, every one capable of bearing arms will be armed, and will use his arms with deadly effect, according as the course of events may seduce or oblige him to do so. It is, indeed, possible that some wonderful interposition of God, or some sudden and heroic impulse falling upon the people, may even yet avert the terrible catastrophe, and arrest the destruction even as it is ready to descend. It is equally possible that, before these lines are printed, great armies which already face each other, may have fought one of those bloody and decisive battles, whose issues determine the fate not only of wars, but of ages. Ignorant of all the future, and imperfectly informed concerning passing events, it becomes us to speak with moderation and candor of the prospects before us. Penetrated with the deepest sorrow at the mournful, though it be in many respects sublime, scene which our country presents, we would forbear to speak at all, if it were not that the general tenor of what we purpose to utter, is designed to keep alive in the hearts of our countrymen the conviction that the whole country may, even yet, be restored; and to influence, so far as anything we can do may influence, the conduct of all these terrible affairs, to that end, and by that idea. It is this which is the burden of all we have hitherto said and done — it is this which justifies nearly any effort, any sacrifice, any suffering, on the part of the nation — it is this which we must keep before the minds of men if we would preserve our countrymen from turning savages, under the influence of the civil war upon which we have entered, and for the prosecution of which such enormous preparations are made by both parties.

Digitized by Google

II. The long and terrible reign of Parties. Majestic Reappearance of the Nation on the scene of Affairs. Great Truths accepted, and to be maintained.

1. For a long course of years political parties, sectional factions, and the clamor of demagogues, had given that sort of political education to the people, and occupied the thoughts of men with that description of political ideas and desires, that *the nation — the mighty American Nation* — had disappeared from the area of our general politics. It had been for a whole generation Whig, and Democrat, and Republican, and Know-Nothing, and Secessionist, and Abolitionist, and Fire-Eater; the people rent, and confused, and maddened — fraud and violence reigning in the heated canvasses and elections — and the most shameless corruption spreading like a pestilence amongst public men. The glorious Nation had disappeared utterly, as the controlling element in national affairs; — so utterly, that a President of the United States was found capable of conniving — whether through timidity, through folly, through imbecility, or through corruption let posterity decide — at the ruin of the nationality which his Government represented, and the overthrow of the Constitution by virtue of which it existed. So utterly, that a revolt openly conducted in flagrant contempt of the President, the Constitution, and the nation, and attended in all its stages by innumerable acts of war — was allowed to spread from State to State, without the slightest attempt of the nation, or any one representing it, to make itself felt or even heard; until the vast extent of the revolt, and the great number of States on which the partizans of it had seized, became the chief embarrassment in dealing with it at all, and the main plea with timid statesmen why the degraded nation should accept its own destruction, as a fact fully accomplished.

2. *That mighty Nation has reäppeared once more on the theatre of affairs.* All thoughtful men knew that such a destruction as was attempted, could not be accomplished by war on one side, without begetting war on the other side. It may be considered madness in the Confederate Government to have preferred the bombardment of Fort Sumter, to its peaceable surrender in three days, through starvation. But it was a choice precisely in the spirit of every act towards the American nation and its Govern-

Digitized by Google

ment, which had characterized the whole previous course of the revolt, and which has marked the whole treatment extended to Union men in every seceding State, to the present moment. It was possible to have divided the American nation *peaceably*, into two or more nations, by the consent of the American people, and the change of the Federal Constitution. But it was not, in the nature of things, possible to rend it by a military revolt, characterised by a spirit of contemptuous and reckless violence, alike illegal, unjust, and fatal, without arousing the outraged nation, and bringing all the mighty questions at issue, to that arbitrament of arms which the secessionists had chosen — and by which, in one form or another of violence, they have achieved every conquest they have made. We are not partizans of the present National Administration, and have no adequate means of forming an opinion, as to whether the particular occasion and moment — or whether earlier, or whether later, occasions and times — were best suited for armed resistance by it, to the progress of the great military revolt, whose avowed objects were the destruction of the Government, the overthrow of the Constitution, and the ruin of the nation. What we wish to signalize is the majestic reäppearance of the American Nation in the mighty scene — the simultaneous perishing of all factions, and disappearance of all parties but the party of the nation, and the party of secession — and the unanimous conviction of all American citizens loyal to their country, that the National Government is the true and only lawful representative of the nation itself. With almost absolute unanimity the twenty millions of people in the nineteen Northern States; the great majority of the four millions of white persons in the five Border Slave States; and, as we firmly believe, a very large portion of the four millions of white people in the remaining ten Slave States, though now cruelly oppressed and silenced, cordially recognize these great truths, and will maintain them — namely, that the American people are a nation — that the Constitution and laws of the United States are supreme in this nation — that the Federal Government is the true and only legal representative of this nation, charged with the defence of its safety, the execution of its laws, and the protection of its liberties — in the execution of which duties it is bound to repel force by force.

Digitized by Google

Nothing can give greater intensity to the facts and principles to which the foregoing statements relate, than a comparison of what has occurred in all the States which have seceded, with what has occurred in all those which have not seceded — touching the means by which the revolutionists have gained the mastery and silenced opposition in the former, and the manner in which the nation has spontaneously roused itself in its own defence in the latter.

III. Duty of the Nation to loyal citizens in the seceded States. Their subjection to a Reign of Terror. Alleged unanimity in the seceded States.

1. Next in importance to the clear apprehension of the duty, which every loyal citizen of the nation owes to the National Government, in this most painful crisis — concerning which we have just endeavored to disclose the enthusiastic conviction of the nation itself; is an equally clear apprehension of the duty which the nation owes to loyal citizens in those States in which the revolutionary party has gained the ascendency, or in which that party may hereafter gain it. This latter question, as far as we know, seems not, as yet, to have been fully considered or determined by the General Government. The secession party seems to have decided it at once, and according to its violent instincts; and not only does their unanimous judgment demand of them exile, death, or conversion — but their legal authorities are reputed to be prompt, and their ubiquitous committees of vigilance very vehement in the execution of a code — nearly as simple and efficacious as that of Mahomet himself. There is much reason to believe that the actual majority of votes was cast against the secessionists in several States upon which they have seized; that in several others held by them, such a majority would have been cast, if an opportunity had been allowed; that in not one of those States has there been a true and fair popular ratification of secession; that before the actual commencement of armed resistance on a large scale by the Federal Government, the actual majority of the people in the Confederate States, taken as a body, was hostile to secession; and that, undeniably, a certain number, and that considerable, of loyal citizens, are in every one of those States. Allowing that a state of things even tolerably near to that contained in the foregoing statement exists — nothing seems to us more clear than that the

Digitized by Google

American people, and by consequence the Federal Government, are bound to put forth their utmost strength for the protection of American citizens situated as persons loyal to the Union are believed to be, in every State that has seceded. Questions of property, questions of rights of various kinds, questions of profit and advantage — may be compromised or even gracefully surrendered on many occasions. But no Government — no people — no gentleman — no Christian, can withdraw protection and support from those who are bound to them by the most sacred and tender mutual ties, and leave them to be degraded, oppressed, and persecuted — without atrocious iniquity and boundless degradation. It seems to us that it would be transparently clear, even if nine-tenths of the people in every one of the Confederate States, were decided secessionists — that they should be required to treat the loyal citizens of the United States, found casually amongst them, much more those resident amongst them upon the sudden outbreak of revolt, with justice and humanity. If, however, it is really true that the secessionists are the minority in many of those States, upon which they have seized by superior organization, and the suddenness and violence of their proceedings; then, undoubtedly, the duty of the nation is as obvious to deliver those States from such a despotism, as it would be if their oppressors were foreign invaders. In like manner, it is the duty of the General Government to furnish all the munitions of war to its loyal citizens residing in States where it is necessary for them to defend, by arms, their loyalty to the Union, against armed conspiracies seeking to force them into secession.

2. Peaceable revolutions are made by voting; and the fundamental principle of republican government — which the nation is bound by the Constitution to guarantee to every State — is that the majority of those entitled to vote — and not an armed faction — represents the sovereignty. It would be curious to compare the universal contempt for popular rights and institutions, and for all the principles and usages of American freedom, which has so conspicuously distinguished the career of this secession revolution — since the aristocratic minority has got possession of power; with the theory of "Concurrent Majorities," so carefully elaborated by their first Apostle, Mr. Calhoun, for the special protec-

Digitized by Google

tion of the rights of minorities in free governments. Widely different from the principle of Mr. Calhoun's theory, is that now reduced to practice in the seceded States, by getting together a certain number of persons called a "Convention"—in whom the sovereignty of the people is supposed to reside in a permanent and manageable form; bodies which in the revolted States have been converted into secret, permanent, and irresponsible engines, first of revolution, and then of despotism. We do not speak of the suppression of such desperate substitutes for republican government; nor will we stop to point out how fatally such proceedings reveal the anarchy from which they take their rise, and the military despotism in the future to which they unerringly point. What we have to urge is, the solemn duty of the nation to protect loyal minorities, much more loyal majorities, against the ferocious proceedings already made manifest under the workings of these institutions; and to warn those yet free from their pitiless grasp, to prepare for slavery before they rush into the power of such rulers.

3. Nor is it out of place to remind those who clamor incessantly about the unanimity of the South, and the folly and wickedness of attempting to resist the settled purpose of a whole people who have resolved to leave a Union which they detest; that the nation does not believe in either the alleged "unanimity," or the proclaimed "fixed purpose." Doubtless it is true, that the peculiar notions of exclusive loyalty to the State we live in, which prevail extensively in the Southern States — have caused many loyal people to submit to the despotism which forced them into secession; and State pride, affection for our native land, and many other considerations, have swelled the ranks of the army of the secessionists, since war on a large scale, and imminent peril to their cause, suddenly and most unexpectedly met them in their violent career. But the American people, in this great crisis of their destiny, have solemn duties to perform — and have a right to be satisfied that they are truly informed, before they take steps which they may never be able to retrace. The American people fervently desire the entire restoration of the Union, with the entire consent of all the secession States. And they firmly believe that result — attended by the total overthrow of the secession faction — would

Digitized by Google

immediately succeed a reäction in the South, not the tenth part as great as that which has just occurred in the North — not greater, indeed, than the one, in an opposite direction, which has occurred throughout the South, within half a year. It is, just now, a question of testimony first, and then of duty founded thereon;— a question, not between the South and the North; but between a nation of some twenty-six or seven millions, and an active faction, possibly under one million, in revolt against it.

IV. The Seceded *States* may return to the Union, or the Secession *Party* may maintain their Revolt by Arms. The War one of Self-Preservation, on the Part of the Nation. Not aggressive and against the South—but defensive and against Secessionists. Supposing the Triumph of the Secessionists; insuperable Difficulties. Every benefit contemplated by Secession, defeated by the War into which it plunged. Restoration to the Union the true Result.

1. We have already said that the issues of this unnatural war, are in many respects as uncertain as they will probably be vast. Contingently, however, the most immediate and direct issue of it, can have but one, of two results. Either the seceded States must return to their loyalty to the nation, and their position as members of the United States of America; or the secession party must be able to vindicate by arms the course upon which they have entered, and, maintaining the independence of as many of the States as may finally adhere to them, those States must be acknowledged by the American people and Government as a separate nation. Of course, there can be no such result as the conquest of the seceded States, and the holding them as Provinces or Territories, by the Federal Government. Such an attempt is not to be thought of as possible — nor to be entertained, for a moment, even if it were possible, as a permanent policy — but, beyond all this, even if it were politic and easy, it would be even more abhorrent, if possible, than secession itself, to the feelings of the American people, and the principles of American liberty. Which of these issues will be realized depends, apparently, on the event of the war: concerning which we will add something presently, seeing the probabilities of that event ought to be a very weighty consideration with both parties to it. In the meantime let it be observed, that the mere statement of the case makes it manifest that the war entered upon by the nation, not as one of aggression and con-

Digitized by Google

quest, but one of self-defence and self-preservation, can be conducted only as war upon the secession party and Government — and not as war against the people of the South; a war, therefore, which would end of itself, upon the overthrow of the secession party, and the suppression of the Confederate Government erected by that party.

2. Upon the happening of such an event, which certainly is possible, perhaps highly probable, the allegation is that no people — no South — would remain to reconstruct society and government, and restore the seceded States to their place in the Union. We have already spoken of the want of faith in all such extravagant statements; an incredulity fortified by the whole career of the revolt, both in its method of usurping power, and its method of producing unanimity afterwards; to which must be added the undeniable proofs existing in public acts and records, in popular movements and votes, in numberless private communications, in the persecutions lavishly inflicted upon thousands of persons, and in the seductions habitually employed against every doubtful, and the menaces against every loyal, citizen. What is now passing in Tennessee and Virginia, while we write, is full of significance as to what might be expected if the army of the secessionists were driven out of those States. What happened, months ago, in various Southern States in which that party succeeded in establishing their despotism — and what has recently happened in Maryland, Missouri, and Kentucky, where their desperate efforts failed — is conclusive as to the great fact, that the mass of the community every where needed only to have been wisely and bravely led, to have conquered what seems to have been, almost every where that it existed, a faction of the minority. What made it powerful, was its long previous training — its activity and daring at a moment of great popular discontent, mortification, and alarm — and the fatal connivance of Mr. Buchanan, rendered decisive by the active coöperation with the revolt, of those members of his Cabinet whose positions had given them special opportunities to promote its organization and its first acts. It had, originally, no element of a national movement — it has now no aspect of a national revolution. And, in our judgment, the moment it encounters signal defeat, a counter revolution will set in, that will strip it of all that did not

Digitized by Google

belong to it in its first stages; and under just and wise treatment, will eventually restore to the Union every seceded State, not excepting South Carolina itself. For ourselves, and we believe in this we utter the sentiments of the whole nation, we desire for the people in the States now held in armed opposition to the National Government, nothing worse than their complete deliverance from the iron despotism of a disloyal and frantic party, and their speedy and complete restoration, in perfect equality and renewed fraternity, to all the glory of our common nationality, and all the blessings of our true and regulated freedom.

3. Supposing we are mistaken in the essential conditions by which the foregoing result is to be obtained, there remains only the alternative of the triumph of the revolt over the nation, and the permanent independence of the seceded States. We do not propose to discuss, at this time, the consequences of such a division of the nation—but only to look calmly at some of the most obvious difficulties of its accomplishment. And in the very front of all these, is the question of the ability of the secession party, either to obtain from the consent of the nation, the concession of the independence of the Confederate States, or its ability to wrest it from the nation by arms. The question of that consent is a question of peace, not of war; a question which the secession party disdained even to discuss before they flew to arms; a question which will, hereafter, depend essentially upon the state of the country, and the wishes of the States now under the dominion of that party, after the war is ended. The great principle on which the consent of the nation could, in any circumstances be given, is precisely opposite to the great principle on which this revolt proceeds — namely, veneration for popular rights and the popular will. What view the people of the South may take of their rights, and what may be their will touching their erection into a separate nation — are questions which may be very greatly affected by the progress of events — and the decision of which, by themselves, may be very various, according as they are in circumstances which allow them to vote and act freely, or, which oblige them to vote and act under a ubiquitous military despotism, administered by armed revolutionary committees of vigilance. What is passing now in Virginia and Tennessee — what has passed

Digitized by Google

in every State that has already seceded — what was attempted in Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri — would not, in all probability, be taken — by a great nation loyal to popular rights, and full of veneration for free institutions — for such an expression of the popular desire and will, on the part of great numbers of its citizens, as would challenge its consent to its own dismemberment. It is not to be disguised, however, that even under the most favorable aspect in which the subject of the peaceable division of the nation could be presented, there are obstacles in the way of its accomplishment which nothing but the highest and noblest convictions of mutual obligations, united with the profoundest sense of mutual forbearance, accommodation, and good will — could surmount. In the present state of the country, it is superfluous to discuss these obstacles. And in the degree that independence, by whatever means, as the only alternative to restoration to the Union, is environed with difficulties; is the madness of the secession movement manifest, and the duty of the nation to suppress it clear.

4. It seems to remain, then, that the solitary result of the war, is the restoration of the seceded States to the Union, or the triumph of the arms of the secessionists over the nation. The more completely this great truth is fixed in the minds of all parties, the better for all. The more thoroughly the nation understands that it is fighting neither for vengeance nor for conquest, but directly for self-preservation — and remotely for the maintenance of its independence in the face of all other nations, and for its future peace, security, and advancement in the glorious career now threatened to be cut short; the more it will be disposed to prosecute the war forced upon it, in the manner which becomes such a people, driven into such a conflict. And the more completely those who are in arms against the nation realize, that what they seek is, probably, not attainable; and the more clearly the States and people now seduced or terrified into a revolt so unnatural, understand that the suppression of that revolt means, not their degradation, but their restoration to all that was won by the valor, and confirmed by the wisdom of their ancestors; the more certain will be the cure of their present frenzy — the more rapid their deliverance from the delusions under which they have erred ex-

Digitized by Google

ceedingly — and the more thorough their overthrow of the faction now leading them to destruction.

5. To all human appearance, the establishment of the independence of the Confederate States by the present war, is impossible. How much blood may be shed, how much treasure may be squandered, how much suffering may be inflicted, how much ruin, in ten thousand ways, may be brought upon millions of people, and how near to the brink of destruction the country may be brought — can now be known only to the Ruler of the Universe. But so far as any object avowed, or even conceivable, which ever was, or can be, proposed as a benefit to the Southern States, was expected to be promoted by secession; this war renders that object unattainable. We do not propose to enter into discussions from a military point of view, nor do we underrate the difficulties of every kind, which the General Government has to encounter. But it seems to us perfectly inevitable, that without the special interposition of God for the destruction of this great nation, the certainty is complete — that the independence of the Confederate States cannot be established as the result of this war. In the degree that this judgment may be supposed to be just, two conclusions, both of them of great weight, follow. The first is, the wickedness and folly not only of the revolt itself, but of the whole spirit and method in which it has been prosecuted; the second is the certainty that the fact itself, in proportion as it becomes manifest, must weaken, throughout the whole South, the purpose to prosecute a conflict so ruinous and so bootless. No doubt there are wars which may be prosecuted to the last extremity; and, no doubt, many thousands of secessionists may have persuaded themselves that this is such a war, or may have so deeply wrecked all other hopes that only this desperate stake is left to them. But the dictates of reason and morality — the judgment of mankind — and the irreversible decree of posterity, is different here. This is a revolt, whose complete success would not have justified the war into which it has plunged a great country; and, therefore, the certainty of its failure robs its continuance of all pretext. And such, at no distant period, may be expected to be the judgment of the great mass of the Southern people; and, by consequence, their peaceful and cordial return to their loyalty, and to

Digitized by Google

the exercise of all their rights as citizens of the United States — instead of being a preposterous dream — is not only the most probable, but apparently the certain result, of a wise and courageous treatment of affairs.

V. Miscalculations of Secession. Miscarriage as to a "United South." And as to a "Divided North." And as to the temper, and purpose of the Nation. And as to Expansion, the Slave trade, Free trade, Boundless Prosperity, Cotton Monopoly. Secession a frightful and incalculable mistake.

1. If we consider for a moment the signal miscarriage of all the permanent objects of the secessionists, and the strange miscalculations, and absurd pretensions upon which their hopes of ultimate success rested; it will diminish, on one hand, all distrust of the grounds on which their hopes of establishing their independence by terrifying the nation into consent, or conquering it by arms, have been shown to be futile; and will augment, on the other hand, the just confidence of the nation that it is master of the situation; and augment, also, the confidence with which every man in the South, whether loyal or disloyal, ought to contemplate the disastrous end of this revolt, as inevitable. To succeed in establishing, by force, the independence of the South — using that word in its large sense, as embracing all the Slave States — necessarily involved, as the very first condition, the unanimity of the whole South in the movement. Instead of this, such a line of conduct was adopted, as made the action of every Southern State isolated; and this policy was pursued in such a manner, as to make a resort to violence necessary in securing unanimity in any State — and as to make the principles of despotism supplant the principles of freedom, in every State. The seeds of utter defeat were thickly sown in the first open movement of the conspiracy. To-day, instead of a completely united, there is a thoroughly divided South. And we feel perfectly satisfied, that if every arm was removed from the fifteen Slave States, and every man in them all was allowed freely to choose his side — and then the whole population was equally and completely armed, and the question fought out; the result would be the suppression of the revolt. Born of Southern parents, in a Southern State — never having owed or professed allegiance to any other government than that of the United States, and that

Digitized by Google

of the Commonwealth of Kentucky — never having even resided, during a life far from short, except temporarily and for brief periods, out of the South — and having been obliged by our course of life to acquire a large acquaintance with the people, the institutions, and the interests of the South; the opinion we have expressed may be fairly weighed against a large amount of clamor. It would, we are convinced, be vouched as true and sound, on the conditions stated, by more than half a million of Southern men — ready upon fair occasion, and if need required, to uphold it with their lives.

2. Again, the second imperative necessity, preliminary to any flagrant proceedings by force, was the absolute certainty that the pretensions of the South would be supported, at least by opinion, in the twenty States of the North, in such a way as to divide and weaken all concerted movements, designed to precipitate the overwhelming force of twenty millions of people, upon eight millions — if the whole South was united — with four millions of slaves scattered amongst them; concerning the freedom or the servitude of which slaves, the revolutionists professed that the chief cause of the war lay. Instead of that, the unanimity of the North proved, from the start, to be complete, and its enthusiasm so great, that a brief proclamation of the President, after the bombardment at Charleston, called three or four hundred thousand volunteers to the standard of the nation; a single State, (Ohio) offering more men than were demanded for the whole nation. With these two facts, nothing can be more obvious, than the utter incompetency or the desperate recklessness, of those who precipitated their followers into a conflict as unequal as it was wicked — and did this with boastings and revilings as unseemly as they were unfounded.

3. Again, no delusion was ever more complete than that into which the leaders of the secession party fell and slept, during their long conspiracy of thirty years, of the true character, and actual position and temper of the American people, and of the force of the power they had themselves accumulated, and the value of the preparation they had made for the setting of a great nation at defiance. They had talked treason so long together, that they seemed to consider it a power of

Digitized by Google

itself, and all patriotism extinct. The national treasury made bankrupt, the small army put totally out of reach, and the arms of the nation diligently stored where they could be seized — the little navy laid up, or scattered in different seas — the unhappy President deluded, seduced, or terrified — and a secret band of sworn allies made up of desperate adventurers, disloyal soldiers, and corrupt politicians scattered over the nation; these, as far as the public are yet informed, seem to have been the original implements which were deemed adequate for the first start of a military revolution, whose object was the dismemberment of one of the greatest of existing nations of the most warlike people, with the finest and firmest nationality in the world. Their subsequent success — founded upon a temporary phrenzy in the public mind, and upon the military ardor of the Southern people, their devotion to their domestic institutions, and their personal and State pride — may be allowed to redeem, in some degree, the miscalculated force of the conspiracy, from utter contempt. It is not, however, to the force or foresight of the conspiracy, but it is to the disordered and perilous state of the country, itself due to causes which we have developed in publications hitherto recently made; that the great political and military movements throughout the larger portion of the South, subsequent to the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, are to be attributed. These movements — in many points of view most deplorable, in many others illustrative of noble traits of character of the Southern people, and which have given to the secession cause most of its strength and all its dignity — even if they could have been foreseen as one element of the future, are the farthest possible from excusing the revolt. For great as they may be, and unworthy as the cause of secession may be of them — their inadequacy to achieve the objects proposed by the war, is none the less certain; an inadequacy founded in the nature of things, and which wise leaders would have foreseen, and generous leaders would not have sacrificed.

4. When we turn our thoughts towards topics more remote than those hitherto considered, they all appear to conspire to the same result — the entire defeat of every permanent object proposed to be gained by the secession war. If the whole of the

Digitized by Google

Slave States were united, as the result of this war, in a separate Confederacy — all the ideas of the future expansion of the new nation, which have occupied so large a space in the thoughts of men, might be surrendered at once. One year would not elapse, in all probability, before an alliance of all nations interested in the vast and increasing commerce which must pass across the isthmus of Panama, and amongst the islands of the Caribbean sea, and across the waters of the Gulf of Mexico; would effectually close the question of expansion, for the Confederate States. In like manner, the question of the Slave Trade, to the free prosecution of which so much importance continues to be attached, in the most earnest of the seceded States; may be considered definitively at an end, let this revolt terminate as it may. In like manner, the doctrine of Free Trade, in favor of which the doctrine of secession took its rise in South Carolina, and which has been continually and conspicuously held forth as one of the priceless blessings to be secured by the revolt; is utterly subverted by one of the earliest acts of the Confederate Congress, imposing a duty on exports — a form of obstructing commerce forbidden by the Federal Constitution. And the boasted career of incalculable wealth which secession promised to inaugurate — in the first year of its existence is signalized by the charity of the people of Illinois sending corn free of charge, to the starving poor of Mississippi; while, if the war shall continue till the Confederate States conquer the United States, their first year of peace will exhibit the heaviest ratable public debt, perhaps, in the world, and the most burdensome taxation ever borne by an agricultural people; and a bankruptcy as absolute as the golden dreams of secession were preposterous. To make but one suggestion more, it would, perhaps, have been impossible for any madness less destructive than this secession war, to have seriously disturbed for a century to come, the near approach which the South was making to the most productive and extensive monopoly, ever possessed by any people in the products of the earth — in its growing control of the cotton market of the world. At present, so imminent is the peril into which this boundless source of wealth has been brought, not only for a few seasons, but it may be in permanence — that the armed intervention of the great mari-

Digitized by Google

time and manufacturing nations of the world, for the deliverance and protection of the cotton of the Confederate States, is amongst the desperate hopes to which their situation gives expression.

5. Now it does appear to us, that these statements reveal principles and facts of supreme significance, all pointing in the same direction, and challenging profound consideration. They appear to prove, that secession, in its origin, its progress, its present condition, and its terrible future — is a blunder, a failure, a frightful and incalculable mistake, founded upon every sort of error and miscalculation. It is in that view of them, and of their teachings, that we have arrayed them. Allowing whatever may be thought necessary for our mistake, for our want of full knowledge, even for our supposed prejudice or want of candor, enough remains to indicate, what we have so earnestly insisted on, that the complete restoration of the Union, is not only a glorious event within our reach — which it is the highest duty and interest, both of the nation and of the seceded States, to accept and act upon; but that the ordinary course of the immense and terrible affairs now passing before our eyes, leads, though it may be through frightful sufferings, towards that result. Would to God, it might have been in peace, and by reason and love, that the country had been saved! Thanks be to God, for a refuge to all parties, such as seems to us to be set before them all, when these calamities are overpassed! For the blood that is shed, and the crimes that are committed — let them who are responsible answer to God!

VI. The Border Slave States. State of parties in 1860. Sudden and secret Revolution in Virginia. Probable effects, political and military. Western Virginia. Central mountain Route to the central South. Delaware, Maryland, Missouri. The original States — the States carved out of them — the purchased States. Kentucky, her position, peril, temper, purpose.

1. At the start, this secession movement was exclusively confined to the disciples of Mr. Calhoun — and they, having their chief seat in South Carolina, and schools rather than parties in the upper Slave States, did not hold the controlling power even in 1860, in one half of the Cotton States. By degrees, the Democratic party of the South had become imbued, under the abused name of "State Rights," with the doctrines of free trade, of the

Digitized by Google

increase and extension of slavery, and of secession: and the disruption of that party at Charleston and Baltimore, as far as the public are now informed, was in the interest of these new ideas, and of those old disciples of Mr. Calhoun. The parties, in the fifteen Slave States, which supported Mr. Bell and Mr. Douglass for the Presidency in 1860, could, if they had united, have carried nearly all those States — and, for the time, have put down secession. If the Whig Convention, at Baltimore, had nominated Gen. Houston, instead of Mr. Bell, this result would probably have followed. It is, in effect, the want of ability, or the want of patriotism, in the leaders of parties in the Slave States in 1860, to which a very large part of the present danger of the nation is to be attributed. In the mean time, the Democratic party had already, before 1860, acquired the predominance in all the Slave States, and when the secession party took up arms against the National Government, the political and military power of all those States was in the hands of that party. The election of Mr. Lincoln, which produced such a shock throughout the Slave States, afforded the opportunity of creating a powerful agitation, upon the extreme pro-slavery aspect of secession; and it was used with so little scruple and so great diligence, that to be loyal to the Union, and to be an abolitionist, have come to mean the same thing in the vocabulary of secessionists; and organized political fanatics and ruffians, wherever they are not repressed by the fear of effectual resistance, have, under that pretext, initiated a reign of terror. The common predominance of the Democratic party, and the universal existence of the institution of slavery in all those States, were the bonds of union amongst them all, whereby those who meditated revolt expected and sought to carry them all for secession: the latter fact affording the secessionists the most powerful means of inflaming the passions of men, and the former fact providing the power to coerce such as could not be seduced. So far as the five Border Slave States were concerned, of which we have now to speak particularly, (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri) the presidential election of 1860 broke the back of this scheme, by breaking, in those five States, the power of the party which supported Major Breckinridge for the Presidency. The other part of the scheme of the

Digitized by Google

secessionists, encountered, in those five States, obstacles which proved to be extremely serious. In the first place, the loyalty of the people was far more stubborn than had been expected, and the peril of attempting to coerce them into disloyalty far more grave than had been encountered elsewhere. In the second place, the institution of slavery, in those States, stood in a position, and the people occupied toward it a relation, widely different from the corresponding facts in the Cotton States; and the people, satisfied with the matter as it stood, saw nothing but peril in the remedy offered by secession. In the third place, the geographical position of those States gave them immense weight while peace could be maintained, and made them the theatre of the war, which every one could see the secessionists were making inevitable; so that every consideration of wisdom, patriotism and self-respect, admonished them to maintain, inviolably, their position as citizens of the United States.

2. Such, briefly, was the nature of the situation, generally considered, in the five Border Slave States; which contain more white inhabitants, and military resources, than the remaining ten Slave States. If these five States had stood firm, the fate of secession was sealed. The war must have been short, as the speedy and complete restoration of the Union certain. The sudden, secret, and deplorable revolution created in Virginia by a Convention, pledged to the great majority of the people who had elected them, and expressly bound, by the law which created the body, to take a widely different course; necessarily changed, in many respects, the posture of events, and the nature and course of the war. It cannot, in our judgment, as we have shown, change the final result. It will inflict incalculable injury upon Virginia herself — and must, so far as she is concerned, end in the division of the commonwealth, or in radical changes in the nature of her government, and in her internal policy. As we understand the matter, the popular representation rests on a mixed and arbitrary basis of land, slaves, and voters, distributing representation by great sections of the State, and then by counties, and towns perhaps, in those sections respectively; the general result being, that the great central section of the State is unequally represented as compared with the eastern section, and the still greater western

Digitized by Google

section still more unequally as compared with both the others The government, thus permanently thrown into the hands of a minority of the people occupying the eastern and southern sections of the State, has been long considered disregardful of the ordinary rights and interests of the subject majority, occupying the western and northern sections of the State. A permanent and flagrant instance of this chronic injustice, is an unequal system of taxation, so framed as to relieve the immense aggregate wealth, in the form of slaves, held by the ruling minority, in large part from any tax at all, and as to the remainder, from a large part of the property tax, by fixing a low and arbitrary value on slaves, by act of Assembly. Another instance of the same sort is alleged to exist, in the systematic injustice with which the revenue thus fraudulently raised, is spent entirely in the interest of the same ruling minority, with complete disregard of the special interests of the heavily taxed majority. The Convention which voted, in secret session, the ordinance of secession, with a mob of secession ruffians, as is alleged, clamoring at their reluctant obedience to its behests; passed, also, and submitted with that ordinance, to the people for ratification, an act proposing to concede something concerning this slave taxation. Even this concession, wrung by the necessity of the occasion — was characteristic of the ruling spirit; the great revolution, though submitted to the idle form of a popular vote, under the eyes of fifty thousand armed secessionists — being made effectual and executed at once, as if already approved by the people; the little act of concession, being made ineffectual, till ratified by the popular vote. This statement, necessary to the full understanding of the case between Eastern and Western Virginia, makes it all the more probable that the movement in the latter against secession, and against the dominant minority in the former, will have consequences at once permanent and important; all bearing directly against the efficacy of the revolutionary action of Eastern Virginia, and of the late Convention.

3. Not the least important of the consequences involved in the state of affairs we have been disclosing, is that a perfectly practicable military route is thus opened through the heart of the most loyal population of the whole South, into the very heart of

Digitized by Google

the inland secession country; whereby the General Government may lead an army for the protection of loyal citizens in the back parts of Georgia and both the Carolinas on the left hand, in Northern Mississippi and Alabama in front, and in West Tennessee on the right. The mountain region which covers Western Virginia and Eastern Kentucky and Tennessee, penetrates into Georgia, Alabama, and North and South Carolina. Two hundred miles wide from east to west, and double as long from north to south, the long valleys of this remarkable region, flanked everywhere by mountain ranges, run precisely in the direction that an army for protection of loyal citizens of the South should take. A march of ten or fifteen days from the Ohio river, through Western Virginia, would place a force in the mountains of East Tennessee, cutting the line of the railroad which connects the Atlantic ocean with the Mississippi river at Memphis. The effects of such a forward movement, invited by the conduct of Virginia, and indicated by the highest military and political considerations — would be immediate and decisive, if sustained by an adequate force, under an able commander. And our persecuted brethren in East Tennessee, Northern Alabama, and the back parts of Georgia and the Carolinas, may see — in the hints that we have ventured to throw out — that they are not out of the reach of succor. We believe that ten thousand volunteers from the mountains of Kentucky, would follow ROBERT ANDERSON in such an expedition, for such an object; and it may be confidently added, ten thousand more from Western Virginia, and ten thousand who would join them in East Tennessee. No portion of America had less motive to betray herself than Virginia had; none could ever put more at stake, by one act of, what seems to us, suicidal folly, than she has done. Renowned and venerated name! — well do we know that many of your heroic sons will die for you, on the mere point of honor, even though they blush at what you have done! They will die in vain; neither maintaining what you have decreed, nor wiping out its stain!

4. The posture of Delaware and Maryland may be considered definitively settled, and, as to the result, essentially the same, in many respects; and that of Missouri is so analagous to that of Maryland, that we need not separate it from them, in the few

Digitized by Google

remarks it is necessary to make. Delaware casts in her lot, with a prompt movement and a loyal heart, with the nation of which she is so small but so true a part. The relation of Delaware to Maryland is geographically such, that it seems a great marvel that both of them should, in times like these, apparently overlook the great mutual importance of their forming the closest bonds with each other. Maryland looked to Virginia for guidance — when she and Delaware united were really more important to the Federal Government, than Virginia was; and far more entitled, in the circumstances, to give the lead than to follow Virginia. Her great peril before the late revolt in Baltimore, was her want of preparation, watchfulness, and self-reliance; which, but for the wise, forbearing, and firm conduct of the General Government, would have cost her dear. Her great peril now is, from the seductions of Virginia, and the machinations of her own disloyal sons. As to her destiny — no discussion can make it any plainer than it is already, to every one who will reflect upon her whole position. As long as the Federal Government exists, and Washington is the capital of the American nation, Maryland is an indispensable portion of that nation; and as such, has before her a boundless career of prosperity, freedom, and honor. In her, disloyalty to the nation is not only wickedness — it is folly. The same general state of case, though for reasons in some respects different, exists with regard to Missouri. If the country west of Missouri is to remain a portion of the nation, it is impossible for the nation to allow that State to separate from it. If the South is to become a separate nation, it is equally impossible for the United States to give up the military position — one of the strongest in the world — covered by the mouths of the Ohio and Missouri rivers. The position of Missouri is central, and unspeakably powerful and important, as a member of the Federal Union; and there is no degree of wealth, power, and influence, to which she may not attain, if the Union is maintained. So that her own interest, in every conceivable way, points to the same great career, which the absolute necessities of the nation will secure for her, if she continues loyal to it. To us, we admit, this whole affair of secession has been an enigma, in this — that all the reasons and pretexts, alleged as a justification, or even an excuse

Digitized by Google

for the course which the revolt has taken, have appeared to us so totally disproportioned to the conduct they professed to explain; that we have felt as if there must be other grounds, as yet concealed from the public, upon which men of sense and honor pursued a line of conduct, apparently so monstrous, as compared with all the known defences of it. We regret to say that the secessionists in Missouri, and we must add, though perhaps in a less degree, in Maryland, appear to be signally amenable to this charge, whether we consider what it was they attempted — or the means which they resorted to — or the manner in which they quailed, when it became necessary to assume the responsibility of what they had done — or the machinations they have kept up, since their conspiracy in both those States was defeated. It is clear to us that the million and a half, or upwards, of white inhabitants, in Delaware, Maryland, and Missouri, must be counted out — whenever the strength of secession is summed up. And we will now proceed to show that the million in Kentucky must also be deducted.

5. There are very high senses in which all the States are equal, both in fact, and in the contemplation of the Federal Constitution. Nevertheless, there are circumstances connected with the past history, and indeed with the origin, of all the States, that seem to place them in positions by no means identical — touching the "State Rights," and the corresponding "National Rights," which enter so largely into the difficulties produced by secession. We have, in a former publication, attempted to show that a National Government and State Governments united into one political system, is the original, continuous, exclusive, and perpetual form of government chosen by the American people since ever they were a nation, and by all the commonwealths composing that nation since ever they were States; and we have attempted, after establishing this controlling truth, to show its bearing upon secession, in various points of view. What we have to say now is, that at the bar of reason and conscience, there is a difference touching the rights claimed, as to secession, between the original thirteen States, and the twenty-one States added since; and that there is a difference, again, between those out of these twenty-one added States, which were acquired by conquest, treaty, or purchase,

Digitized by Google

and those which were created out of portions of the first thirteen States. The plea of Virginia or North Carolina, for example, might have a certain aspect entitling it to grave consideration; while the plea, for example, of Louisiana, Texas, and Florida, might provoke only derision; while the plea, for example, of Tennessee to have the benefit of the Repeal Ordinance of her mother North Carolina, might appear to be nearer, in equity, to the first than to the second of the two other classes. Our judgment is against the validity of the very highest of these pleas; and the lowest of them seem to us monstrous, in every point of view. Considering the past history of the case of Louisiana, for example, her recent conduct, so far from being founded in justice, is even destitute of a decent regard for appearances.

6. The position of Kentucky, the only remaining Border Slave State, is historically at the head of the class of new States carved out of old ones. From her birth as the first State added, nearly seventy years ago, to the original thirteen, her whole career has been marked by the noble qualities of Virginia, at that period, and before, and long after, and which shone, with peculiar luster, in the founders of the young commonwealth. And we confidently predict, that let Virginia falter and fall, as she may, her daughter will maintain her loyalty to the good, and will reject the evil, in her example. Behold an example and a proof: Virginia asked her to meet her in counsel to *preserve* the Union; meantime, Virginia suddenly determined, before the appointed day of counsel, to *destroy* the Union. Kentucky having accepted the former counsel and invitation, went on totally regardless of the subsequent madness — elected her commissioners without opposition, and by the largest popular vote she ever gave to any proposition — and kept the appointed day. There is, in fact, but one internal peril hanging over Kentucky. The executive power of the State, and the command of her military force, is in the hands of a Governor — having yet two years to serve — who is totally out of sympathy with the great mass of the people, and who has used the influence of his office, and all its power, in a direction, and towards an end, hateful to the bulk of those whose Governor he is. If Mr. Magoffin was a loyal Union man, the whole internal difficulty of Kentucky would terminate in a

Digitized by Google

week; unless the secession minority should be mad enough to take up arms, and call in Confederate troops; in which case, of course, unless Kentucky should instantly suppress them, she would become one of the theatres of the war. That event may happen. It is believed by many to be highly probable, under present circumstances. Situated as the State is, it is a contingency which is constantly impending; and to meet which, if it should happen, there is no way but by arms. The very plainest duty of the Union men of Kentucky, therefore, for months past, has been to arm and organize themselves, to the very last man, and in the most effectual manner, and in the shortest possible time. We desire, from the bottom of our heart, that Governor Magoffin, and the party with which he acts, may be content to guide their conduct by law, and in obedience to the known will of the people of Kentucky; and that by so doing, he may keep the calamities of war from desolating the State. But if he and his party will not do this, or cannot do it — upon both of which points there is deep and wide distrust in the public mind — then he and they must take the responsibility of all that may follow. And he and they both well know, that the people of Kentucky will not submit to the despotism of the Confederate States — will not allow of a reign of terror — will not tolerate revolutionary committees — will not tamely submit to injuries, insults, oppressions, or usurpations of any kind — and will not give up their loyalty to the American nation, or their place in the American Union. The mass of the people of Kentucky sincerely desire the restoration of the entire Union; they strongly disapprove of the whole course of the secessionists from the beginning; they believe, at the same time, that the whole South has had great cause of dissatisfaction — and they do not feel free to take part in the war against the Confederate States: nor will they take part against the Federal Government, which, however they may disapprove of it, or its acts, they recognize as the representative of the nation of which they are a loyal part, and the chief executive authority under that Constitution which is the supreme law. What they desire and propose, therefore, is to take no part in this war; and by this means, they intend — in the first place, to express the true state of their feelings; in the second place, to occupy a position in

Digitized by Google

which, as a mediator, they may, as soon and as often as occasion offers, do all in their power to restore peace and Union, if that be possible; and in the third place, to preserve themselves and their State from the horrors of a conflict which they did all they could to prevent, which they cannot engage in with a good will, and which, in the divided state of opinion amongst her people, and by reason of her geographical position, would probably be ruinous to the State, by means of her becoming actively engaged in it.

7. Such we believe to be the existing state of opinion and affairs in Kentucky. With regard to it, we will make but two general remarks. The first is, that in our judgment, the state of opinion in Kentucky is chiefly characterized by the public mind being torn by conflicting principles and passions, often working even in the same mind, in opposite directions,— and, as the general result, begetting a decided popular reluctance to any violent measures, or any extreme courses, or any irrecoverable step; but that the tendency of opinion has been constant and rapid, in favor of the Union; and that, at every period, and especially at present, the number of persons who would vote to take Kentucky out of the Union, is a comparatively small portion of the people — made dangerous by their violence, their activity, their organization, their being extensively armed, their good understanding with the secession leaders and military officers, and their sympathy with the chief executive and military authorities in the Commonwealth. The second remark we have to make is, that the same wise and lofty forbearance manifested by the general Government towards Maryland, and we will add towards Missouri — will be manifested, there is every reason to believe, towards Kentucky, in the high but unusual position she has felt it to be her duty to assume. In the case of Kentucky — and we may add Missouri — this conduct of the President, which those States certainly should applaud, and which would give them peace at once, if it were imitated by the Confederate Government, is extremely significant; as it seems to indicate that, in his opinion, the neutral and yet loyal position of these two great central States, may, in certain highly probable events of the war, be turned to great advantage, in that complete restoration of the

Digitized by Google

Union, which the loyal citizens of both of those States ardently desire.

VII. General Conclusion.

There remain many topics of great importance and significance, concerning which we have said nothing. And yet the number and the magnitude of those we have attempted to elucidate, compared with the narrowness of the space they occupy, might indicate that our error may rather be in attempting too much, than in not attempting more. The whole subject is one, of which we never think seriously, without profound astonishment and anguish; about which we have never written a line without attempting to exercise the severest rectitude, as if we were speaking in the face of another generation. This civil war is a terrible portent. All civilized nations regard it with horror; and posterity will be obliged to pronounce it an inconceivable outrage upon the freedom, the morality, and the civilization of the present age. To what ends God, in his adorable Providence, has allowed it, and will conduct it, and use it — it behooves every one, who acknowledges there is a God, to ponder deeply — and every one, who professes to serve God, to search diligently.

A few great truths seem to us transparently clear — and amongst them not one is more impressive, at the present moment, than that which we have attempted to illustrate in this paper. The American Nation ought to be preserved, and the American Union ought to be restored. This war ought to be conducted by the Nation — under the impression of that solemn necessity — which, as far as we can judge, is shown to be attainable, alike by the indications of Divine Providence, and by all the circumstances upon which enlightened human judgments can be formed. If in these things we err, nothing will remain, but for the nation to bow its august head reverently before the known will of God, and the irresistible force of destiny. It has already redeemed itself from the ignominious fate to which the last Federal Administration had consigned it. Let its destruction bear some just proportion to the glory of its past life.

* *
*

Digitized by Google

DISCOURSE

OF

DR. R. J. BRECKINRIDGE,

DELIVERED ON THE DAY OF

NATIONAL HUMILIATION,

JANUARY 4, 1861,

AT LEXINGTON, KY.

It is in circumstances, my friends, of terrible solemnity, that this great nation presents herself in an attitude of humiliation before the Lord God of Hosts; in circumstances of great solemnity, that she stands before the bar of all surrounding nations, under that universal public opinion which gives fame or stamps with infamy; and hardly less solemn than both, is her attitude at the bar of distant ages and especially our own posterity, that awful tribunal whose decrees can be reversed only by the decree of God. It is the first of these three aspects, either passing by in silence or touching very slightly the other two, that I am to consider before you now. And what I shall chiefly attempt to show is, that our duties can never be made subordinate to our passions without involving us in ruin, and that our rights can never be set above our interests without destroying both.

In taking this direction, let us bear in mind that the proclamation of the Chief Magistate of the Republic which calls us to this service, asserts, in the first place, that ruin is impending over our national institutions; and asserts, in the second place, that so far as appears to him no human resources remain that are adequate to save them; and, in the third place, that the whole nation, according to his judgment, ought

Digitized by Google

to prostrate itself before God and cry to him for deliverance. —Upon this I have to say, in the great name of God, and by the authority of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, these two things: *First*, that national judgments never come except by reason of national sins; nor are they ever turned aside except upon condition of repentance for the sins which produced them: and, *Secondly*, that repentance for sin, as it is the absolute and universal, so it is the infallible condition of divine pardon and acceptance, not only in the case of individuals, but more obviously still and more immediately in the case of nations, since nations, as such, have no existence in a future life. Wherefore, if we are in the way of fearful evils, we are also in the way of clear duty, and therein we may hope for assured deliverance in the degree, first, that every one will go before another in earnest endeavors to rectify in himself all that is abominable to God; and, secondly, that every one will evince towards others the forbearance which he desires that God should extend towards him. Wherefore, also, we may boldly say that the remedy from God to us need not be expected to manifest itself by means of political parties, or by means of combinations of political leaders, or by means of new political compacts, or by means of additional legal enactments, or by means of more explicit constitutional provisions; but that it must come from God to us, and be made manifest through a profound movement in the source of all power in free governments, namely, first, in the hearts of individuals, men turning from their sins, their follies, and their madness; and, secondly, in the uprising of an irresistible impulse thus created, which over the length and breadth of the land shall array itself in the power of God, against every endeavor to bring upon us the evils which we are imploring God to avert.

The first and greatest of these evils that we beseech God to avert, and that we should strive with all our might to prevent, is the annihilation of the nation itself, by tearing it into fragments. Men may talk of rights perpetually and out-

Digitized by Google

rageously violated—they may talk of injuries that are obliged to be redressed — they may talk about guarantees without which they can submit to no further peace—and there is doubtless much that has force and much more that is captivating to ardent minds in such expositions of our sad condition. For what problem half so terrible was ever agitated upon which it was not easy to advance much on every side of it? I will not consume the short time allowed to me in examining such views. What I assert, in answer to them all is, that we have overwhelming duties and incalculable interests which dictate a special line of conduct, the chief aim of which should be the preservation of the American Union, and therein of the American nation.

To be more explicit, it seems to me that there are inestimable blessings connected with the preservation of our National Union; and that there are intolerable evils involved in its destruction. For the blessings: there is the blessing of peace amongst ourselves, there is the blessing of freedom to ourselves and to our posterity, there is the blessing of internal prosperity secured by that peace, and freedom, never before excelled, if attained, by any people; there is the blessing of national independence secured by our invincible strength, against all the powers of the earth combined; there is the blessing of our glorious example to all nations and to all ages; there is the blessing of irresistible power to do good to all peoples, and to prevent evil over the face of the whole earth: there is the blessing of an unfettered Gospel and an open Bible and a divine Saviour, more and more manifested in our whole national life as that life deepens and spreads, subduing and possessing the widest and the noblest inheritance ever given to any people, and overflowing and fructifying all peoples besides. It is the problem sought to be solved from the beginning of time, and, to say, the least, the nearest approximation made to its solution, namely, the complete possession of freedom united with irresistible national force, and all directed to the glory of God and to the good of man. And this is that glorious estate

Digitized by Google

now declared to be in fearful peril, and which we are called upon to beseech God to preserve unto us.

On the other hand, the evils of rending this nation. Which of the blessings that I have enumerated—and I have enumerated only those that appeared to me to be the most obvious—which of these is there—peace, freedom, prosperity, independence, the glory of our example, the power to do good and to prevent evil, the opportunity to give permanent efficiency all over this continent, and in a certain degree all over this earth to the Gospel of God; which of these blessings is there that may not be utterly lost to vast portions of the nation;—which of them that may not be jeoparded over this whole continent; which of them is there that may not depart forevermore from us and our posterity in the attempt to destroy our oneness as a people, and in the results of that unparalleled self-destruction? Besides all this, how obvious and how terrible are the evils over and above, which the very attempt begets, and which our after progress must necessarily make permanent if that attempt succeeds. First, we have already incurred the perils of universal bankruptcy before the first act is achieved by one of the least important of the thirty-three States. Secondly, we have already seen constitutional government both in its essence and in its form trampled under foot by the convention of that State; and all the powers of sovereignty itself, both ordinary and extraordinary, assumed by it in such a manner that life, liberty and property have no more security in South Carolina than anywhere under Heaven where absolute despotism or absolute anarchy prevails, except in the personal characters of the gentlemen who hold the power. Thirdly, we have already seen that small community preparing to treat with foreign nations, and if need be introduce foreign armies into this country: headlong in the career in which she disdains all counsel, scorns all consultation and all entreaty, and treats all ties, all recollections, all existing engagements and obligations as if her ordinance of secession had not only denationalized that

Digitized by Google

community, but had extinguished all its past existence. Fourthly, we see the glorious flag of this Union torn down and a colonial flag floating in its place; yea, we see that community thrown into paroxysms of rage, and the Cabinet at Washington thrown into confusion because in the harbor of Charleston our national flag instead of being still further dishonored, yet floats over a single tower! What then did they expect, who sent to the harbor of Charleston, to occupy the national fortress there, the son of a companion of Washington, a hero whose veins are full of revolutionary blood, and whose body is covered with honorable scars won in the service of his country? Why did they send that Kentucky hero there if they did not intend the place they put into his hands to be kept, to the last extremity? But I need not enlarge upon this terrible aspect of what is coming to us all if the Union is destroyed. These are but the beginnings of sorrows. The men and the parties who initiate the reign of lawless passion, rarely escape destruction amid the storms they create, but are unable to control. Law comes from the depth of eternity, and in its sublime sway is the *nexus* of the universe. Institutions *grow;* they are not *made*. Desolated empires are never restored. All history furnishes no such example. If we desire to perish, all we have to do is to leap into this vortex of disunion. If we have any just conception of the solemnity of this day, let us beseech God that our country shall not be torn to pieces; and under the power of these solemnities let us quit ourselves like men in order to avert that most horrible of all national calamities.

Let us consider, in the next place, those rights, as they are called, by means of which, and in their extreme exercise, all the calamities that threaten us are to be brought upon us at any moment: nay, are to be so brought upon us that our destruction shall be perfectly regular, perfectly legal, perfectly constitutional! In which case a system like ours—a system the most enduring of all others, whether we consider the history of the past or the laws which enter into its composition—a

Digitized by Google

system the hardest of all others to be deranged, and the easiest of all to be readjusted when deranged; such a system is alleged to have a secret in it, designed expressly to kill it, at the option of the smallest fragment of it. I allude to the claim of the right of Nullification and the claim of the right of Secession as being Constitutional rights; and I desire to explain myself briefly in regard to them.

According to my comprehension there is a thorough and fundamental difference between the two. The power of Nullification, supposing it to exist, would be an extreme right within the Union, and is necessarily temporary in its effect, and promptly tends to the termination of the difficulty upon which it arises. And this settlement may occur by the action of our complex system of government in various ways. It may be in the way of some compromise of existing difficulties; or in the way of repeal, by one party or the other, or in the modification of the obnoxious laws; or in the way of some judicial decision settling the difficulty; or—which is the true remedy—instead of Nullification, by an appeal to the people at the polls, who are the source of all power in free governments, and by obedience to their decisions when rendered—by voting, instead of fighting; or, at the worst, by an appeal to arms; but even in that case the result necessarily secures the continuance of the pre-existing system of government on the restoration of peace; let that peace be by victory on which side you please. The doctrine of Nullification stands related to the doctrine of State Rights—precisely as the doctrine of consolidation stands related to the old federal doctrine of a strong central Goverment. In both cases, the theory of a great party has been pushed to a logical absurdity, which subverted our political system. That the will of the greater part should prevail—and that the smaller parts should have the power of appeal to this will, at the polls—and in judgment upon every principle of civil and political liberty—was the ultimate form in which this great doctrine entered into the political creed of that old Republican party which

Digitized by Google

came into power with Mr. Jefferson in 1801, and was expounded as they held it in those famous resolutions of Kentucky and Virginia in the latter part of the last century. Its connection with the whole theory of every mixed political system, is not only absolute but is vital. More especially is it so with our complex system. It has been carried, as it stands connected with the constitutional, and much more with the reserved rights of the States, to an extreme on that side, opposite to the extreme of Consolidation. But even in its extremest form it bears no proportion in mischief to the doctrine of Secession. Considered in its true and original form, I judge it to be indispensable to the preservation of our political system; and that the opposite mode of interpreting our political duties, and rights and remedies, terminates in subjugating the States to the General Government, and in subjugating both the General Government and the exposition of every political principle to the Supreme Court of the United States. The former system is natural and permanent—the latter is absurd and invites rebellion. This great phenomenon has occured in this country, that, by reason of the extraordinary ability of some of the advocates of the system which passed away in 1801, it has assumed a new form and a new life in general opinion; and seconded by the peculiar constitution of the Supreme Court of the United States, the old Republican or Democratic notions upon this great subject, though constantly triumphant in the country, have been constantly disallowed in the interpretations of that court. I judge that the doctrine of Secession is an extreme reaction against this Federal interpretation of the relations of the States to each other and to the nation. For when you arrive at an interpretation which is final and hateful to immense parties and interests; and there is no remedy but arms, secession or absolute submission; the expression of the popular will against the interpretation you have made, brings society to a condition that in an excitable race and amongst a free people can hardly be expected to be safe

Digitized by Google

or easy to be managed. You have therefore this perilous and extraordinary claim of the right of secession under this extreme reaction; differing absolutely from the idea of the old States Rights' party, and differing absolutely even from nullification itself.

Secession is a proceeding which begins by tearing to pieces the whole fabric of government, both social and political. It begins by rendering all redress of all possible evils utterly impossible under the system that exists, for its very object is to destroy its existence. It begins by provoking war, and rendering its occurrence apparently inevitable, and its termination well-nigh impossible. Its very design is not to reform the administration of existing laws, not to obtain their repeal or modification, but to annihilate the institutions of the country, and to make many nations out of one. If it is the constitutional right of any State to do this, then we have no National Government, and never had any. Then, also, it is perfectly idle to speak of new Constitutions, since the new Constitutions can have no more force than the Constitution already despised and disobeyed. Then, also, the possibility is ended—ended in the very theory of the case, and illustrated in the utter failure of its practice—of uniting republican freedom with national strength in any country, or under any form of government. But according to my belief, and according to the universal belief of the American people but a little while ago, no such right, legal or constitutional, as that of secession, does or can exist under any form of government, and least of all under such institutions as ours.

And, first of all, no State in this Union ever had any sovereignty at all independent of and except as they were *United* States. When they speak of recovering their sovereignty, when they speak of returning to their condition as sovereigns in which they were before they were members of the confederacy, called at first the United Colonies, and then the United States, they speak of a thing that is historically without any foundation. They were not States; they were

Digitized by Google

colonies of the British, the Spanish, the French, and the Dutch governments; they were colonies granted by royal charters to particular individuals, or particular companies. Pennsylvania was the estate, the property of William Penn; Georgia, the larger part, perhaps the whole of it, of General Oglethorpe. They were settled under charters to individuals and to companies—settled as colonies of foreign kings and States by their subjects. As such they revolted; as such, before their revolt, they united in a continental government, more or less complete; as such united colonies, they pronounced that famous Declaration of Independence, which, after a heroic struggle of seven years, still as united colonies, they made good. That great Washington, who led that great war, was the commander-in-chief for and in behalf of these united colonies. As such they were born States. The treaty of peace that made them independent States, was concluded with them altogether—as United States. What sovereignty did Kentucky ever have except the sovereignty that she has as a State of these United States, born at the same moment a State of the American Union and a separate sovereign State? We were a district of Virginia. We became a State and we became one of the United States at the same moment, for the same purpose, and for good and all. What I mean by this, is to point out the fact that the complex system of government which we have in this country did always, does now, and, in the nature of the case, must contemplate these States as united into a common government, and that common government as really a part of our political system, as the particular institutions of the separate sovereignties are a part of our political system. And while, as you will observe, I have attempted, while repudiating the doctrine of nullification, to vindicate that doctrine of State Rights, which, as I firmly believe, is an integral and indispensable part of our political system; yet, on the other hand, the doctrine that we are a nation, and that we have a national government, is and always was just as truly a part of our system as the other.

Digitized by Google

And our political system always stood as much upon the basis that we are a nation, as it stood upon the basis that that nation is composed of sovereign States. They were born into both relations; so born that each State is equally and forever, by force of its very existence and the manner thereof, both a part of this American nation, and also a sov ereign State of itself. The people, therefore, can no more legally throw off their national allegiance than they can legally throw off their State allegiance; nor can any State any more legally absolve the allegiance of its people to the nation, than the nation can legally absolve the allegiance due by the people to the State they live in. Either attempt, considered in any legal, in any constitutional, in any historical light, is pure madness.

Now the pretext of founding the right of secession upon the right to change or abolish the government, which is constitutionally secured to the people of the nation and the States, seems to me, and I say it with all the respect due to others, to be both immoral and absurd. Absurd, since they who claim to exercise it are, according to the very statement of the case, but an insignificant minority of those in whom the real right resides. It is a right vested by God, and recognized by our constitutions as residing in the greater part of those who are citizens under the constitution, which they change or abolish. But what, in the name of God, and all the possible and all the imaginable arrogance of South Carolina, could lead her to believe that she is the major part of all the people that profess allegiance to the Constitution of the United States? And it is immoral, because it is trifling with the sacred rights of others, with the most solemn obligations on our own part, and the most vital interests of all concerned. And it is both immoral and absurd in one, because, as a political pretext, its use in this manner invalidates and renders perilous and odious the grandest contribution of modern times to the science of government, and therein to the peace of society, the security of liberty, and the progress

Digitized by Google

of civilization; namely, the giving constitutional validity to this natural right of men to change or to abolish the government under which they live, by voting, when the major part see fit to do so. It is trifling with this great natural right, legalized in all our American constitutions, fatally caricaturing and recklessly converting it into the most terrible engine of organized legal destruction. More than that: it is impossible, in the very nature of the case, and in the very nature of government, that any such legal power, or any such constitutional right, could exist; because its existence pre-supposes law to have changed its nature; to have become mere advice; and pre-supposes government to have changed its nature, and ceasing to be a permanent ordinance of God, to become a temporary instrument of evil in the hands of factions, as they successively arise. Above all places under heaven, no such right of destruction can exist under our American constitutions, since it is they that have devised this very remedy of voting instead of fighting; they that have made this natural right a constitutional right; they that have done it for the preservation and not for the ruin of society. And it has preserved, for more than seventy years, the noblest form of human society, in constant security, and it could, if justly exercised, preserve it forever.

But let us go a little deeper still. It can not be denied that the right of self-preservation, both in men and States, is a supreme right. In private persons, it is a right regulated by law, in all communities that have laws. Among nations, there is no common supreme authority, and it must be regulated in their intercourse with each other by the discretion of each; and arms are the final appeal. In our system of government, there is ample provision made. In all disputes between any State and a foreign nation, the General Government will protect and redress the State. In disputes between two States, the Supreme Court is the constitutional arbiter. It is only in disputes that may arise between the General Government and a particular State that any serious difference

Digitized by Google

of opinion as to the remedy has manifested itself in this country; and on that subject it is the less necessary that I add any thing to what has been said when speaking of nullification, as the grounds of our existing difficulties are not between disaffected States and the General Government chiefly, if at all; but they are difficulties rather founded on opposite states of public opinion touching the institution of negro slavery, in the Northern and in the Southern States.

It may be confidently asserted that if the power of nullification, or the power of secession, or both of them, were perfectly constitutional rights, neither of them should be, under any circumstances, wantonly exercised. Nor should either of them, most especially the right of secession, ever be exercised except under extreme necessity. But if these powers, or either of them, is a mere usurpation, founded on no right whatever, then no State may resort to rebellion or revolution without, in the first place, such a necessary cause as may not be otherwise maintained; or, in the second place, without such a prospect of success as justifies the evil of rebellion or revolution, or else such intolerable evils as justify the most desperate attempts. Now it is my profound conviction that nothing has occurred, that nothing exists, which justifies that revolution which has occurred in South Carolina, and which seems to be impending in other Southern States. Beyond all doubt, nothing has occurred of this description, connected with any other interest or topic, except that of negro slavery; and connected with that, my deep assurance is, that the just and necessary cause of the slave States, may be otherwise maintained than by secession, revolution, or rebellion; nay, that it may be incomparably better maintained otherwise; nay, that it can not be maintained in that way at all, and that the attempt to do so will be fatal as regards the avowed object, and pregnant with incalculable evils besides.

In such discussions as these, the nature of the institution of slavery is perfectly immaterial. So long as the Union of the States survives, the constitutional guaranty and the fed-

Digitized by Google

eral power, which have proved adequate for more than seventy years, are that much added to whatever other force States or sections may possess to protect their rights. Nor is there, in the nature of the case, any reason why States with slaves and States without slaves, should not abide together in peace, as portions of the same great nation, as they have done from the beginning. The unhallowed passions of men; the fanaticism of the times; the mutual injuries and insults which portions of the people have inflicted on each other; the cruel use which political parties have made of unnatural and transient popular excitements; and, I must add, the unjust, offensive, and unconstitutional enactments by various State Legislatures at the North; the repeal of the Missouri Compromise by Congress; the attempt of the Supreme Court to settle political principles deemed to be of vast importance by all parties, in the Dred Scott case, which principles were not in the case at all; the subsequent conduct of the Federal Government and of the people in Kansas; the total overthrow of the Whig and American parties, the division and defeat of the Democratic party, and the triumph of the Republican party; the ordinance of secession of South Carolina; the agitation pervading the whole nation, especially the greater part of the Southern States; and to crown all, and if possible to make all desperate, the amazing conduct of the President of the United States amidst these great disorders: this is the sad outline of this slavery agitation, the posture of which for a moment is thus exhibited, no one knowing how soon new and fatal steps may hurry us still further. What I assert in the face of so much that is painful and full of peril, and what I confidently rely will be the verdict of posterity, is that all this, terrible as it is, affords no justification for the secession of any single State of the Union—none for the disruption of the American Union. They who make the attempt, will find in it no remedy for the evils from which they flee. They who goad others to this fatal step, will find that they have themselves erred exceedingly. They who have had the lead

Digitized by Google

in both acts of madness, have no hope for good from coming ages, half so great, as that they may be utterly forgotten. Posterity will receive with scorn every plea that can be made for thirty millions of free people, professing to be Christian, in extenuation of the unparalleled folly of their self-destruction, by reason that they could not deal successfully with three or four millions of African slaves, scattered amongst them. Oh! everlasting infamy, that the children of Washington did not know how to be free! Oh! degradation still deeper, that children of God did not know how to be just and to forbear with one another!

It is said, however, it is now too late.—The evil is already done. South Carolina has already gone. Florida, it is most likely went yesterday, or will go to-day, even while we are pleading with one another and with God to put a better mind in her. Soon, it may be possible within the present month, all the Cotton States will go. We, it is added, by reason of being a slave State, must also go. Our destiny, they say, our interests, our duty, our all, is bound up with theirs, and we must go together. If this be your mind, distinctly made up, then the whole services of this day are a national mockery of God; a national attempt to make our passionate impulses assume the dignity of divine suggestions, and thus seduce the Ruler of the Universe into complicity with our sins and follies, through which all our miseries are inflicted upon us. Let it be admitted that a certain number of States, and that considerable, will attempt to form a Southern Confederacy, or to form as many new sovereignties as there are seceding States. Let it be assumed that either of these results is achieved, and that either by way of peace or by war. Let all be admitted.—What then? Thirteen States by their delegates formed the present Constitution, more than seventy years ago. By the terms of the Constitution itself, it was to be enforced when any *nine* of these thirteen States adopted it—whether by convention of their people or otherwise is immaterial to the present matter. Thirteen States made the Constitution

Digitized by Google

by their delegates. A clause is inserted in it that it shall go into effect when any nine of the thirteen States adopt it, let any four refuse as they might. If they had refused what would have happened would have been, that these four States, born States, and born United States, by the Declaration of Independence, by the war of the Revolution, by the peace with Great Britain, and by the articles of confederation, would, by a common agreement among the whole thirteen, have refused to go further or to make any stronger national government; while the other nine would have gone further and made that stronger national government. But such was the desire of all parties that there should be no separation of the States at all, that the whole thirteen unanimously adopted the new Constitution, putting a clause into it that it should not go into effect unless a majority so great as nine to four would sign it. I say if a minority of States had not adopted the new Constitution, it would have occurred, that they would have passed by common consent into a new condition, and for the first time have become separate sovereign States. As you well know, none of them refused permanently. What I make this statement for, is to show that, taking that principle as just and permanent, as clearly laid down in the Constitution, it requires at least eleven States out of the existing thirty-three States to destroy, or affect in the slightest degree, the question as to whether or not the remaining States are the United States of America, under the same Constitution. Twenty-two States, according to that principle, left after eleven had seceded, would be as really the United States of America under that Federal Constitution, as they were before, according to the fundamental principle involved in the original mode of giving validity to the Constitution. Kentucky would still be as really one of these United States of America, as she was at first when, as a district of Virginia, who was one of the nine adopting States, she became, as such district, a part thereof. And by consequence, a secession of less than eleven States, can in no event, and upon no hypothesis, even so much as embarrass Ken-

Digitized by Google

tucky in determining for herself, what her duty, her honor, and her safety require her to do.

This fact is so perfectly obvious, that I presume if the six New England States were to revolt, and to establish a new confederacy, there is not a man in the State of Kentucky who would be led thereby to suppose, that our relations with the Union and the Constitution were in the slighest degree affected; or that we were on that account under the slightest obligation to revolt also. It may sound harsh, but I am very much inclined to think that there are many thousands of men in Kentucky who might be apt to suppose that the secession of the New England States would be a capital reason why nobody else should secede. It is the principle however, which I am attempting to explain.

The answer to this view, I am aware is, that we are a slave State, and that our relations are therefore necessarily different with respect to other slave States, as compared with the free States, or with the nation at large. The reply to which is various: First. The Institution of Slavery, as it exists in this country, presents a threefold, and very distinct aspect. First, the aspect of it in those States whose great staples are rice, sugar and cotton, commonly and well enough expressed by calling them the Cotton States. Then the aspect of it presented by those States in portions of which these staples are raised, and in other portions of which they are not; which we may well enough call the mixed portion of the slave States. And then its aspect in those slave States which are not producers of those great staples, in the midst of which, and out of which these great commotions come. What I assert is, that the relation of slavery to the community, and the relation of the community by reason of slavery to the General Government and the world, is widely different in all three of these classes of States. The relation of slavery to the community, to the government and to our future, in Missouri, in Kentucky, in Virginia, in Maryland, in Delaware, is evidently different from the relation of slavery in all these respects in Louisiana,

Digitized by Google

in South Carolina and in all the other Cotton States. In the meantime also, the relation is different from both of those, wherein it exists in what I have called the mixed States; in Arkansas, part of which is a farming country and a part of which is thoroughly planting; in Tennessee, part cotton, and the eastern part a mountainous farming country; in Texas and North Carolina, where similar facts exist; and perhaps in some other States. What I desire is that you get the idea I have of the matter; that while it is true that all the slave States have certain ties and sympathies between them which are real, and ought not to be broken; yet, on the other hand, it is extremely easy to carry this idea to a fatal and a false extent, and to ruin ourselves forever under the illusion begotten thereby. In Kentucky, the institution of slavery exists about in the proportion of one slave to four white people, and the gap between the two races is widening at every census. In South Carolina there are about five slaves to three white persons, and the increment is on the slave side. In the Cotton States, I know of no way in which the institution of slavery can be dealt with at all, except by keeping the relation as it stands, as an intregal portion of the body politic, unmanageable except in the present relation of the negro to the white man: and, in this posture, it is the duty of the nation to protect and defend the Cotton States. In regard to Kentucky, the institution of slavery is in such a position that the people can do with it whatever they may see fit, both now, and at any future period, without being obliged, by reason of it, to resort to any desperate expedient, in any direction.

The state of things I have sketched necessarily produces a general resemblance, indeed, because slavery is general—but, at the same time innumerable diversities, responsive to the very condition of slavery, of its prospects, and of its influence in the body politic, in the different slave States. And you never committed a greater folly than you will commit if, disregarding these things, you allow this single consideration—that you are a slave State—to swallow up every other con

Digitized by Google

sideration, and control your whole action in this great crisis. We in Kentucky are tolerant of opinion. Inform yourselves of what is passing, of an opposite character, throughout South Carolina: and reflect on the change that must pass on you, before you would be prepared to tear down the most venerable institutions, to insult the proudest emblems of your country's glory, and to treat constitutions and laws as if they were play-things for children; before you are prepared to descend from your present noble posture, and surrender yourself to the guidance and dictation of such counsels and such statesmen as rule this disunion movement. Nothing seems to me more obvious, and nothing is more important to be pressed on your attention at this moment, than that the non-cotton States stand in a position radically different in all respects from the position in which the Cotton States stand, both with regard to the institution of slavery, and with regard to the balance of the nation. The result is that all these States, the Cotton States, and the mixed States, and the non-cotton slave States, and the free States, may enjoy peace and may enjoy prosperity under a common government, and in a common Union, as they have done from the beginning; where the rights of all, and the interests of all may be respected and protected, and yet where the interests of every portion must be regulated by some general consideration of the interests which are common to every body. On the other hand, in a confederacy where cotton is the great idea and end, it is utterly impossible for the mixed, much more for the non-cotton States, to protect adequately any of their rights, except the right of slavery, to carry out any of their purposes except purposes connected with slavery, to inaugurate any system of policy or even to be free, otherwise than as they servilely follow the lead, and bow to the rule of the Cotton States. The very instant you enter a confederacy in which all is regulated and created by the supreme interest of cotton, every thing precious and distinctive of you, is jeoparded! Do you want the slave trade re-opened? Do you want free trade and direct taxation?

Digitized by Google

Do you want some millions more of African cannibals thrown amongst you broadcast throughout the whole slave States? Do you want to begin a war which shall end when you have taken possession of the whole Southern part of this continent down to the isthmus of Darien? If your design is to accept the principles, purposes and policy, which are openly avowed in the interest of secession, and which you see exhibited on a small scale, but in their essence, in South Carolina; if that is your notion of regulated freedom and the perfect security of life and property; if that is your understanding of high national prosperity, where the great idea is more negroes, more cotton, direct taxes, free imports from all nations, and the conquest of all outlaying land that will bring cotton; then, undoubtedly, Kentucky is no longer what she has been, and her new career, beginning with secession, leads her far away from her strength and her renown.

The second suggestion I have to make to you is, that if the slave line is made the line of division, all the slave States seceding from the Union, and all the free States standing unitedly by the Union; what I assert in that case is, that the possibility of the perpetuity of negro slavery in any border State terminates at once. In our affected zeal for slavery, we will have taken the most effectual means of extinguishing it; and that in the most disastrous of all possible ways. On the contrary, if this Union is to be saved, it is by the cordial sympathy of the border States on one side and on the other side of the slave line that it must be saved. We have nothing to hope from the extreme States on either side; nothing from the passionate violence of the extreme South—nothing from the turbulent fanaticism of the extreme North. It is along that slave line—and in the spirit of mutual confidence, and the sense of a common interest of the people on the north and on the south of that line, that the nation must seek the instruments of its safety. It is Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, on the one side; and Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri—God send that I might

Digitized by Google

add with confidence Tennessee and North Carolina—on the other side; these are the States that are competent to save this Union. Nothing, therefore, can be more suicidal, than for the border slave States to adopt any line of conduct which can justly deprive them of the sympathy and confidence of the border free States—now largely possessed by them. And nothing is more certain than that a patriotic devotion to the Union, and a willingness to do all that honorable men should do, or moderate men ask, in order to preserve it—is as strongly prevalent at this moment, among the people of the border free States, as amongst those of the border slave States. The great central States I have enumerated—must necessarily control the fate both of the nation and of the continent—whenever they act in concert; and the fate, both of the nation and the continent, is utterly inscrutable after the division of them on the slave line—except that we know that when Samson is shorn of his strength, the enemies of Israel and of God will make the land desolate. Fronting on the Atlantic Ocean through many degrees of latitude, running back across the continent so as to include an area larger than all Western Europe, and finer than any of equal extent upon the globe, embracing a population inferior to none on earth, and sufficiently numerous at present to constitute a great nation; it is this immense power, free, to a great extent, from the opposite and intractable fanaticisms of the extreme States on both sides of it, that is charged with the preservation of our national institutions, and with them our national power and glory. There are two aspects of the case thus put—in either of which success by peaceful means, is impossible: first, if these great central States fail to apprehend this part of the great mission committed to them; secondly, if the Cotton States, following the example of South Carolina—or the Northern States adhering to extreme purposes in the opposite direction—by either means render all peaceful adjustment impossible.

But even in that case, the mission of these great States is

Digitized by Google

not ended. If under the curse of God, and the madness of the extreme Northern and Southern States, the preservation of the Union should be impossible; then it belongs to this immense central power, to re-construct the nation, upon the slave line as its central idea; and thus perpetuate our institutions, our principles, and our hopes, with an unchanged nationality. For even they who act in the mere interests of slavery, ought to see, that after the secession of the Cotton States, the border slave States are obliged, even for the sake of slavery, to be destroyed, or to adhere to the Union as long as any Union exists; and that if the Union were utterly destroyed, its re-construction upon the slave line, is the solitary condition on which slavery can exist in security anywhere, or can exist at all in any border State.

I have considered three possible solutions of the existing state of things: The preservation of the Union as it is; the probable secession of the cotton slave States, and the effect thereof upon the Union, and upon the course Kentucky ought to take; the total destruction of the Union, and its re-construction upon the slave line. I have considered the whole matter, from the point of view understood to be taken by the President of the United States; namely: that he judges there is no power in the General Government to prevent, by force, its own dissolution by means of the secession of the States; and I have done this, because however ruinous or absurd any one may suppose the views of the President to be, it is nevertheless under their sway that the first acts of our impending revolutions are progressing. Under the same helpless aspect of the General Government, there remain two more possible solutions of the posture and duty of Kentucky, and other States similarly situated. The first of these is, that in the progress of events, it may well become the border slave States to unite themselves into a separate confederacy; the second is, that it may well become Kentucky, under various contingencies, to assume a separate sovereign position, and act by herself. Having clearly stated my own conclusions, I will

Digitized by Google

only say that the first of these two results is not one to be sought as desirable in itself, but only as an alternative to be preferred to more dangerous arrangements. For my unalterable conviction is, that the slave line is the only permanent and secure basis of a confederacy for the slave States, and especially for the border slave States, and that the union of free and slave States, in the same confederacy, is the indispensable condition of the peaceful and secure existence of slavery. As to the possible isolation of Kentucky, this also, it seems to me, is not a result to be sought. If it should occur as the alternative to evils still greater, Kentucky ought to embrace it with calmness and dignity, and, awaiting the progress of events, show by her wisdom, her courage, her moderation, her invincible rectitude, both to this age and to all that are to come, how fully she understood in the midst of a gainsaying and backsliding generation, that no people ever performed anything glorious who did not trust God, who did not love their country, and who were not faithful to their oaths.

It seems to me, therefore, that the immediate duty of Kentucky may be clearly stated in very few words.

First. To stand by the Constitution and the Union of the country, to the last extremity.

Second. To prevent, as for the moment the impending and immediate danger, all attempts to seduce her, all attempts to terrify her, into the taking of any step inconsistent with her own constitution and laws—any step disregardful of the constitution and laws of the United States, any step which can possibly compromise her position, or draw her on otherwise than by her own free choice deliberately expressed at the polls, according to her existing laws and constitution, whereby she will choose her own destiny.

Third. To settle in her heart that the rending of this Union on the slave line is, for her, whatever it may be for others, the most fatal issue that the times can have; and the doing this in such a way as to subject her to the dominion of

Digitized by Google

the Cotton States for all time to come, is the very worst form of that most fatal issue.

After all, my friends, after all,—we have the great promise of God that all things shall work together for good to them that love him. I do not know but that it may be the mind of God and his divine purpose to break this Union up, and to make of it other nations, that shall at last be more powerful than it, unitedly, would have been. I do not know, I do not pretend to say, how the Lord will use the passions of men to glorify his name. He restrains the remainder of wrath and will cause the wrath of man to praise him. We have his divine assurance that all nations that have gone before us, and all that will follow us, and we ourselves, by our rise, by our progress, and alas! by our decay and ruin, are but instruments of his infinite purpose, and means in his adorable providence, whereby the everlasting reign of Messiah, the Christ of God, is to be made absolute and universal.

Great then, is our consolation, as we tremble for our country, to be confident in our Lord! Great is our comfort, as we bewail the miseries which have befallen our glorious inheritance, to know that the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth! Infinitely precious is the assurance, amidst the trials now impending, and the woes which threaten us, that the heroic self-devotion with which our personal duty is discharged, is one part of our fitness to become partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light!

Digitized by Google

Art. VI. — *Bibliography.*

AMERICA.

The "Boston Review" is the title of a new Theological and Literary Journal, intended to represent what is known in New England as the Old Divinity or the Puritan Theology, as this is exhibited in Calvin, the Westminster Divines, and Edwards. The work is to be published once in two months, and it promises to be an able and fearless advocate of the truth. The March number contains a thorough exposure of the modern heresy that future punishment will be merely the results of natural laws; showing that God superadds to these results special, positive visitations for sin. The articles are anonymous, but among the persons engaged as contributors are Drs. Nathan Lord, Parsons Cooke, Nehemiah Adams, S. M. Worcester, and Joseph Tracy.

Gould & Lincoln, Boston, will shortly issue an American edition of the "Introduction to the study of the Gospels," by Brook Foss Westcott, with an Introduction by Dr. H. B. Hackett; also the "Life of Christ historically considered," by C. J. Ellicott — both valuable works.

Dr. Henry B. Smith has issued the first volume of Hagenbach's "History of Doctrines." The Edinburgh translation has been revised, with large additions from the fourth German edition, and from Geiseler, Neander and Bauer. References are also given to late English, American and German works on the subject.

Robert Carter & Bros. publish "The Gold Thread: a story for the Young," by Dr. Norman Macleod of Glasgow; "The Haven and Prize," by the author of the "Memorials of Captain Vicars;" "The Sailor's Text Book" and "The Soldier's Text Book," by Rev. J. R. McDuff.

A new work is announced with the title, "The Presbyterian's Hand Book of the Church, for the use of Members, Deacons, Elders and Ministers." By Rev. Joel Parker, D. D., and Rev. T. Ralston Smith. 12mo.

M. W. Dodd issues "Discourses on Sacramental Occasions," by the late Dr. Ichabod S. Spencer, with an Introduction by Dr. Gardiner Spring.

Digitized by Google

Gould & Lincoln, Boston, will soon publish the "Life and Times of John Huss; or the Bohemian Reformation of the Fifteenth Century."

The Rev. William E. Moore, of West Chester, Pa., has published a "New Digest of the Acts of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church," compiled by order of the New School Assembly. Since the Division of the Presbyterian Church in 1837, this work records the acts and deliverances of the Assembly just indicated. E. P. H.

ENGLAND.

A volume is in press containing Replies to the notorious "Essays and Reviews." The names of the contributors, as far as announced, are Dr. Goulburn, Dr. Hurtley, Dr. Irons, the Rev. J. H. Rose, and Dr. Wordsworth. The Bishop of Oxford will prepare the preface.

Archbishop Sumner will publish a new edition of his "Evidences of Christianity," revised with reference to recent objections.

Dr. Smith, Colonial Bishop of Victoria, has published a book of travels styled "Ten Weeks in Japan," with many illustrations of the manners and customs of the singular race inhabiting that Island.

Lord Brougham publishes the second edition of his "History of England under the House of Lancaster, with an Introductory view of the Early Reformation."

"The Conquest of England; Letters to the Prince Consort on Popery, Puseyism, Neology, Infidelity, and the Aggressive Policy of the Church of Rome." By John Campbell.

Two contributions to Church History are announced. One is a new edition of "Clemens Romani Recognitiones Syriacæ." The other is "Syriac Miscellanies: or Extracts relating to the First and Second General Councils, and various other Quotations, Theological, Historical and Classical" — translated from the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, and Imperial Library, Paris; by B. H. Cowper.

"Intuitionalism: or the Insufficiency of the pure Reason in matters of Religion: a Critique and a Protest;" by B. Frankland.

Digitized by Google

Among the Replies to the Essays and Reviews is Charles Herbert's "Neology not True, and Truth not New."

Alexander Keith publishes "The History and Destiny of the World and of the Church, according to Scripture."

From the fruitful pen of A. P. Stanley we have "Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church," with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History.

The third edition of "Jelf's Greek Grammar" is issued. The work in this edition has been greatly enlarged, and considerable portions have been re-written, with reference to the latest researches of Hellenic Philology. It contains an Index to the grammatical constructions of the New Testament. Published in two volumes: Vol. I. Accidence. Vol. II. Syntax. Price in New York, $7.50.

Dr. Pusey has published Part II. — Joel — Amos, of his Commentary on the Minor Prophets.

Bohn's Classical Library contains a "Library Atlas of Classical Geography," with an Index of latitude and longitude of many places named in the maps. Twenty-two maps, colored.

A letter from Jerusalem, published in the London Athenæum, states that Dr. Basil Levisohn, of the Russian Episcopal establishment, has recently discovered and purchased a MS. vellum copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which he believes to have been written during the time of the First Temple of Jerusalem. If this be so, it is by many centuries the oldest extant MS. of the Pentateuch, so far as is known.

Part IV. of Dr. Wordsworth's "Notes on the New Testament," completing the work, has been issued. The whole work costs about $25, in this country.

Among the new works announced in London are the 2nd vol. of Dr. William Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible;" J. F. Jones on "Egypt in its Biblical Relations;" "An Ecclesiastical Dictionary of Denominations, Creeds, &c.;" by John Eadie; an "Introduction to the New Testament," by F. H. Scrivener; "A Companion to the New Testament," by A. C. Barret; a 2nd edition of "Eadie on the Ephesians;" and "A History of the New Jerusalem Church," by Heidmarsh.

Sir Henry Rawlinson is pursuing, with his well known indus-

Digitized by Google

try, a comparative study of ancient Egyptian and Assyrian history, as unfolded in the monumental records of those old kingdoms brought to light by recent discoveries. The Hieroglyphics are found to agree with the Arrow-headed inscriptions, and both to confirm the Hebrew Scriptures. The first clear account of conflict between the Egyptians and the Assyrians occurs in the reign of Sargon, B. C. 721–702, the king who carried the Jews captive from Samaria. The results of Sir Henry's inquiries will appear in his brother's new edition of Herodotus. E. P. H.

SCOTLAND.

Dr. Williams L. Alexander is preparing a new edition of "Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia." The editor is assisted by able Biblical scholars, and the edition is expected to contain the results of the most recent learning in philology, archæology, and exegesis. It is to be hoped that the work will be purged of the old leaven of rationalism which leavens the edition now in use.

The Rev. Donald M'Donald has published, in two volumes, an "Introduction to the Pentateuch," vindicating its genuineness as the work of Moses, and its inspiration: and pointing out the various providential ends for which it was designed. Among these are, the self-revelation of God; a description of man's condition as first created, next fallen, and then redeemed; the discovery of redemption and a future life; and the preparation for the introduction of the Gospel by the instrumentality of a chosen people.

Mr. J. Nichol, of Edinburgh, has issued proposals for the republication, in uniform style, of the more important and scarce productions of the Puritan Divines. The chief authors are Manton, Goodwin, Adams, Bishop Reynolds, Gibbs, Brooks, Clarkson, and Charnock. Six volumes are to be published annually for about ten years, at a guinea per annum: each volume to contain from 500 to 600 pages. The present cost of the works selected is about $350; and they are to be afforded at about $55 in the new edition. Mr. Nichol will make arrangements for their distribution in this country.

"English Puritanism and its Leaders, Cromwell, Milton, Baxter, Bunyan," is the title of a new work by Professor Tulloch, of the University of St. Andrews, and author of the "Leaders of the Reformation."

Digitized by Google

"Ebrard's Commentary on the Epistles of John, in continuation of the work of Olshausen: with an Appendix on the Catholic Epistles, and an Introductory essay on the Life and Writings of John," has been translated and published as a part of Clark's Theological Library. His doctrinal sympathies are Calvinistic.

The posthumous works of Dr. Ralph Wardlaw, of Glasgow, edited by his son, are in the course of publication. The series will comprise the following separate works of Dr. Wardlaw, not heretofore published: "Expository Lectures on the Book of Proverbs," three volumes; "The Prophecies of Zachariah;" "The Epistle to the Romans;" "The Epistle of James;" and "Lectures on the Life and Character of the Apostle Paul."

The April No. of the "Edinburgh Review" contains an article on the Essay and Review controversy, with a decided leaning towards the neological side of the debate. The course of the leading quarterly organs of the religious sentiment in Great Britain is characteristic. First comes the Westminster, fanatically infidel; then the Quarterly, vigorously orthodox; then the British Quarterly, learned and sound: now the Edinburgh, demi-semi-Christian. For the honor of Old Presbyterian Scotland, a current rumor may be mentioned, to the effect that the Edinburgh Review is controlled and published in London, not in Edinburgh — *lucus a non lucendo*. E. P. H.

THEOLOGY.

Liber Psalmorum hebraicus. Textum Masoreticum accuratius quam adhuc factum est expressit, brevem de accentibus metricis institutionem præmisit notas criticas adjecit S. Baer. Præfatus est F. Delitzsch. Lipsiæ, 1861.

Eine Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief, namentlich seinen Verfasser und seine Leser. Mit einem Vorwort zur Vertheidigung und über die Nothwendigkeit einer wissenschaftlichen exegese. Von K. Wieseler. 1 Hälfte. Kiel, 1861.

Vollständige Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde. Von Ch. C. J. Bunsen. Mit Bibel-Atlas. Liepzig, 1860.

Talmud Biblonski. (In the original Text.) Warsaw, 1860.

Aurora, sive Bibliotheca selecta ex scriptis eorum qui ante Lutherum ecclesiæ studuerunt restituendæ. Edid. Schœpff et Neumann. Tom. VII. Dresdæ, 1860.

Digitized by Google

La Conscience ou la Règle des actions humaines. Par L. Bautain. Paris, 1860.

Commentar über den Psalter. 2 Theile. Uebersetzung und Auslegung Ps. xc–ci. Von F. Delitzsch. Liepzig, 1860.

Die Psalmen; von Hupfeld: 4r Band, Schluss. Gotha, 1861.

Leben und ausgewählte Schrifte der Vater und Begründer der Reformirten Kirche. Herausgegeben von einem verein. 1 Hälfte 4 Theile enthalte das Leben Calvin's. Elberfeld, 1860.

Messianischen Prophetzien des Jesaias: von G. K. Mayer. Vienna, 1860.

. Monumenta sacra inedita; nova collectio, seu Fragmenta Origenianæ octateuchi editionis, cum fragmentis evangeliorum græcis palimsestis. E Codice Leidensi folioque Petropolitano quarti vel quinti, Guelpherbytano codice quinti, Sangellensi octavi ferè sæculi, eruit atque edidit Tischendorf. Lipsiæ, 1860.

Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen, von F. A. Tholuck. Gotha, 1860.

Uppström's Codex Argenteus. Eine Nachschrift zu der Ausgabe des Ulfilas, von Gabelentz und Löbe. Leipzig, 1860.

Novum Testamentum Græce. Secundum codicem principem Vaticanum cum lexidio grammatico. Edid. Eduardus de Muralto. Hamburgii, 1860.

Vetus Testamentum Græce juxta LXX. interpretes, Textum Vaticanum Romanum emendatum edidit, argumenta et locos parallelos N. T. notavit C. Tischendorf. Ed. III. Lipsiæ, 1861.

Notitia editionis codicis bibliorum Sinaitici, auspiciis imperatoris Alexandri II. susceptæ, edidit C. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ, 1861.

Ulrici Hutteni opera quæ reperiri potuerunt omnia, edidit E. Böcking. Lipsiæ, 1860.

Bengelii Gnomon Novi Testamenti: Editio Quinta cum Auctoris Effigie: Stuttgardiæ. 1860.

Studien und Kritiken. Eine Zeitschrift für Theologie, Jahrgang 1861. zweites Heft, Gotha. *Contents:* — Exposition of Isaiah lii: 13 – liii: 12. By Bleek, former Professor at Bonn. — Pedobaptism, its Nature and Lawfulness. By Richter, Dean in Luckau. — The use of ἐκεῖνος in classic Greek and in St. John's Gospel. By G. E. Steitz, P. D. — Contributions to the Exposition of St. Matthew. By J. F. K. Gurlitt, Pastor in Bellwerder. —

Digitized by Google

Life and Writings of Ambrose Blaurer, or Blaer, the Swabian Reformer.

* METAPHYSICS.

Œuvres de Descartes. Nouvelle edition par Jul. Simon. Paris, 1860.

Die Philosophie Platon's in ihren inneren Beziehung zur geoffenbarten Wahrheit: von F. Michels. 2 Abthiel. Munster, 1860.

Notice sur l'œuvre et sur la vie d' Auguste Comte, par Robinet. Paris, 1860.

De logische analyse. Antwoord op de bedenkingen von Prof. T. Roorda. Zutphen, 1860.

Mathematik og Dialektik. En philosophisk Afhandlung. R. Neilsen. Copenhagen, 1859.

Introduction critique aux œuvres de Spinoza. Par E. Saisset. Paris, 1860.

Erlauterungen zu den Elementen der Aristolileschen Logik. Trendelenburg. Berlin, 1860.

* PHILOLOGY.

Thesaurus Linguæ Græcæ ab H. Stephono constructus. Post Edit. Anglicanam novis additamentis auctum, edid. Hase, G. et L. Dindorfius. Vol. III. Fasic. 9. Parisiis, 1861.

Grundriss der Griechischen Literatur, von Bernhardy. 1 Theil. Innere Geschichte. 3 Ed. Halle, 1861.

Hessychi Alexandri Lexicon post Joannem Albertum recensuit Schmidt. Jenæ, 1861.

Plotin. Les Eneades. Traduites pour le premier fois en français, par N. Bouillet. Vol. III. Paris, 1861.

Porphyrii Philosophi Platonici, opuscula tria. Recognovit Nauck. Lipsiæ, 1860.

Virgilii Maronis opera. Recensuit Ribbeck. Vol. II. Lipsiæ, 1859–60.

Forcellini totius latinitatis lexicon. Edidit De Vit. Prati, 1859–60.

Bibliotheca Indica. Published by the East India Company. Numbers 150–9, containing part of the Yajur Veda, with commentary; and a Dictionary of the scientific terms employed by the Arabs. Calcutta, 1859–60.

Digitized by Google

Principes de Grammaire Arabe, suivis d' un Traitè de la langue Arabe considéreé selon le systeme des grammariens Arabes; avec des exercices d' analyse grammaticales; par Glaire. Paris, 1861.

Le Papyrus magique Harris. Traduction analytique et commentee d' un manuscrit Egyptien. Comprenant le texte hieratique. par F. Chabas. Chalon Sur Saone, 1861.

Essai de grammaire Japonaise, par Donker-Curtius. Traduit du Hollandais par Leon Pagès. Paris, 1861.

Einleitung in die traditionellen Schriften der Parsen. F. Spiegel. Leipzig, 1860.

* HISTORY AND BELLES LETTRES.

Geschidenis der nationale Synode in 1618 en 1619 gehouden te Dordrecht. Leiden, 1860.

Colecion de documentos ineditos del archives general de la corona de Arragon. Barcelona, 1858.

Historia general de España, por Lafuente. Madrid, 1860.

Geschichte der Europaischen Staaten, von Heeren und Ukert. Liefer. 33. Abtheil. 1. Gotha, 1861.

Denkmaler der Alten Kunst. Nach der Auswahl und Anordnung von C. O. Müller. Zweite Bearbeitung durch F. Wieseler Gottlingen, 1860.

Results of a Scientific Mission to India and High Asia, undertaken between the years 1854–8, by H., A., and R. Schlagintweit, at the order of the East India Company. With Atlas and Views. Leipsic, 1861.

Ueber die geschichtliche Entweckelung der Begriffe von Recht, Staat und Politik: von F. v. Raumer. 3 Auf. Leipzig, 1861.

*

Art. VII. — CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. — *Notes on New Testament Literature and Ecclesiastical History.* By Joseph Addison Alexander. New York: C. Scribner. 1861.

This volume contains all of the Biblical and Historical Lectures which its distinguished author left in a condition to be

Digitized by Google

published. The result of his labours in seeking to know the mind of the Spirit as revealed in the Scriptures, in their inspired languages, the Church has, in his Commentaries upon Isaiah, Psalms, and portions of the New Testament.

The volume before us, though fragmentary, is, nevertheless, valuable to the student on this account. We are thus introduced into the method by which so remarkable a man crystallized his thoughts, upon the subjects treated of in this book. To say that it is a source of regret that his labors in the departments treated of in this volume, which formed the specialities of his Professorship, are incomplete, is only to say that the Church still mourns his loss.

The first 146 pages of the volume furnishes us with valuable notes upon New Testament Literature. It will richly compensate any student of the New Testament to examine his notes, from sections 75 to 182 inclusive. The dialect of the New Testament Greek is a dialect peculiar to but few works extant. The technical terms and phrases thereof are to be interpreted from Biblical usage, and from such aids as are written in the Hellenistic dialect of the Greek Language. No one who examines their prelections can fail to be convinced of the fact, that pretended scholars have placed too much stress upon classical usage of Greek terms, in the interpretation of the New Testament in its original language. In this behalf we find here germs which students of the Bible will do well to develope.

From pages 147–317, inclusive, we find his notes upon Ecclesiastical History. To one not familiar with his method of instruction in Church History to his classes, these notes do not contain much that is of special interest. They seem to be an outline of directions to the student *how* to study Church History, and *what* to study — rather than Church History itself. These notes in the hands of Dr. Alexander, doubtless, were made to possess a life, in the Lecture room, of which they may be destitute upon the printed page. The method here mapped out, was one most consonant with his other labors, and congenial to a mind constituted like his, but perhaps not the most profitable to the student of Church History. The true idea of teaching Church History consists more in furnishing to the student by lectures the *staples* of

Digitized by Google

the Church's life through the ages, in its *organization*, *doctrines*, and *controversies*, than in designating sources for information. Books upon Ecclesiastical History and doctrines may be used as reference books, and as collateral to the lectures. But the professor's investigations as embodied in his lectures, should form the staple of the pupil's studies in his department.

The blemishes of this volume, which has been given to the public and to a Church which loved and admired Dr. Alexander, can only be accounted for from the fact, that the notes were left in an unfinished condition by the author. No editor could supply what the author's head and hand alone would have done. The gems which it contains, more than compensate for any defects.

G. M.

---

2. — *The Pulpit of the American Revolution:* or the political sermons of the period of 1776. With a historical introduction, notes, and illustrations. By JOHN WINGATE THORNTON, A. M. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. pp. 537.

There is an interval of more than thirty-three years between the time when the first and the last of the sermons in this volume were delivered. It is only, then, in a very indefinite sense, if properly in any sense, that they can be said to belong to the period of 1776. Moreover, there would have been less pretentiousness, and more truth in the title page, if it had read "*A few of* the political sermons of the period," &c., &c. There are in all just nine sermons in the volume. But, bating these exceptions, the book is in many respects adapted to command attention. It is interesting now to know what theories of government were then prevalent — what latitude ministers allowed to themselves, in the discussion of political rights and duties in the pulpit — what the hopes and anticipations of the men of that generation were, respecting the ultimate destiny of the nation whose birth they had witnessed. From the sermons themselves, as well as the editorial matter contained in the notes and introduction, much information on these points may be gained.

†. †.

Digitized by Google

3. — *Sermons for the New Life.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. Seventh Edition. New York: Charles Scribner. 1861.

This modest title page, and the dedication, "To my dear flock in Hartford, who have adhered to me in days of accusation," is all the information to be gained from the volume itself, respecting the origin of the book, or the design of the author in its publication. Prefaces and introductions are proverbially very dull reading, and by very many, are not read at all; but we would have felt very much obliged to the author, had he been not quite so reticent, but told us something of the history of these discourses, the end aimed at in their original preparation, and the principles which governed the selection of these particular ones, to the exclusion of others delivered during the last "quarter of a century," to the flock of which he is pastor.

We might, possibly, have satisfied our curiosity on some of these points, if not on all, by a thorough perusal of the book itself. But it was received at so late an hour, and the pressure of other duties has been so great, as to deprive us of that privilege and pleasure. Only some four or five, of the thirty-three sermons included in the volume, have we read entire, and not even these with the care and attention which they deserve. We can give, then, only impressions, rather than a settled judgment respecting its contents. That it has reached its seventh edition is a proof of popular appreciation which not many books on serious topics, least of all books of sermons, can boast.

We think we can see in the character of the book, as a literary production, a justification of the popular approval. It is inexpressibly refreshing to a jaded reviewer — whose very temples ache after a vain attempt to fathom the mysteries of a Germanized sentence, or to obtain some glimpses of meaning from page after page of the horrid jargon in which so many *profound* treatises in Philosophy and Theology are now written — to open a volume the very first page of which gives assurance that the author has a meaning, that he knows what that meaning is, and that he can express it in the English idiom. This praise is eminently due to our author. The principle to be discussed is commonly deduced from the language of the text by exegesis; is distinctly and

Digitized by Google

plainly stated in good Saxon English; and then is illustrated and enforced in a most striking and original manner, and in language of great beauty, simplicity and power. Not even humor is wholly rejected, but is employed occasionally, with great effect, to give a rich coloring to a description. Speaking of a class who hide the grace of God in their heart, instead of bearing an open testimony, and making a formal profession of Christ before men, he says:

"They are not simple; they are unnatural: what is in them, in their feeling, their secret hope, their joy begun, they regulate and suppress. If they were placed in heaven itself, they would not sing the first month, pretending that they had not tried their voices, or, perchance, doubting whether it is quite modest in them to thank God for his mercy, till they are right sure whether it is really to be sufficient in them. There is a great deal of unbelief in their backwardness; a great deal of self-consciousness in their modesty; and sometimes a little will is cunningly mixed with both." pp. 384–5.

The prevailing character of the work is ethical and practical rather than doctrinal. His doctrinal views, when presented at all, are commonly brought out rather incidentally than professedly and directly. It is known that the friends of evangelical truth were much alarmed at the views presented in former works of Dr. Bushnell. We have found no passages, in the portions read of the present work, to indicate heretical tendency. Sometimes we feel that there is a want of fullness in setting forth a doctrine, which we would be glad to see more boldly and definitely presented; but this may be the result of local habits and influences, rather than a distaste for evangelical truth. We have happened, however, to light on other passages, with which we were agreeably surprised, not expecting so clear a testimony to important truth, from a New England divine of the "liberal" school. The sermon entitled "DUTY NOT MEASURED BY OUR OWN ABILITY," in addition to the sound doctrine contained in the very caption, abounds in passages of this sort. But we have room for but a single citation, which we take from the sermon on Regeneration:

"Every man is conscious of this; that when he acts in any particular manner of wrong-doing, or sin, or neglect of God, there is some-

Digitized by Google

thing in the matter besides the mere act or acts. There is a something back of the action which is the reason why it is done. In the mere act itself, there is, in fact, no character at all. .... The wrong is back of the act, in some habit of soul, some disposition, some *status* of character, whence the action comes. Now this something, whatever it be, is the wrong of all wrong, the sin of all sin, and this must be changed — which change is the condition of salvation." p. 116.

Evidently, Dr. Bushnell repudiates the doctrine that all sin consists in voluntary acts, or, as another New England divine wittily and pithily expresses it, all sin consists in sinning. We are glad to have such goodly company. May not Dr. Bushnell, as well as divines of a more Southern latitude, be puzzled by the Andover riddle — the conjugation of the verb to sin, in the passive voice.

We were surprised to find, in our limited examination of the volume, the solecism "you was," at least thrice. "Deliver us *of* the bad causes," p. 96, in this region would be regarded as an impropriety. The expression to "mill out a scheme," p. 100, is new, and not very clear. "Goes a prospecting," p. 25, is a provincialism, taken from the mines of California, which, though possessing a certain raciness, and perhaps excusable in an oral address, is hardly admissible in a grave and scholar-like publication. †. †.

---

4. — *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records stated anew.* By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1861.

The great interest awakened in the religious and scientific world by the discovery of the Zodiac of Denderah, has scarcely yet ceased to be felt. Many still remember what a shout of exultation infidelity set up when the *savans* at Paris declared it to be an unmistakable refutation of the Biblical chronology. Weak Christians trembled for the ark of God; but others, strong in faith, set about a more thorough examination of this astronomical monument; and the result was a complete and acknowledged refutation of the boasts which skepticism had so untimely uttered;

Digitized by Google

and the zodiac became, by the interpretation of true science, a confirmation of the Divine record. Such a triumph has scarcely ever been achieved by one hostile party without the annihilation of the other. But infidelity, always bold in proportion to the badness of its cause, and vociferous in inverse ratio to the strength of its arguments, will not be silent. True, unbelievers have been somewhat cautious in heralding their triumphs derived from monumental inscriptions, since their memorable defeat; for by their assertions Christian men have been stimulated to a zealous study of whatever testimonies the ancient world delivers to us relative to the Biblical narrative. The results have been highly satisfactory to the friends of Christianity; and the evidence derived from the Assyrian, Phœnician and Egyptian inscriptions, are assuming a real importance to our historical faith. Still, as the truths of revelation are more explicitly corroborated by concurring heathen testimonies, in order to support a falling cause skeptics have recourse to confident assertion of oft refuted calumnies, and assume arrant falsehoods as acknowledged truths. While mere traitors in our camp *under the garb of a nominal Christianity, and fed by its emoluments*, continue to retail their abuse from Oxford and Tübingen, and the rationalistic prophet of Heilbronn persists in coming forth from his deserved obscurity, it is grateful to meet with a candid, veracious book like the Historical Researches, from a true son of Oxford. We breathe the atmosphere of truth and sound learning while reading this timely vindication of the Scripture record. Stimulated by the researches of his distinguished brother, and eminently fitted for the task by his own labors in the great work of editing Herodotus, Mr. Rawlinson, in the Bampton Lectures, gives a contribution to science which must take its place with those of Paley and Lardner.

The author proposes in his preface not to meet each objection of infidelity *seriatim*, and show the falsity; but, in general, to exhibit the agreement between Scripture and profane history, as far as the latter has any testimony to offer. This, in the case of the Bible, is the more easy, because there are so many facts narrated which, necessarily, connect its system with the history of the world. There is a clear distinction between the Biblical

Digitized by Google

narrative and those of the Korân, the Zend Avesta, the Vedas, or the Classical Mythology; for the latter either make no references to historical events, or to such only as belong rather to a mythical age; and therefore do not admit of verification. The events of Scripture narration are examined according to the usual and admitted canons of historical criticism; for the author does not assume anything more in his inquiry than is done in the case of any composition. The canons are, 1. When an author is contemporary and veracious, and also has the means of observing the fact he narrates, his testimony is to be placed on a par with that of witnesses in a court. 2. When the writer received his knowledge directly from those who knew personally, this is to be accepted as probably true, unless the statements made are impossible in themselves. 3. When the writer lived some time after the event, and depended on oral tradition; if the event be important, notorious, and affecting the national character, and commemorated by some rite, his testimony may be accepted in the main. 4. When the traditions of one people, weak in their individual testimony, are corroborated by those of another far removed, different in character and hostile, these deserve acceptance; unless precluded by inherent impossibility. The unfairness of infidelity is adverted to because it postulates the impossibility of miracles, which precludes any reasoning on the subject, and stops the mouths of all witnesses. It does more than this; it limits the power of God to the operations of general laws and thus subordinates Omnipotence to the fate of the stoic. This skepticism is absurd, for it would, as shown by Chalmers in answer to Hume, involve a greater miracle in requiring all testimony to be false and framed by collusion.

The Scripture narrative naturally divides itself into five periods: — First, from the Creation to the death of Moses; second, from the end of the first until the accession of Rehoboam; the third, embracing the time intervening until the Captivity of Judah; the fourth, from the Captivity of Judah till the reform of Nehemiah; and the last is the time of the establishment of Christianity. The treatment of the first of these may be taken as a specimen. Writing is shown to have been common in Egypt, both by inscription and on papyrus, prior to the time of Moses; so that he,

Digitized by Google

being instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, could be the writer of the Pentateuch. Heathen writers, as Manetho and Berosus, testify to the general facts of the Pentateuch, such as the Exodus; while the monuments give evidence of Chedorlaomer's expedition. In the other periods the testimonies become more abundant and definite; making a perfect agreement between the records of the Tyrians and Babylonians, and the Chronicles of David and Nehemiah. It is worthy of remark that not any of the inscriptions yet deciphered have clearly contradicted the facts of Scripture; but are all corroborative. And thus, while the monuments whose inscriptions have been read are but few, the evidence hitherto is all cumulative; and since so much has been done by a science still in its infancy, we may look for a rich harvest of facts verifying the Holy Scripture, as men continue to excavate the ruins of Assyria and Egypt. The believer may well rejoice in beholding the temples of heathenism giving unintentional testimony to the Word of his faith. The very gods of Philistia testify to the divinity of the God of Israel; and even from the dust of buried ages a voice is heard rebuking the skeptic of the nineteenth century.

*

---

5. — *A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges.* By JAMES HADLEY, Professor in Yale College. D. Appleton & Co. 1860.

No field of science has been more fully cultivated of late than that of Greek Grammar. Since Hermann's treatise "*De Emendandâ ratione Græcæ Grammaticæ*," this department has made rapid strides towards perfection. The works of Buttmann, Matthiæ, Rost, Thiersch, Kühner, Krüger, Jelf, Donaldson, Moor, Sophocles and Crosby, have each their excellencies, united with some errors, and many defects in arrangement; but united would seem to form a thesaurus from which may be obtained a solution of all the difficulties in the language. But still, there is no more reason to believe that entire perfection has been, or ever will be, attained in this, than in any other branch of investigation. And, doubtless, every teacher has felt a want, not met in any

Digitized by Google

of the excellent systems mentioned, either in simplicity of arrangement, aptness of illustration, or accuracy of diction. We therefore welcome another publication on this subject; both because of its intrinsic excellence, and as an evidence of an awakened zeal in our country for independent investigation, in a sphere where we have hitherto relied too much on the labors of foreign scholars. In the unostentatious title and modest preface we recognize the evidences of conscious power; and this is verified in the pages which follow. Every portion of the book bears marks of patient investigation, fullness of learning, and clearness of statement, for which Mr. Hadley is known by those who have enjoyed his instructions. This is the most accurate and complete work of the kind which American authorship can claim; and from the cordial manner it has been received by scholars, the author will be encouraged to continue his labors; and others be stimulated to produce text books suited to the advanced step of classical learning in our country.

*

6.— *Plato's Apology and Crito.* With notes, by W. S. Tyler, Professor of Greek in Amherst College. D. Appleton & Co. 1860.

Quinti Horatii Flacci opera omnia: ex recensione A. J. MACLEANE. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860.

Æschylus: ex novissima recensione F. A. PALEY. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860.

Euripides: ex recensione F. A. PALEY. Accedit verborum et nominum index. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860.

Herodotus. Recensuit J. W. BLAKESLEY; S. T. B. Cantab. Vol. II. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861.

The Appletons have brought out another excellent text book, the "Apology and Crito of Plato." The days of Collectanea have passed; and our public calls for whole editions, or complete treatises, of the Classics. Prof. Tyler has produced a book which will prove grateful to students; being gotten up in the editor's well known scholarly style; not being overburdened with unnecessary exposition, and still explaining every real difficulty. He has availed himself of the labors of the best European

Digitized by Google

critics, but not servilely followed any; for on every page we see evidences of his own independent investigation. The progress of classical learning among us cannot be discerned more clearly by any other evidence, than by the large editions of Greek and Latin authors now called for. The Leipsic editions of Tauchnitz and Tübner have found an immense market in this country; and are held in deserved estimation for their accuracy, convenience and cheapness. But we are glad to see that our enterprising publishers, the Harpers, are engaged in reprinting the best of the classics in a style and at a price which will render them even preferable to those issued in Germany or England. In those we have examined, viz.: Horace, Æschylus, Euripides, and Herodotus, we have all that could be desired in editions containing merely the text. Their accuracy is fully equal to that of the best European editions; while the paper and binding are much better than the cheap foreign specimens we have seen. These will prove favorites with the lovers of classical learning; and should the Messrs. H. continue their labors in this department, we will soon have no more occasion to send abroad for complete editions of Greek and Roman authors.

*

---

7. — *The Character of Jesus:* forbidding his possible classification with men. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner. pp. 173. 24mo.

This volume contains the tenth chapter in Dr. Bushnell's treatise on "Nature and the Supernatural," published about three years since. The work, as a whole, was vitiated by the author's conception of the supernatural — taken from Coleridge; and it meets with no favor from discerning evangelical critics. But the tenth chapter is an admirable delineation of the character of Jesus — not original, indeed, in its primal idea, but unfolded with rare felicity and skill. It is the product of a fine genius, and abounds in passages of touching eloquence. It is a book to be put into the hands of skeptics whose education and taste will enable them to appreciate a high argument stated in brilliant diction, and with wonderful beauty of illustration. E. P. H.

Digitized by Google

8. — *The Beauty of Immanuel.* By LE ROY J. HALSEY, D. D. Author of "Life Pictures from the Bible," "Literary Attractions," &c. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861.

We are glad to welcome another volume from the amiable and accomplished author of this work. The themes to the discussion of which Dr. Halsey addresses himself, are of never-failing interest to the child of God; and the graceful, and even elegant, style in which he clothes his conceptions would, we suppose, commend his works to every reader of taste and discrimination, whatever his religious character might be. This volume is a worthy companion of the preceding works from the same accomplished pen. †. †.

---

9. — *A Mother's Prayers Answered.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1860.

Mackerel Will. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861.

The Child's Mission. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861.

Three very interesting little works: the first showing the power of a mother's prayers; the second, the history of a fisher boy, and the way by which he was brought to the Saviour; the third, the history of a foundling, showing the influence of a child, in leading those of more mature age to serious thought. †. †.

---

10. — *The Principles and Practice of Land Drainage:* embracing a brief history of Under-draining: a detailed examination of its operations and advantages; a description of various kinds of drains, with practical directions for their construction; the manufacture of drain-tile, etc. Illustrated by nearly 100 engravings. By JOHN H. KLIPPART. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1861. 12mo. pp. 454.

This is a successful attempt to unfold the important science or art of Land-drainage; a subject which is beginning to attract the attention of practical farmers in the Western country. The title, given above, describes the scope and purpose of the work.

Digitized by Google

The attention of the reader will be arrested by the description of the mole-plow, at p. 231, by which drains may be made in the sub-soil clay, without tiles or pipe, using the walls of the drain instead; and at an expense varying from one cent to three cents a yard. The book deserves a wide circulation. E. P. H.

---

11. — *Logic in Theology, and other Essays.* By ISAAC TAYLOR. With a Sketch of the Life of the Author, and a Catalogue of his Writings. New York: William Gowans. 1860. 12mo. pp. 297.

A few years since, Mr. Taylor prepared an Introductory Essay to an edition of "Edwards on the Will." That Essay is in this volume, reprinted under the title of "Logic in Theology." It is followed by six other essays upon various topics — making up a pleasant collection of miscellanies. The essay which furnishes the title to the work is inferior to some of those that accompany it. Mr. Taylor is not an accomplished logician, but is a fine scholar, a bold defender of the truth, and a man of genius, discursive, somewhat obscure in style, and in these essays diffuse to a degree, yet instructive and occasionally brilliant. Mr. Gowans has published the book in his sumptuous style. Such type and paper and binding would minister positive enjoyment to the reader, even if the matter were less attractive. E. P. H.

---

12. — *Chambers' Encyclopædia:* A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge for the People. On the basis of the latest edition of the German Conversations-Lexicon. Illustrated by wood engravings and maps. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

The title of this work gives a correct notion of its contents. Without being so extensive as the German work on which it is based, by its selection of matter it is better adapted for English readers, and especially for the common masses. The subjects are treated in familiar style, yet with great accuracy. Scientific terms are avoided where this can be done conveniently; and the work is fully up with the latest results of science and art. It is a readable work, as all those of the Messrs. Chambers are, and will be well received by the public.

*

Digitized by Google

13. — *Rhetorical Praxis*: The Principles of Rhetoric exemplified and applied in copious exercises for systematic practice, chiefly in the development of Thought. For use in Schools and Colleges. By HENRY N. DAY, author of the "Elements of Rhetoric," and "Art of Elocution." Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, Keys & Co. 1860.

We heartily agree with the closing sentence of the preface of this book, "that no greater desideratum exists in the supply of educational text books, than precisely in this field of instruction." And we concur in the judgment, that "exercises in composition in our seminaries of learning are, for the most part, repulsive to teacher and pupil, and attended, comparatively, with little profit."

We took up this book, therefore, with peculiar pleasure, hoping that the "desideratum" had, at last, been obtained. No one, who has given any attention to this department of learning, will say, that any one, of all the text books before the public, half-way meets the wants either of pupils or teachers. Those teachers who have tried most faithfully to instruct in this department, will admit most freely that their efforts have, in large part, failed for the want of a suitable text book. None that has been offered has fully met the approbation of teachers; although many of them have been extensively used for the want of better ones. The Lectures of Dr. Blair, so long and so extensively used, are too *rhetorical*, shallow, arbitrary, giving rules for practice without a thorough discussion of principles; and are now considered antiquated. Campbell's "Philosophy of Rhetoric," invaluable as a discussion of the *principles* that underlie the whole subject of thought, and its expression in language, is well adapted to educated men, already well drilled by metaphysical discussions; but, for this reason, poorly suits the learner. Whately's Rhetoric is a brief compound of Logic, Metaphysics and Elocution. The Logic he has himself better taught elsewhere; the Metaphysics others have better taught; the Elocution well emanates from an author who condemns all *practice* in speaking. Other works that we have seen are inferior to those mentioned.

The "idea" in this book, that makes it worthy of special attention, is contained in the saying of Daniel Webster, that, "all true power in writing is in the idea; not in the style." Agreeing with this view, the author has prepared this book "*as a guide to*

Digitized by Google

the unfolding of the thought." Its purpose is to teach the art of composition, by first teaching to think, by waking the dormant faculties of the young, stimulating them to mental action, and guiding them to independent efforts. It overturns, completely, the fatal fallacy of the young writer, that good writing consists merely of "pretty words and sonorous periods." By a judicious selection of *themes*, adapted to the pupil's progress, on which he is required to think patiently and write methodically, he is conducted along from his earliest efforts in composition, to the highest which can be reached by a mind still under instruction. The book is peculiarly rich in *themes*, containing over a thousand well selected, supplying freely that greatest of all wants, to a young writer, a "subject." "Rhetoric is the art of discourse." "Discourse is the expression of thought in language." Each and every kind of discourse is clearly defined, and the pupil taught, by precept and example, how to write well all the kinds — and *thus* is taught Rhetoric. The book is called a Praxis, and is to English what the "Latin and Greek Compositions" are to those classic languages. The idea of teaching our native tongue in this scientific form is new with this author and a few others. We welcome it with pleasure as an evidence that attention is beginning to turn at last to the study of our own rich and classic language. We are persuaded that, if composition is taught on this method, it will prove repulsive neither to pupil nor teacher; on the contrary, will become an exceedingly interesting subject of study to the pupil, and in the hands of an *intelligent teacher*, may become one of the most effective instruments of mental discipline; — for it is easy to see, that in so teaching Rhetoric, he is teaching not only the philosophy of language, but also of mind. Under the ordinary acceptation, this is not a complete treatise on Rhetoric, ignoring (wisely in view of the purpose) many matters commonly treated in such works. We do not, therefore, think it adapted to supply the place of more extensive works for the higher College Classes — it ought to be thoroughly studied in the Grammar School, or lower College Classes. There yet remains, then, the desideratum of a scientific and exhaustive text book for mature minds and the higher classes of undergraduates. "As the object of this work is purely practical, only summary state-

Digitized by Google

ments of the principles of Rhetoric are given." "For more extended views, with fuller expositions of the grounds of these principles," the author makes reference to his "Elements of Rhetoric," a work designed for more advanced minds. This latter work we have not seen, but earnestly hope that it is the much needed book. The publishers have done their part in excellent style. McK.

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

The Atonement: its Reality, Completeness and Extent. By Robert S. Candish, D. D., Free St. George's, Edinburgh. London and New York: T. Nelson & Sons. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1861. 12mo. pp. 400.

Gildas Salvianus. The Reformed Pastor: shewing the Nature of the Pastoral Work, especially in private instruction and catechising. By Rev. Richard Baxter. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1860. 8vo. pp. 560.

Outlines of Theology. By the Rev. A. Alexander Hodge, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Fredericksburg, Va. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. 8vo. pp. 522.

An Exposition of the Book of Ecclesiastes. By Rev. Chas. Bridges, M. A., Rector of Hinton Martell, Dorset; Author of "Commentary on Proverbs," "Exposition of Psalm cxix," &c. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 389.

Annals of the Rescued. By the Author of "Haste to the Rescue." With a Preface, by Rev. Charles E. L. Wightman. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 263.

True Manhood: its Nature, Foundation and Development. A book for young men. By Wm. Landels. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 260.

Evenings with John Bunyan; or the Dream interpreted. By James Large. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 353.

Memoir of the Life and Brief Ministry of the Rev. David Sandeman, Missionary to China. By Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, Author of "Memoir of McCheyne," etc. London; James Nisbet & Co. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 313.

Grapes of Eshcol: or, Gleanings from the Land of Promise. By John R. Macduff, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. 18mo. pp. 275.

Help Heavenward; or Words of Strength and Heart-Cheer to Zion's Travellers. By Octavius Winslow, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. 18mo. pp. 326.

My Saviour; or, Devotional Meditations in prose and verse, on the Names and Titles of the Lord Jesus Christ. By Rev. John East, A. M., Rector of Croscombe, Somerset, England. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1860. 18mo. pp. 252.

The Life of Trust: being a Narrative of the Lord's Dealings with George Muller, written by himself. Edited and condensed by Rev. H. Lincoln Wayland, Pastor of 3d Baptist Church, Worcester, Mass. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1861. 12mo. pp. 486.

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. First American, from the third London edition, with the Notes translated. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1860. 12mo. pp. 362.

Digitized by Google

WHEELER & WILSON'S

SEWING MACHINES,

NOW, AS EVER, IN THE ASCENDANT.

PRICES JUST REDUCED.

Sewing-Machine Awards by the American Institute, N. Y., 1859-60.



We would ask the earnest and candid attention of the public, and *especially* of that public more immediately represented by the DANVILLE REVIEW, to the following discriminating award of the intelligent Committee on Sewing-Machines of the American Institute:

The Machines are arranged according to the stitch made, and the purpose to which the machine is to be applied, in four classes—First, Second, Third and Fourth; a classification indicating the order of importance and usefulness

Class First includes the Shuttle or Lock-Stitch Machine for family use, and for manufactures in the same range of purpose and material. The Committee assign to this class the highest rank on account of the *elasticity, permanence, beauty,* and *general desirableness of the stitching when done and the wide range of its application.* At the *head* of this class they place the Wheeler & Wilson Machine, *the uniform award* for *this* Machine wherever it has been exhibited in competition in all parts of the country.

Class Second includes the Shuttle or Lock-Stitch Machines for heavy manufacturing purposes.

Class Third includes the *Double Thread Chain-Stitch* Machines. The Committee object to the stitch made by these, as it requires more thread than any other stitch, and leaves a ridge projecting from one side of the seam, which, in the Committee's opinion, must usually impair the durability of the seam, and the value and durability of the garments, or other manufactures put together with it, though *some of the machines* making this stitch can be used very well for the plain *line embroidering purposes*, and for garments that it may be desirable to alter, as the stitch may be *raveled* in the same manner as *knitting-work*. "At the head of this class the Committee place the Grover & Baker Machine."

Class Fourth includes the *Single Thread Chain-Stitch* Machines. The Committee consider the *tendency* of this stitch to ravel to be an objection so serious that they refuse to recommend the machine, making for it no reward or premium.

THE WHEELER & WILSON MACHINE

Still continues to hold the relative position given it by this award, which is sustained by more than one hundred COUNTY, STATE and UNITED STATES awards, and by all of the leading religious and secular journals of the country, together with the array of the most intelligent and influential clergymen, ladies, gentlemen, manufacturers, and professional seamstresses in all parts of the United States, Europe, British America, West Indies, Central and South America, Turkey, India, China, and Japan.

Awarded the highest premium at the UNITED STATES FAIRS of 1858, 1859, and 1860.

The stitch is *alike on both sides*, leaving no CHAIN or RIDGE on the under side.

The sworn report to Mr. Howe, to whom all Sewing-Machines pay a license, shows for 1859, that

Wheeler & Wilson sold	21,305 Machines.
I. M. Singer & Co.	10,953 "
Grover & Baker	10,280 "

☞ All Machines warranted three years.

WM. SUMNER & CO., AGENTS,

Pike's Opera House, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Digitized by Google

THE

Danville Quarterly Review.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION BY WHICH THIS PERIODICAL IS CONDUCTED:

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,
EDWARD P. HUMPHREY,
STEPHEN YERKES,
JOSEPH T. SMITH,
} Professors in Danville Theological Seminary.

JAMES MATTHEWS,
JACOB COOPER,
} Professors in Center College, Danville, Ky.

ROBERT W. LANDIS, Pastor, Somerset, Kentucky.
JOHN M. WORRALL, " Covington, Kentucky.
ROBERT L. BRECK, " New Albany, Indiana.

☞ Original articles or letters in reference to matter for publication in the Review, should be addressed to DANVILLE REVIEW, Danville, Kentucky, or to some member of the Association.

The DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW will be issued regularly in the first week of the months of March, June, September, and December, and contain 176 pages a number.

TERMS:

For one copy, one year, payable in advance	$3 00
For one copy, two years, if paid strictly in advance	5 00
For four copies, one year, if paid strictly in advance	10 00
For five copies, one year, payable in advance, (the sender to receive the fifth copy for his trouble,)	12 00
For one copy of any single number, by mail, prepaid	80
For ten copies of any single number, by mail, prepaid	6 60
To Missionaries, if paid in advance, one copy per year	2 00

Remittances for the work, by mail, will be at the Publisher's risk, if in registered letters. Subscribers are requested to remit by mail, as it gives them the least trouble, and the money is received more promptly. Large amounts should be sent by check or draft.

This being a Quarterly Periodical, the postage, when paid by subscribers quarterly in advance, is THREE AND A HALF CENTS on each number, or FOURTEEN CENTS for the year, to all parts of the United States.

Remittances, and other letters on business, should be addressed to

RICHARD H. COLLINS,
Publisher Danville Review,
25 WEST FOURTH ST., CINCINNATI.

ADVANCE SHEETS.

A large edition of Art. IV, by Rev. Dr. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, on "*Our Country—its Peril—its Deliverance,*" was issued as Advance Sheets, in pamphlet form. A few remain unsold, and will be sent, post-paid, for 10 cents each.

Digitized by Google

TERMS, THREE DOLLARS A YEAR, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

THE

DANVILLE QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

EDITED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

SEPTEMBER, 1861.

Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.—2 TIM. 1: 10

DANVILLE, KY., AND CINCINNATI, OHIO:
PUBLISHED BY
RICHARD H. COLLINS, 25 WEST FOURTH STREET, CINCINNATI,
AND SOLD BY
CROSBY, NICHOLS & CO., BOSTON; ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK; WM. S. & ALFRED MARTIEN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT S. DAVIS, PITTSBURGH; JOHN D. THORPE, ROBERT CLARKE & CO., GEO. S. BLANCHARD, AND RICKEY & CARROLL, CINCINNATI; A. DAVIDSON, LOUISVILLE; KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; WM. G. HOLMES, CHICAGO.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1861, by
RICHARD H. COLLINS,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

Postage, to all parts of the U. S., when paid Quarterly in advance, 3½ cents on each number, or 14 cents for a year

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF No. III.

		PAGE.
ART. I.	— THE NEW GOSPEL OF RATIONALISM, -	365
ART. II.	— IMPUTATION. Part I. - - -	390
ART. III.	— THE CONDUCTING OF PUBLIC AND SOCIAL PRAYER, - - - - -	427
ART. IV.	— THE DEATH AND BURIAL OF MOSES, -	450
ART. V.	— DESIGN OF THE SACRAMENTS, - -	461
ART. VI.	— GREEK PLASTIC ART, - - - -	479
ART. VII.	— THE LATE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. — CHURCH AND STATE, - - - - -	498
ART. VIII.	— BIBLIOGRAPHY, - - - - -	535
ART. IX.	— CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - -	546
	NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED, - -	552

Stereotyped at the
FRANKLIN TYPE AND STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY,
Cincinnati, O.

Printed by
MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.,
Cincinnati, O.

Digitized by Google

1862, May 16.
Gift of
Rev. J. T. Shane
of Cincinnati, Ohio.

DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. III.

SEPTEMBER, 1861.

ART. I. — *The New Gospel of Rationalism.*

Institutiones Theologiæ Christianæ Dogmaticæ: Scripsit JUL. AUG. LUD. WEGSCHEIDER. Editio Octava: Lipsiæ, 1844.

Das Leben Jesu. Kritisch bearbeitet von Dr. DAVID FRIEDERICH STRAUSS. 4te Auflage. Tübingen, 1840.

Recent Inquiries in Theology: By eminent English Churchmen; being "Essays and Reviews." Second American Edition. Edited, with an Introduction, by Rev. F. H. HEDGE, D. D. Boston, 1861.

The existence of the Kingdom of Christ upon earth involves a constant strife with the spirit and practice of this world. For it is only by encroachments of the former upon the domain of the latter that a Church can be founded; and hence the verification of our Lord's declaration, that he came not to bring peace, but a sword. The principles of holiness and sin being in direct antagonism, they can never exist in harmony side by side; but must work out their essential natures in open hostility to each other. This is equally true whether contemplated in the life of the believer or in the visible Church of the Redeemer; for there is no difference, except numerically, between the two, and the nature of the foes with which they have to contend. The Christian life is emphatically a warfare; continuous, unyielding and deadly, until, at the end of the probation, his captain enables

Digitized by Google

him to sing the pæan — It is finished. For the corrupt nature we inherit must be subdued, and this never yields while any strength remains; and a wicked world around, incited by the spirit of all evil, continually renews the attack even after domestic foes are vanquished. So in the life of the Church. We are to expect that same spirit of enmity and intolerance; for the adversary of Christ's Kingdom will never cease his machinations until in the latter day glory he shall be put under the mighty Conqueror's feet, and the Church militant becomes triumphant. Hence, we are not taken unawares by this hostility; it is what the Lord foretold; it is what we must expect from the essential strife between holiness and sin; as well as what daily experience confirms in fact.

Nor are we to expect any consistent line of attack to be pursued; but as the Church foils her adversaries in one way this will be abandoned, and a new method resorted to, that vulnerable points may be discovered. Accordingly we see that the hostility of the devil assumes various forms, and frequently diametrically opposite. At one time it is persecution from the temporal power; at another the meretricious seductions of earthly glory, when Babylon sits as a harlot in guilty splendor and allures the unwary to her unholy embraces. For example: At the founding of the apostolic Church, heathenism, stirred up by a pharisaical Judaism, incited the Roman Government to a bloody persecution; but soon the Kingdom of Christ became established so firmly that it was impossible by this method to exterminate or even to weaken it; for violence only strengthened the people of God in the faith. Again the tactics are varied, and now the kingdoms of the earth are offered by Satan to the Church, provided she will abase herself before her enemy; and this temptation proved far more destructive than direct opposition. For the simplicity of the true faith was buried under the pomp of a gorgeous ritual, and the power of a divine principle exchanged for the traditions of men; until there was little left but the form, since the power of godliness was denied. But when the mighty spirits of the Reformation awoke the Church by the clarion notes of a pure gospel, she again shook herself as a warrior, and putting on the beautiful garments of justification by faith in a per-

Digitized by Google

sonal Saviour, she stood up once again as a conqueror. Still she had no rest, because her vocation is strife and toil while on earth. The same spirit of enmity displays itself, now within and now without, — ever vexing and persecuting the followers of Christ. Thus, there is a constant recurrence to old methods of attack, as well as application of new ones; for while the enemies are baffled completely on one tack, this will be disused until the Church is unprepared from its omission, when there is a renewal, and old objections are brought forward with all the confidence of unanswered arguments, though they had before been satisfactorily silenced. So that while Satan doubtless suggests new devices to his emissaries, yet the chief weapons of attack are exhibited in a kind of ever-revolving circle; and special phases of hostility to the faith of Jesus become conspicuous in each age, and concentrate the powers of evil in their application.

The point of attack in the present age is from within. The Saviour says the enemies of a man are of his own household, and never, apparently, was this more applicable than at the present time. Before, there have been bold blasphemers who openly attacked the truth of the Christian religion; but while bad enough they had at least this recommendation of their honesty, that they did not pretend so much as to be friends or apologists for the claims of revelation. They were open in their hostility, and avowed their determination to sap its foundations; so that no one at least was lured by their arguments, as by a pretended friend of that which he attacked. But during the last three quarters of a century, the Christian world has contemplated the strange spectacle of men holding the highest positions of honor and emolument in the bosom of the Church, eating as a canker into the very vitals of the body they were sworn to protect, and shamelessly sucking the breasts of that mother which nurtured them, while endeavoring with parricidal hand to deal her a death blow. We have seen this exhibited in the great defection of Rationalism in Germany, Broad Church liberalism in Britain, and Arian heresy of New England. This movement is characterized by a denial of all that is essential in Christian faith, veiled under the specious garb of appeal to human reason as a criterion. It is an ingenious species of tumbling in the domain of mysticism, from

Digitized by Google

the basis of a narrow philosophy. As it has none of the lineaments of that system of faith once delivered to the saints, and constantly appeals to reason and science, it may not inaptly be termed the *New Gospel of Rationalism.* In the present paper it will be the attempt to show the essential nature of this species of Infidelity; answer some of its leading arguments; and exhibit the monstrous inconsistency of its advocates, whose bare-faced effrontery enables them still to hold on to their positions in the Church.

We maintain that this Gospel is,

Irrational in its principles;
Impious in its claims;
False in its interpretation of Holy Writ;
Abandoned in its morality.

These charges we propose to prove by six specifications, which are all involved in the claim formally or tacitly assumed by the champions of Rationalism. The first of these specifications

I. is, A positive denial of miraculous power, and consequently the attempt to bound the operations of Omnipotence by human experience. We might with propriety call this system of doctrine the Gospel of Human Nature; for it pretends to emancipate man from all the shackles of intellectual and moral bondage, so as to leave him free to follow the dictates of his own reason. But, whatever be its true character, it is unquestionably another Gospel than that which Paul preached; and whether true or false, cannot be mistaken for that which depends for its support on the Revelation of God. For it involves a denial of all that is essential in that Revelation as comprehended by the defenders of Christianity and exhibited in the life of the believer.

One of the prominent dogmas of this school of Infidels is the impossibility of miracles. This is urged with the more vehemence, because if it can be successfully maintained, it renders all the subsequent steps for invalidating the Christian faith comparatively easy. Indeed, if it can be shown that miracles are impossible, then all Revelation is false; for its very condition and existence is thereby denied. If there is no miraculous interference, we cannot possibly know the mind of God touching our race; nay more, we have no reliable knowledge of a God at all;

Digitized by Google

since without direct communication from Him we can know nothing more than is revealed in external phenomena; which, to say the least, leaves out all testimony touching our relations to Him. Nowhere is the unfair dealing of Rationalists more forcibly exhibited than in the treatment of this subject. Instead of following the dictation of their boasted principle of reason, at the first step they embrace the absurdity of assuming the very point in dispute. In every argument from such sources which it has been our misfortune to see, the operation is based upon the *a priori* grounds that a miracle, being contrary to the order of Nature, cannot occur. Here let us reflect on what is meant by the order of Nature. Is it our preconceived opinions of the manner a world is to be governed physically and morally; or is it a regimen which must be deduced from a collation of all the facts of universal history? Clearly it is illogical for us to say how the world is to be governed, except in so far as the concurrent testimony of all ages enables us to catch glimpses of a systematic procedure. This result must rest on human testimony; and here the Rationalist unblushingly ignores the fact that miracles are on record, well attested by honest, disinterested, and, if more were necessary, by hostile witnesses. So that this position assumed by Hume and his followers is utterly groundless, because directly contrary to the facts in the case. Here is the argument: Miracles are contrary to the order of Nature. But the order of Nature is uniform; *ergo*, Miracles are impossible! How strange that so acute a philosopher did not at once see the fallacy of his position! for he maintained that our knowledge of uniformity in the physical world depended on human testimony; and then assumed that miracles are false because contradictory to this: that is, Human testimony is false because it attests miracles; the course of Nature is uniform because it is attested to be so by human experience; so that what proves the one to be true, proves the other to be false. This is a fallacy so glaring, and is reiterated with an effrontery so scandalous, that nothing but a determination to shut the eyes to all the light of reason urged on by a depraved heart, can account for in any manner.

But again: We utterly deny that human testimony is against miracles, even putting out of the question those recorded in

Digitized by Google

Divine Revelation. There is no fact more evident in the world's history than that the Divinity is believed to have held intercourse supernaturally with the human race. Deep down in the consciousness of humanity is the conviction founded upon tradition among all nations that God visits the children of men and manifests himself by the suspension of the material laws. How this conviction arose, whether by a common manifestation of himself to all the tribes of earth; or whether only through the channels mentioned in the revealed Word, it is not our business now to inquire. We fully believe the latter view; but what we wish to call attention to is the fact that such conviction exists, and ever has existed; so that if the voice of human nature when uttered by the consciousness of the species is worth anything in attesting the course of the natural world, then no fact can be more triumphantly established than that Divine Providence has suspended the ordinary workings of the cosmical system to prove his interest in the sons of men. Much is said about the concurrent testimony of the human race as being sufficient to establish any truth; because the response of mankind must be adequate to prove any fact which relates to the moral and intellectual wants of those who thus respond. Whatever value may be attached to this, one thing is certain, it is the argument adduced by infidels in support of their system; and is at least fair to be used in reasoning with them.

Another fact is wholly ignored by these boasted advocates of reason, to wit: If a Revelation be made at all, the only condition of its possibility is by the intervention of miracles. Hence, the case is put thus: There can be no Revelation because the miracles which attest it cannot rationally be true; and there cannot be a revelation without miracles, because nothing else is competent to accredit it: consequently there can be no Revelation. This is reasoning in a circle, assuming one position to prove another, and then, as if the second was established, returning to make good the first.

Let us, however, consider the nature of a miracle. From the meaning of the word we perceive that something wonderful, and therefore out of the usual order of things as known to us, is intended. The action may be natural enough, quite in accordance

Digitized by Google

with the course of Providence, but simply unknown to or seldom seen by us. If we saw the same thing take place often, how strange soever it first appeared, it would cease to seem miraculous to us, and would be placed in the category of ordinary phenomena. So that we cannot take it upon ourselves to say whether a certain action is strange in itself or not; it is merely strange to us, and may, for ought we know, be normal, and only one link of a long chain of sequences of which the rest is hidden from our sight. Nor does a miracle involve an absurdity or contradiction. The same power which carries on any of the simplest operations of nature is quite adequate to the production of those unusual effects, which we merely from their infrequency denominate miracles. The contrary view limits the power of God, and prescribes the method of Divine Government by the dictates of a reckless philosophy. Truly, he that framed the law can, for reasons satisfactory to himself, suspend its operation, were that necessary for great moral interests; but, in fact, miracles are more rationally considered as parts of that complete system, unseen, perhaps, to us in all its workings, but consonant with the final purpose of creation.

The effort to rob the Christian faith of this evidence is also a blow at particular Divine Providence. It is vain to talk of the operations of Natural laws, as though they had any power to act. The law itself effects nothing, but is only the expression of the modes of action which are observable in the world. Laws effect nothing at all *per se*, because they are neither active nor regulative potentially, but the norm according to which a secret power displays its activity. The grandiloquent language respecting the working of natural laws in the sense they are referred to by rationalistic philosophers, is sheer nonsense. As well say that the statute books ruled the state, or that common law directed the polity of the civilized world. There are forces back of these which are the real governors. The moral sense of right and wrong represented in the person of the magistrate as the head of a people, is that which rules the state. Without this, what could statutes do? So without the efficiency of Providence what could Natural law do? Rather where would any such regulations be found? The effect is put for the cause, and thus the

Digitized by Google

aim of infidelity to eliminate God from the universe becomes manifest. The absurdity of perpetual motion in mechanics is no greater than the assumption that the powers of nature are self-sustaining. Every movement of matter requires the application of force, and the moment that force is withdrawn the motion tends to cease. So the generation of plants, the growth of vegetation, and the progress of animal life, involve a constant intervention of energy to carry on the process. It is the nature of matter to be inert, and it only moves as it is moved: much less has it a tendency to generate vitality. The idea, then, of spontaneous generation, involves such an absurdity that if expressed in the language of practical life would entitle its advocate to the straight jacket of the asylum. For if we assume geological periods of any length whatever, this only removes the difficulty to a greater distance. The question to be settled is, whether nothing can produce something; whether effects arise without causes; life and activity from inanition; or intelligence springs up spontaneously. If this be the case, then all our systems of science rest on a false basis, and there is nothing true either in their theory or application: so that all the results of human experience are unsettled. But it is only by relegating that which is plain to the domain of the obscure, that the inherent folly of this procedure escapes. These cuttle fishes hide behind the dark illimitable periods which they assume, and claim as conceded facts those monstrous doctrines which are abhorrent to common sense; because, forsooth, the times are so long that almost anything may have taken place in them.

If we admit the existence of God the creation is conceivable; but if not, then we can in no wise account for the so-called operations of nature. Moreover, the being of a First Cause involves the necessity of independent action, both in the beginning and throughout all the subsequent developments of actualized power. We can no more prescribe the manner of his action than control our own creation. Neither are we competent to say whether this or that course of action is agreeable to the course of Providence, for all that we can do is to observe facts and draw *á posteriori* conclusions from them. In our little sphere we can write a history; but if we go beyond the records of revelation

Digitized by Google

and experience we compose romance, and attribute to it more importance than to that which God has written in the book of Nature as interpreted by the Word of Life. In a word, we place our own judgment higher than the wisdom of God, and the powers of the created world both independent and more efficient than their Creator.

II. In any reasonable conception of a revelation from God we must naturally expect difficulties beyond our understanding. For did nothing exist which we are not competent to attain by our own unaided effort, then the need of revelation would not exist. Faith, then, is necessary to its very idea; so that if we make our understandings the measure thereof we at once supersede its necessity. The only consistent position to be taken by those who distrust revelation because of its difficulties, is that the thing is impossible. But while this is, doubtless, the ulterior object aimed at, there are few skeptics of the Rationalistic school who have the boldness to avow openly their sentiments. Hence, while professing a certain respect for the Divine Word, they are perpetually casting doubt and uncertainty on its record. Says Dr. Williams, page 92:

"Again: on the side of external criticism, we find the evidences of our canonical books, and of the patristic authors nearest to them, are sufficient to prove illustration in outward act of principles perpetually true, but not adequate to guarantee narratives inherently incredible or precepts evidently wrong. Hence, we are obliged to assume in ourselves a verifying faculty, not unlike the discretion which a mathematician would use in weighing a treatise on geometry, or the liberty which a musician would reserve in reporting a law of harmony.... It is not our part to dictate to Almighty God, that he ought to have spared us this strain upon our consciences; nor, in giving us through his Son a deeper revelation of his own presence, was he bound to accompany his gift by a special form of record."

Forgetful of the real nature and claim of a book bearing the credentials of Divinity, it must be submitted to the tortures of criticism like any other book; which is no more than begging the question. If the Bible be from God, it is more than human composition, and must be treated with corresponding respect. If not, then it has no claim upon us whatever, and should not be

Digitized by Google

treated with any deference, because its claims are in that case false, and its objects must be wrong. Again, Wegscheider, § 12, lays down this fundamental principle for his system:

"Quod vero ad summi numinis ideam attinet recte informandam, persuasio de *supernaturali* et *miraculosa* eademque *immediata* Dei revelatione conciliari nequit cum idea Dei æterni, semper sibi constantis, omnipotentis, omniscii et sapientissimi, cujus virtute per omnem æternitatem actuosa consiliisque optimis optime accommodata fieri, ut et sit et conservetur tota verum natura, recte docemus."

But the effort to found a system of religion on such a basis as that the Bible is to be interpreted exclusively on rationalistic principles, and that every thing contrary to our preconceived idea of what a revelation should be, is suicidal to its own attempts. If rationalism is a procrustean bed, and every thing not corresponding precisely to its dimensions must be reduced to its measure or lopped off, then Revelation is not the standard of reason in regard to divine things, but reason that of Revelation; which at once cuts up by the roots all the Christian's hope. If we eliminate the miraculous from God's doings in the world, and all that is inexplicable in the knowledge he gives us of himself in the plan of Grace, there remains no room for the display of his power or the manifestations of his wisdom. Vain is it for the rationalist to demur against this sweeping conclusion; for no other one is legitimately possible from his own premises. Yet we see this cropping out of the system in all the books referred to at the head of this article. Scripture infallibility is attacked by every conceivable method; but which may be chiefly for convenience referred to the following three heads. In the first place, the corrupt state of the text is a favorite ground of objection. But is this corrupt condition of the written Word as great as it is assumed? What do the inaccuracies which are heralded in triumph before the world amount to? Do they if all admitted to their fullest extent invalidate a single article of faith? This has never been shown by any objector; but, on the contrary, they are so insignificant that it makes no possible difference to the believer whether we take the received text, or those of Lachmann, Scholz, and Theile. For the variations are insignificant, consisting chiefly in differ-

Digitized by Google

ences of pointing, orthography, the omission of a word occasionally; and sometimes the apparent interpolation of a short sentence. The labors of critics are often quite unintentionally verifying the general accuracy of the written Word, and every new revision by competent scholars does but confirm this more and more. The publication of ancient versions, the discovery of old manuscripts, exhibit the same concurrence in all that is necessary to constitute the Divine Word an infallible code of faith and morals, so far as this depends on the purity of the text. The efforts made by the enemies of our faith would be considered contemptible if applied to any other book. Suppose, for example, that the doctrines of formal logic as taught by Aristotle, or the statements of Thucydides were to be impugned, because some variations had crept into the text, who is there of these cavillers that would not exclaim against the folly and falsity of this proceeding? Yet in the case of these treatises, or any other remains of ancient literature, there are far greater discrepancies in the text than in Holy Writ — differences which frequently do change the sense in important matters. No one thinks, however, of assailing their general accuracy; but rather accounts for the differences on obvious principles, which leave the character of the book and its author unscathed.

Another favorite objection is the alleged discrepancy between Revelation and the results of science. This objection ought to be silenced for ever by the obvious truth, that the purpose of a supernatural communication to man was not intended to teach him those things which he can by his own powers discover; but to instruct him in his moral obligations and his relations as a creature dependent on God. No system of science is pretended to be taught; and whatever allusions are incidentally made, are suited to the times and notions of the people addressed. This is necessary for two reasons. If a revelation was made which did not refer to natural phenomena as apparent to the senses, then it must be either incomprehensible to those addressed; or else rejected as false because denying their testimony. And if science be taught at all formally, then it must be in its absolute truth; which would anticipate all discovery, and render unnecessary the exercise of human ingenuity in the natural progress of scientific

Digitized by Google

research. But it is a matter well worthy the attention of skeptics and rationalists that the farther progress of science does not falsify any of the incidental allusions of Scripture, (and this is all that can be required, considering the domain of each,) but rather confirms them. No scholar deserving the name can pretend that the results of geological inquiry touching the age of the world are in opposition to the Mosaic cosmogony. This could be done only by showing that the term *day* as used in Genesis corresponds with the astronomical period of twenty-four hours. But any orientalist knows that this term, both in Hebrew and all its cognate languages, signifies either a period of time without any reference to its duration; a particular juncture corrresponding with the Greek καῖρος; or the civil day. To confine this word to the strict scientific meaning throughout the literature of these languages would be to render their statements absurd and nonsensical in multitudes of passages. Why then fetter the first chapter of Genesis by this signification? Surely a witness is not to be found to utter what he does not intend, and then to be condemned because his testimony is false; or because his plain statements are chosen to be understood in a sense which he neither warrants, nor is consonant with the general tenor of his deposition.

But again: It is altogether unfair to try the Scripture in the crucible of science, for the simple reason that the latter is only relative, while the former, if true, is absolute. Of what period of the world, for example, are we to take the deductions of science and say that Scripture does not agree with them, and therefore it cannot be true? Admitting this to be done a thousand years ago, the comparison, in consequence of the progress of scientific knowledge, must needs be renewed now; and if agreement existed in one period it could not at the other. Until, therefore, science has come to perfection, the comparison cannot in justice be made; and the triumphant shout of infidelity in one age at apparent discrepancies, confutes its own falsity in another.

Still farther: It is asserted that there are mistakes in history proven to be such by contemporary records. Perhaps no field of unbelief has been scanned more closely than this; for here seems an opportunity for tangible arguments to disprove the

Digitized by Google

Scripture records. Hence ancient inscriptions, while imperfectly understood, were appealed to, and apparent discrepancies carefully collected and employed without stint by scoffers and semi-infidels; but this stirred up a spirit of inquiry among the defenders of the faith. This led to the triumphant refutations of Lardner and Paley; the former of whom collected the historical evidence, and the latter stated the results in logical form, which arrested for a time the audacity of all opponents. But again in our own day, we have seen the attack renewed by reference to the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, which has been met by the labors of Rawlinson, putting to silence for a time the unscrupulous maligners of our faith. The whole procedure of those who deny the historic truth of the Bible is characterized by their usual unfairness; for we are required to doubt or disbelieve every thing not confirmed by contemporary evidence; a process which, from the paucity of records yet discovered, is utterly impossible. All that can in fairness be expected in the present advancement of monumental decyphering, is that there be no contradiction between the Divine record and those historic testimonies which are known to be true; for where there is a difference of statement we must determine the monument to be true before we can affirm the Bible to be false. Hence, then, even granting no preëminence to the statements of Revelation, all must admit a balancing of probabilities before we can say authoritatively that it is untrustworthy. Yet the moment an apparent discord is observed it is at once asserted that the monument overthrows the testimony of Revelation, though subsequent investigations have proved the entire harmony in all cases where the opportunity has been had for verification.

III. In the efforts of Rationalists it is everywhere manifest that they do not hesitate to go contrary to the obvious meaning and intent of the sacred writers. Nothing is more clear than that the prophets and apostles intended their statements where matters of fact are narrated, as the plain literal truth. For example, when Isaiah predicts the captivity; or when the Evangelists mention the murder of the children by Herod, or Christ's walking on the water; the statements are to be taken in their obvious import, unless we can prove them to be false. So that

Digitized by Google

here again Rationalism is in direct opposition to the spirit and claims of Revelation. The latter appeals to the supernatural power of prophecy or the working of miracles in attestation of the truths it affirms; while the former says all must be explained as history of subsequent events, or as the results of the ordinary workings of Nature. Which then must we admit? for both cannot be true; and there is no middle course, no higher unity in which both can be comprehended. The special pleading of Strauss by which he eliminates well nigh all the life of Christ, if adopted as true, exhibits the writers of the New Testament as the most corrupt and false chroniclers of all time; for it is perfectly clear that they spoke and wrote in the manner of those who believed what they asserted. If, however, we take refuge behind the supposition that the Gospels and Epistles are not the genuine productions of those whose names they bear, the difficulty yet remains in full force. These writings had some authors, whether they appeared contemporaneously with the recorded events, or were the slow growth of centuries; and whoever their composers were, they wrote in the name or by the pretended authority of the persons whose credentials they have; and hence, if not the real persons, they have this double guilt of assuming an untrue character, and uttering as true that which they knew to be false. There is a still farther consideration. However much the writers of the Bible were, on rationalistic grounds, either false or deceived; if this were all, then might we consider the consequences as being less injurious, and the errors, if wicked in intent, yet not pernicious. But the writers knew that they would be believed, and therefore deceived consciously. What consequences does this monstrous view lead to? When Christ raised the widow's son, he practiced jugglery before the eyes of a simple-minded, believing crowd. In their sincerity they actually believed that he did raise the young man; but according to our rationalistic guides he did not. His declaration to the sorrowing mother, Weep not, and his authoritative command to the dead to arise, are solemn mockery. At the resurrection of Lazarus, the discourse with the sisters concerning his own divine power, and corroborated by the miracle, are consciously deceptive. The mind revolts in horror from such a view; for it makes

Digitized by Google

the Saviour of sinners a conscious and wilful deceiver touching matters of the greatest possible interest to those who confided implicitly in him. But how can we expect Jesus Christ to be any other than a deceiver, if we accept the account which Strauss gives of the miraculous birth? Life of Jesus, Eng. Trans. § 29:

"If, says Gabler in his review of the Commentary of Paulus, we must relinquish the supernatural origin of Jesus, in order to escape the ridicule of our contemporaries, and if, on the other hand, the natural explanation leads to conclusions not only extravagant but revolting; the adoption of the mythus, by which all their difficulties are obviated, is to be preferred. In the world of mythology many great men had extraordinary births, and were sons of the gods. Jesus himself spoke of his heavenly origin, and called God his father; besides, his title as Messiah was — Son of God. From Matthew i: 22, it is further evident that the passage of Isaiah vii: 14 was referred to Jesus by the early Christian Church. In conformity with this passage the belief prevailed that Jesus as the Messiah should be born of a virgin by means of divine agency; it was therefore taken for granted that what was to be, actually did occur; and thus originated a philosophical (dogmatical) mythus concerning the birth of Jesus. But according to historical truth Jesus was the offspring of an ordinary marriage between Joseph and Mary."

This must have been known by Strauss to be false, since no trustworthy record has ever asserted it; but all, on the contrary, have held that the Lord was not the offspring of Joseph, and all the revolting consequences must follow which can on any blasphemous supposition; how much soever the author tries to hide behind his mythical cloud. Hear him again, in the same section:

"This natural disposition to understand the Messianic title *Son of God* more and more literally, was fostered by the expression in the Psalms ii: 7, *Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee*, interpreted of the Messiah; words which can scarcely fail to suggest a physical relation; it was also nurtured by the prophecy of Isaiah respecting the virgin who should be with child, which it appears was applied to the Messiah; as were so many other prophecies of which the immediate signification had become obscure. This application may be seen in the Greek word chosen by the Septuagint, παρθένος a pure unspotted virgin, whereas by Aquila and other Greek translators the

Digitized by Google

word *νἱανις* is used. Thus did the notions *Son of God* and *a son of a virgin* complete one another, till at last the divine agency was substituted for human paternal participation."

This extract speaks for itself. Under the cover of a specious exterior, there is all the unfair dealing with the plain intent of Scripture, the reckless disregard of christian sensibility, and the malignant scoffing, of the Age of Reason. If the Christ of the Bible can be shown to be such as delineated in Strauss' account of his origin, every man must turn from him as the chief of impostors. Nothing could equal the baseness of such a deceiver, except the effort of those who prostrate their lives to the task of taking away all the Christian's hope.

IV. Now when the Bible has been levelled to the position of an ordinary book, or rather, we should say, relegated to the domain of myth and conscious falsehood, it is not strange that little confidence is placed in the essentials of religion. Hence, we see the constant tendency to ignore all the positive and characteristic teachings of our faith, either by denying their obvious meaning, or by obliterating their distinctive features until they are degraded to the level of heathen morality. Of course, according to these teachers, Christ performed no miracles and was not the Son of God; and therefore, no faith can be placed in him as a personal Saviour. If he taught conscious falsehood or was deceived in matters of sense, no reliance can be placed in his moral teachings. The same also follows from the view that his doctrines are to be understood wholly in a rationalistic sense; for the evident design of revelation is that they are to be taken in a special spiritual meaning which can only be obtained by Divine illumination. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned. To this, the pure Rationalism of Wegscheider, the courtly phraseology of Oxford free-thinkers, and the bold scoffing and universal doubt of Strauss, are all directly opposed. Accordingly, they fritter the Atonement away until it is only the suffering of a martyr testifying to the truths of universal morality; but which becomes, if the principles assumed be true, the death of a false prophet, who lived the life of a deceiver and died justly under

Digitized by Google

the Jewish law. For the rationalist and Pilate are at one; because, though they can find no fault in his moral life, yet they both must yield to the Jews; since the Lord claimed to be divine, who, unless he was, deceived the people, and deserved the punishment. It is vain to deny this consequence; for certainly the Lord and his apostles well knew the impressions they made on their hearers and followers, which is unpardonable unless they were the very characters and endowed with the gifts they claimed. The attempt to call these claims and the acceptance of the homage rendered by the people, a harmless deception, the end justifying the means, is nothing but the shameless morality of the Jesuits; and when assumed even in the mildest form must destroy all confidence in the person and work of the Messiah.

Again, the work of Regeneration is so mutilated, that it cannot be recognized as the doctrine of Scripture. It is held to be merely a subjective determination to amend the life, followed by the forsaking of outward acts of immorality, but having no foundation in the work of God's Spirit. The advocates of the New Gospel wax eloquent in dissertations on the beauty of virtue and the moral fitness of things. One would think that they were in raptures over Seneca or Zerdusht; for certainly their views of holiness have not the slightest resemblance to the new birth so clearly and repeatedly taught in the Word of God. The millennium holiness is merely the combined result of the world's education in successive ages; to which Greek, Roman, Hindoo, and Parsee morality have contributed, alike with the doctrines and example of the Saviour of men. Man never is born again, because he has never become dead in sin. There is no need for an entire change to be wrought by the Spirit of God, since man possesses still enough of inward goodness to save himself without the help of a new-creating spirit. Justification by Faith is thus summarily disposed of: "Why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes to trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer?" p. 90. So we might go on with the doctrine of the Resurrection, and show that authors of the New Gospel doubt the rising of our Lord; and consequently, if this truth be invalidated, we have no assurance of quickening from the dead and

Digitized by Google

of future life at all, since our hopes of this rest upon the assertions of the Lord Jesus and his own triumph over the powers of the grave. True, we have vague generalities about all, both good and bad, "being brought back to the bosom of the Universal Father," and there to enjoy eternal bliss; but this dogma as stated by the Essayists might equally well be deduced from the Shasters by the Brahmin who adopts the crudest Pantheism. So that it is impossible to say where this destructive process would cease, and what we would have left as the residuum after Scripture is tried in the crucible of scientific theology such as rationalistic divines advocate and employ.

V. There is something equally characteristic and unfair in the attacks of skeptics in the constant reiteration of stale falsehoods, and the vamping of objections as new, which have been silenced for the hundredth time. Direct falsehoods or reasonings devoid of any logical evidence, after having been exposed and put to silence, will lie in obscurity for centuries until they are forgotten by the Church. Then these will be paraded again, the same in substance but changed a little in shape to conceal their snaky forms, with a great flourish of trumpets; and in premature triumph the Christian religion is declared to be demolished. It is curious to observe how this process has been going on continually since the Church had an existence. Philo, Porphyry, and Celsus brought to bear all that learning and ingenuity, urged on by the virulence of infidelity, could do; and in ponderous treatises collected every species of objection. Complete answers were given by Origen, Augustine, and other Fathers, and for ages the refutations were deemed satisfactory. Even the works of the skeptics were well nigh forgotten, and would have been quite so in many instances, but for the amber of Christian truth wherewith the Apologists surrounded them. Then, after the Reformation, when Christianity began to shake herself from the dust and rubbish of a corrupt formality, infidelity appeared again. When the Church is corrupt, infidelity sleeps; but when pure religion shines in her beautiful garments, her enemies awake to bespatter her with their slime and spit upon her with their venom. So we find Chubb, Woolston, and Bolingbroke renewing the attacks which their brethren of the early ages had begun.

Digitized by Google

All they had to do was to ransack the volumes containing the oft refuted slanders against early Christianity, to find plenty of objections ready furnished. It is always more easy to make an objection than to answer it satisfactorily, especially to those who do not wish to be convinced; and falsehood can outrun the truth, when it has every corrupt heart as a relay to give it fresh vigor. When these English infidels began their work, it passed for originality until men of erudition hunted the falsehoods down, when it was found that the process had been completed before; but still error was just as unblushing as though her naked ugliness had never been exposed. France and Germany now borrowed from England, (ready to pay back at a convenient season); and by the change of translating, the same objections reappeared as new on the Continent, there to be asserted as though never yet answered, and to expand into collossal proportions by the aid of a mystifying metaphysics. By dint of alliance with a false philosophy, piety was made to decay and a frigid formality introduced, until irreligion grew and extended its thousand arms, till, like a monster cuttle-fish, it caught hold of every interest in the Church, and threatened to swallow up even the form of religion. But there is little, if anything, original in the Neology of Germany. In Strauss we have a careful collection and exceedingly skillful disposition of the materials furnished him by previous writers; but scarcely a single objection which had not been met, or a theory which had not been exploded. The same may be said of the lesser lights of this system. And now we have this new book purporting to be "Recent inquiries in Theology by ministers of the Church of England;" but we appeal to any candid reader to show us what there is recent in it. We verily believe that we can point out every leading idea therein contained, in the writings of the German rationalists of the first four decades of the present century. Yet here is the spectacle of some of the most distinguished scholars and dignitaries of the English Church, who in a manner seemingly unaccountable, have lent their aid for the destruction of that faith they are solemnly bound to maintain, coming forward with a joint publication pretending to be recent inquiries, when their authors do know that their very arguments have been used by their brethren across the

Digitized by Google

channel, and have been successfully answered by Neander, Tholuck and Hengstenberg, men living in their own day, and whose writings are well nigh every where. Never was there a more audacious exhibition of effrontery than by the publications of Strauss and these Essayists; yet they continue to issue edition after edition, claiming originality for that which is as old as skepticism, and which has been and now is still answered successfully wherever and whenever presented. We may specify a few instances. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah has been especially subject to assault, and the attempt made to show that this refers to almost anything rather than to that which it obviously does. Yet this kind of objection ought to be forever put to silence by the clear application which Philip the Evangelist makes of it, when expounding the passage to the eunuch. The very difficulty raised as to whom it does refer, is obviated by the use which Philip made of it; and this should be satisfactory to those who have any regard for the divine authority of the Scripture. Yet we find it objected again and again that this cannot allude to the suffering Saviour; but while often met successfully, and especially in Hengstenberg's Christology, still, after all, Bunsen and his approving reviewer Dr. Williams, reäffirm the stale error with all the boldness of new discovery and the triumph of pretended truth. The same may be said of the twenty-second Psalm. There is an unmistakable reference of this, in the New Testament, to the sufferings of the crucifixion; and the circumstances, even though described in the language of poetry, are so accordant with the fact, that no plain man could read the account in the Evangelists and this Psalm without being impressed with the fact that they allude to one and the same scene. But in regard to the Messianic prophecies in general, this veracious and candid Dr. Williams complacently says:

"When so vast an induction on the destructive side has been gone through, it avails little that some passages may be doubtful — one perhaps in Zechariah, and one in Isaiah, capable of being made directly Messianic; and a chapter, possibly, in Deuteronomy foreshadowing the final fall of Jerusalem. Even these few cases, the remnant of so much confident rhetoric, tend to melt, if they are not already melted, in the crucible of searching inquiry." p. 78.

Digitized by Google

VI. There is still one aspect in which we view these defamers of Christianity with, if possible, still greater astonishment and indignation — that is the fact that while, both by the substance and spirit of their writings and the applause they receive from avowed infidels, they are proven to be hostile to the Christian faith, they still hold positions of honor and profit in the bosom of the Church. There is something peculiarly dishonorable and hateful in the position of a traitor. An open enemy may be tolerated; for he has at least the position, and may have the reality, of honesty in his opposition. At least he has not the double dishonor of being an enemy while acting the pretended friend. Nor is the outrageous nature of this corruption lessened because it is so easy to hide the real purpose by vague expressions, or atone for seeming enmity by occasional declarations of fidelity. Hence it matters little what such authors say they mean when all the world besides understands them to be enemies to the Christian faith. Nor does an assertion of belief however strong counteract the poison of systematic doubt diffused through a whole book. So that there is in such cases no palliation whatever. Let us consider the case of some of these writers. Wegscheider died a few years since, and until his death was a salaried professor of Theology in the Lutheran University of Halle. He was required by the oath of office to teach in accordance with the doctrines of that Church whose servant he was; to defend those doctrines against all assaults; and to maintain them in their purity. Did he do this? Let his book, which consists of the lectures he delivered during many years to classes of theological students, testify. There is the subversion of the fundamental truths of all Christian doctrine, or the ignoring of every distinctive tenet of our faith; — and this by whom? A man under oath to teach according to the doctrines of the Bible as understood by the Lutheran Church and expounded in her standards; a man who lived by the emoluments of his office, and honored because occupying a position which he, in fact, was laboring to render a nullity; a man who was under the most solemn vows to teach in conformity with the Gospel of Christ, and yet who did every thing in his power to bring this Gospel into contempt. Here is D. F. Strauss, who held office in the Church until the

Digitized by Google

people of Basle arose in their indignation, and declared that he should not act as professor to teach his abominable infidelity in their university; but who, we understand, by the peculiar law of that corporation continued to draw his salary, and perhaps does yet, though welcomed the world over by the coarsest infidels as a co-laborer in their cause. There are the seven Essayists aptly called "*Septem contra Christum*," all, except one, ministers of the Church of England — most of them enjoying very honorable and richly endowed offices therein, and yet preying upon her very vitals. Can there be anything more shameful than this? Can any man of honor among worldly men, not to say of Christian integrity, occupy such a position? Let us briefly consider what that position involves. The incumbent is sworn to support the doctrines of the Thirty-nine Articles, and to teach nothing contrary to them. He is the accredited minister of a Church of evangelical faith, having a commission to proselyte men thereunto. He is looked up to as the proper standard of faith and practice by the people committed to his charge. He is under solemn vows to preach Christ and him crucified; while in truth the doctrines of these Essayists deprive the Lord of his divinity and his cross of its glory. These authors receive their subsistence under the sanction of the rule that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Now how do they fulfill these duties? They wound the Lord in the house of his friends. They lead men into darkness when it is their office to hold up before them the lamp of life. Can these things be true? Is it possible that any man can, consistently with his own self respect, continue to hold such a position? Even the Westminster Review, which heartily embraces their doctrines and utters a loud welcome of such material to the ranks of "Liberal" Christianity, is conscious of the false position they occupy, and calls upon them to shake off their normal allegiance. There ministerial brethren are scandalized at their teaching, and demand of them the vacation of situations they dishonor, that they may stand forth before the world in the true colors which their avowed opinions make evident. What boots it, though they in "earnestly respectful letters" to bishops or their friends in hair-splitting distinctions, or the Edinburgh Review by a loose sophistical morality, endeavor to uphold the

Digitized by Google

consistency of saying one thing formally while the life and influence are devoted to the denial thereof? Men of candor will call this by its right name, *falsehood*, however it be disguised, and assign the principals and their abettors their true position of infamy. But the past in the conduct of these writers may well prepare us for anything in the future. Hence, we are not surprised at the jesuitical morality which attempts a justification of their position and a defence of their oath of subscription, because they exhibit a degree of shamelessness and corruption which would hesitate at nothing while temporalities are in danger. *Yea, they are greedy dogs strong of appetite, and they are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter.* The influence of such men in a Church must be truly deplorable, for it leaves it open to attack from without and within. They give a free invitation — *all ye beasts of the field, come to devour, yea, all ye beasts in the forest.* The German Church while under the guidance of such leaders was rapidly sliding into open unbelief. Many of the theological schools where they held sway had not a single member, either among the faculty or students, that was evangelical. The most distinguished doctors of theology ridiculed the Bible, and their students lived lives of drunkenness and profligacy. But this excess was its own corrective; for it raised up a party from the few in the Church who had not bowed the knee to Baal; and now the prophets of the New Gospel are falling into merited contempt, being scarcely permitted longer to wear the hairy garment to deceive. Paulus, the great commentator of this system, lived to see all his famed interpretations of Holy Writ abandoned, as outraging both common sense and decency; while he, a wretched foolish old man, fell into merited contempt. So we trust it will be in the English Church; but for the present, the influence of the Essayists is of the most insidious character. Not that there is anything profound or especially shrewd in their writings, but their position commands a certain influence and exposes the Church to the scoffs of the unbelieving rabble without. But doubtless the whole will be overruled for good. Such a commotion has been raised by the evangelical party that the matters of this book will be thoroughly sifted; and doubtless

Digitized by Google

other refutations will follow, and with them also more complete expositions of the Christian grounds of faith which have been attacked.

We have thus endeavored to show something of the character of this New Faith which men have tried to substitute for the simplicity of the Gospel. It makes the boast of being agreeable to human reason and better adapted to the present state of the world than the antiquated creeds and doctrines of the Bible. Doubtless it is far more agreeable to corrupt human nature than the strict requirements of Evangelical doctrine; but this is far from being a proof of its excellency. All over the world those of loose belief or doubtful morality have hailed the appearance of these Essays with delight. There is no mistaking the American Editor's joy in the supplication: "May this spirit which is now leavening the Church of England find abundant entrance into the churches of our land."

But is the system of the New Gospel of such a character as to commend itself to enlightened reason? Does it not, by begging the very question at issue, outrage the fundamental dictates of reason? Is it not impious in pretending to prescribe the manner that God must make himself known, and constituting reason a criterion of Revelation, when by its nature the latter must illumine and guide the former? Does it not take away all confidence in Holy Writ, by impugning the genuineness and questioning the integrity of its narrators? Does it not take from them all guidance of the Holy Spirit and leave them on a par with other erring mortals? Nay more:—Does it not accuse them of pandering to the corrupt views of men, and even of willfully deceiving those who put their trust in them? Verily it makes him whom the Christian recognizes as his Lord and God, no more than a juggler and an enthusiast, an impostor and a cheat. *Facilis discensus Averni;*—It teaches men that they can swear solemnly and yet be free from the binding consequences of such oath; that they can be traitors and yet honorably remain in the camp of Israel. These censures may seem harsh, but the subject demands them. Good men have been outraged long enough by the abandoned morality of those wolves in sheep's clothing. The conscience of evangelical Christendom calls upon them to leave

Digitized by Google

positions they have dishonored; and we hope that the spirit of the English Church will be roused, and, not deterred by the false cry of persecution which these writers now that they are attacked attempt to raise, interpose with a strong arm to hurl them from fat benefices which they are turning into kennels from which to snarl with impunity at the simplicity of the Christian Religion. *Intus et in cute*, is the motto with which to pierce the flimsy garb wherewith they cover the naked shame of that casuistry which defends the consistency of their present position.

These are some of the characteristics of that new form of doctrine advocated by those who extol human reason to the disparagement of the Divine Word — a species of doctrine old as the Church, but ever appearing under some of the protean shapes which lead astray while endeavoring to keep out of sight their radical errors. We ask, Is this the Gospel of Christ which teaches us that we are helpless sinners and must have an almighty Saviour or perish? Is this the doctrine to abase man and exalt and glorify God? The two systems have nothing in common, and therefore one of them must be abandoned. It matters not then by whom this New Gospel be advocated. Genius, learning and position cannot commend that which the conscience of enlightened Christian faith rejects; nor escape the censure of good men and the anathema of inspiration — Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

*

Digitized by Google

Art. II. — *Imputation.* *

PART I.

Nothing can be plainer even from the discussions to which we have referred in the margin, than that the interests of theology and religion require in this age a thorough reinvestigation of the whole subject of Imputation; for while the truth of the doctrine appears to be most cheerfully conceded, there seems to be but little agreement as to what the doctrine really is; or what are the principles involved in its maintenance. In the early ages of the Christian Church, and before any specific error on the subject had developed itself into form and efficiency, the simple and obvious facts involved in the doctrine were received and acknowledged by her members — just as all the other distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel had been — without any attempt at logical refinement, or scientific precision of statement. But when various forms of error had sought to obscure and even to ignore the truths asserted in the doctrine; and the attention of the Church of Christ was thus specifically called to the subject; it was not long ere the teachings of the Word of God in relation to this doctrine, as also in relation to the kindred doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, were fully evolved and received a clear and definite statement. In what we propose now to offer, our wish is, if possible, to prepare the way for a thorough reïnvestigation of the subject; regarding the necessity which calls for it as imperative, from the fact that grave misapprehensions are still entertained concerning it. The facts connected with the history of the doctrine itself, or its development and maintenance as

* Published with some reference to the following tractates:

Articles on Imputation and Original Sin, in the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review for 1830 and 1838. Republished in Princeton Essays, vol. 1. 1846.

Articles on Imputation in the Quarterly Christian Spectator (New Haven) for 1830, 1831.

The Elohim Revealed, by Rev. Samuel J. Baird, D. D. 1860.

Reviews of the Elohim Revealed in Princeton Review for April, 1860; and in the Southern Presbyterian Review for April, 1860.

Dr. Baird's Rejoinder to the Princeton Review. 1860.

Rejoinder of the Princeton Review, Oct. 1860.

Digitized by Google

presented in the theology of the Reformed or Calvinistic Church, are clearly not understood, even by many whose utterances on the subject are most dogmatic and decided.

The opening of the grand drama of the Reformation evinced that nearly all of its prominent actors on the side of the Protestants were not only imbued with the spirit of deep and earnest piety, but of learning likewise; and that they had evinced their high and just appreciation of its importance, by a thorough literary training.* They studied with intense interest the original languages of the Holy Scriptures; were thoroughly conversant with the different schools of philosophy and theology which divided the Latin Church; and, of course, their views of mental philosophy and of ethics, and their modes of thought, of investigation, and of argument, had been, at least to a very considerable extent, directed and shaped by the masters of those schools. Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Hales, and other renowned doctors still retained all their honors and authority; and were often referred to as authoritative in Philosophy and Ethics, and (until Luther dissolved the charm,) even in matters of faith, as is evinced, more or less, even by the earlier writings of the Reformers themselves. They could not, and did not, nor was it to be expected that they should succeed at the outset to free themselves wholly from the shackles thus imposed. And their glory was not so much in defining and adjusting the principles of speculative theology (though even here they have borne away the palm from all competitors) as in unfolding and exhibiting the long-concealed treasures of the Word of God. Nor is any thing hazarded by the assertion that as interpreters of the heavenly oracles they

* The professed theologian who affects to speak slightingly of the leading minds of the first generation of the Reformers, evinces only his own ignorance or incapacity. Among the men whom God then raised up (to speak only of the theologians,) may be named Luther, Capito, Melancthon, Jonas, Calvin, Carlostadt, Zuinglius, Farell, Bucer, Fagius or Reuchlin, Martyr, Bullinger, Hyperius, Musculus, Pellicanus, Stapulensis, Knox, Ridley, Beza, Bertram of Geneva, T. Bibliander, Borrhaus, Charpentier, A. Durer, Myconius, Œcolampadius, Stancarus, Viret, Xylander, Grynæus, Brentius, the learned but abused Pistorius, the erratic Osiander, J. Agricola, &c., either of whom might have given character to a later age. Nor was the second age much inferior, including such men as Ursinus, Zanchius, F. Junius, Gomarus, Polanus, S. Grynæus, Keckerman, Kuchlin, Pareus, Piscator, and others.

Digitized by Google

were not only immeasurably in advance of all that preceded them, but that they have had few equals and no superiors since; as is now admitted in the intelligent schools of criticism. It was to the cultivation of this great province that their main attention was directed.

Such being the state of the case, it were unreasonable to expect that there should be no diversity or disagreement amongst them, in the terms wherein they expressed their views of those doctrines which from diverse stand-points they were called upon to assert and to defend. But they practically recognized the principle that substantial agreement may exist under diversity of statement: and we owe it to them and to ourselves to recognize the same principle in interpreting their writings. They, for example, agreed fully and entirely on the doctrine of *justification by faith alone;* that is, as distinct from all personal or subjective merit or desert on the part of the justified; and held that this justification was by, through, or on account of the imputation of the merits or righteousness of Christ: though there may be found slight and unimportant variations in the forms of their statement of this truth, (as in the celebrated passage in Bucer, over which Grotius and Rivetus had their foolish controversy.) But the great fact itself was avowed; and none doubted it of all the early reformed Church. But when the later among them, along with their successors, attempted in more peaceful times to define the exact import of some of the terms employed in stating the doctrine, they differed somewhat; and the result was, a multitude of questions were started in relation to them: as for example, Does faith pertain to the intellect or to the will? Is the passive or active righteousness of Christ, or both, imputed in justification? (a question started by Karg of Wittemberg, about 1564.) And in laboring after a punctilious exactness of definition, the influence of their early mental training was manifested. But the question, whether Adam's guilt was imputed for condemnation; and whether Christ's righteousness was imputed for justification; *was never litigated by them.* The man who would have denied or disputed either the one or the other, would have been regarded as an enemy to the reformed faith. In all their presentations of Christian doctrine these great truths are found in their length

Digitized by Google

and breadth and fullness; and nothing but ignorance would venture to call it in question. But with all their efforts to free themselves from the barbarous technicology of scholasticism, both in philosophy and theology, they could not change at once their modes of thought and forms of expression; as may be seen abundantly exemplified in all their attempted refinements on the great and admitted facts of their own recognized theology. The sovereignty of God in the whole matter of human salvation was asserted fully and universally, just as it had been asserted by Augustine; but when they attempted to refine thereon the diverse philosophies of the contending sects of Scholasticism were at length called in to assist. They indeed quoted Plato and Aristotle; but often reasoned and refined with Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Ockham, &c. *The Will of God* as the foundation of moral obligation, was made the key-note of some; while *the Immutable Justice of God* became the key-note of others: the former reasoning themselves into what has since been called *Supralapsarianism*; and the latter into *Infralapsarianism.** And hereupon an embittered controversy began; which continued until the speculations of the Socinian and Remonstrant schools apprized them of the fact that matters of direct practical importance demanded their attention. A large volume might be properly devoted to the consideration of several points here referred to.

The fact of Adam's headship of the human family; and that all the race were federally represented by him; to the extent, too, that had he obeyed the Divine mandate all his descendants would have been as a consequence or certain result made partakers with him of the happy effects of his obedience; as all have been made partakers of the unhappy effects of his disobedience; is a fact which was universally regarded by them as fundamental in theology; and the pretense of the Socinians, and of some of the earlier Remonstrants, that they also recognized the whole of the truth involved therein, by the admission that Adam represented his natural descendants as a parent represents his children; and that Christ is truly the head of his redeemed inasmuch as he prepared the way for their salvation and acceptance with God; was uni-

* *Sublapsarian* as the antithesis of *supralapsarian*, is inaccurate and contrary to the best usage.

Digitized by Google

versally denounced by the Reformed Church as an utter denial of the Headship both of Adam and of Christ. Their uniform doctrine on the subject is thus briefly and correctly stated by Wendeline:

Ut secundi *Adami*, hoc est *Christi*, justitia nobis imputatur ad vitam: sic primi *Adami* injustitia nobis imputata ad mortem est. Hinc Theologi monent, *Adamum* non peccasse ut personam singularem: sed genus humanum tanquam in stirpe et origine representasse: ideoque peccatum ejus imputari universo generi humano. *

Assuming the truth of the great scriptural doctrine of Divine predestination, as all both Lutheran and reformed substantially did at the outset, the difficulty arose to Reconcile the doctrine with the equally admitted truth of the responsibility of the creature; and of his conceded accountability to God for his thoughts, words and actions. And the grand nodus was (as in the time of Augustine,) how to explain the fall of our first parents, or the introduction of sin into the world, so as to maintain predestination without either making God the author of sin, or destroying the accountability of man. Luther, in his treatise *De Servo Arbitrio*, took the highest ground, denying utterly that the creature had freedom of will; and Melancthon accepted and endorsed his statements hereon. Both, subsequently, modified their views; though others who had become convinced by the argument still retained the doctrine which it defended. In the discussions on Election and Reprobation, the same question, so to speak, became intensified, (as we shall have occasion to remark more fully hereafter;) and it was boldly asserted that the reprobate were created in order that they might be damned, and to show forth the power and severity of God. By far the greater part of the Church discarded and denounced this doctrine as soon as a thorough discussion of the subject had evinced its true character. Others, however, retained it; and some who admitted the premises sought to shelter themselves against the consequences of an open avowal of the conclusion, by taking refuge in the distinction between the revealed and secret purposes of God. And it was in immediate connection with these speculations on the accountability of man

* Christ. Theologia. p. 248. Anno 1633.

Digitized by Google

that the doctrine of imputation was brought forth again for a more particular consideration, as will be seen presently. And we need hardly add that in this connection we find no little confusion in the discussion itself. It was universally admitted that the race was condemned to death for Adam's transgression; but those who maintained that creation itself was only a means for the purpose of carrying out the decree of election; and who held that sin was not the ground upon which the lost were reprobated;* excogitated in the same connection, and as an outgrowth and utterance of the same principle, the idea that the imputation of sin was what has since been technically called *antecedent and immediate, and not in consequence of inherited or participated guilt and depravity.* Moral corruption was not the ground of reprobation, said they; nor was it the ground but the result of imputation. The argument was used in both cases, and is equally applicable to both. And hence it has been alleged in our own day, by the impugners of the doctrine of imputation and of the federal relation of Adam to his posterity, that the doctrine of imputation as originally received and taught by the Reformed Church involved a mysterious identity of the race with Adam, so that his act was their act; or, at least, a literal transfer from him to them of the moral turpitude of the sin by which he fell. But nothing can justify such a representation as this; for never did the Reformed Church entertain the idea of personal identification with Adam, or of the transfer of moral character, as in any way involved in the doctrine of federal headship and imputation.

As to the terms *impute* and *imputation*, the meaning attached to them by the Reformed Church from the very beginning until now is one and uniform, even though there has been a diversity in the statements in which the *doctrine* has been formally expressed. As to the term itself, Gomar, in his Analytical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, chap. iv, remarks that:

"Neither the Hebrew term חָשַׁב nor the Greek λογίζεσθαι by which Paul interprets it; nor even the Latin *imputare*, (as is shown by the

* "Creatio est via electionis." *Gomar.* "Decreti reprobationis causa efficiens non est peccatum." "Neque æterna prævisio peccati est causa decreti reprobationis; ut argumenta sequentia evincunt." *Polanus.*

Digitized by Google

usage of good authors,) has by itself a special signification; but it means generally *to repute, esteem, adjudge, ascribe* or *attribute, whether it be done truly or otherwise:* nor has any place been cited either from the Sacred Scriptures or from approved authors of the languages which proves the contrary. *

Turrettin fully sustains this:

"Verbum *imputandi* quod Heb. est חָשַׁב, Græcis λογίζεσθαι vel ἐλλογεῖν, bifarium posse sumi, vel proprie vel improprie. *Improprie* imputari dicitur alicui, id quod fecit ipse, vel habet, quum nimirum propterea præmium vel pœna illi decernitur. Ut *peccatum imputari* dicitur impiis. 2 Sam. xix: 19, &c. *Proprie* est eum, qui aliquid non fecit, habere ac si fecisset; et vicissem non imputare, est eum qui aliquid fecit, habere ac si non fecisset; &c. †

Nothing is more false than the assertion that these terms in their scriptural usage never mean *to ascribe to an individual that which is not by his own personal act or demerit, his own,* as any intelligent examination would evince. And even Knapp ‡ avers that theologians "for the most part will agree that the phrase, *God imputes the sin of our progenitors to their posterity,* means, that *for the sin committed by our progenitors God punishes their descendants.*"

The doctrine as held by the ancient Jews expressed merely the fact that all the descendants of Adam had sinned in his person, and that thus man was deprived of the immortal happiness for which he was created, and became the heir of death. (Compare Wisdom ii: 23, 24, and Sirach xxv: 32.) And this seems likewise to have been the earliest view of the Latin Church, and was asserted and defended by Tertullian, Ambrose, Augustine, &c. (See the texts to which they referred in support of it, in *Vossii Historia Pelagiana,* pp. 134–276.) But that this emphatic assertion of the natural headship of Adam did, in their estimation, exclude or was inconsistent with the doctrine of his federal headship, is an idle dream.

Since the Reformation different views have been entertained of the doctrine; to two of which it will be proper here to refer

* Opera, I., p. 897. † Opera, II., pp. 569, 570.
‡ Christian Theology. Sect. 76, p. 248.

Digitized by Google

before we proceed: the first of these we reject as unsupported and erroneous; while we regard the second as the view entertained by the Reformed Church, and as presented for our acceptance in the Word of God.

The former of these views is thus presented by Dr. Hodge, of Princeton:

"Some hold that in virtue of a covenant entered into by God with Adam, not only for himself but for all his posterity, he was constituted their head and representative. And in consequence of this relation, his act, (as every other of a public person acting as such,) was considered the act of all those whom he represented. When he sinned, therefore, they sinned, not actually but virtually; when he fell, they fell. Hence the penalty he incurred comes on them. God regards and treats them as covenant-breakers, withholds from them those communications which produced his image on the soul of Adam at his first creation; so that the result is destitution of righteousness and corruption of nature. *According to this view, hereditary depravity follows as a penal evil from Adam's sin, and is not the ground of its imputation to men. This, according to our understanding of it, is essentially the old Calvinistic doctrine. This is our doctrine, and the doctrine of the standards of our Church.*" *

The other view to which we refer is described as follows by Dr. Hodge, though not accurately; and it is the main design of all his essays on imputation to refute this view of the doctrine and to establish the former. His words are:

"Others *exclude the idea of imputation of Adam's sin, but admit that all men derive by ordinary generation from our first parents a corrupt nature, which is the ground, even prior to actual transgressions, of their exposure to condemnation.* This is essentially the view of Placæus, against which, as we endeavored to show, the Calvinistic world of his time protested. This is the view, in the main, of Stapfer, and in one place of Edwards. This is Dr. Dwight's doctrine, and that of many others. Most of the older advocates of this opinion retained at least the name of imputation, but made the inherent corruption of men the ground of it." †

Without pausing here to point out the inaccuracies of this whole representation, (which will be sufficiently apparent in the

* Princeton Essays, vol. I., pp. 167, 168. † Idem, p. 168.

Digitized by Google

course of our discussion,) we shall presently offer a statement in the language of those who entertain it, of the doctrine here referred to. And the reader will be able from our subsequent citation of testimonies to determine which, of the two views here presented of the doctrine of imputation, has received the approval of the Calvinistic Church. The doctrine, as we hold it, and as will be seen, admits both the natural and federal headship of Adam, (the *caput naturale* and the *caput morale;*) and its supporters, instead of making the distinction between mediate and immediate imputation; and attempting to explicate the doctrine of original sin from either, (as Dr. Hodge so laboriously essays to do;) *conjoin the two and maintain them to be inseparable.*

As to Placæus — through whose name Dr. Hodge in all his essays above referred to, endeavors to throw the odium of heresy upon all who dissent from his doctrine of antecedent or immediate imputation, * and of whom he apparently knows nothing except what is detailed respecting him in De Moor and Turrettin — it may be proper here to observe, in passing, that "the protest of the Calvinistic world" against his views, however understood, is not to be regarded as an endorsement of the doctrine of *immediate imputation.* Dr. Hodge has strenuously labored to make the contrary impression; but why he has endeavored to do this is difficult to determine. Placæus invented the formal distinction between mediate and immediate imputation; and Dr. Hodge has adopted it, and endeavors to explicate the doctrine of original sin from the stand-point thus assumed; but "the protest of the Calvinistic world" *was against the distinction itself* as contrary to the approved theology of the Reformed. This Dr. Hodge could have learned even from the work of De Moor. A single instance, and all that we can here stop to adduce, will evince this to be so. The celebrated and learned Walch, as cited by De Moor, † after referring to Placæus and explaining the import of *immediate imputation,* adds:

"Illam rejecit Placæus; hanc verò, sive *mediatam,* admisit. *Ita*

* See Princeton Essays, vol. I., pp. 146, 147, 150, 168, 178, 182, 183, 195 and 196: and Princeton Repertory, for 1860, pp. 343, 345, 346.

† Tom. III. Cap. 15. Sect. 32. p. 282.

Digitized by Google

nec ipsum Peccatum Originale, nec peccati Adamitici Imputationem in se spectatam; sed certum tantum hujus modum negavit; fuerunt tamen, qui ei se opponerent. ".. *Nos utramque Imputationem, quam dicunt, et immediatam et mediatam conjungendam et admittendam esse existimamus.* Adamus considerandus est non tantum ut caput naturale; sed etiam ut caput morale sive fœderale. Hinc et posteri ejus duplicem cum eo nexum habent, et naturalem et moralem. Pro hoc duplici nexu duplicem quoque Imputationis rationem Adamus in se continet, quod et Paulus *Roman.* v: 12, 18, 19, confirmat. *Quæ quum ita sint, haud dicendum est Placæum graviter errasse, ac momentum controversiæ hujus fuisse magnum.*"

Let this suffice for the present, so far as Placæus is concerned.

As to the view which Dr. Hodge assails as antagonistic to his immediate imputation scheme, and which he represents under the title of *mediate imputation*, we shall in order to do him full justice cite it as presented by both Stapfer and Edwards, to whom he has referred as inculcating it. Edwards, in Part IV, chap. iii, of his work on *Original Sin*, (the "one place" referred to by Dr. Hodge,) remarks as follows:

"The *first being* of an evil disposition in a child of Adam, whereby he is disposed to *approve* the sin of his first father, so far as to imply a full and perfect *consent* of heart to it, I think, *is not to be looked upon as a consequence of the imputation of that first sin*, any more than the full consent of Adam's own heart in the act of sinning; which was not consequent on the imputation, but rather *prior* to it in the order of nature. Indeed the derivation of the evil disposition to Adam's posterity, or rather the *co-existence* of the evil disposition implied in Adam's first rebellion, in the *root* and *branches*, *is a consequence of the union that the wise Author of the world has established between Adam and his posterity; but not properly a consequence of the imputation of his sin; nay, is rather antecedent to it as it was in Adam himself. The first depravity of heart, and the imputation of that sin, are both the consequences of that established union; but yet, in such order, that the evil disposition is first, and the charge of guilt consequent, as it was in the case of Adam himself.*"

In immediate connection with this passage, and in illustration of its meaning, he quotes largely from the *Theologia Polemica* of Stapfer; and among other extracts the following is given

Digitized by Google

from Tom. iv., Sect. 78, and from the note appended thereto. The translation is that of Edwards:

"The imputation of Adam's first sin consists in nothing else than this, that his posterity are viewed as in the same place with their father, and are like him. But seeing, agreeably to what we have already proved, God might, according to his own righteous judgment, which was founded on his most righteous law, give Adam a posterity that were *like himself;* and indeed it could not be otherwise, according to the very laws of nature; therefore he might also in righteous judgment impute Adam's sin to them, inasmuch as to give Adam a posterity *like himself*, and to *impute* his sin to them, is one and the same thing. And therefore if the former be not contrary to the divine perfections, so neither is the latter." . . . . "Our *adversaries* contend with us chiefly on this account, that according to our doctrine of original sin, such an *imputation* of the first sin is maintained, whereby God, without any regard to universal native *corruption*, esteems all Adam's posterity as *guilty*, and holds them as liable to condemnation, *purely* on account of that sinful act of their first parent; so that they without any respect had to *to their own sin*, and so, as *innocent* in themselves, are destined to eternal punishment.... *I have therefore ever been careful to show, that they do* INJURIOUSLY *suppose these things to be separated in our doctrine which are by no means to be separated.* The whole of the controversy they have with us about this matter, evidently arises from this, that they suppose the *mediate* and the *immediate* imputation are distinguished one from the other, not only in the manner of conception, but in reality. And so indeed they consider *imputation* only as *immediate* and abstractedly from the *mediate; when yet our divines suppose, that neither ought to be considered separately from the other:* (cum tamen Theologi nostri neutram ab altera separandam velint.) *Therefore I chose not to use any such distinction, or to suppose any such thing, in what I have said on the subject;* but only have endeavored to explain the thing itself, and to reconcile it with the divine attributes. *And therefore I have every where conjoined both these conceptions concerning the imputation of the first sin as inseparable; and judged that one ought never to be considered without the other:* [ut licet et hic ab hac distinctione abstinuerim, utramque tamen imputationem verbis meis involverim, nec reipsa à Theologorum nostrorum, vel ipsius etiam Apostoli Pauli, sententia discesserim. *] While I have been writing

* The clause between the brackets renders the quotation continuous.

Digitized by Google

this note, *I consulted all the systems of divinity which I have by me, that I might see what was the true and genuine opinion of our chief divines in this affair; and I found they were of the same mind with me; namely, that these two kinds of imputation are by no means to be separated, or to be considered abstractedly one from the other*, but that one does (necessarily) involve the other."

In support of this statement he then cites largely from both *Vitringa* and *Lampius*, who fully sustain the representation, though Dr. Hodge attempts to deny it in respect to Lampius.

If these things are so, (and that they are will be fully shown in the sequel,) then Dr. Hodge has committed several grievous errors in his treatment of the subject. 1. He errs with Placæus against the whole reformed theology, by allowing the distinction at all. For down to the time of Placæus it never had been formally made or allowed, except impliedly by the Supralapsarians; and when made by him it was almost universally disallowed by the Calvinistic Church. 2. He errs against the whole of the approved theology of the Reformed by endeavoring to explicate the doctrine of original sin, on the ground of that distinction, and from the stand-point of *immediate* imputation. And 3. He errs against the same true Calvinistic theology; and against plain matter of fact; and against his brethren of the present age; by maintaining that all who do not recognize this distinction, but refuse assent to the doctrine of immediate imputation as presented by himself, do not really hold the doctrine of imputation as it was entertained by the Reformed Church; but are mediate imputationists and followers of Placæus. But of these things more hereafter.

Before passing on, we ask attention in this connection, and as a matter of simple justice to a distinguished divine of the present time, whose doctrine on this subject has been arraigned as a departure from the approved theology of Calvinism, to the following passage. In speaking of the nature of original sin he remarks that:

"Its first element is the guilt of Adam's first sin. *By which is meant that on account of our natural and covenanted relations with Adam, we are considered and treated precisely as we would have been, if each of us*

Digitized by Google

had personally done what Adam did. The guilt of Adam's first sin is imputed to his posterity. There is doubtless a wide difference between imputed sin, and inherent sin. We, however, have both — and that naturally; *and it tends only to error to attempt to explicate either of them in disregard of the other, or to separate what God has indissolubly united, namely, our double relation to Adam.* It is infinitely certain, that God would never make a legal fiction a pretext to punish as sinners, dependent and helpless creatures who were actually innocent. The imputation of our sins to Christ, affords no pretext for such a statement; because that was done by the express consent of Christ, and was, in every respect, the most stupendous proof of divine grace. Nor is the righteousness of Christ ever imputed for justification, except to the elect: nor ever received except by faith, which is a grace of the Spirit peculiar to the renewed soul. *In like manner the sin of Adam is imputed to us,* but *never irrespective of our nature and its inherent sin. That is, we must not attempt to separate Adam's federal from his natural headship — by the union of which he is the ROOT of the human race; since we have not a particle of reason to believe that the former would ever have existed without the latter.* Nay, Christ to become our federal head, had to take our nature." *

What any intelligent man can mean by denouncing such a representation of the subject as *Placæanism;* or as a departure from the approved theology of Calvinism; is truly hard to determine. And that our readers may perceive the precise nature of our difficulty herein, we shall now lay before them the decision of the National Synod of the French Reformed Churches, at Charenton, near Paris, in 1645, before which the doctrine of Placæus was arraigned; and which, after examining, condemned it in these words: †

"Whereas, a report has been made to the Synod of certain writings, (*i. e.* those of Placæus,) printed and manuscript, by which the nature of original sin is made to consist solely in the hereditary corruption, originally residing in all men, *but the imputation of the first sin of Adam is denied;* the Synod condemns the aforesaid doctrine, *so*

* *The Knowledge of God Objectively considered,* by Dr. Breckinridge. pp. 498, 499.

† The decision is given in De Moor, *ut supra.* We cite it as presented by Dr. Hodge in Princeton Essays, vol. I., p. 195. The italics are our own here, and in all the other quotations.

Digitized by Google

far as it restricts the nature of original sin to the mere hereditary corruption of Adam's posterity, excluding the imputation of the first sin by which he fell; and, under the penalty of censures of all kinds, forbids all pastors, professors, and others, who may treat this subject, to depart from the common opinion of *all Protestant churches, which, besides corruption, have always acknowledged the aforesaid imputation to the whole posterity of Adam.* And [the National Synod] commands all synods and classes, in taking steps for the reception of students into the sacred ministry, to require of them subscription to this statute."

Here, then, is the condemnation of the doctrine which is attributed to Placæus; and we only ask of the intelligent reader to decide for himself whether there is the remotest connection between the doctrine thus condemned, and the doctrine presented above from Edwards, Stapfer and Breckinridge; and which Dr. Hodge has so studiously and so frequently represented as essentially the same with it. That Placæus was misunderstood, will, we presume, appear in the sequel. But between the doctrine here attributed to him, and the doctrine presented above, (and which Dr. Hodge has labored to confound with it,) there is as plain and radical a difference as that existing between the doctrine advocated by Dr. Hodge, and that which we have cited from the writers above referred to. For while he condemns Placæus, he adopts his distinction; but they, while they reject the doctrines of Placæus, reject also his distinction. *

The claim of Dr. Hodge that our standards sustain the view which he advocates, must be taken *cum grano salis.* He is himself very far from being uniformly consistent in the statement of his views; and it can scarcely have escaped his observation

* And yet Dr. Hodge does not hesitate to affirm in the following most explicit terms, the identity of the two: "*The doctrine of Edwards is precisely that which was so formally rejected when presented by Placæus.*" P. Essays, I., p. 150. It certainly is amusing to consider this inaccurate and dogmatical asseveration alongside of the following statement, in which *a* Jonathan Edwards is represented as writing *against* the views of Placæus: "Cum *Dan. Whitbius*, Anglus, an. 1711., in Tractatu quodam errorem *Josuæ Placæi* de *peccato Adami, posteris ejus non imputato*, recoqueret, *Jonath. Edwardum*, et ex Germanis *Jac. Carpovium*, nactus est adversarios." *Joh. Alphons. Turrettini, Compend. Hist. Eccles., cum continuatione*, &c. p. 836. Halæ, 1750. The reference, of course, is not to the *treatise* of Edwards on Original Sin.

Digitized by Google

that our standards sustain as fully and as unequivocally the doctrine which he opposes, as they do the doctrine which he advocates; which can only be explained on the ground that the assembly of divines did not recognize, as he does, the distinction between mediate and immediate imputation, * but took the view of the matter which the Church had ever taken, and which is illustrated by the extract from Walch on a preceding page. Yet Dr. Hodge, after carefully defining the view which he entertains, (and as exhibited by us on a previous page,) adds:

"This, according to our understanding of it, is essentially the old Calvinistic doctrine. *This is our doctrine, and the doctrine of the standards of our Church.* For they make original sin to consist, 1st, in the guilt of Adam's first sin; 2ndly, the want of original righteousness; and 3dly, the corruption of our whole nature."

And he repeats this asseveration substantially a number of times.

Now Dr. Hodge, in the effort to explicate the doctrine of original sin from the stand-point of immediate or antecedent imputation, declares (and he repeats it in every form of expression,) that "the want of original righteousness," and "the corruption of our whole nature," are *the punishment of imputed sin.* And, as we have seen, he utterly discards, as erroneous, the doctrine of those who refuse to recognize the distinction between mediate and immediate imputation, and who contend that the doctrine of original sin should be explained without reference to it. But where, within the whole compass of our standards, does he find anything to justify such a representation? In Chap. VI. of the Westminster Confession it is stated, that our first parents sinned and "fell from their original righteousness, and communion with God, *and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body,*" and that "*being the root of all mankind the guilt of this sin was imputed,* and the same death in sin and corrupted nature *conveyed* [that is, through them as the root of all mankind,] *to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation;*" and that "*from this original corruption* [that is, not the mere imputed guilt, as Dr. Hodge's theory would

* At the time of its session (1643) Placæus had not invented this distinction.

Digitized by Google

assume, but the same death in sin and corrupted nature *thus conveyed,*] whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." The same truth is equally manifest from the concluding paragraph of the chapter:

"Every *sin, both original and actual,* being a transgression of the law of God and contrary thereunto, *doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner,* whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal."

Here, likewise, the aforesaid distinction of Dr. Hodge and Placæus is clearly ignored; and any attempt to illustrate and carry it out by a reference to this passage would result in indescribable confusion: for Dr. Hodge does concede that none of the descendants of Adam either will be, or could justly be, consigned to the eternal wrath of God, simply on account of Adam's first sin, though his logic sustains not the conclusion.

If we refer to the Catechism, we find the very same disregard of uniformity in the arrangement of the topics touching this subject. For instance, in the answer to question 18, we have the order to which Dr. Hodge refers above, to wit: guilt of Adam's first sin; want of original righteousness; corruption of our whole nature. But the answers to questions 16, and 17, explicitly declare that all the natural descendants of Adam "*sinned* in him, and *fell with him* in his first transgression;" and that "*the Fall brought* mankind into an estate of sin and misery." Dr. Hodge may say that we sinned by *imputation,* and that the *guilt* thus imputed brought the race into its present condition as a penal consequence. But the Catechism says nothing of the kind. And the simple and obvious fact, which Dr. Hodge has failed to observe, and which yet is patent upon the whole statement of the doctrine as presented in our standards, *is that they attach no importance at all to the order observed in the statement of the topics;* (that is, whether it be stated as 1. guilt, 2. depravity, 3. death; or 1. depravity, 2. guilt, 3. death;) and are content if only the topics are clearly stated in the connection; while, on the contrary, Dr. Hodge proposes to make every thing depend upon the order

Digitized by Google

in which the topics are stated. Since the time of Placæus more attention has been given to the order; and the highest importance is attached to it by theologians who sympathize with the peculiar views of Dr. Hodge. But any attempt to authenticate and verify such an idea by appealing to the earlier Calvinistic divines (except where they were Supralapsarian,) can result in nothing but confusion and perplexing disappointment — so far is it from being the fact that the Reformed Church has ever sanctioned the views of Dr. Hodge!

Before we pass on, it may gratify the reader to be presented with an illustration confirmatory of this representation; and we shall therefore here briefly advert to one or two plain and obvious instances, which can be easily verified. The Calvinistic soundness of the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England has ever been admitted by the Reformed Church; and yet by referring to the IXth of those articles, we read that —

"Original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation."

Here, then, all the topics are found clearly and most forcibly expressed; but the *order* of their statement (which, according to Dr. Hodge, is every thing,) is precisely the reverse of that given in *Shorter Catechism*, Quest. 18. (above quoted.) Instead of being as there, *guilt, depravity, death;* it is *depravity, guilt, death.*

Another instance easy of verification, is that of Calvin. In his *Instit., lib.* II., cap. i., he says:

"This is that *hereditary corruption* which the fathers called *original sin; meaning, by sin, the depravation of a nature previously good and pure.*" Sect. 5. . . . . "We shall not find *the origin of this pollution*, unless we ascend to the first parent of us all, as to the fountain which sends forth all the streams." . . . . "And therefore, between these two persons (Adam and Christ) there is this relation, that the one ruined us by involving us in his destruction, the other by his grace has restored us to salvation." . . . . . "Our nature is there (Ephes. ii: 3,) characterized, not as it was created by God, but as it was vitiated in

Digitized by Google

Adam; because it would be unreasonable to make God the author of death. Adam therefore corrupted himself in such a manner, that the *contagion* has been communicated from him to all his offspring." Sect. 6. . . . . "To remove all uncertainty and misunderstanding on this subject, let us define original sin. It is not my intention to discuss all the definitions given by writers; I shall only produce one which I think perfectly consistent with the truth. Original sin, therefore, appears to be a hereditary pravity and corruption of our nature, diffused through all the parts of the soul: *rendering us obnoxious to the Divine wrath, and producing in us those works which the Scripture calls 'works of the flesh.'*" Sect. 8.

Here, likewise, the order of Dr. Hodge is reversed; and instead of it we have, 1. depravity, 2. guilt, 3. death. In other words, no such distinction as that which is made by both Placæus and Dr. Hodge is attempted; and no attempt is made to explicate the doctrine of original sin from the stand-point of immediate imputation; but, while a clear and wide distinction is observed between imputed sin and inherent corruption, the fact that we have both, and that naturally, is in the fullest manner recognized.

The importance which Dr. Hodge, and those who sympathize with him in his views, attach to the *order* of these topics which he has adopted, and about which the Reformed Church (except the Supralapsarians) was so utterly indifferent, may be learned from one of his latest discussions of the subject; * from which we offer the following citation:

"We cannot help agreeing with Dr. Thornwell in saying that this (*i. e.* Dr. Baird's mediate imputation theory,) is substituting absurdity for obscurity. Still there is no sin in absurdity. But the case is very different when we are told we must believe this doctrine, because otherwise God would be unjust; or, when it is asserted in support of this theory, that the judgments of God must be founded on the personal merits or demerits of those whom they affect; that it is a denial of his moral nature, and even atheistic, to say that he can pronounce the just unjust, or the unjust just; *that the only legitimate ground of judgment are character and works;* † and when still further it is asserted, that

* See Princeton Review for 1860. pp. 763, 764; and also the views of Dr. Thornwell, in the Southern Presbyterian Review for 1860. pp. 198–202.

† See on this point an extract from Dr. Witherspoon's works, on our concluding page.

Digitized by Google

community in a propagated nature involves all those to whom that nature belongs in the criminality and pollution of their progenitor. *Then we say the whole gospel is destroyed, and every scriptural ground of salvation of sinners is renounced.*"

Then, after expatiating largely on these points, he adds:

"We hold, in common with our own standards and the faith of the Reformation, that Adam's sin as the sin of our head and representative, was the ground of the condemnation of his race, *and inherent personal corruption its penal consequence.*"

In like manner Dr. Thornwell, (as referred to above, p. 202,) says:

"We insisted then, and insist now, that the immediate formal ground of guilt is the covenant headship of Adam; *that our depravity of nature is the penal consequence of our guilt in him,* and that we are made parties to the covenant by the circumstance of birth, or the natural relation to Adam."

And he adds that after a thorough examination he is convinced that, on this subject, the doctrine of Calvin is the same as his own: though Calvin uses no such language, but, on the contrary, expressly avers that—

"We are not condemned by imputation alone [non per solam imputationem damnamur,] as though the punishment of the sin of another were exacted of us; [that is, as the sole ground of the condemnation;] *but we therefore endure its punishment because we also are guilty so far as this, that our nature having become vitiated in him is regarded as guilty of the iniquity before God;*" sed ideo pœnam ejus sustinemus, quia et culpæ sumus rei, quatenus scilicet natura nostra in ipso vitiata, iniquitatis reatu obstringitur apud Deum. Rom. v: 17.

To represent these views as the same, is, as it seems to us, to trifle with the meaning of language.

We have remarked that Dr. Hodge and those who now, along with him, make the distinction aforesaid, and insist that the doctrine of original sin should be explicated from the stand-point of immediate or antecedent imputation, making "natural corruption" *the penalty or penal consequences* * of Adam's sin, are

* Dr. Hodge in referring to this matter says distinctly, "We think the posi-

Digitized by Google

greatly inconsistent in their statements of the doctrine. For while they make native moral corruption the penalty of imputed sin, they insist that no one is ever condemned to hell for imputed sin alone; but that moral corruption is necessary in order to secure such condemnation; *which, in other words, means that no one is condemned to hell unless the penalty of imputed sin is first inflicted on him* — which to us seems to be a mere evasion of the point or issue raised; since, if moral corruption is the punishment of imputed sin, and the subject of moral corruption is condemned to hell for the punishment of imputed sin, it is plainly an evasion and absurd to say that he is not thus condemned for imputed sin. But passing this and other points in which the inconsistency of their statements is apparent; and in view of the high importance which, it appears from the foregoing extracts, they attach to their doctrine of immediate imputation; we purpose to enter into an investigation of the theory itself, and to subject it to a thorough criticism; after which we shall take up and consider the doctrine which they have assailed. And at the outset we affirm that this principle of immediate imputation is but a relic of *the old Supralapsarian scheme, which never received the sanction of the Reformed or Calvinistic Church.* We know not whether the statement will be controverted; but if it should be, any number of facts shall be given in its illustration and confirmation, in addition to the few which we here present, and which we claim do evince the inseparable connection of the two.

The origin and development of the Supralapsarian scheme we shall have occasion to consider hereafter; but its prominent principles were fully developed during the time of the second and third generation of the Reformed divines, in their discussion of predestination and reprobation. And here it was that the principles involved in the doctrine of immediate or antecedent imputation were evolved, and brought to apply in the treatment of the doctrine of original sin. The reader will judge of the identity of the two, first from such facts as the following: The celebrated Molinæus in his *Anatome Arminianismi*, cap. 13, thus announces

tion of Storr *is perfectly correct, that the consequences of punishment are themselves punishment, in so far as they were taken into view by the judge in passing sentence, and came within the scope of his design.*" See Princeton Essays, vol. I., p. 158.

Digitized by Google

the real faith of the Reformed Church on the general subject; and the reader can see the bearing of the remark not only upon the point to which Molinæus directs it, but likewise on the point now before us:

"Deus non potuit integra justitia sua pœnis (*sc.* damnationis) afficere homines quos considerasset sine peccato. Deus enim non punit insontes. [That is, he could not *thus punish* the innocent.] *Estque damnatio actus divinæ justitiæ, quæ sibi constare non posset, si homo innocens et nullum ob culpam destinaretur ad desertionem, ex qua æterna perditio necessario consequeretur.*"

Thus far, Dr. Hodge may say, the statement is consistent with his own views; but how with the following?

"Quod si Deus insontem creaturam destinavit ad perditionem, *necesse est eandem destinaverit ad peccatum, sine quo non potest esse justa perditio, et sic Deus erit causa impulsiva peccati. Nec homo poterit juste puniri ob peccatum, ad quod est aut præcise destinatus, aut Dei voluntate compulsus.*"

In the following passage, the bearing of the remarks upon the general subject will be seen by substituting *imputation* for *reprobation:*

"Hac reprobatione creatura innocens non modo fit miserrima, sed etiam pessima. Nam quod Deus odit, necesse est Deum oderit aut odio habiturus sit. Negationem enim Spiritus Dei sequitur necessario aversio voluntatis creaturæ. Cumque juxta hoc dogma Deus prius oderit hominem à se factum, quam homo Deum oderit, fieri non potest, *quin Dei odium quo hominem odit, per idem dogma fiat causa odii quo homo Deum odit, et sic Deus peccati author.*"

And he adds —

"They cannot avoid this conclusion who should say that by reprobation men are not destined to damnation, but are only passed by or not elected: (as the Supralapsarians pleaded:) for this is only expressing the same thing in milder terms. *For it amounts to the same whether God should destine man to damnation, or should do that from which damnation necessarily follows.* *

* Molinæus was born 1568, and died 1658. It is of him the Synod of Dort says that pro accuratissimo judicio suo et consensu in doctrina gratiæ egerit. He expressly affirms *nec reprobari adeo quemquam nisi ob peccatum.*

Digitized by Google

Here, then, is the great point which has ever been in litigation between the Supra and Infralapsarians. Its identity with the principle which underlies the doctrine of immediate imputation will hardly be questioned; and the arguments by which the Supralapsarians endeavor to sustain it, are precisely those employed to sustain the latter doctrine by Drs. Hodge, Thornwell, &c., as will be shown more fully hereafter.

Another illustration in point is the following: When Episcopius (as related by Hales,) had been declaiming in the Synod of Dort against the doctrine of Reprobation, that it made God the author of sin, Dr. Gomar (perhaps the most thoroughly consistent Supralapsarian that ever lived,) feeling himself aimed at by the remarks, said that —

> Episcopius had slandered the doctrine of reprobation, by representing it as merely designed to exhibit the severity and power of God; since no man believed that God absolutely decreed to reprobate man without respect to sin. For as God decreed the end, so also did he decree the means to the end; as he predestinated men to death, so he predestinated them to sin as the only way to death."

Hales remarks that Gomar seemed greatly pleased with the idea that he had thus removed all ground of exception against the doctrine; but that for himself he thought he "was merely playing the part of a tinker, who in attempting to mend a kettle, makes it worse than it was before." And it was for merely denying this same principle in his tractate on "*the Prescience of God*" that Dr. John Howe was denounced by the Supralapsarians of his day as an Arminian. In fact, it has long been the fashion of the Supralapsarians to denounce the Infralapsarians as Arminians; as it is now the fashion of the immediate imputationists to represent those who reject their theory, as rejecting the true doctrine of imputation. But to conclude: Capellus frankly owns that the two parties, that is, the Supra and Infralapsarians, could not agree in defining the *object* of predestination and reprobation; for, while Molinæus and his friends maintain that they make God the author of sin who take the ground that the object was man in his *unfallen* state, Beza, and Zanchius, and Gomar, and others, affirm that they make God unwise *qui absolutæ electionis objectum*

Digitized by Google

faciunt hominem lapsum; which is, substantially, the very argument cited from Dr. Hodge above, in favor of the theory of immediate imputation.

If God can, as this theory claims, first impute moral corruption to an otherwise innocent creature — that is, if he can find such a creature guilty of moral corruption as the penalty of merely imputed sin — what is to hinder his punishing that creature with eternal death as the penalty of that moral corruption? Dr. Hodge has never answered this question, and we opine that he never will. On the view which he opposes, the difficulty has no existence; but on his own view it is insuperable. And here, too, we find the perfect identity between the schemes of immediate imputation and supralapsarianism. And hence the Supralapsarians have ever boldly advocated the doctrine of infant damnation, which as logically follows from the one scheme as from the other. Perkins, for instance, who had fallen somewhat into supralapsarianism, says, "There are many infants of pious parents, who, dying before they have the use of reason but are yet affected by the stain of original sin, will be damned." *Armil., cap.* 52. The same is repeated by Gomar, Polanus, Scharp, and other supralapsarians; and hence, ignorance or malignity, or both, have charged the doctrine upon Calvinism itself. But Supralapsarianism and Calvinism have ever been distinct systems, (as we shall show hereafter,) though *many Calvinists* adopted the supralapsarian scheme, even down to the time of the Synod of Dort and later, whose emphatic decisions on the subject, however, gave an effectual quietus to the system. And it certainly is high time for Calvinistic theology to disburden itself of the whole scheme; and to cease to recognize either the earlier or later advocates of Supralapsarianism as true representatives either of its spirit or of its teachings, so far as its distinctive principles are concerned.

Moral corruption of course deserves endless condemnation, and justly deserves it; and any thing that does not justly deserve it cannot be named moral corruption. If, therefore, moral corruption be the penalty of antecedently imputed sin, then all to whom such sin is imputed justly deserve eternal death. And it is well worthy of note that the method adopted by Dr. Hodge

Digitized by Google

for reconciling the immediate imputation scheme with the righteous administration of God, is precisely the method by which the Supralapsarians endeavor to reconcile therewith the doctrine of reprobation as held by themselves. As the result or consequence of imputation, says Dr. Hodge, we have, 1. desertion, 2. moral corruption, or sin, 3. the penalty of sin, or eternal death. As the result or consequence of reprobation, says Dr. Gomar, we have, 1. desertion, 2. sin, 3. the punishment of sin. *Reprobationem tria consequuntur, privatio gratiæ, peccata, pœnæ peccatorum. Disput. de Prædest.* Festus Hommius, also, in his *Thesaurus Catecheticus*, thus repeats the same creabilitarian notion; and if in the first sentence *imputatio* were substituted for *reprobatio*, the sentence might be regarded as taken from Dr. Hodge's tractates on immediate imputation:

"Impellens sive movens causa reprobationis nulla etiam alia est quam solum beneplacitum Dei et propositum." . . . . . "Fructus rejectionis, aut ea quæ ex rejectione consequuntur, sunt *primo, creatio reproborum. Secundo*, Desertio, sive subductio gratiæ Dei et mediorum. *Tertio*, Excæcatio et induratio. *Quarto*, Perseverantia in peccatis."

And such was the uniform representation whenever the *will*, instead of the *immutable justice*, of God was adopted as the standpoint from which to explicate the fundamental principles of theology. Some who adopted the theory, as Beza, and Gomar, and Twisse, carried it out fearlessly and consistently. Many, however, only adopted it in part, and we may find the same inconsistency in their writings, as Dr. Hodge abundantly exhibits on the subject before us. Beza, for instance, in his book against Castalio, meets his exception in the following intrepid style:

"Quod subjicis Deum non tantum ad damnationem, sed etiam ad causas damnationis prædestinasse quoscunque libuit, *verum esse agnoscimus.*"

See also his annotations on Rom. ix: 21. But in a passage cited by De Moor, III., 266, and Turrettin, I., 567, he states the doctrine of imputation in the usual language of the Reformed. Dr. Hodge quotes a single line of it (P. Essays, I., 183,) and misrepresents the whole by making it say that *corruption* is the *pun-*

Digitized by Google

ishment of Adam's sin; though Beza refers it directly to the fact that "*omnes peccavimus* in Protoplasto." His words are as follows:

"Tria sunt, quæ hominem constituunt reum coram Deo; 1. Culpa promanans ex eo, quod omnes peccavimus in protoplasto, Rom. v: 12. 2. *Corruptio, quæ est pœna istius culpæ*, imposita tam Adamo quam posteris, Heb. ix: 27. 3. Peccata, quæ perpetrant homines adulti, *suntque fructus*" *etc.*

In respect to Turrettin, however, it is in point here to remark, (and the remark is partly applicable to Pareus, and several other eminent and learned theologians,)* that — though he professes to reject, and technically does reject, the principles of the supralapsarian system and to reason from infralapsarian ground — he is not unfrequently inconsistent with this his profession; and the reader can scarcely avoid the impression that the rejection is merely technical. The Synod of Dort (though some of its most learned members were Supralapsarians,) dealt without remorse and without compromise the death-blow to that system; † but yet Gomar and Twisse ‡ and others regarded not this rejection as a refutation; and it was long ere the Reformed theology was entirely delivered from its entanglements, and the Justice of God, instead of his Will recognized as the true foundation of moral obligation. Beza, (†1605,) Ursinus, (†1583,) Zanchius, and Piscator, (†1625,) taught that "*peccandi necessitatem à prima causa pendere;*" and sought to justify the sentiment by a reference to the will of God. And when Arminius (†1609,) in his dispute with Gomar asserted the principle which was afterwards so fully recognized as true by the Synod of Dort, (to-wit,

* *Pareus*, (David) was born in 1548, and died in 1623. *Turrettin*, (Francis) born 1623, died 1687.

† To say nothing of its decision in the matter between Lubbertus and Maccovius, (to which we shall refer hereafter,) in which the same statements are reiterated; its decision in relation to the principle litigated between the Supra and Infralapsarian schools condemns, without stint, those who affirm that God *nudo puroque voluntatis arbitrio, absque omni ullius peccati respectu vel intuitu, maximam mundi partem ad æternam damnationem creasse et prædestinasse*;" and further that "*Ecclesias Reformatas hæc non solum non agnoscere, sed etiam toto pectore detestari.*" It is not surprising that the theological reputation of Gomar and of Maccovius could not survive this. They soon thereafter sank out of view, though Gomar lived till 1641, and Maccovius till 1644.

‡ Gomar was born in 1563, and Twisse in 1604.

Digitized by Google

that it was an error to suppose that the Divine Will may impinge upon the Divine Justice,) many regarded the sentiment as erroneous because Arminius had asserted it: though Calvin († 1564,) and multitudes of others of the Reformed had most fully and explicitly asserted it before. It is just here that Turrettin appears to vacillate, sometimes assuming the one principle and sometimes the other; and hence on this one subject his work should not be, and cannot properly be, regarded as representing the theology of the Reformed Church. We cannot go into this matter fully here, but it must necessarily come up in the course of our argument in the way of illustration. But it is highly important, in order that the subject under discussion may be brought fully to view in all its bearings, to go into a thorough discussion of the leading principles of the supralapsarian scheme, which we shall attempt to do in another essay; after which we shall be prepared to consider the question as to the doctrine of imputation as entertained and taught by the Reformed Church. For to us the question as presented by Dr. Hodge — whether imputation be antecedent and immediate, and is itself through a penal infliction the procuring cause of the native moral corruption of the race — appears to be only the question, in another form, whether the system of Supralapsarianism is to be regarded as the true exponent of the Reformed or Calvinistic theology.

The Supralapsarians or Creabilitarians taught that God in the decree of reprobation contemplated man as yet unfallen; and that without any regard to his fall, or to his native corruption or actual transgression, he adjudged the reprobate to ignominy and eternal death. They perpetually deceived themselves with the sophism that if sin was the procuring cause of reprobation, then good works were the procuring cause of election. * And in attempting to carry out their views they make a distinction between the decree of reprobation and the decree of condemnation; and assert that sin is the procuring cause of the latter but not of the former; since the *vera atque unica causa impellens propter quam*

* Thus, for example; "Si peccata essent causa efficiens reprobationis, tum bona opera essent causa efficiens electionis. At hoc non est: ergo nec illud." And they attribute the argument to Augustine. See Polanus' Syntagma Theol. lib. iv, cap. 10, p. 800.

Digitized by Google

decretum reprobationis factum est æternum beneplacitum seu voluntas Dei libera: precisely the reasoning of Dr. Thornwell in defence of the doctrine of immediate imputation, and which leads him to the conclusion that "if it were wrong to create man under guilt, it is wrong to permit him to be generated under guilt:" * and thus, along with the whole supralapsarian school who have always employed this language, affirms on this grand subject what he has no means either of knowing to be true or of making his assertion good. The distinction thus attempted to be made between the cause of reprobation and the cause of condemnation, though backed by the reiterated assertion that "eternal reprobation is not the cause of sin, for if so then God would be the cause of sin," (tum et Deus erit causa peccati. *Quod enim est causa causæ, est etiam causa causati,*) had no weight with the Infralapsarians, as may be seen by the extract above given from Molinæus. They denied the distinction, and the whole theory connected with it; and denied that it was any part of the Calvinistic system, so called. And as early as July 17, 1627, Antonius Walæus (professor in Leyden,) uttered the following decisive language on the subject, in a discussion of Arminianism: "They [the Reformed Churches,] *agree* also in this, that election is the work of divine grace: *but that reprobation is the work of divine justice and power.*" † This is truly a remarkable declaration, all things considered, as evincing how the Supralapsarian element had dwindled into utter insignificance within nine years after the session of the Synod of Dort. And, to adduce a single illustration more, we find Jurieu, (in 1688,) in a work designed to present the leading points of agreement in the Reformed Church ‡ (and which so bitterly provoked the wrath of Bossuet, ||) expressing the same sentiment as follows:

"Neminem ergo Deus destinavit ad mortem æternam nisi prævisa vel ipsius impœnitentiâ et incredulitate, vel in jus et leges naturæ

* Southern Presbyterian Review for April, 1860. p. 181.

† "In eo quoque consensus est, electionem esse opus divinæ gratiæ: reprobationem vero esse opus justitiæ ac potestatis divinæ. *Disput. Theol., Thes.* 5. See also Theses 11 and 13, in which the same is repeated.

‡ De Pace inter Protestantes ineunda consultatio. p. 278. *Utrajecti*, 1688.

|| See his "Variations," B. 14, vol. II. pp. 336–347.

Digitized by Google

rebellione protervâ pervicaci et perpetuâ. *Neque etiam decrevit gloriam suam et gratiam denegare nisi indignis et justâ de causâ reprobandis*, ... decreta inquam respectu boni verè operativa, respectu mali tantum permissiva."

Thus the whole principle which underlies the speculations on which the doctrine of immediate imputation is now sought to be justified, was utterly repudiated by the Reformed Church as a body; and found no advocacy except among the Supralapsarians. And the distinction made by Placæus (though we do not employ it in the explication of the doctrine of original sin,) merely placed the question where it should have been placed, so far as concerned the doctrine entertained on the subject by that class of divines. For if imputation be antecedent and immediate in the sense contended for by Gomar, a predecessor of Placæus in the chair of theology at Saumur, then it is obvious that sentence comes upon man not for sin, nor corruption, nor personal guilt; but that these, as Dr. Hodge avers, are the penal infliction which comes immediately and antecedently, and of the mere good pleasure of God, as the Supralapsarians so fully maintain. The question, therefore, is one relating not to a point of theology, but to a system. And we do most emphatically deny the identity of Calvinism with Supralapsarianism. It has never been anything but a mere theory — a philosophical theory, sought to be engrafted on that system; but repudiated by its best expounders ever since the true character of that theory has been developed and understood.

As to Placæus, it is of no importance to the question how he explained the distinction which he had made; or what were his views of imputation itself. At any rate, those who reject the doctrine of immediate imputation, are not required either to adopt or to defend his views. And we do neither, for we care nothing about them. Yet the objection of De Moor (in Marck,) so often repeated and insisted on by Dr. Hodge — that *imputation which is not antecedent and immediate is no imputation at all*, and that therefore, if God antecedently regards the posterity of Adam as guilty, he does not impute guilt to them — is a pure sophism; though Turrettin himself, in utter inconsistency with his own repeated asseverations on the subject, has not scrupled to advance

Digitized by Google

it; and every creabilitarian imputationist since the days of De Moor has done the same. But in view of it we ask, what is the usual and literal import of חָשַׁב in the Old Testament, and of λογίζομαι and ἐλλογέω in the New? We have already defined their import, and have adduced the learned testimony of both Turrettin and Gomar on the subject. The term, in general, as there shown, signifies *to reckon, ascribe or attribute to, charge upon*, &c., without any reference to the question whether what is so charged, or reckoned, or ascribed, was or was not done *in propria persona* by him who is thus charged. If it be a crime, he may have been guilty thereof, or he may have been innocent, but this affects not the question. It may be imputed to him in either case; and in either case the word *impute* is properly and classically employed. This was acknowledged by Gomar and Turrettin, and known to De Moor and to the Princeton Review. Then what is meant by the assertion *that if guilt be presupposed there is no imputation?* That the usual, and by far the most frequent, use of the term in the Scriptures is *to ascribe to a man that which is really and properly his*, will not be questioned; at least, we affirm, without fear of contradiction, that no candid and competent mind will ever think of calling it in question. What then is meant by this reiteration of the assertion of De Moor and Turrettin? Is it that in the case supposed by them there can be no imputation, in the sense in which the Scriptures employ the word impute? This cannot be the meaning, for the simple reason that they knew this assertion to be utterly unfounded in fact. The expression, therefore, can only mean, that in the case of presupposed guilt and moral corruption, there can be *no antecedent or immediate imputation;* which would be to say in other words, and on the authority of De Moor and Turrettin, and those who repeat after them, that Placæus' doctrine of imputation is really not the same as the doctrine which he rejected. But while we are duly grateful for this piece of singular information, it would be really gratifying to our curiosity to be informed of the reason why such an announcement was deemed important and needful. Placæus never claimed nor supposed that his view was the same with the view which he rejected; nor did the Synod which condemned his doctrine; nor did Rivetus; nor any one that we have heard of

Digitized by Google

since. And why, then, are we to be so dogmatically assured that mediate and immediate imputation are really not the same? And what is meant, moreover, by the ever repeated assertion that those who deny that imputation is antecedent and immediate, deny both the Calvinistic and the Bible doctrine of imputation? Are such charges to be tolerated in our day, and in view of all the facts referred to above; and of the multitude of others no less explicit to which reference will be made in the course of this discussion? Is the Supralapsarian scheme, with its philosophy, destructive as it is to the foundation of both religion and morality, to be revived and palmed off upon the Church of God as the exponent of true Calvinistic theology? and all our brethren to be hereticated who will not consent to adopt it? Such an idea was never claimed on its behalf even in its palmiest days. And now when it has been condemned by the Synod of Dort: and rejected by the Westminster Assembly; and by all the leading divines since, except Crisp and Gill and a few others; are we to be told that its fundamental principles are identical with those of the Reformed Church? and that all who receive them not are no true Calvinists? Time will determine whether this is to be so. *

The manner in which the Princeton Review was led into this great error, is perfectly apparent to us, and may be made the subject of explication hereafter. But we repeat it, the Reformed

* In illustration of the really indefinite or unsettled views of Dr. Hodge, on the very point respecting which he is so dogmatic, we may refer to the fact that although he, as above stated, so emphatically reiterates the asseveration of De Moor and Turrettin, *that imputation which is not antecedent and immediate is no imputation at all;* we yet find him in vol. I., p. 139, of "Princeton Essays," employing on the same subject the following language: "*Any man* who holds that there is such an ascription of the sin of Adam to his posterity, as to be the ground of their bearing the punishment of that sin, *holds the doctrine of imputation; whether he undertakes to justify this imputation merely on the ground that we are the children of Adam, or on the principle of representation, or of scientia media; or whether he chooses to philosophise on the nature of unity until he confounds all notions of personal identity as President Edwards appears to have done.*" And then, as if to make the matter still worse, he asserts in another place that "the doctrine of Edwards is *precisely* that which was so formally rejected when presented by Placæus." p. 150. If *precisely the same*, how comes it that Edwards "holds" the doctrine of imputation, while Placæus rejects it?

Digitized by Google

Church never acknowledged the distinctive principles upon which this doctrine is based; and Dr. Hodge never would have thought to the contrary, had he not been led to regard as representative men, several divines who never have been by the Church itself regarded as representative. But in our next essay we shall consider this subject fully, at least sufficiently so to make apparent its bearing on the whole question of imputation. And we shall now conclude with an additional remark or two on the theory advocated by Dr. Hodge.

If a creature free from sin and guilt becomes a subject of moral corruption by imputation, then, (and the assertion will not admit of doubt,) he makes him a sinner who is the author of the imputation; for, as already remarked, and the principle is admitted universally, *quid est causa causæ, est etiam causa causati.* If, for example, it could be supposed that Adam in his state of primitive rectitude, had become a sinner by antecedent imputation, and had in consequence been punished by an infliction of moral corruption; or that God should thus immediately impute sin to the holy angels who have never sinned; then he who would impute sin and punish it by an infliction of moral corruption in these cases, would, of course, make or constitute the creatures referred to sinners. The authorship of the sin in such a case would be his alone, and could in no sense of the term which is regarded as just and proper, be said to be theirs. The guilt and moral corruption itself may perhaps be said to be theirs putatively; but this would be a mere legal fiction, (for it came upon them antecedently or immediately;) but he made it theirs who imputed it to them. *In such a case,* God would be, beyond all question, the author of moral corruption. Now the old creabilitarian hypothesis, which was so decidedly asserted by Gomar, and so expressly rejected by the Synod of Dort, claims that as a means to secure the damnation of the reprobate, all men are born in inherent sin or moral corruption *as a punishment for imputed sin;* and that imputed sin thus becomes, and penally, the *causa causans* of inherent (sometimes vaguely called by them *original*) sin; and of all subsequent actual transgressions. Thus guilt is first charged irrespective of the moral status of those on whom it is charged; then follows moral corruption as the punish-

Digitized by Google

ment of this guilt; then follows, finally, exclusion from the holiness and happiness of heaven, as the punishment of this moral corruption. Or as Hommius and Gomar, as cited above, have, with all the old Supralapsarians, stated it: *First*, the decree of reprobation; then the creation of the reprobate; then their desertion and hardening; then their persistence in sin; and then, finally, their damnation: a regular chain of causation and consequences until the end is secured — Reprobation, creation, desertion, hardening, persistence in sin, damnation. Now set alongside of this the immediate imputation scheme as advocated by Dr. Hodge and others; and you have *first*, the guiltless creature; *then* the imputed guilt; *then* desertion; *then* moral corruption, and actual sin; *then* the punishment of that moral corruption and sin.

Surely it was to be rationally expected that sentiments such as these would be objected to by most men, (be their theological school what it may,)who had any adequate idea of the equity and righteousness of God as taught in the Scriptures. And for Dr. Baird's reviewers to resort to the *argumentum ad invidiam*, and to charge that he assails the notion with argument employed by Socinians and Arminians, is a course of procedure not likely to be referred to as evincing a very high degree of either candor or magnanimity. For the question is as to the conclusiveness or inconclusiveness of the arguments; and not as to who has employed them. The day when such argumentation would be regarded as forcible, is so far past, that any attempt to enkindle the *odium theologicum* on such grounds cannot fail to awaken the conviction in all intelligent readers, that resort would not be had to any such procedure except in the case of a conscious deficiency of strength and resources. If Dr. Baird assails a manifest absurdity as every other man assails it, are all the sins and errors of those who have employed or who do employ the arguments he uses, to be imputed to him; and he be thus constituted guilty of errors with which he has no more sympathy than his reviewers have; and then be punished for being guilty? We protest against any such attempt at a practical application of the doctrine of immediate imputation.

And then further: That the aforesaid inherent moral corruption in creatures no otherwise corrupt than by imputation, should be,

Digitized by Google

as Turrettin avers, the penalty of imputed guilt or criminality, and yet be at the same time a just ground of their punishment, is certainly an idea which is at war alike with the dictates of Scripture and of right reason. How can moral corruption be both the punishment of imputed sin and at the same time the effect of that sin, in a creature otherwise innocent? Or how can a creature not otherwise guilty, deserve punishment simply for being punished? If inherent or moral corruption, therefore, be the punishment of imputed sin, then God has inflicted that punishment as the punishment of imputed sin: and it is, of course, a just and righteous punishment. And this being so, how, or on what grounds are we to suppose that he will likewise punish those whom he has already thus punished, simply because he has thus punished them? that is, that he should consign them to hell on account of that very punishment which he had already inflicted? If such a procedure can be established from the Word of God, or can be justified on any principles of Scripture or of reason, we should like to know what those principles are. It may be consistent with the Supralapsarian theory, but it is in utter antagonism to Calvinism. Punishment being in a certain sense compensatory though retributory, it is obvious that if sin, or moral corruption, may be the punishment of imputed sin, the compensation of sin may itself deserve a new compensation; and so on *in infinitum*.

It is no answer to this to reply that imputed guilt leaves the soul in that state, that it shall by its own act acquire personal guilt. For the guiltiness supposed in immediate imputation, is a guiltiness that without the grace of God must consign the soul to everlasting death, without any possible remedy. So that the mere punishment of sin according to this idea, may be of itself the ground for a further, and even an everlasting punishment. We only ask here, whether it can be possible in any intelligent sense to attribute such an arrangement to a just and holy God?

We are aware that efforts have been made in this connection to blunt the point of such enquiries, and we shall advert to them presently. And we ask the reader to observe that the question is not, whether the infliction of punishment *for sin* may lead to the perpetration of other sins; for no one will either doubt or

Digitized by Google

deny this. But the point is, whether the mere fact of punishment having been inflicted upon one who was only guilty by imputation can, by virtue of that punishment alone, furnish ground for regarding him as an object deserving of further punishment? Does the punishment *of itself* of his imputed guilt, impart to him of itself, a desert of eternal punishment? If it does, then our exceptions lie against the doctrine that it is subversive of both Scripture and reason; and if it does not, then the doctrine itself which asserts it is blasphemous and false.

There are admitted instances in which *sinners* have been judicially punished in a way which has tended dreadfully to enhance their guilt. See 2 Thess. ii: 11; and likewise the instances alleged in De Moor, III., 332, 333; and in Turrettin, I., 589–593., They present and ably discuss the question, *an peccatum possit esse pœna peccati?* but any attempt to apply their instances and their reasonings to the support of the doctrine before us would be sheer absurdity. None of them are applicable to the matter in hand, though often alleged to meet the case; for they all suppose the individuals referred to to be already morally corrupt *in propria persona;* and already under the just judgment of God on account of their guilt. But the case before us is not of this character. It supposes that the creature is first made guilty by imputation, and punished for this his guilt; and that then this punishment itself logically furnishes just ground for his further punishment, even for his endless condemnation in hell. And the question is whether Scripture or reason furnishes any ground to justify the assertion of such a principle? We emphatically deny that they do. And yet this principle underlies the whole scheme of immediate imputation, which, without it, must fall to the ground. It is substantially, as already remarked, the principle which underlies the whole creabilitarian hypothesis — that God created the reprobate to be damned, and predestinated the requisite means to secure their damnation.

Nothing is more common with all Calvinists, in defending the doctrine of imputation as taught in the Bible, and in the standards of the Reformed Church, than to claim that the principle involved is susceptible of illustration from the course of nature and providence; and that the proceeding itself is analogous to the pro-

Digitized by Google

ceedings of God in his government of the world. And this surely is so. The analogous illustrations, found both in Scripture and in the operations of God amongst men, are almost innumerable. But we ask, can a single instance be found in either, illustrating analogically the doctrine of immediate imputation? — the doctrine that God first imputes guilt to the innocent; then punishes it by imparting moral corruption; which moral corruption is afterwards punished with eternal death. For if moral corruption is the penalty of imputed guilt, then such is indeed the fact. And if it is, then we affirm that the procedure is without a solitary analogy in either the word or the works of God. If, on the contrary, it is not the penalty of imputed guilt, then the doctrine of immediate imputation is false.

The attempts to perplex this question by involving it with the work of our blessed Redeemer — which appear in the two reviews of Dr. Baird above referred to — do not really ascend to the dignity of argument. They are the merest sophisms. Christ voluntarily undertook the office of our legal substitute; and our sins in all their guilt and enormity were imputed to him. But is this analogous to an imputation of guilt which is not voluntarily accepted? Then, moreover, the punishment of the guilt imputed to the posterity of Adam, is, by the immediate imputationists, asserted to be moral corruption. Did then the imputation of our guilt to Christ bring with it moral corruption? Where then is the analogy? Then further: the punishment of imputed guilt in the scheme of immediate imputation, is the infliction, in some way or other, of moral corruption; but Christ fully bore the penalty of our imputed guilt; and was that penalty moral corruption, in any sense of the term? Then still further: the punishment, that is, the penal infliction upon us of moral corruption for imputed guilt, on the immediate imputation scheme, of itself involves the desert of eternal punishment, as above shown; that is, we, by being punished for imputed guilt, thereby acquire the desert of eternal punishment. But did the fact that Christ was punished for our guilt imputed to him, render him in like manner, still further guilty? and deserving of still further punishment? If not, why pretend, as these reviewers do, that there is any such parallel as they assert, between the divine proceed-

Digitized by Google

ings therein? There is no such parallel; and the attempt to reason from one to the other as they do, is therefore an absurdity.

The attempt to defend the doctrine of immediate imputation, by pleading, as its advocates do, that "our natural corruption does not precede but follows the imputation of the Adamic sin," * is saying nothing to the purpose. No one known to us supposes that our natural corruption occurred, or had an existence before Adam fell; and no Calvinist denies that Adam was the federal head and representative of his posterity, or that his sin was imputed to his posterity. There is no controversy between the school of immediate imputationists and their antagonists on any of these points. The question is whether the posterity of Adam were accounted corrupt because they are corrupt; or whether they were made corrupt because they were accounted guilty by imputation, and as the penalty of this imputed guilt? Is moral corruption, however derived, the ground on which guilt is imputed to us; or is it the penalty of imputed guilt? This is the point. And it would furnish no proof in favor of immediate imputation to repeat, even a thousand times, that "our natural corruption does not precede but follows the imputation of Adam's sin." It may follow it, without being any thing more than the natural result of it, (as some have charged Placæus with maintaining,) under the righteous government of God. And at all events, its following the Adamic sin does not prove that it is *a penal infliction* on account of an antecedent imputation of that sin. And yet this is the point to be proved; and which must be proved before the doctrine of immediate imputation can be sustained.

But we have already extended this essay beyond our prescribed limits; and will conclude with the following citations from Dr. John Witherspoon, the true forerunner and father of Princeton Theology. The bearing of the quotations upon the issues raised in the course of this essay, will be sufficiently apparent without specification.

In the Fourth Volume of his works, pp. 81, 82, this great

* Corruptio nostra naturalis non præcedet sed sequetur imputationem peccati Adamici. See De Moor, *Comment. Perpetuus*, vol. III., p. 272.

Digitized by Google

divine, after speaking of the *order of the divine decrees*, remarks as follows:

"There is certainly a difference between the ordination of things natural, and those which are sinful or holy. The very sinful disposition, considered as becoming a part of the general plan, is certainly as holy an ordination as any other, yet the Scripture teaches us to consider this as a thing quite different from God's determining to send his Son into the world to save sinners. *It seems to be a matter insisted on in the strongest manner in Scripture, that* THE EVIL OR GUILT OF EVERY CREATURE IS TO BE ASCRIBED TO THE CREATURE, AS TO ITS PROPER AND ADEQUATE CAUSE; at the same time it seems fully as plain that whatever connection there may be between one evil and another, the choice of the vessels of mercy is free and unconditional, and that the rejection of others is imputed to the sovereignty of God. Luke x: 21, John xii: 39. That the choice of the vessels of mercy is free and sovereign, appears from the words of Scripture; from their universal state — dead in trespasses and sin; from their visible character, and from the means of their recovery — I mean the omnipotence of divine grace."

Then on page 96, after referring to Rom. v: 12–19 (in speak- of the effects and penalty of Adam's sin upon his posterity,) he adds:

"And indeed when we consider the universality of the effects of the fall, *it is not to be accounted for any other way, than from Adam's being the federal head of the human race, and they sinning in him and falling with him in his first transgression.*"

Thus he utterly condemns the attempt to explain the doctrine before us except on the old Calvinistic ground of our *double relation* to Adam.

The following is from pp. 97, 98, of the same volume:

"As to the *nature of original sin* and the transmission of it, I think a few remarks may suffice. We certainly discover in mankind, not only a disposition without restraint to commit errors of a gross nature, but in general an attachment to, and love of the creature, more than the Creator. It may not be improper here to consider the question, whether the whole nature is corrupt," &c. . . . . "As to the transmission of original sin, the question is to be sure difficult, and we ought to

Digitized by Google

be reserved upon the subject. St. Augustine said it was of more consequence to know how we are delivered from sin by Christ, than how we derive it from Adam. Yet we shall say a few words on this topic. It seems to be agreed by the greatest part that the soul is not derived from our parents by natural generation, and yet it seems not reasonable to suppose that the soul is created impure. Therefore it should follow that *a general corruption is communicated by the body*, and that there is so close a union between the soul and body that the impressions conveyed to us through the bodily organs, do tend to attach the affections of the soul to things earthly and sensual. *If it should be said, that the soul, on this supposition, must be united to the body, as an act of punishment or severity; I would answer, that the soul is united to the body, in consequence of an act of government, by which the Creator decreed, that men should be propagated by way of natural generation.*"

L.

Art. III. — *The Conducting of Public and Social Prayer.*

The ordinary worship of Almighty God, under the New Testament dispensation, consists of prayer, praise, the reading and exposition of Scripture, the administration of the Sacraments, and alms-giving. The most solemn and comforting of these ordinances, and indeed that on which, in a great measure, the solemnity, impressiveness and profit, of all the others depend, is prayer. For it is in its believing use, we make our nearest approach unto God, by that new and living way, which is Christ; and bring up in remembrance, as it were by a memorial offering, that blessed work which He did on earth, vicariously for us, and through the boundless merits of which we sue for forgiveness and hope to obtain justification. It is fraught with rich blessings; for when rightly employed, with enlarged desires and an elevated faith, it is the appointed means of our securing those priceless benefits which we crave in our poorness of spirit; and which our Heavenly Father engages to bestow on his humble and contrite children, in copious abundance, when they devoutly ask Him. As this is

Digitized by Google

a service of great usefulness to the people of God, the conducting of it becomes one of the most difficult and delicate, and at the same time one of the most delightful duties of the Christian pastor; and, in like manner, it may become such to any and all of God's servants who are called on, under various circumstances, to take an active part in maintaining the observances of religion. We trust, therefore, that the conducting of public and social prayer may be found a subject of sufficient interest to our readers to warrant us in asking their attention to it for a brief season. We cannot attempt, indeed, in the space allotted to an article in this Quarterly, to give a full and exhaustive discussion of such a theme; but we hope to be able to make some suggestive observations, which may not be found devoid of profit to others.

The nature of prayer is well explained in the Shorter Catechism, where it is said: "Prayer is the offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to His will, in the name of Christ, with confession of our sins and thankful acknowledgment of His mercies." When we attempt, in the public or social assembly, to lead, and to a certain extent direct the worship of others, we must remember that although the circumstances which surround us are different, the nature of prayer is the same that it is in our closets.

1. There must be a presentation or an "offering up of our desires unto God." There can be no such thing as prayer, until the soul is burdened with lamentable distresses, and, with wrestling, pours forth its ardent desires. It is not all that is needed for a man simply to know that he is a lost sinner; he must feel it. It is not enough for us to ascertain our state of abject wretchedness; we must have a deep, a realizing sense of it. Nor will it suffice for us to learn our helplessness, and at the same time be convinced of God's willingness to save, in order to make an acceptable approach unto Him. Before we can in any proper or scriptural sense be said to pray, we must lay our inly-felt wants open before God, as well as the convictions of the judgment; our beseechings must flow from the inmost soul; and our suppliant cry must arise from affectionate faith in God's compassionate promises. Hence in giving direction to the orisons of others, our great aim must be to present the common and es-

Digitized by Google

pecial necessities of the people, and in general such petitions as may be presumed to express their anxious yearnings. But this ought to be done in such a manner as, with the Divine blessing, to quicken the pious affections, and to awaken into activity the dormant faith of humble Christians. For, although we may succeed in representing their instant wishes, unless it be accomplished with such effect as to lead them to the exercise, not only of genuine devoutness but also of an expansive faith and a holy confidence in God, we fail to become, in any just sense, the leaders of the devotions of the Church.

2. Our offerings to God, besides being the sincere desires of our hearts, must be made "for things agreeable to His will." It would indeed be impious to ask anything contrary to His known will. Nor need we be in doubt what God's will is; for the Bible has been given for the express purpose of revealing it. When we hunger and thirst after righteousness, when we seek the heavenly manna in the Sacred Oracles, when our aspirations take their scope from the inspired word, we can then, indeed and in truth, make "an offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to His will;" with confidence we can present our supplications, and with hope we can look for an answer to them; and in the full enjoyment of the spirit of adoption, we can feed upon the sincere milk of the word until our souls are satisfied. Therefore, in order to success and usefulness, we must give expression to the requests which flow from our lips in a scriptural form, if not in the very words of the Bible. We have no other source of knowledge, as to what God's will is, except His word; and besides, when the faithful disciple, in his deep abasement, finds the very cravings of his spirit ascending to the merciful Throne, in the precise words of the Divine pledges, he is enabled to obtain an assurance of acceptance and an earnest expectation of an answer, which he cannot realize when the language employed fails to remind him of his heavenly Father's covenanted engagements.

Acceptable prayer is the breathing out of our souls unto God, in the spirit of adoption, and hence with the undoubting trustfulness of children. In coming before Him, we must believe that, through Jesus Christ, He is both able and willing to help us; we must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of all them

Digitized by Google

who diligently seek Him. This enters into the very essence of saving faith, and is essential to all welcome access into His presence. And just here lies the difficulty in the way of unregenerate men. They are often made sensible, under the preaching of the gospel, that they are sinners, and are led to see and acknowledge the wondrous love of God in the gift of His son; yea, and even to covet salvation. But they are unwilling to give up all hope in themselves, and to trust Christ; they do not believe in Him as their Saviour; in a word, they will not come unto Him, that they might have life; and hence they fail to obtain the blessings which they long after. In order, then, to obtain access at the door of mercy, we must always cherish a firm belief in that Almighty Power of God which gives Him the ability, and in the tenderness of that love displayed in the gift of Christ, whereby He has exhibited His willingness to do for us far abundantly above anything we are able to ask or to think. Nor is it ordinarily possible for us, in conducting services of united worship, to profit the children of God and to encourage a holy boldness in them, when we have no faith ourselves. To direct the heavenward thoughts of others is a heavy responsibility, which cah only be discharged in a meet manner, by those whose hearts are filled with Divine love, and who repose securely on the promises.

Prayer is divided by theologians into the five acts of adoration, thanksgiving, confession, petition and intercession. *Adoration* is the heart-felt acknowledgement of all the great and adorable attributes and offices belonging to the Tri-une Jehovah, and the ascription of praise to His great name, because of all His limitless perfections and matchless works, and especially because of his amazing condescension in His dealings with lost sinners, as the basis of our hopes in presenting ourselves before the Throne of Grace. These praises are as various as the numberless manifestations of His glory and majesty; they are as boundless as His works of creation, providence and grace; and as manifold as the infinite excellencies of His being; and thus there is furnished the opportunity of introducing great and refreshing variety into this part of religious service. The use of adoration is to impress the mind with awful solemnity, under a sense of the Divine presence, and in contemplation of the Divine char-

Digitized by Google

acter; and it ought to be briefly expressed, with an avoidance of a didactic manner and theological phraseology. *Thanksgiving* is the expression of our dependence on God's providential care, from whom we confess that we have derived all the good things which we have ever enjoyed, from whose gracious love salvation is offered to us, and by whose long-suffering the hopes of glory are still held out before us. The effect it is expected to produce is to elevate the soul toward God in gratitude and love, under a sense of a Father's goodness in the constant bestowment of unmerited favors; and it prepares the heart for giving a wider range to its expectations, and for the presentation of renewed demands. *Confession* is the spreading of the soul open before God in acknowledgment of its wretchedness, corruption and need; and in it, we deplore our sinfulness and depravity, and prostrate ourselves in contrition before the Throne, under a deep consciousness of ill-desert. It not only enables us to gain a clearer perception of our misery and defilement, but it brings us with contrite and repentant hearts to a realization of our pervading ruin, our helplessness, and indigence; from whence our ardent pleadings and inward yearnings take their spring. *Petition* is the direct appeal made to God, in the name of Christ, for the relief of our distresses, for the help of our infirmities, for the forgiveness of our sins and depravity, for the renewal of our hearts and the salvation of our souls, and for such personal or general blessings as we crave in our weakness and poverty. It is the chief end of every invocation; when urged without fainting, we have hope, as we wrestle before God, that we shall obtain an answer; and while the other acts are essential, they are subsidiary to it. *Intercession* is simply the presentation of our supplications on behalf of our friends, our country, the Church of Christ, a perishing world; or on behalf of whomsoever we may wish thus to remember; and is, hence, simply petition for others.

Some of the old divines thought it absolutely indispensable that there should be a methodical and systematic division of prayer, even as much as logic should be observed in the preparation of a sermon. But it seems to us any constrained following of such a logical plan as this would bring us into that formalism from which

Digitized by Google

we endeavor to escape, when we reject a liturgy. For although in using a liturgy, we may make a constant and unvarying statement of the common necessities, spiritual or otherwise, of worshipers in the general, we have no security that we are presenting our own special and felt wishes, or those of anybody else. On the other hand, those scholastic and elaborate exercises, which abound more in logic than in unction, which exhibit more dialectical skill than acquaintance with the secret things of the soul, degenerate into disquisitions on the attributes of God, the depravity of human nature, the plan of redemption, &c., &c., very suitable for sermons; but they do not rise to the dignity of eager supplication, nor do they have the effect of animating the dormant piety of others. Nor do we mean by this to assert that a rambling and unpremeditated manner ought even to be tolerated, especially in the stated ministrations of the Christian pastor. Logic, truly, is a good thing, even in prayer. But the method of logic belonging to prayer is one thing, that belonging to a disquisition is quite another. In prayer, there ought to be a complete avoidance of confusion; it is well to have just enough of logical arrangement to secure method and order; and this, not the method of the dialectician, but the order of the soul's wants and desires; while, on the other hand, in a sermon or a disquisition, a truth is to be presented, or a proposition proved, which belongs wholly to the processes of reflective reasoning.

While, then, every true prayer either contains or implies these five acts into which theologians divide it, and all corresponding exercises of the spiritual man, it is neither necessary nor profitble for us to make a logical division of it; but rather we should allow each of these acts to come into its fit place, as the spontaneous effusion of our trustful and religious feelings. For no man can ask God to bestow a favor on himself or on others, without adoration of that majesty and that grace which give him the anticipation of an answer; without thanksgiving for mercies already experienced; and without confession of ill-deserts, even while asking. So that they all belong to every petition; and in every address to God it is best that each should gush up, unbidden as it were, excited by the zeal and the engagedness of the leader of the service. Let us, therefore, aim at making the

Digitized by Google

various entreaties in an appropriate and orderly manner, so as to elicit, with the best effect, the interest, the devoutness, and the holy confidence of the people of God; but at the same time, let us avoid the trammels of formal logic in attempting to lead them to pour out their souls, as they plead at the mercy seat. Nor can any rule be given as to the relative proportion which each of these five acts ought to occupy. This must be spontaneously determined by the nature of the offerings made, the circumstances of the congregation, the subject of the discourse, and the personal exercises of the soul of the officiating minister, who will doubtless be able to speak unto edifying, if he keep a sensible head and a pious heart in proper employ.

It is true, the leader of an ordinance so solemn, requires qualifications which are very important but very simple. They are such that no pious man need despair of obtaining them in an adequate degree, if he make persevering effort in this behalf; and yet, they are such that there is no one who has acquired so great excellence therein that he may not, by the diligent use of the appointed means, secure a still higher measure of the needful ability or gift.

1. The supreme and indispensable qualification is sincere piety. Without this, all other qualifications, however eminent, will not constitute a fitness for the discharge of a duty so solemn and weighty. But when it is manifest that the leader is a consecrated man, whose heart is overflowing with Divine love, many defects will thereby be covered, and the attentive and pious auditor will overlook minor imperfections or short-comings. Earnestness, zeal, faith, humility, love; these and the like Christian graces are those which ought to be found in the renewed heart, and are worth more in preparing a man for such duties as those belonging to the leader of the people in calling on God than any kind of attainments merely human. Indeed, the most excellent prayers are not always made by men of the highest culture and the greatest intelligence. We have never listened to any which were more edifying than we have heard uttered in lisping and broken accents by untutored and unlettered African negroes, brought from the midst of their native savageism and degradation in heathenish vice to become the sons of toil in this land, and at

Digitized by Google

the same time, through the knowledge of the gospel, to obtain the liberty wherewith Christ hath made his people free. The truth is, the kind of learning which is needed is not of the scholastic order. It is a knowledge of the state of the soul, and an insight into its crying necessities, which are requisite; and these are not to be found in the pursuit of any form of knowledge, save Divine knowledge. The man who has ascertained his own spiritual needs, knows those of others sufficiently well to be able to edify them by his invocations, provided he shall steadily cultivate in his heart longing aspirations after salvation and fellowship with God.

2. The necessity of a knowledge of the Word of God, with some intelligent apprehension of the promises and belief in them, it shall suffice for our present purpose simply to mention here, as this point is noticed in another connection.

3. The attainment of classical learning and the knowledge of science and philosophy are desirable to man, in every relation which he is called to occupy; and they are undoubtedly a great comfort to their possessor, by whom they may be made a means of much usefulness as well as enjoyment. To the Christian minister, whose duty it is statedly to superintend the ceremonies of worship, their acquisition is very important; for, possessing these attainments, he may achieve more success in giving variety, fullness, and adaptation to the ordinance in question. But these do not constitute an indispensable qualification. Many Christians excuse themselves from engaging in the prayer meeting, and even from conducting family worship, because they are not men of learning or of eloquence. But what special connection there is between the learning of the schools and the thirstings of the renewed soul, is something they are not able to explain. Humility is the proper spirit of the devout man; but it is too often pride which induces men to refuse to join in the social meeting. They are afraid lest they should not be as eloquent as some others; they become frightened from their propriety, lest some foolish or wicked person should laugh at their embarrassment; in a word, they are unwilling to bear the cross in the face of the world.

Along with these and the like qualifications there must be previous preparation; but there is much diversity of judgment as to

Digitized by Google

the character and extent of it. Some denominations are unwilling to trust the matter in the hands even of their ministers, and hence have a prescribed liturgy, more or less obligatory. We reject the liturgical worship, because we have neither the authority nor the example of the apostles and the primitive Church in its favor; the use of it is unfavorable to the cultivation of a devotional spirit; and a liturgy cannot take in the diversified wants and varying circumstances of the worshipers. The same objections, as it seems to us, lie against writing and memorizing prayers, which we urge against a liturgy, but with additional force; for, 1st, The very effort of composing and committing them to memory is apt to eradicate true and deep earnestness of feeling: and hence, being read or repeated without inbred fervor, they must fail rightly to engage the interest of the attending throng. 2nd. A written prayer and a liturgy alike lack the freeness and are not capable of the expansion of spontaneous prayer; whilst in extemporaneous address, the minister can better give expression to the known and ascertained necessities of his congregation, as he and they stand as supplicants at the mercy seat. But whilst these and many other objections lie against studying prayers, until they become forms — it matters not how they be made such — we are nevertheless of the opinion that no minister can successfully discharge this duty without previous preparation, in several particulars: —

1. The Christian pastor ought to make the religious condition of the people of his charge the matter of careful and zealous observation. The better he knows and the more deeply he sympathizes with them, in their joys and sorrows, in their conflicts and triumphs, in their growth in grace, and in their strivings after divine knowledge and spiritual communion, the better is he prepared to entreat for them, and to lead them to the fountain of never failing mercy, where their sorrows are turned into joy, their conflicts into triumphs, and their strivings after knowledge into the attainment of true spiritual communion.

2. In order to acceptability and eminent usefulness in the discharge of this duty, he must be a devoted student of the Bible; and especially must he treasure up all its comforting hopes, if not in their exact words, at all events in their very spirit. For

Digitized by Google

it is God's own promises which it is his duty and privilege to plead; and hence he can urge them with more ardor, with greater importunity, and with stronger assurance of faith, when he presents them in the very language in which they are contained in the Sacred Scriptures; and much more can he stir up the faith of the pious to implore God, when their very supplications are the gracious words which proceed out of the mouth of their Heavenly Father. It is, therefore, manifest that the more familiar a man is with the promises, in the wonderful and refreshing variety of their statement in the Divine Record, the better is he prepared to be a help to God's people in leading them to hold converse with Him, whether at the family altar, in the chamber of sickness, at the social meeting, or in the great congregation. And so, every minister of our knowledge, who has become eminent on account of his ability in prayer, has been baptized in spirit with an unction out of the Bible. The late distinguished and lamented John Todd Edgar of Nashville was much spoken of, wherever he went, on account of his wonderful power in conducting prayer; indeed, he was one of the most gifted men we have ever heard raise the voice of supplication. But the great secret of his success was the ardor and holy courage with which he plead the precious sayings of God, all pregnant with rich consolation in the precise words in which they are recorded in the revealed volume. The late reverend and venerable Thomas D. Baird of Pittsburgh, was much distinguished for his gifts in prayer, and was greatly blessed, in the conducting of this service, as a comforter of humble Christians, mourning under heavy dispensations of Providence, or sorrowing at the mishaps of their Christian warfare. But from his earliest manhood he was esteemed mighty in the Scriptures; he took great delight in meditating in the law of the Lord; there was scarce a gracious assurance which he could not repeat verbatim, even in his venerable age, giving chapter and context: hence, as we have often heard Christians say of him, he seemed to know the Bible by heart, and to have it at his tongue's end; and so with importunity, fervor and trustfulness, he plead the very promises. The person, then, who would aim at excellence in the performance of this duty, ought to memorize the Scriptures with reference to using

Digitized by Google

them for the purpose indicated, by which means he will doubtless gain much Christian comfort, and at the same time will fit himself for great usefulness in his public ministrations, as well as in performing more private pastoral duties.

3. He should study his own heart. The most difficult and yet the most essential of all knowledge is self-knowledge. The religious importance of it arises from the fact that thereby we get an insight into our depravity, and ascertain the depth of our spiritual requirements. When, therefore, the minister thus studies his heart, and is constrained in his public wrestlings to spread it open before God, with its native and acquired defilement, and with a pervading sense of abject helplessness, the complaints and pleadings of his soul will find a response in every pious heart, and he will be enabled the better to give expression to the believing hopes, and sad bemoanings of the humble and contrite ones.

4. The cultivation of a devotional spirit is a matter of great importance, especially to all who are called on to lead in conducting religious worship. Besides the appointment of stated times for meditating in the word of God, and for secret prayer, it is very profitable to read a daily portion in some work of an experimental and practical character, or treating of personal religion in some of its aspects; and it is wise for every one to have such a book always at hand. It will be found a great aid to the Christian, who aims at the attainment of eminent piety, or seeks to become useful.

5. It may be advisable, especially for young ministers, to write out prayers in full, not so much to be committed to memory, as to be made the occasion of accustoming them to the mode and language of invocation. Devotional composition is a good exercise occasionally both for the head and heart; it can be made the means of saving us from falling into a sameness in the discharge of this duty; and as all have not equal gifts, some persons find it absolutely needful. If not relied on too much, it may become a source of great improvement to probationers.

The subjects of petition are co-extensive with the personal and general promises contained in the Bible. All these subjects, however, must not necessarily be dwelt on, or even alluded to,

Digitized by Google

during the services connected with every occasion of religious assembly. The matters pertaining to the general, and especially the spiritual, necessities of the congregation are the chiefest in importance, and ought to be presented more or less fully, according to time and circumstances. After the minds of the supplicants have been exercised in pleading for the supply of their own importunate claims, they are prepared, like David in the LIst Psalm, in a few brief words, to make intercession for Zion, for their country, for their friends, and for all proper subjects external to themselves. Nor do the multitude of words add to the earthly or heavenly value of prayer.

Prayer, however, should be appropriate to the occasion on which it is offered. The minds of the auditory are ready to follow their leader, just so long as his petitions are fitting; but they soon become weary, whenever he introduces inappropriate topics and untimely supplications. As his aim is to "beat the heavenward flame" in the breasts of others, of course whenever he begins to wander, they know not whither, and to enlarge on matters foreign to the objects of their assemblage, he utterly fails of the end which he is professedly seeking. Hence, it is very important for the requests, in large part, to have an immediate reference to the purpose of the meeting. Moreover: it gives expansion, and adds impressiveness, and is every way very becoming, for the pastor, in his stated ministrations, to observe the circumstances of his charge, of the community, of the country, and of the world — so as to make the matters which have already occupied the minds of the people, the subjects of their prayerful meditations. In this way, remarkable events of Providence — such as a sudden death, the prevalence of an epidemic, unusual drought, over-abundant rains, plentiful or scant crops, the existence of war or of famine at home or abroad, unusual or striking phenomena, the prevalence of revivals, &c. — all may be made to produce their effect on the minds and hearts of the people, as evidences of the presence and power of God, and may thus give freshness and an increased solemnity to the service.

Again: during seasons of special religious interest, it is very important that the exercises of every kind should be apposite, and especially that in the pulpit and in the social meeting the plaint-

Digitized by Google

ive appeals made to God should be relevant to the exact state of the congregation, and give expression to the desires which burden the hearts of Christians. As the services are many and frequent, it is necessary, in order to prevent weariness, that they should be spirited; and that much variety should be thrown into them. And, more particularly, that the preaching and praying should be such as to cause the people gratefully to perceive and realize its immediate adaptedness to the occasion. Nor can anything be much more unmeet than one of those long, wordy prayers, which are sometimes made in the social meeting by unwise but excellent brethren, who seem to be trying to out-do the preachers in length and in prosiness. At such times, our patience is reduced to the lowest point short of exhaustion. Hence, while we can say nothing in approbation of the conduct of the minister in the following anecdote, we acknowledge we have more than once felt the same loss of equanimity which he exhibited. During a protracted meeting at a Methodist Church in East Tennessee, on one occasion, when some "mourners" were at the "rail," or "altar," the minister in charge called on a Presbyterian elder who was present to pray for them. The Elder began one of those long, pointless, didactic effusions, the dispensation of which we have often endured; and was engaged in a very full discussion of the Divine attributes and perfections, when the stock of endurance possessed by the eccentric preacher gave out, and he stopped him, saying aloud, "Never mind that, Brother; never mind that. The Lord knows more about that than either you or I. Pray for these sinners." Whatever opinion we may form of the reverence of such conduct, no doubt all of our readers have known men, both ministers and laymen, who deserved just such a rebuke as that man received.

And here it may not be amiss to observe, by the way, that vanity is often mingled with this kind of praying to a fearful extent. An example of this in point we can relate, from our own pastoral experience. We were, with the aid of a ministerial brother, conducting a very interesting and hopeful protracted meeting, which was injuring from the lengthy and inappropriate style of prayer indulged in by some. We resolved on an effort to break up the nuisance; and hence, when calling on the

Digitized by Google

brethren, we asked them "to lead in a *short* prayer." There was immediately perceptible an evident improvement in the meeting. But one Elder, who was distinguished for his staid and "ministerial" manner in this service, came to us the next day, before the meeting began, and in a petulant tone, showing much vexation, said he did not wish us to call on him any more. We enquired what was the matter, when we learned that we had hurried him so that he could not bring his prayer to a comfortable close, but was compelled to wind it up too abruptly; that we had thus spoiled it; and that he did not wish to be called on again, if he was to be hurried in that way. Well, it was manifest to us that something, or else somebody, was spoiled; and so, we concluded that he had better be let alone, for the then present; and so we acted. But observe the vanity of the human heart. The complaint was not that his soul was so burdened that he had not time to make his complaints known unto the Lord, and thus to discharge the weight; but his performance did not receive those finishing touches with which he designed to polish it off! And yet that was a good man, whom we loved at times to hear pray.

Such praying as this does harm in two ways. It injures the meeting, because it never becomes, in any proper sense, a leading of the worship of the people, but is really eradicative of pious emotion, because annoying; and then, it leads modest persons into the error of supposing that they have not the gifts to join in social services, because they know that they cannot make such supplications as that, which they are thus led to consider the right kind. Now, the prayer meeting is an institution, so to speak, essential to the well-being of every church; and every male member ought to strive to gain the ability to unite in sustaining it. Nor is this so difficult to accomplish as it is generally thought. Persons form their ideas on this subject from the minister; and they think because they cannot emulate the pulpit style, that they cannot pray at all. But this is a mistake, as it will take but a moment's reflection to convince any one. Prayer ought to be adapted to the circumstances which surround us, as we have already shown. The minister conducts the whole of the ordinary church service himself; and his efforts are designed to be exhaustive, so far as the necessities of public worship are

Digitized by Google

concerned. He begins with an invocation; then, before the sermon, comes what is, with a fearful aptness in the case of too many, called "the long prayer;" and finally, after sermon, he renders thanks and implores a blessing on what has been done. Everything has an exact fitness. But suppose some one person, whether minister or private member, should, at the social meeting, make that "long prayer," in imitation of the example of the pulpit, and equalling or surpassing that of the minister both as to its latitude and longitude, is it not manifest that he would thereby do an essential injury to the meeting? Whoever else should be called on, must needs traverse the same ground; and if he should do it as lengthily and unreasonably as his predecessor, the whole meeting would be effectually and irretrievably ruined, by the time he had wound up his discourse, erroneously called a prayer. Instead, therefore, of its being wise to imitate the pulpit manner, when we go to the social meeting or to the family altar, it ought rather to be carefully shunned. It is, however, a lamentable fact that ministers themselves are, as a general thing, the only persons who adopt a different, more simple, and more direct style, when they are at meetings of a merely devotional kind. We have particularly spoken of the great importance of avoiding an indulgence in spiritless and stereotyped supplication, during seasons of protracted services. We hence approve the wisdom with which, in conducting the meetings connected with the recent revival movement, all exercises have been limited to five minutes, and in some places the prayers have been shortened to three minutes, which is sufficiently long for a social meeting, if the purpose be to make it an occasion of real interest. Manifestly, it is no more unreasonable for a layman to thrust on a social meeting one of those wordy performances to which we have alluded, than it would be for a minister under the name of an exhortation to inflict on it a full sermon. It was to the habit of which we here speak, the eccentric Lorenzo Dow alluded in the remark attributed to him, when he said, if Peter had made one of our modern prayers, instead of his direct one, "Lord save me!" he would have been fifty fathoms under water, before he got to his petition.

Now, since this pulpit or ministerial style is not only not re-

Digitized by Google

quisite at family worship, or in the social meeting, but is absolutely hurtful; the fact that a man cannot "pray like a preacher," is no excuse for his failure to engage in such services. On the other hand, if he be able to tell his wants to the Lord — and no man need say that he cannot do this, if he will — and if he carefully avoid the dull and elaborate manner of address of which we have spoken, and which we often hear, our opinion is that he is the very man who is qualified to lead, and who ought to be brought up to the work. Thus much on this point, by way of episode.

It is our duty always to remember our country, however briefly, on every occasion of social or public worship; and in our judgment, the omission of intercession for it and for our rulers, although this error is often committed, is inexcusable. For the great interests of our country pertain to the individual and personal concerns of every worshiper; the government is a source of boundless blessings or of untold evils to every citizen; and God is the Ruler of Nations. Hence, we ought, in our daily and weekly offerings, to make constant mention of our rulers and our country. Had our ministers and people been faithful in past days, in imploring God's continued favor on these once United States, with that reliance which He authorizes us to place in his Providential care, He might, in answer to their cry, have averted from us the judgments with which He is now afflicting us as a people. In discharging this part of our duty, however, we should most carefully and religiously abstain from making any partisan allusions, and ought so to measure our words that no one could ascertain our political sentiments from what we speak. The reason is obvious. We are the appointed leaders of the Church; and we have no right to make requests in which the children of God generally are unable to join. It would be as inappropriate and impertinent as it would be for us to confess our secret sins, and to offer oblations pertaining to our personal estate — duties which belong to closet devotion. But, besides, to make our political opinions conspicuous would be very irreverent; for thereby we exhibit an assurance on our part, that we are absolutely right in our principles of polity, and of course that our opponents are certainly wrong; whereas, in coming before God, prop-

Digitized by Google

er humility demands that we should divest ourselves of self-confidence, and of reliance on our frail judgments, and that we should submit everything to the disposal of God. We have, nevertheless, sometimes heard ministers commit indiscretion in this matter, by entreating for the prevalence of their political sentiments, or for the triumph of their party. The utter offensiveness and impropriety of this conduct we can illustrate by an anecdote we believe never before published, but which we learned in such a manner as to make us certain of its authenticity. Politics ran high, in 1800 and 1801, when the old Republican party came into power, at the defeat of the Federal party, which had held the reins of the government from the adoption of the Constitution until that time. The chagrin of the Federalists knew no bounds, and their mortification showed itself even in the pulpit. There was a venerable minister of New England, who, in the olden time, was wont to be sent to the legislature of Massachusetts by his town, and who belonged to the Federal party, and of course was opposed to Mr. Jefferson. On the Sabbath after the inauguration of Mr. Jefferson, this minister used the following language in his leading prayer; "Oh Lord! thou hast commanded us to pray for our enemies. Accordingly we begin with Thomas Jefferson," &c., &c. This illustration may, indeed, be said to be an extreme case; but it only exhibits in the more striking light the evil and the utter unsuitableness of the introduction of political matters into such an exercise. Assuredly such allusions to partisan views and positions are improper in the sanctuary, but especially in addressing God. Moreover, they are calculated, if not intended, to arouse the very worst passions of the human heart, in all those present who may happen to be arrayed on the opposite side in politics; and, hence, cannot but defeat the purpose of united prayer.

As to the manner of the minister in conducting this part of public worship, we have but little to say. We may observe, however, that it is important for him to aim at naturalness and simplicity. There ought to be no display of elocution or declamation. Solemnity of tone and devotional appearance are necessary to true dignity, and to impressiveness. Hence, in prayer, pronouncing the benediction, and asking the blessing at the table,

Digitized by Google

the eyes ought to be reverently closed; and especially should the opening and closing of them during prayer be avoided.

Again; Mannerism is unbecoming, and ought to be shunned. We ought to avoid swaying the body, movements or gestures with the hands or body, and generally all physical action which is calculated to draw attention from God himself, whom we are professing to adore, to the minister who officiates. The same objection lies against free-and-easy positions, such as leaning forward bodily on the pulpit, swinging on one foot, and reclining on the elbow. They lack dignity, and look irreverent.

The best manner is for the minister to rise deliberately and solemnly, and to wait until the people have arisen and become quiet and composed, before beginning. Let him stand erect, in sacred adoration, with his hands devoutly clasped, or resting on the Bible or desk before him, and with his eyes closed; or in some similar manner equally reverential and free from just objection. Let him not prepare to resume his seat, nor feel for the hymn book, nor take his watch out, before ending. But let him stand carefully still, as in the presence of God, until he with his lips, and the people in their hearts, have said, "Amen."

The faults of prayer are many, too numerous indeed to be discussed in detail in a single Review article. Some have already come up incidentally for animadversion, in our previous remarks. At this time, we shall confine ourselves, in our additional criticisms, to such as we have most commonly met with, in our past experience of ministers. That the following list is susceptible of much enlargement, we doubt not will be evident to every observant reader: —

1. The most common and probably the most unpardonable of the errors of ministers and others, is to make their prayers too long. There may be some difference of opinion as to the proper portion of time which ought to be occupied, under various circumstances, by this ordinance. But there can be no dispute that the object to be sought is the edification of the devout Christian, and the assisting of him in disburdening his soul; and that, whenever it is made so long as to become a weariness to him, it fails of its end. Many persons, we doubt not, would be very much surprised at their own lengthiness, if they would only take the trouble to time themselves for a few Sabbaths. We

Digitized by Google

have often heard ministers complain of their brethren for making this service too long, who were not as liable to criticism in this respect as the very persons were who made the complaint. Once, several years ago, we were present in an audience on which the minister inflicted a prayer three quarters of an hour in length. It is but little over a year since a licentiate, whom we casually took into the pulpit with us, made a prayer, after we had preached a sermon of forty minutes, just twenty-seven minutes long by the watch. If ministers would exhibit some regard for the circumstances and comfort of their congregations, as well as for the cultivation of true piety, in this respect, we think it would be a great improvement of manner; it would add much to the edification of their people, and it would enable old and delicate persons to attend church without running the risk of injury, from the fatigues occasioned by the services. And, further: it would accomplish more, twice over, toward arresting the indecent but growing habit of sitting during prayer, than preaching on the subject, or the passage of resolutions about it through the General Assembly. In the olden time, the fathers made long prayers; but the churches were built with reference to it, with pews having high backs; so that the people had a prop or support at hand, against which to lean. But with the common low-backed pews, this part of worship, even on extraordinary occasions, should not exceed ten minutes, at the outside, and our ordinary so-called "long prayers," ought to range from five to eight minutes. In social assemblies, the range should be from three to five minutes. Had this matter been attended to by our ministers formerly, we doubt not it would have had its marked effect in giving our branch of the Church a stronger hold on the public. We saw it stated recently in some of the secular journals, that one of the statesmen of Kentucky of the generation just passed, (but which one we have forgotten,) had said that the Presbyterian Church would have been the most powerful denomination in that State, long since, but for the lengthy prayers of her ministers. We doubt not this cause has had its influence on the public mind, not only in Kentucky, but elsewhere, in determining the popularity and usefulness of our branch of the Church.

Digitized by Google

2. A fault which is sometimes acquired by those who seek to obviate the previous error, is to indulge in a rapid and hurried utterance. An unseemly haste is utterly destructive of devotion. A manner too slow or hesitating is just as objectionable. Public prayer ought to be conducted at all times, whether the circumstances require it to be brief or more extended, with sufficient deliberation to characterize it by solemnity; with sufficient rapidity of speech to exhibit that earnestness and warmth which should always pervade it.

3. A similar objection lies against the practice of some ministers, who rush to the pulpit desk and begin speaking before the congregation have had time to rise to their feet. And sometimes they are done before the people have become sufficiently quiet to hear what is said, or have had time to compose themselves to unite in the supplications. In such a manner, the idea of leading others is entirely lost sight of — indeed, it is difficult to see how the officiating person can rightly exercise penitent and devout feelings or a lively faith, himself; and, at all events, there is in it an apparent absence of reverence painful to be seen.

4. Sometimes the current of devotion is arrested within us, when the minister begins to retrace his steps, and to indulge in what the Saviour calls "vain repetition." It shows at once clear evidence of a lack of proper meditation, before undertaking to present himself with his people in the presence of the Lord; it is disgusting to hear a man attempt to call on God, who manifestly does not know what to ask Him for; and it is proof positive of a want of proper care in the discharge of his solemn and responsible duties.

5. We often hear the exclamations, "Oh!" and "Oh, Lord!" or "Oh, God!" &c., &c. Some persons utter one or another of these in almost every sentence. This vocative style is in very bad taste; but, what is a worse objection, it is most frequently used by those who show clearly they are not certain what next to beseech God for; and that these exclamations are used simply to give the mind rest in order to consider what is to follow; and hence Dr. Miller used to call them the "setting poles" of praying and preaching. The same objection may be made to the frequent recurrence of the names and titles of God. We have

Digitized by Google

heard persons use the Lord's name in almost every sentence. It is very irreverent, to say the least; and it is shocking to serious persons, because it savors of profanity. Besides, it seems to exhibit an affectation of earnestness, which is very objectionable.

6. Quaint expressions, nice theological distinctions, ungrammatical and cant phrases, and hackneyed forms of expression are exceptionable. These last, if scriptural and used in the proper scriptural sense, are endurable, but otherwise they are utterly intolerable. Unusual words and colloquial phrases ought in like manner to be shunned. We should always aim at simplicity and directness; and nothing which can divert the minds of our fellow-worshipers from the subject-matter of the prayer should be allowed to enter into it or to surround it.

7. Ministers sometimes fall into a formality of manner, and their prayers become stereotyped, insomuch that their regular hearers learn to anticipate their invocations sentence by sentence. This must be regarded as a great blemish. We have claimed for free and spontaneous prayer the advantage of enabling us, with greater fervor, to express the very wishes of our hearts. But rather than fall into this distressing sameness, we had better at once resort to a liturgy. The error they commit is, that they depend on the circumstances which surround them to bring animation, as they stand up with their people to call on God. But the excitement does not come and bring the anticipated inspiration; and since no previous preparation has been made, the old ideas naturally come back to them. Hence, they fall into the old forms of expression; they lack freshness in the matter and variety in the language employed; and they pronounce the same thoughts, in almost identically the same phraseology, with no refreshing earnestness. The result is that the mind flags; they forget what they have already spoken; and resort to a confused repetition of the same hackneyed sentences. This sameness is both wearying and disgusting, and exhibits anything rather than an evidence of true engagedness. We doubt not the story which is told of the man who was just half done when he got to Noah and the flood, at family prayer, was designed to burlesque this mode of addressing God, of which we here speak.

Digitized by Google

8. Theological discussions are entirely out of place, whether they be introduced under the pretence of adoration, or by way of the enlargement of a discourse just delivered. Nor is this the place to correct the errors, nor to supplement the omissions of a sermon to which we have listened. To discuss theology with the Lord is impious; to address an argument to men, while professing to invoke God, is nothing short of hypocrisy. If we propose to give instruction, preaching is the appointed mode; it is designed for that purpose, and for no other. But when we raise our cry unto God, our purposes are very different.

9. Prayer is not the place to indulge in exhortation, whether to the pious or the impenitent. A minister is frequently tempted to do this after preaching a sermon himself, or after hearing one from a ministerial brother which has made a deep impression on his mind. It is natural for him, in his concern for the flock committed to his charge, to desire that they should receive similar impressions. But this course if adopted, besides being an entire perversion of a divine ordinance, is calculated to defeat the end in view. For we thereby exhibit a lack of faith in the Spirit of God, who alone can deepen impressions. This very impulse by which we are prompted is wrong; and, moreover, when it exhibits itself in the pulpit, it becomes contagious.

10. Personalities ought never to be indulged in, on any occasion nor to any extent, whether it be designed to convey reproof, or to give information or instruction in any form; nor ought any one ever to be mentioned by name in prayer. We may ask a blessing on the President or the Governor, but not on Abraham Lincoln or Jefferson Davis or Mr. Magoffin. It is unusual to pronounce the name of one for whom we are interceding, and of course it would sound oddly. It would, therefore, be calculated to excite irreverence, and to create unfavorable impressions in reference to the motive. We have never heard any one guilty of such a breach of propriety, but it has been committed. Maine was a District of Massachusetts, before becoming a State. At the time of its erection into a State, there was some dispute as to when the powers of the old government terminated, and those of the new began. The then Governor of Massachusetts was named Allan, and the first Governor of the new State of Maine was also named

Digitized by Google

Allan. In the interim, a venerable minister of Maine, who was equally learned and eccentric, offered the following petition, during a church service: — "Oh, Lord! we pray for Thy blessing to rest on the Chief Magistrate of this Commonwealth;" certainly a very timely and proper request, had he allowed it to rest at that; but stopping a moment, he added by way of parenthesis, "Bill Allan, I mean;" apparently fearful lest his audience should be in doubt which side of the dispute he had taken. It happened that "Bill Allan" was present. Of course the effect on the congregation was the inverse of that which solemn worship ought to produce. Whatever militates against solemnity, we should avoid.

11. Some conduct this ordinance apparently with an entire reference to its effects on the attending audience, using it simply as a means of grace, in the same sense in which preaching is such a means. But prayer is the offering up of holy desires unto God, and it presumes faith that an answer is to be obtained. Hence nothing belongs to it but the presentation of felt wants, which we expect our gracious Father to supply. An observance of this manifest principle would shorten many of our long prayers, by at least one half.

Other faults and other considerations we must pass by, and bring our remarks to a close. Did time and room permit, we should be tempted to make some observations on excellencies in prayer, and on its adaptation to the various circumstances in which it is offered. But these and other points we must omit, since our article has already become overgrown. Hence, with a single additional suggestion, we will conclude what we have to present, on a subject which we trust has not proved itself wholly destitute of interest to our readers.

Let those of us who are called to maintain the ordinances of religion, and to lead the public devotions of others, be ourselves men of prayer. Let us aim to become well acquainted with the lineaments and likeness of Jesus, by frequenting our closets, and there holding converse and enjoying personal communion with him. So that, when we rise before our congregations to lead them to the foot-stool of mercy and the gates of salvation, they shall discover, from the fervor of our speech and the courage of our demands, that we have been with Jesus. Moreover, let us

Digitized by Google

look for an answer to our plaintive appeals, and let us teach our people to claim and to expect very blessings. So that our congregations shall learn, when they approach the Throne of Grace, that they are presenting themselves there to cast off heavy burdens, to make clamant entreaties, and to obtain abundant supplies. Very soon the savor of such an influence would be widely felt in the midst of our churches; and we should cease to mourn when we assemble at our solemn feasts. For so soon as we, by the wrestlings of faith, shall accept the overtures of mercy, and embrace the sacred promises, our heavenly Father, with his divine benediction, will pour upon us the riches of his consolations until our souls are satisfied. E. T. B.

ART. IV. — *Death and Burial of Moses.*

Moses, the man of God, having delivered the children of Israel from the land of Egypt and from the house of bondage, and having suffered their reproaches and discontent during the forty years wandering, brought them a second time to the borders of the promised land. Their Lawgiver, Ruler, Prophet, and Priest— he was their Mediator, too, and on more than one occasion did his intercessions stay the avenging arm of Jehovah. A man great and remarkable not only in the number of capacities in which he served, but great and remarkable in each — the greatest of lawgivers, the wisest of rulers — he was a prophet whose antitype was found only in Christ. With a firm reliance and a constant faith in God, he led his people, murmuring and fretful, through all their journeyings. He a second time neared the land of his fathers, but none of the former generation were there, save Joshua and Caleb. Their sin at Kadesh Barnea had laid their bones to whiten in the wilderness, and he himself was about to die for his sin at Meribah. He wrote out the law, and

Digitized by Google

ordained Joshua to be his successor in the command of Israel; he wrote his sublime song, setting forth the mercy and vengeance of Jehovah, and then read all the words thereof to the congregation of Israel; he gave his charge to the people, and once more turned to Joshua and said in the name of the Lord, "Be strong and of good courage, for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I sware unto them, and I will be with thee;" then, blessing Israel, he ascended Mount Nebo, viewed the promised land and "died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord; and he buried him in a valley, over against Beth-peor, but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day."

This historic account of the death and burial of Moses, as recorded in Deuteronomy — taken in connection with the passage in Jude, referring to the contest over his body; and his appearance with Elias at the Transfiguration of Christ — would seem to indicate that there was something altogether peculiar in his death and burial; and suggests at least the thought that God prepared for Moses a different door into the future state, from that through which all others of Adam's children pass. We purpose briefly to consider this subject — not with any hope of solving the difficulties, but to get precisely what the Scriptures reveal concerning it, and to state some of the solutions that have been proposed. And, first, we will consider critically the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy xxxiv: 5, 6.

וַיָּמָת שָׁם מֹשֶׁה עֶבֶד־יְהוָה בְּאֶרֶץ מוֹאָב עַל־פִּי יְהוָה (Ver. 5.)

And Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there, in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord.

וַיָּמָת, *died*, is the future Kal. of מוּת, with the ו conversive future. The same word, with but slight modifications in sound, occurs in about ten different languages — all denoting death, separation of soul and body, whether from causes natural or violent. In Piel and Hiphil it means, to put to death, to kill. The meaning of this word and its usage, is a sufficient answer to the Jewish Rabbins — who have been followed by Josephus, and among the Fathers, by Ambrose and Hilary — who maintain that Moses did not die, but was translated to heaven and there ministers before God.

שָׁם, *there*, — *i. e.* the place spoken of in verse 1, Mount Nebo.

Digitized by Google

עֶבֶד יְהוָה, *the servant of Jehovah.* This phrase is used in the Old Testament, tropically, in various senses. In Nehemiah, it is applied to a worshiper of God. It is also used for a minister or ambassador of God; and in this sense it is applied to Moses, for in the 1st chapter of Joshua, God in speaking of Moses calls him *His servant,* as the most eminent minister He had ever employed in Israel. The same phrase is applied to Abraham, Job, Joshua, David, and Daniel; and in Zechariah we find it applied to the Messiah. Some have attempted to show that it was never applied to Moses until after his death, and argue from it that then Moses was admitted into the nearest familiarity with the Divine Majesty; but an equivalent expression is used in Num. xii: 7, where God in speaking of Moses says, *My servant.*

בְּאֶרֶץ מוֹאָב, *In the land of Moab.* It was still called the land of Moab, though it had been conquered by Sihon, king of the Amorites, and afterwards conquered and now held by Israel. So Moses really died and was buried in the land of Israel.

עַל־פִּי יְהוָה, *according to the word of the Lord,* or, literally, *upon the mouth of Jehovah.* The Jerusalem Targum expounds this phrase, "according to the sentence of the decree of Jehovah," *i. e.* as the Lord had before determined and decreed, as recorded in Deut. xxxii: 49, 50, and Num. xxvii: 12, 13. That this is the true meaning of the phrase is manifest — 1st, from the facts as recorded. God had before declared that Moses, on account of his sin at Meribah, should not bring the children of Israel into the promised land. Num. xx: 12. Again, in Num. xxvii: 12, 13, we find God expressly commanding Moses to go on Nebo and die; the reason then given, is the sin at Meribah. In Deut. xxxii: 49, the same command occurs again, and for the same reason. The record moreover shows that Moses, in accordance with this command, actually did go on Mount Nebo, and there died — not from disease, nor from old age, "for his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated," but עַל־פִּי יְהוָה, *according to the command and decree of Jehovah.* 2d. That this is the true meaning of the phrase is manifest from the usage of it in other places. In Num. xxxiii: 38, we find the death of Aaron spoken of as being עַל־פִּי יְהוָה; and that, too, under the same circumstances as the death of Moses. It also occurs

Digitized by Google

in Gen. xlv: 21, Num. iii: 16, and xxxvi: 5, Job xxxix: 27, and many other places — in *all* of which it manifestly means, *according to the command*, or *by the word*. But there have not been wanting many and learned Jews, and among them Maimonides, who have translated these words עַל פִּי יְהוָה, "*at the mouth of Jehovah*, or "*upon the mouth of Jehovah;*" and made them to mean, that the Lord drew the soul of Moses out of his body, with a kiss. They contend that Aaron and Miriam died in the same way, *i. e.* they all died of too much love, from the pleasure they had in the thoughts of God. Their desire was, "Let Him kiss me with the kisses of His mouth," *i. e.* kill me with love. But when we remember the proneness of the Rabbins to glorify Moses; and then extract the poetry of the exposition, as expressive of his sweet and happy death; the conceit is too palpable for refutation.

וַיִּקְבֹּר אֹתוֹ בַּגַּי בְּאֶרֶץ מוֹאָב מוּל בֵּית פְּעוֹר וְלֹא־יָדַע אִישׁ אֶת־קִבְרָתוֹ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, Verse 6. *And he buried him in a valley, in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor, and no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.*

יִקְבֹּר, future Kal of קָבַר, *to bury*. According to Gesenius, its primary meaning is, *heaping up, making a hill*. But the question which here arises, and the most important question connected with the whole passage, is — who is the subject of יִקְבֹּר — who buried him? Some have contended that the verb here is used impersonally; and, according to Nordheimer, verbs in Hebrew are often construed impersonally, to denote the performance of an action by some person or persons, without mentioning by whom; for which the 3rd Per. Masc. Sing. is used. In this case, then, it would be rendered "*they* (man) *buried him.*" This is the LXX. translation (*εθαψαν αυτον.*) But this rendering is set aside by the context — "no man knoweth of his grave unto this day." Rosenmüller takes the subject from the verb itself, and makes it to mean, "*he buried him,*" viz.: whoever did bury him; this rendering may be accepted, if we allow the context to supplement and designate Jehovah as the one burying him. Others still, have contended for a passive rendering of the verb, and translate it, "*he was buried.*" This is in accordance with the usage of the language, and like the other may be accepted, if we

Digitized by Google

allow the context to designate Jehovah as the one burying him. Admitting then the grammatical correctness of all these different renderings, the context, both before and after, forces us to the conclusion that Jehovah is the subject of the verb; and therefore, Jehovah buried him.

בַּגַּי, *In a valley.* The valley here spoken of must have been a depression on Mount Nebo, (see verse 1,) which was in the land of Moab. Nebo was the highest peak of the mountains of Abarim, which stood *over against* (מוּל) Beth-peor, a place where once stood the ancient temple of Peor.

The next sentence, "*and no man knoweth* (אִישׁ וְלֹא־יָדַע) *of his sepulchre unto this day,*" shows that this passage was not written by Moses, by the spirit of prophecy — as Josephus and Philo say — but was added at some later day, by some other hand.

קִבְרָתוֹ, *his sepulchre,* derived from קָבַר, *to bury,* like the word above used יִקְבֹּר, is decisive of the fact that Moses was really buried.

This, then, is precisely what we learn from the text: Moses went upon Mount Nebo, for two reasons, as stated, in the preceding chapter — 1st, to view the promised land; 2nd, to die. His death took place, not from disease or old age, or any other natural cause, but (עַל־פִּי יְהוָה) *by the express command and decree of Jehovah;* and Jehovah buried him, so secretly that no man hath found his grave, unto this day.

But now the question arises, why did Jehovah bury Moses, and what was its intent and signification? From the time of the Fathers, down to the present day, the almost invariable answer to this question has been; "To prevent a superstitious or idolatrous veneration of his sepulchre or remains." It is contended that a people so prone to idolatry as the Jews, and so fond of glorifying the great ones of their own race, would have been certain to have worshiped at the tomb of one so great and so good; and when trial and affliction came upon them, they would cry to him to intercede for them, whose intercessions had so often before proved effectual. The fact that the inhabitants of Arabia Petræa, hearing of the wonderful miracles of Moses, and thinking him a god, worshiped his image; and the fact that the brazen

Digitized by Google

serpent which Moses made, was afterwards worshiped in Israel; are both alleged as proof, that had they known where the body and grave of Moses was, they would have paid it idolatrous veneration. This explanation, almost without exception, has been received and accepted by the Fathers and Commentators, ancient, mediæval and modern; and in accordance with it the passage in Jude has been interpreted. It is alleged that Michael wanted to conceal the body of Moses by burying it, in order that the children of Israel might not be tempted to commit idolatry, by worshiping it. The devil, on the other hand, desirous of throwing every temptation in their way to commit sin, contested the right of Michael to bury the body; and hence the contest, spoken of between these two mighty spirit-princes.

The totally unsatisfactory nature of this solution appears, the moment we remember the notions which the Jews entertained concerning the defiling influence of dead bodies and sepulchres. Nor were these notions introduced by the laws of purification on this subject, which had a place in the Jewish code; but were coeval with the race. The idea that death and its circumstances exerted a defiling influence, manifestly was a result of the knowledge that sin was the cause of death; and that, upon the principle that what obtains to the cause, obtains to the effect. Hence we find these notions prevailing to some extent among all nations, until the time of our Saviour and His resurrection; when death and the grave were conquered, and honor instead of defilement were placed thereon. Among the Romans the Pontifex was not allowed to look upon a funeral, and the Flamen Dialis was not permitted even to go into a place where a coffin was. Among the Greeks, too, we find the same notions prevailing. Indeed, among all nations there seems to be a natural and instinctive dread and shrinking from dead bodies and graves. Hence we may well conclude that the Jewish laws on this subject did not introduce these notions, but were merely expressive of them; and like all expression of feeling, tended to strengthen and increase them. It is hardly conceivable, then, that the Jews, with such notions as they entertained on the defiling influence of death, and its circumstances, should ever be tempted to worship at a grave — no matter what their affection and what their ad-

Digitized by Google

miration for the departed. Besides this, we know that they were well acquainted with the sepulchre of Abraham, and the bones of Jacob and of Joseph they brought with them from Egypt to bury in Canaan; yet we never hear of their paying any superstitious reverence or committing any idolatry to these relics. This solution, then. of the question why Jehovah buried Moses? we give up as untenable — supported by nothing save a long and brilliant list of names, all of whom seem to have rested in it, more for the want of something better, than any satisfaction which it contained.

The only other solution of any respectability which we have seen, is that proposed by Kurtz, in his *History of the Old Covenant*, Vol. III., § 61, 4. Kurtz maintains that this peculiar death and burial of Moses, on the part of Jehovah, was intended to open a different door into the future state, from that through which all other men pass; and to prepare for him a different way to eternal life, from that of the corruption of the body. If Jehovah buried Moses, the reason must have been, that such a burial was intended for him as no *man* could have given. Now men bury the corpse, in order that it may pass into corruption; if Jehovah then would not permit men to bury Moses, it is natural to seek for the reason in the fact, that he did not intend to leave his body to corruption. These suggestions, taken in connection with the appearance of Moses with Elijah, (who was translated) at the transfiguration of Christ, conclude to the supposition that God intended to place Moses in the same category with Enoch and Elijah — to deliver him from going down to the grave like the rest of Adam's children, and prepare for him a condition, both of soul and body, resembling that of these two men of God. Now while Moses was not saved from death, in the same manner as Enoch and Elijah — for he really died, (יָמֹת) and his body was buried (יִקְבֹּר) — yet Kurtz assumes that, like them, his body was saved from corruption by some virtue, communicated by the hand of Jehovah at his burial — which prepared for him an entrance into the same state of existence with these two men, who never died or were buried.

According to this theory, the death of Moses was a peculiar and distinguished entrance into the future life; and, on the part

Digitized by Google

of God, was but one of the many instances in which we see his mercy going hand in hand with His justice. The justice of God demanded that Moses, for his sin at Meribah, must die. Again, his death was necessary, as an example to the children of Israel; teaching them that "the wages of sin is death," although the sin be slight, and the author of it an intimate friend of God. But when this was accomplished and the justice of God was vindicated, then the Divine mercy and grace bursts forth, and is rendered all the more glorious by reason of the previous punishment. So in the death of Moses, the very act which was employed in satisfying the justice of God, was also employed in showing forth His loving kindness and tender mercy. As an example of justice, Jehovah caused him to die before he entered the promised land; as an example of grace, He prepared for him a distinguished and glorious entrance into another and a far brighter land of promise and rest. So it has ever been, and so it will ever be, in the dealings of God with man. This life is both, "the day of His vengeance and the year of his redeemed." Here "mercy and truth have met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

The state into which Moses passed, like that of Enoch and Elijah, being unrevealed, is to us unknown; and the most that we can do, is to state what it was not. On the one hand, it was not the state of absolute glorification and perfection, incident upon the resurrection, for Christ alone could be the first fruits of this; nor was it, on the other hand, the state of separation of soul and body, and the consequent corruption of the body, into which all other children of Adam enter by their death. It would seem then to be a state intermediate between these two — not, on the one hand, resulting in corruption, as the death of the first Adam; nor, on the other, followed by a resurrection, as in the death of the second Adam. The death of Moses, then, corresponded with his life and mission on earth; he was the mediator of a covenant, which stood intermediate between the covenant of works and the perfect covenant of grace. His life and position was one, intermediate between the head of sinful, dying humanity, and the head of humanity redeemed from sin and death. His whole life was typical; "it was the shadow of good

Digitized by Google

things to come and not the very image of the things." Hence his death — not like the rest of Adam's children, for his position as mediator of a covenant placed him in a different relation to God, and, consequently, to death; nor like that of Christ, followed by a resurrection, for Christ was perfect and the covenant he mediated was perfect, whereas both Moses and the covenant which he mediated were imperfect. The death then of Moses, like his life, was typical.

This solution of the death and burial of Moses seems to be sustained by the apostolic *datum* in the Epistle of Jude, verse 9: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Here a contest is spoken of between Michael and the devil, over the body of Moses, as it were incidentally — not so much by way of revealing the fact, as illustrating by it another point which the writer was enforcing. Nor is it necessary here to enquire where Jude obtained this account; but accepting this epistle as canonical, the fact as stated comes to us with all the weight and certainty of divine revelation. Accepting this account as a historic fact, there is in it a manifest allusion to the peculiar death and burial of Moses, as recorded in Deut. xxxiv: 5, 6.

The first clue to the reconciliation of these two passages, is to be found in the identity of the *Archangel Michael* with the *Jehovah Angel* of the Old Testament. This whole subject Kurtz argues at length in his *History of the Old Covenant,* vol. I., § 50, 2, and III., § 61, 4. Here, we can give only his results. The *Maleach-Jehovah* (מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה) of the Old Testament, is the personal representative of Jehovah, and through him God did all that was done in connection with the covenant with Israel. He was not, as Hengstenberg argues, the very person of Jehovah, and hence the uncreated Logos; but was a created being in whom God made His personal presence known to man, in a manner accessible to his senses. The *Maleach-Jehovah* was a type of the more glorious and perfect manifestation of God, in the incarnation of His son; it was a testimony and an earnest of all His future purposes touching the redemption of man.

This *Maleach-Jehovah* (מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה) is sometimes spoken of

Digitized by Google

simply as *Jehovah* (יְהוָה); and in Dan. x: 13, 21, and xii: 1, he is called the Angel-prince or the Archangel *Michael* (מִיכָאֵל) (*who like God.*) He is the same eminent person of whom we read both in Daniel and the Book of Revelation, "who standeth as the great Prince of Israel for the children of the people." Hengstenberg has clearly shown, and Hoffmann has admitted, that the Michael (מִיכָאֵל) spoken of in Dan. x: 13, 21, and xii: 1. and there distinguished as הַשַּׂר הַגָּדוֹל (*the great prince,*) is the מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, of the historic books.

Moses then was buried by Jehovah (יְהוָה) *i. e.* Maleach Jehovah (מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה) *i. e.* Michael (מִיכָאֵל) the Archangel spoken of in Jude 9, that contended with the devil concerning the body of Moses. Here then is the nexus, at least in part, between these two passages, *to-wit:* the identity of the one burying Moses (מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה), with the one who contended with the devil over his body (*Μιχαὴλ ὁ αρχάγγελος.*) In view then of these facts — that Moses died and was buried in a manner altogether peculiar, to-wit, by the *Jehovah Angel*; that there was a dispute over his body, between Satan and *Michael;* and that *Michael* and the *Jehovah Angel* are one and the same person — then the conclusion almost irresistibly follows, that the time and occasion of the dispute mentioned in Jude 9, was the death and burial of Moses, as recorded in Deut. xxxiv: 5, 6.

Now if the death of Moses (עַל-פִּי יְהוָה), and his burial at the hand of the *Jehovah Angel*, was intended to open for him a different door into the future state, from the corruption of the body; and if it was intended by God to put honor upon His servant Moses, by delivering him from the common fate of sinful humanity, (*i. e.* the separation of soul and body,) and place him in a state intermediate between the first and second Adam, a position analogous to his life and mission; then it was a matter of some interest to Satan, "*who hath the power of death*" and is its author and controller. Nor is it to be wondered at, that Satan — seeing Moses, a man who had sinned, about to be delivered from the full penalty of that sin, to-wit, the separation of soul and body, and the consequent corruption of the body — should have risen up and contended for his prerogative. Satan — "the accuser of our brethren, who accuseth them before our God

Digitized by Google

day and night," who knows that God will and must be just, even to the Prince of devils — was not the one to stand by, unmoved and uninterested, and see a lawful subject of death thus slip from his grasp. Such conduct would not have been in accordance with his characteristic vigilance and malignity; he must contend for the body, although his opponent be Michael the Archangel, his old enemy and conqueror. The words used in Jude 9, to express this contest, *διακρίνομενος* (contending,) and *διελεγετο* (disputed,) both indicate that the contest was one, not involving physical action or force, but disputation, a word conflict. Hence the issue was one of right, not of might. The nature then of the conflict, as herein indicated, would seem to favor the above interpretation: — Satan feeling that his prerogatives were encroached upon, by this death and burial of Moses, rose up, not in might, but in right, to contend (*διακρινω*) — *i. e.* disputed (*διελεγετο*) — for the body. But, as before mentioned, Moses really died, and therein the law was vindicated; hence the Jehovah Angel, Michael, the exalted Spirit-Prince, "who standeth for the children of Israel, in every conflict that arises," carries out his work in spite of Satan's opposition, and silences him, not by railing and abuse, but calmly and solemnly says "The Lord rebuke thee." Such in substance is the solution of this subject proposed by Kurtz; the merits of which the reader will decide for himself. This much, however, all will concede — its marvellous ingenuity, and a degree of plausibility which allows the mind to rest in it, at least until a more satisfactory solution can be proposed. The subject is rather curious than important; and yet a true solution of the difficulties might be the means of throwing more light upon the mission of Moses, and the covenant which he, in one sense, mediated. If Kurtz has done anything towards elucidating the subject, then as he says, "the conflict between the two great spirit-princes, for the body of Moses, which at first sight appeared so strange, acquires the greatest importance in connection with the development of the plan of salvation; and the fact itself, that in spite of Satan's protest Jehovah rescued the body of Moses from the common fate of the sinful children of men, becomes a type and prelude of infinitely greater and more glorious things to come." J. W. N.

Digitized by Google

Art. V. — *Design of the Sacraments.*

Happily, all Protestant Churches are agreed in the fact that Christ has given but two Sacraments — the Lord's Supper and Baptism. The former was instituted just before his death; the latter after his resurrection, and just before his ascension.

These two ordinances — while they were mainly designed, as we propose to show, to embody the two great fundamental ideas which are the corner-stones of the Christian Religion — were intended also to be a bond of union and communion between the various members of his mystical body. But, alas! for centuries they have been the bone of contention, and of endless strife and needless divisions, whereby the energies of the Church have been greatly paralyzed.

Perhaps the gravest heresies that have ever cursed the Church have grown out of a perversion of the doctrine of the sacraments — Transubstantiation and Baptismal-Regeneration. These sacraments are the whole gospel in symbol. They typically embody that which is vital to the whole Christian system. Hence their liability to abuse — and, when abused, the mortality of the wound thus inflicted upon the cause of Christ. The tendency of the Church in all ages has been to rest in outward forms; and when these ordinances have been lifted out of their appropriate spheres as symbols, and are made to convey to the souls of men by some mystical power the grace of God, then the Church has lost the spirituality of her religion and simplicity of her ordinances, in endless strife about rites and ceremonies.

Much evil has also resulted to the Church from the manner in which these controversies have been conducted. The truth has not been always discussed in the spirit of truth. The pen is too often dipped in gall. We often forget that conviction is slow to reach a mind that is rankling with religious jealousy and hatred. To attempt to convert another by first arousing his prejudices, is about as wise as it would be in a general to attempt to sack a city at midnight — taking care that the first thing he does is to go all around and wake up the sentinels. Besides, "it is a victory for truth scarcely worth obtaining, if charity be left bleeding upon the field of battle."

Digitized by Google

Perhaps no service could be rendered the Church, at the present time, more acceptable than to settle definitively all her controversies touching the Sacraments. And it does appear to us that there is no way in which this can be done so effectually, and at the same time in a manner so exhaustive of the whole subject, as by placing the two together, and running a parrallel between them, showing at once the nature and design of each.

During the Old Testament economy there were evidently two very distinct classes of rites, viz.: sacrificial or bloody rites, and lustrations, ablutions — "*διαφοροις βαπτισμοις*." There were the yearly, monthly, weekly, and daily sacrifices — morning and evening. Their altars were perpetually smoking with the sacrifice of slain beasts. There were the burnt-offerings, the peace-offerings, sin-offerings, &c. But these could not take away the sins of the people. And they were not without their meaning. They declared in a manner far more expressive than words, that "without the shedding of blood there was no remission." They pointed to Christ, the "True Passover" — "The Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world." Then there were their "divers washings" — the pouring out and sprinkling of water, blood and oil. These seemed to have constituted as numerous and important part of worship as the other. The laver and the altar stood side by side. They were alike indispensable; the priest, before he could serve at the altar, must first be cleansed at the laver. "These were only shadows of good things to come." These good things thus foreshadowed having now already come, of necessity these rites and ceremonies must cease, or give place to others more appropriate to the advanced state of the Church. Under the gospel dispensation "there must of necessity be a change of the law," in regard to the ordinances of the Church. Beyond all doubt, these numerous rites pertaining to the Old, have been simplified and reduced to only two under the New Testament economy — Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The question may arise — why did Christ give two and only two sacraments to his Church? The answer is most obvious. There are two great truths which lie at the foundation of the work of redemption. The fall of man has produced two grand

Digitized by Google

difficulties in the way of our return to God: the first difficulty is legal, and has respect to God; the other is moral, and has respect to man. Since the fall, God has been brought into an altered relation to man; and man has been brought into an altered relation to his Maker. God is angry with the sinner; the sinner is at enmity with God. These two difficulties must be met. Grace must counterwork the effects of sin. God must be reconciled to man; and man must be reconciled to God. He must be restored both to the favor and image of God, which he has lost. He is perfectly unable of himself to do either. He cannot render satisfaction to God's violated law, and so make an atonement for sin; neither can he recover himself to his original state of normal purity. The rock loosened from the precipice can roll by its own weight to the foot of the plane; but it has no power to lift itself to its place again. Man is the offender — God is offended. Sin is opposed to every attribute of God; and every attribute of God is opposed to sin. The transgressor is held down both by the law of God and the law of sin.

To meet these two difficulties, God sent forth both his Son and his Spirit into our world. The first difficulty it was the official work of Christ to meet — *i. e. to reconcile God to man;* the office work of the Spirit is to remove the second difficulty — *i. e. to reconcile man to God.* Christ is man's advocate at the bar of God in heaven; the Holy Spirit is God's advocate at the bar of man's heart on earth. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to us for our justification, while that of the Spirit is imparted to us for our sanctification. The one gives us a title to, the other a fitness for, heaven. The one pardons, the other purifies. The work of Christ is *for us,* that of the Spirit is *in us.* The one is external — a change of state; the other internal — a change of character. The one is instantaneous and complete — having respect to the past; the other is incomplete and progressive — and having respect to the present and future. The one prepares a heaven for us, the other prepares us for heaven.

It is true that there are many passages in the word of God which seem to ascribe the whole of this double work to Christ alone. But Christ may be said to do in person what he does by his substitute. Indeed, the real sphere of his labors is

Digitized by Google

in heaven; he must ascend up on high. The sphere of the Holy Spirit's work is on earth — Christ only laid the foundation; the Holy Spirit brings up the superstructure. "It is expedient for you," said the Saviour, "that I go away. For if I go not away the Comforter will not come." Moses was commanded to take the blood, and to sprinkle half of it upon the altar and half upon the people — thus impressively showing that God must be propitiated, and that the worshiper must be purified. The whole ecomomy of redemption, then, may be divided into two parts —

1. That which is *legal*:
2. That which is *spiritual*.

And although Christ is the author and finisher of our faith, yet, we think, it is most abundantly taught in the Scriptures, that while he has reserved to himself, officially, the first department of this great work, he has delegated to the Holy Spirit, his substitute and vice-gerent, the second department of it.

Hence it is that he has instituted both sacraments, the Supper, and Baptism. The first has reference to Christ and him alone; while the other has no reference to Christ at all, only so far as it respects the official work of the Holy Spirit. In other words: Christ, as the great High Priest of our profession, has gone into the holiest of all with his own blood, and sprinkled it upon the throne of God, to make reconciliation before God for the sins of men; while upon earth, the Holy Spirit sprinkles the blood of Christ upon the hearts of the people, to purify their hearts from sin. The sacrament of the Supper, then, has reference only to the legal, official work of Christ; while that of Baptism has exclusive reference to his spiritual work — or the work of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts of men.

We cheerfully admit that there is a necessary connection and intimate relation between the sacerdotal intercession and regal glory of Christ, at the right hand of God, and the mission and work of the Spirit upon the earth. The application of Christ's work in the flesh, is accomplished in every one of his people, from first to last, by the agency of the Spirit, communicated through his continual intercession. The actual salvation of any soul, as it is by virtue of his meritorious death, which his intercession pleads, so it is through the agency of his Spirit which

Digitized by Google

that intercession procures. In this intercession, the merit of his death and the might of his Spirit find their legal connection, and by means of it the one passes into the other. There is a continuous presentation of his sacrifice, or of Himself in the virtue of it, in order to a continuous acknowledgment of his right to receive and dispense the Spirit to each of his redeemed in succession, until he shall "appear the second time without sin, unto salvation." *

In that remarkable discourse of our Saviour with Nicodemus, he began by telling him of the necessity of regeneration — the work of the Spirit; "of earthly things," because the sphere of his labors is here upon the earth. Then he proceeded to tell him of himself; "of heavenly things" — because he came from heaven and thither he must return again, that the Spirit might be poured out upon all flesh, and abide with the Church in every place and for all time, "even to the end of the world." John iii.

Now how strikingly appropriate is it, that there should be two sacraments — the one to represent the work of Christ, who brought in an everlasting righteousness *for* us — and the other, the work of the Spirit, who hath wrought that righteousness *in* us! The end and design is one; the work is two-fold.

I. Now that the Bread and Wine do refer to Christ in his official work will not be denied, and need not be argued to any length. The Supper took the place of the Passover, which was typical of Christ. "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat; this is my body which was broken for you: this do in remembrance of me," &c. See 1 Cor. xi: 23–26. Luke xxii: 19, 20.

Besides, the bread and wine are the most appropriate emblems that could have been selected from nature. These were to the Jews the very staff of life. Without bread the body must die — fit type of that "true bread which came from heaven, whereof if a man eat he shall never die." The bread must be ground, baked in the fire, and then broken; the wine be pressed from the grape: all emblematical of the sufferings of Christ. This solemn rite, instituted between the first and second advents, must

* See Brown's Second Advent, p. 121.

Digitized by Google

stand as a perpetual memorial; looking backwards with an eye of faith to a Saviour that has already "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," and also, with an eye of hope, looking forward to a Saviour "that shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

II. Baptism is also an equally striking representation of the work of the Spirit in regenerating and purifying the hearts of men. It must be remembered that this sacrament was given to the Jews, who never had any other conceptions concerning the use of water, in their religious ceremonies, than that it was emblematic of purification. In all their ceremonial purifications, whether at home or abroad, and in all their religious washings with water, purification was evidently the idea intended to be conveyed. To multiply quotations in proof of this would be almost an endless task. The association of water with the idea of purification had grown very strong in the Jewish mind. The representation was appropriate, striking and beautiful. Water is the purifying and regenerating element in the natural world; with it we wash our persons, clothes, dwellings. In the vegetable world, it is the life-giving and life-restoring element. Without the refreshing rain all nature droops, and dies. Hence it is a type of life. For this reason the gospel is set forth as "the water of life"—"Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." Isa. lv: 1. "The Spirit and the Bride say Come, and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." Rev. xxii: 17.

That the sacramental use of water in Baptism does refer to the work of the Holy Spirit in regenerating and purifying the hearts of men, will appear from the following considerations:—

(*a*) It was given *after* the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and just *before* his ascension; upon which event the Holy Spirit was to be poured out upon all flesh. As the Supper was instituted just before the event it was intended to celebrate, so the ordinance of Baptism was given just previous to the descent of the Holy Spirit. The idea of using water religiously to represent anything but purification, to a spiritually-minded Jew never could have been conceived of, unless suggested by divine revelation. If there were going to be any change, therefore, in

Digitized by Google

its religious signification, it would be most naturally looked for in the original institution of the ordinance in the Christian Church. When the Supper was instituted its meaning was distinctly set forth — "Do this in remembrance of me." So when Christ gave to his disciples their great commission, they were commanded to do three things — *make, baptize, and train disciples.* The first part of their work was *missionary* — to preach the gospel to the world. The last was to be *pastoral* — to train up those who were converted, in the Church. The *baptizing* of them was that act of transition by which they passed out from a wicked world into the visible kingdom of God. The baptism of a true believer is God's outward seal, answering to the inward "seal of the Spirit," whereby He clothes him with a solemn investiture and public enfeoffment of his interest in the love of the Father, the grace of the Son, and the communion of the Spirit. It is, on the part of the believer, an expression of his repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus; of his renunciation of the world for the service of the Living God. The formula of baptism is to him also a formula of his faith, by which he acknowledges the Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as his Sovereign, Saviour and Sanctifier. But this glorious change has been wrought in him by the mighty power of God's Spirit, whose it is "to reprove of sin, righteousness, and judgment." Now where, in all this, is there the slightest hint that Christian baptism was instituted to commemorate the death, burial, or resurrection of Christ?

(*b*) Again: Baptism represents our ingrafting into Christ — "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." 1 Cor. xii: 13. "I am the vine," said Christ, "ye are the branches." "Severed" from the vine the branches wither and die. But the branches are grafted into the vine *but once*, where they are perpetually nourished afterwards: so baptism is but once — the type of our engrafting into Christ. The sacrament of the bread and wine, by which that new life in the Living Vine is nourished, is repeated often. Baptism represents a private, personal matter — a transaction between Christ and the believer simply; whereas, the sacrament of the Supper is a social transaction — "a communion." Hence, the one is to be repeated, and the other not. But on the

Digitized by Google

supposition that baptism had reference to the burial and resurrection of Christ, it ought to be repeated as often as the other sacrament, for the event symbolized by the one took place as often as that represented by the other.

(*c*) Taking the view above presented, it is most natural that baptism should come first in order. It is very justly regarded by nearly all denominations, as the door to the Church, and is made the test of communion. This is most certainly as it should be. Taking baptism as a sign and seal of our ingrafting into Christ — of being "born again" — how natural is it that this should take place before we have a right to go to the table of the Lord, or "have faith to discern his body!" But take the other view — and how constrained and unnatural the whole transaction, of putting the ordinance representing the *burial and resurrection* before that typifying the *death* of Christ! *Burying the Saviour before he is dead!* and making faith in that event a test of our partaking the sacrament which represents the meritorious death of our Lord and Saviour!

Besides, the resurrection of Christ was a part of his *judicial* office-work. He was raised by the power of God, acting according to law. It was a legal transaction, as well as an expression of omnipotence. "He was raised again for our justification." Rom. iv: 25. John xvi: 10. But that department of the Saviour's work, as has been abundantly shown, is already represented by the feast of bread and wine.

(*d*) The various baptisms spoken of in the New Testament had all a direct reference to the work of the Spirit, and none whatever to the burial and resurrection of Christ. (1) There was the baptism of John; and (2) the baptism of Christ; and (3) Christian baptism. It will be remembered that the latter baptism was not instituted until after the resurrection of Christ; the first two forms of baptism were therefore Jewish. Christ, while upon earth, did not tear down the old structure, or rather break down its middle walls and extend its boundaries so as to take in "all the nations." He was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. His labors were spent in explaining the spiritual nature of the already existing economy, and preparing the minds of the people for that more universal and world-wide kingdom which

Digitized by Google

his disciples were to set up, in all its power, grace, and glory, when he should have ascended on high, there to be crowned as head of that kingdom and "Lord of all."

(1.) First, then, we have the baptism of John, the Elias and forerunner of the Messiah. It was predicted of him that he should come baptizing—(See Mal. iii.) He was a terrible reformer. He openly and sternly rebuked the people for their sins, and preached unto them "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Mat. iii. He was thus "preparing a people for the Lord" (Christ,) "who should baptize them with the Holy Ghost and with fire." This baptism then had reference to the Holy Spirit, with which Christ would baptize the people on the day of pentecost. (See Acts i: 5, and iii chap.) The personal baptism of Christ in Jordan by John, had no relation to his burial or resurrection. If so, no doubt it would have been deferred until near the time of his death. But he was baptized at the *beginning of his public ministry*—"that he might be made manifest unto Israel," in his official capacity. John i: 31. He was baptized "*after* all the people," (Luke iii: 21) and hence not for an example unto them. His baptism was not Christian baptism, which had not yet been instituted—but was performed by a Jewish priest. It was not for the remission of sins, nor in the name of the Trinity. It was to "fulfill all righteousness" (Mat. iii: 15)—which implies the existence of a law to be fulfilled. This must have been the old law of Levitical baptism—which when fulfilled is then abolished. "He began to be thirty years of age." Luke iii: 23. He must now be made a Priest, and so publicly*—"not by the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Heb. vii: 16. Here was the only true Priest and victim; all others were but shadows of him. He was the Priest of the living God, the Priest of the whole world—made so by "the oath of God"—a Priest forever after the order of Mechisedec—putting an end to the Levitical priesthood, for it was all fulfilled in him, and he is the abolishing end of the ceremonial law. Heb. vii. John understood all this, and after he had baptized him, he said, "Behold the *Lamb of God*

* Christ was not a Priest after the order of Aaron, and did not thus perpetuate that which he came to abolish.

Digitized by Google

who taketh away the sins of *the world.*" John i: 29. Christ himself, on one occasion, appealed to the baptism of John for his authority as a priest to scourge out from the temple (which belonged to the priests) those who sold articles for sacrifice. Mark xi: 28–33. He said "ye have made *my house* a den of thieves;" and He is "an high priest over the house of God." Heb. x: 21. But this Levitical law (every jot and tittle of which he must fulfill, before it could be abolished) required that the Priests of God should be baptized; and the manner of their baptism was prescribed, (Num. viii: 5–8) — which was by having the water of purification sprinkled upon them.

The literal baptism of Jesus at the hands of John was only typical of that true baptism which he was now about to receive at the hands of God: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him; and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Mat. iii: 16, 17. Thus we see "how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power:" — preparing him for his ministerial work — "who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed with the devil; for God was with him." Acts x: 38.

(2.) So, also, the baptism performed by Christ, or rather by his disciples, had no reference to his burial and resurrection, but to the work of the Spirit. In his conversation with Nicodemus, Christ explained to him the spiritual import of baptism — although the only baptism of which Nicodemus knew any thing was Jewish baptism. And Christ marvelled that one who was himself a teacher of the law, had not understood this before. No doubt this Jewish teacher was familiar with the process by which proselytes were brought into his church. "Proselytic baptism, or washing, was in the presence of three Jews, in the day time; the proselyte declaring his abhorrence of his past life, and that no secular motive, but a sincere love for the law of Moses, had influenced him to desire baptism. He was then instructed in the essential parts of the law," &c. * The man was then said to be

* Horne, vol. II., p. 109.

Digitized by Google

"born." Jesus alludes to this and says, "Marvel not that I said, you must be born *again — of the Spirit*," of which the water is but a sign. John iii: 3–5.

Now "Christ did not baptize, but his disciples" did it for him; and, no doubt, as he had taught Nicodemus, he did more fully instruct his own inspired followers, those especially to whom he gave his special commission to baptize, as to the design and import of that sacred ordinance. Of all his Apostles no two were more intimate with their Lord, and no two of them were better instructed in every thing pertaining to his kingdom, than were Peter and John. But did he ever tell them that baptism was performed with reference to his burial and resurrection? To this it may be answered, that Jesus told his disciples many things they did not understand at the first. But this is a very different thing. Had he told them once or twice that the world, for instance, would come to an end in three years from the time he began his ministry, they might not have comprehended him fully, or might have failed to be impressed by what he said. But how different would it have been, had they themselves become Apostles of this doctrine, and gone up and down through all the land, proclaiming to thousands that such an event would soon transpire? Now, when the time did actually come, would the event have taken them by utter surprise, had they believed and taught the doctrine? So if Christ had taught his disciples that at the end of three years he would be buried and rise again; and that his and their baptism, and that of all his followers, was intended to prefigure that event; and now supposing that Peter and John especially, were so impressed with the fact that they preached it everywhere, and baptized hundreds and thousands — telling them why they were thus buried in a "watery grave" and raised up again: that it was to signify to them that their Lord was soon to be buried, and would rise again — is it not reasonable to suppose that Peter and John would have been looking for the resurrection of Christ? But when the event did transpire, they were taken in perfect surprise. It was to them as "an idle tale." No, they did not anticipate the event, and nothing is more conclusive than that they had never been taught it themselves, nor did they ever teach it to others. There is not,

Digitized by Google

in any of the four gospels, the slightest intimation that Christ ever taught his disciples that baptism was designed to prefigure his death, burial and resurrection. But, upon the contrary, he repeatedly explained the spiritual import of the religious use of water. "On the last, the great day of the feast (of Tabernacles,) Jesus stood and cried, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink." John vii: 37. "One of the most remarkable ceremonies at this feast, at the latter period of the Jewish polity, was the libation or pouring out of water drawn from the pool of Siloam, upon the altar, as, according to the Jews themselves, this water was an emblem of the Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ applied the ceremony, and the intention of it, to himself"* in the outpouring of his Spirit. "This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

On one or two occasions Christ speaks of his own baptism. The mother of Zebedee's children asked of Jesus that her two sons might sit, the one on his right hand and the other on his left, in his kingdom. Jesus answered her, "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," &c. Mat. xx: 21–23. Here Jesus alludes to both his sufferings, which were future, and his baptism, which was *past*" — "the baptism that I *am* baptized with," which was the baptism of the Holy Spirit. His disciples were soon to endure the one, and enjoy the other.

(3.) It only remains that we briefly consider the import of Christian Baptism. What is its design? What does it represent? The first recorded instance of Christian baptism was upon the day of Pentecost — that day on which three thousand were converted and added to the Church. On that memorable day the

* "The sense of the Jews in this matter is plainly shown by the following passage of the Jerusalem Talmud. "Why is it called the place or house of drawing? Because from thence they draw the Holy Spirit, as it is written: "And ye shall draw water with joy from the wells of salvation." Horne, vol. II., p. 127.

Digitized by Google

reign of the Holy Spirit — the purchase of Christ's death, and *the* gift of the Father — was fully inaugurated. On that day "the more glorious ministration of the Spirit" began. 2 Cor. iii: 8. The most splendid prophecies concerning his advent were now fulfilled. The Holy Spirit was now given to the Church as a permanent legacy, "to abide alway." All that is infinite in wisdom, ineffable in grace, and transcendent in power, was included in that gift. Under his glorious reign "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the whole earth as the waters do the great deep." Long foreshadowed by their ablutions and libations — the anointings with oil, the sprinklings of blood and water; now, in the fullness of time, he has come — is shed upon them, in a wonderful manner and in mighty power. He begins his office work; thousands are "reproved of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." And so Christian Baptism is also inaugurated, as a perpetual ordinance in the Church of Christ, in commemoration of the outpouring and reign of the Holy Spirit. Acts ii.

Of Christ it was expected that he would baptize, (John i: 25,) because of him it had been predicted that he should purify the hearts of men, "by judgment, and fire, and the spirit of burning." Isa iv: 4. Mal. iii: 1–3. The baptism which he would give would be that of "the Holy Ghost and of fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly *purge* his floor," &c. Mat iii: 11, 12. Mark i: 8. Luke iii: 16, John i: 26, 33. Acts i: 4–8; ii: 1–4, 16–18, 32, 33; x: 44–48; xi: 15, 16. This is that "one baptism" of which the Apostle speaks, (Eph. iv: 5,) performed by the Spirit of God, engrafting us into the spiritual body of Christ. 1 Cor. xii: 13. Gentile converts at the house of Cornelius were baptized because "they had received the Holy Ghost." Acts x: 57.

The Apostle Peter elsewhere calls the Christian ordinance of baptism a figure of salvation. "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. 1 Peter iii: 21. In the preceding verse he alludes to the deluge, and the ark "wherein eight souls were saved by water." These were not saved *from* the water, but *by* the water. These waters swept off the mighty mass of

Digitized by Google

the old world's corruption; while at the same time bearing aloft on their bosom, in safety, the ark, the Church of the living God, "the root of a new order of life not to be destroyed by such a perdition." So does that baptism which comes to us, not as a type of "the resurrection of Jesus Christ," but by *virtue* of it, "wash away all the filthiness of the flesh and the spirit, and give us the "answer of a good conscience towards God." Immersion is nowhere a type of salvation; baptism is; — for in the instance above alluded to, and at the baptism of the Red Sea, there "was both a *baptism* and an *immersion*, but the party *baptized* was the one not *immersed:* and their *baptism* consisted in their escaping *immersion;* whilst the party *immersed* was the one that was not *baptized.*" * The party that were immersed were not saved, while the party saved were not immersed.

Christian baptism is then not *modal*, but spiritual; that is, it is not the *mode*, but its spirit and meaning, that is to be cared for. A literal baptism does not possess, and therefore cannot convey to the soul, any intrinsic virtue. "It is an outward sign of an inward grace," and not of the *manner* in which that grace is bestowed. So, the virtue and the value of the Holy Spirit's baptism does not reside in the mode or manner of his operation, which is to us wholly unknown; but in the fruits and effects of it — our purification from sin — "the answer of a good conscience toward God."

The only passages which seem to conflict with the views above presented are to be found in Rom. vi: 3–5, and Col. ii: 11, 12. That we may rightly interpret any passage correctly, we must look at it in the connection in which it stands. In his epistle to the Romans, Paul had just concluded his exhibition of the doctrine of justification by faith — that as all were sinners and under the curse of the law, so their pardon and justification must be gratuitous, "without the deeds of the law." He, then, in the 6th chapter, proceeds to answer a very popular objection to this doctrine — that it leads to licentiousness. "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound," &c. *That* is the objection which he is now answering. "God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" He then tells them that those believ-

* Dr. Armstrong, p. 104.

Digitized by Google

ers who are justified thus freely, are also *baptized:* and that this baptism, whatever it is, produces in them a death to sin, and a new life in Christ; that their *judicial* and *sanctifying* righteousness always go together, because they are inseparable. Rom. viii: 29, 30.

Now the question for us to determine is this — Is the baptism here spoken of a mere external, ritual baptism in water, or is it not that internal, spiritual baptism by which we are ingrafted into Christ? It is not a baptism into water, for this would not answer the objection against the doctrine of the Apostle; but it is a baptism "into his death." If the baptism here is external and literal, so must be the crucifixion and the death. "An external baptism cannot produce an internal burial, nor can an internal baptism produce an external burial." The death here spoken of is not the death of Christ, but of the old man — a death to sin; and the resurrection is to newness of life. Paul did not mean to say that the Church at Rome was baptized — dipped — literally *into Jesus Christ;* and make that the ground of his inference, "*therefore*" they are "buried *with him* by baptism into death." Besides, he represents their baptism — not as something past, and over with, as it would have been, had it been literal; but as denoting a continued state of being, "Therefore we *are* buried," &c. The process of this baptism is still going on, and is incomplete in the present life. Besides, the effects of this baptism — producing death, burial, putting off the old man, sin, and the resurrection; new life, putting on the new man, which resurrection was performed by faith of the operation of God — could not be produced by a literal baptism. It stood in the place of that spiritual "circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ." Col. ii: 11.

No doubt there is an allusion here to a literal baptism, be the mode of that baptism what it may. But its meaning, by these passages alone, is put beyond all debate or uncertainty. All these phrases — "buried," "planted," "crucified," "dead," "putting off the old man," "putting on the new man," "baptism," &c. — are but so many metaphorical expressions denoting the same thing: the spiritual renovation of our nature — effected by the

Digitized by Google

Spirit of God "by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" — of which water baptism is a sign.

To sum up the whole matter in a few words: God sent forth from heaven the two Great Powers, his Son and his Spirit, as executors of the plan of salvation. The work of the redemption of a lost world has been, by the appointment of the Father and their mutual consent, equally divided between them. They are partners in this undertaking. Christ having "finished the work" assigned him on earth, "ascended up on high." The Holy Spirit descended to earth as his vice-gerent and substitute. The office-work of the one was to propitiate God; that of the other was to reconcile man to his offended Sovereign. Christ purchases, the Holy Spirit applies this salvation to the souls of men. The order in which this work is actually performed: the Spirit brings us to Christ, and Christ brings us to the Father; the Son glorifies the Father, and the Spirit glorifies the Son. We must be quickened by the Spirit, that we may be united to the Son, that we may enjoy the communion of the Father. Christ is the Tree of Life, and we the broken branches. The Spirit alone can engraft us again in him, who is our life, "who will present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

As the Second and Third Persons in the Trinity are the active agents in the execution of the plan of salvation, two sacraments have been given to the Church, commemorative of their work — the Lord's supper and baptism. The work of Christ was first in order; that of the Spirit is first in its application. Hence baptism comes first in the Church; or before we can eat of that Living Bread which came from heaven, we must first be cleansed "at the laver of regeneration." Regeneration is the beginning of the new life, and goes before "faith to discern the Lord's body," by which it is continually nourished. Regeneration is elementary; and hence baptism is initiatory.

These two sacraments must not be confounded. We should be infinitely more concerned for their true meaning, than their mode. There is a very broad reason why there should be two sacraments. But if we make baptism refer to Christ, and not to the Spirit, we have two ordinances representing one thing, and none to represent the other; thus discrediting, if not ignoring, the whole

Digitized by Google

work of the Spirit — leading us directly to the miserable delusion of baptismal regeneration and will-worship. Besides all this, there is no sort of propriety in appointing the religious use of water as a type of a grave. Baptism to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, would be as sad a perversion of that ordinance as to make the bread and wine refer to the operation of the Holy Spirit. In all the "divers washings" of the Levitical economy — in the baptism of John — of Christ and his disciples — at the institution of Christian baptism — there is not the faintest allusion to the burial and resurrection of Christ; but, most unquestionably, they do all have reference to that baptism that Christ was to give, the baptism of the Holy Spirit. If kept distinct, they are the most beautiful and impressive types, the one of Christ, and the other of his Spirit, that could have been chosen. The wine represents his blood; pressed from the grape, his sufferings; poured out, "his shed blood" — which is death, but when sprinkled upon the souls of men, it is life-giving (Gen. ix: 4,) and purifying. Eph. v: 26. Heb. 9: 14.

> "But water seals the blessings now
> That once were sealed with blood."

But, change these symbols! and at once we have confusion, where before was order. We rob the Spirit of his appropriate symbol, and make that which was the sign of purity and life, a type of putrefaction and a grave!

Again: One of these ordinances is just as important as the other. The virtue of neither resides in the mode, nor in the quantity of the elements used in their celebration. The manner in which one of them was at first observed we do know: that it was at night, in an upper room, in a reclining posture, after a full meal, and in the absence of all females; yet no one regards the manner of the celebration of this sacrament as of any importance. Why then should the Church of Christ be divided, and often separated by unchristian hatred, from each other, in disputings concerning the other sacrament, whose mode is still involved in uncertainty? Besides, we are now living under the more "glorious ministration of the Spirit." The worship of God is emphatically a spiritual worship. The blessings of God are no longer

Digitized by Google

bound up in any frame work of ceremony. "Woman, the hour cometh, when ye shall, neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father." "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv: 20, 24. "For the kingdom of heaven is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Rom. xiv: 17.

There is no truth in the Bible more distinctly and repeatedly taught, than that baptism does refer to the work of the Spirit. The texts of Scripture directly and indirectly teaching this fact, are about ten times as many as those which refer the bread and wine to the death of Christ. And if baptism does refer to the Holy Spirit, as the administrator of Christ's kingdom upon the earth, why must the Church be bound down to one particular mode in its administration? Indeed, if immersion is the only baptism, baptism being the only door to the Church, there is but one Church on earth; and never has been, nor can be, but one. But if baptism refers to the Spirit; and as the office of that Spirit is not to immerse the souls of men, but to "*purify*" them by being "shed" or "poured upon" them; why may not the sprinkling or pouring out of water answer as well, and even better than immersing the body in water? There is as much real virtue in a drop as in the ocean. It is the significance of the sign, and not the manner of its application, that constitutes its virtue. Says Dr. Carson:

"Had no emblem but that of purification been intended in the ordinance, we do not say that immersion would be either desirable or preferable. In a partial ablution there may be an emblem of purification, but no emblem of death, burial and resurrection." *

The settlement of this point in the controversy, then, settles the whole question. The world can hardly contain the books which have been written upon the mode of baptism; but comparatively little has been said, on either side, upon the point under discussion. Besides being infinitely the most important point to be decided, it will be infinitely easier to decide.

This discussion has been undertaken by the writer, with the

* Carson on Baptism, p. 336.

Digitized by Google

purest motives, and in the kindest spirit towards our brethren who differ from us only upon this one point — praying that we may be brought to see alike, that we may feel alike, that we all may be one, and that the world may believe on Christ, and exclaim, "Behold, how these Christians love one another."

T. H. C.

ART. VI. — *Greek Plastic Art.*

Geschichte Der Griechischen Plastik Für Künstler und Kunstfreunde von J. OVERBECK. *Mit Illustrationen Gezeichnet, von* H. STRELLER, *Geschnitten von* J. G. FLEGEL. *Leipzig: Verlag Der J. C. Hinrichs'schen Buchhandlung.* 1857.

This work, comprising two large volumes, is a complete history of Grecian and Græco-Roman Plastic Art, from the earliest period down to the time of Theodosius. It is beautifully illustrated with plates, exhibiting the progress of the art through all the periods of its improvement and decay.

Art has its foundation in human nature. This nature is twofold — material and spiritual. The material forms a part of the universe of matter: the spiritual constitutes a part of the universe of mind. The wants of man's material nature have chiefly led him to those discoveries in physical science, which form the striking characteristic of our age; the necessities of his spiritual being, to the practice of religion and the cultivation of art — religion arising from his moral and spiritual wants, and art from his æsthetic. The character and development of art are conditioned by the healthiness, vigor, and activity of that part of our constitution to which it owes its origin. This part is that by which we are susceptible of the emotions of sublimity and beauty. It sustains very much the same relation to the physical world that conscience does to the moral. As the latter distinguishes

Digitized by Google

between what is right and wrong, or beautiful and deformed, in thought, feeling and action; so the former distinguishes between beauty and deformity, in color, shape, form and expression.

The channels by which this faculty finds its outward expression are the Fine Arts. The prime object of these arts is the creation and development of beauty in all its variety of forms and hues. "The vast cathedral, the penciling of a rose-leaf, the peal of the organ, and the spirit harmonies of verse, alike come within their scope. They are addressed through the eye and the ear to that fine inner sense, which can seize the meaning of the artist from his inanimate handiwork, and sympathize with the offspring of his imagination as if they were living realties;"

> "Giving virtue a new birth,
> And a life that ne'er grows old."

In some of the fine arts, — Architecture, Sculpture, and Poetry — the ancient Greeks attained to such a preëminence that it has been the highest ambition of subsequent generations to equal, but not to excel them. In the object of this ambition they have failed. In Architecture and Sculpture, especially, Greece has never been equalled. She eclipsed Egypt, Chaldea and Assyria, countries rich in art before Homer sang; and she looks down upon all succeeding times, with an eye of triumph, provoking imitation, but smiling at any attempt to unwind from her brow the wreath of victory.

In the development and culture of art the Greeks possessed the greatest advantages. Endowed with the most exquisite sensibilities, and with reasoning faculties of the highest order, they were keenly alive to the beautiful in all its manifestations. With a fancy brilliant as the blushes of his own rosy-fingered Eos, with an innate sense of harmony and proportion, the native of Hellas aggregated the forms of his own beautiful land into some one form, or group, of surpassing loveliness. His imagination, correct, chaste, but never gorgeous like that of the oriental, took and moulded the objects of nature, made them speak the language of men, and rendered them instinct with the inspired breath of human passion.

In addition to his happy mental endowments, the Greek was

Digitized by Google

placed in a land abounding in scenes of sublimity and enchanting beauty. His eye daily rested on the snow-capped peaks of Olympus, the residence of the Gods: the vale of Tempe spread out before him its fairy scenes: Parnassus and Helicon, the favored haunts of the Muses, with their rich poetic associations, concealed their heads among the clouds that floated through the Bœotian sky: Arcadia, with its hills and glens and sunny vales, the land of shepherds and of bleating flocks, even more beautiful than the Arcadian Dream, was, in ancient, to a much greater degree than it is in modern times, the type of rural loveliness. The sea, too, the beautiful Ægæan, studded with islands, resembling so many emerald gems, was not the least beautiful part of the panorama, which was daily spread out before the eye of the dweller in Hellas.

The sea was a powerful instrument in moulding the intellectual character of the Greeks. It was the source of their power and the scene of some of their most brilliant achievements. The mountains were perhaps equally powerful in their influence upon the Grecian mind. They formed the barriers which protected one state against another, and prevented Greece from becoming one centralized government until the time of Philip, whose success in subjugating the different states of Hellas to his sway was chiefly due to bribery and treachery. "The poetical beauty of the Grecian mountains has often called forth the admiration of modern travelers. Their craggy, broken forms and rich silvery color give to the Grecian landscape a peculiar charm, and justify the description of the Poet Gray, when he speaks of Greece as a land,

> "Where each *old poetic mountain*
> Inspiration breathes around."

All this beauty of scenery is increased by the transparency of the Grecian atmosphere, so much celebrated by poets and travelers. Euripides speaks of the Athenians as —

> ἀεὶ διὰ λαμπροτάτου
> βαίνοντες ἁβρῶς αἰθέρος; *

and a celebrated traveler says: "It is impossible to describe the

* Always walking delicately through serenest air.

Digitized by Google

varied tints which dye the marbles of Hymettus, which bathe the islands of the Ægæan, and fringe the crests of the mountains." To this bright and cheerful climate Cicero attributed the clearness of Attic wit.

The most powerful auxiliary to Grecian art, however, was religion. Indeed, the fine arts of the Greeks may be said to have been, in a great measure, a product of the religion of the country.

The religion of the Greeks was very different from that of the orientals. Among the latter the objects of worship were, at first, the visible objects of nature; and then there was a transition from these to the powers of nature, which were symbolized by certain expressive forms. The forms, by which these objects and powers of nature were represented, were sometimes the human; but this was a mere secondary affair, the indispensable means of representing them to the senses. Quite as frequently the forms of the lower animals were chosen, and sometimes a union of both the human and the bestial. A striking illustration of this is exhibited in the forms of the Egyptian and Hindoo gods, among which can be found the head of some unseemly animal set upon human shoulders, and *vice versa*. But the Greeks, though their religion was partly derived from the East, dismissed these symbolical representations, and adopted the human form. Their gods were *moral persons*. Thus the Grecian divinities, if not so originally, became entirely the property of the Greeks; that is, the representations that they made of them differed wholly from the conceptions of those oriental nations from which they may have borrowed them.

When we call the gods of the Greeks *moral persons*, we do not mean that a degree of moral purity was attributed to them above that which mortals can attain; but rather that the whole nature of man, with its defects and excellencies, was considered as belonging to them. At the same time, they were supposed to possess superior physical strength, a more delicately organized system, and a more exalted form than mortals enjoy. These views of the gods were commonly entertained by the Grecian people, and formed a striking contrast to the views of other nations generally respecting the gods. The Grecian gods were like ourselves, only more exalted, sometimes quarreling among them-

Digitized by Google

selves and with their divine spouses, from whom a mortal's beauty sometimes drew off their affections, causing alienation followed by a season of pouting that seemed anything but heavenly.

That so remarkable a difference should obtain between the Grecian and foreign gods may seem strange to some, seeing the gods of the Greeks were many of them originally the same as those of the surrounding countries. It is scarcely satisfactory to say that this difference was effected by a transformation of the deities adopted by the Greeks, without stating at the same time how this transformation was made. It was made by poetry and sculpture. Poetry was the creating power, and sculpture confirmed the representations which she called into being by conferring on them visible forms. Here is the point of connection between Grecian religion and Grecian art; and for some of its purposes did art ever have a finer field? The religion of Greece was a highly poetical one. Besides the divine assembly of Olympus, there were numberless inferior deities, Ocean nymphs, Naiads, Oreads, Dryads, and Hamadryads. To the imagination of the Greek,

"Millions of spiritual beings walked the earth,"

during both his waking and sleeping hours. All nature teemed with life, from the lowest to the divinest forms.

Having briefly enumerated the advantages which the Greeks possessed for the cultivation of art, we will devote the remainder of this article to the consideration of what is generally styled Plastic Art. Under this term was originally comprehended modeling in clay, or in soft masses; but it was, in the course of time, applied to the formation of images out of hard masses, such as wood, marble, ivory, and metals. Many rude attempts were made in this art previous to the time of Homer, and some successfully executed, if his poems may be credited. Prior to his time Dædalus, the mythic ancestor of the race of the Dædalidæ, whose name was used to denote the activity of the Attic and Cretan artists, carved images; and, according to tradition, invented many instruments to facilitate his labors. Whatever may have been the number of the works of the ancient Dædalidæ, the most of them had perished before the time of Pausanias, and only two of them remain until the present. These are the lions on the gate of Mycenæ,

Digitized by Google

and the Niobe on Mount Sipylus, near Magnesia. Besides the name of Dædalus, we find that of Smilis, who is said to have wrought under Procles, in Samos, one hundred and forty years after the Trojan war. It is probable, however, that he was a mythical character, as his name seems to be derived from σμίλη, a knife for carving wood. The name of the Telchines is still more mythical and obscure. They are supposed to have been an ancient guild of smiths and image-makers at Sicyon, Crete and Rhodes, to the Dædalian life of whose statues and the evil fame of whose sorceries Pindar alludes in one of his odes.

For a knowledge of the condition of Plastic Art in the time of Homer we are indebted to his poems. In these he mentions the statue of Athena, at Troy, and the head-band, or chaplet, of the far-darting Apollo, which the priest, Chryses, held in his hands, when he went to supplicate the Greeks and Atridæ to release his daughter. This fillet, or head-band, Mr. Overbeck thinks belonged to a statue of Apollo. His argument is that had the fillet been a symbol of the priestly dignity of Chryses, he would have carried it on his head and not in his hands. These statues of the gods mentioned by Homer — if he mentions more than one — were probably wooden figures called by the Greeks Xoana. But working in metals — especially bronze and gold — was not unknown. Objects of art made of these metals seem to have been very abundant. The Father of Epic Poetry, in his description of the shield of Achilles, represents groups of figures; which communicates the fact that such groups in metal had already been successfully attempted. In the Odyssey, rows of dogs of gold and silver are described as standing at the door of Alcinous; and in the hall are golden statues of boys, upon pedestals, holding torches.

With Homer and Hesiod closes the *most ancient period* of Grecian art. But what is properly denominated the *ancient period* does not terminate until the fiftieth Olympiad, about 580 years B. C. Between the Trojan war and the Olympiad just mentioned, certain political movements and mechanical inventions contributed much to the progress of art in Greece. It was during this time that the Dorians, descending from the mountains of Northern Hellas, spread themselves over the Peloponnesus. They were an

Digitized by Google

earnest people, endowed with a sense of strict order and due proportion; and to them we are indebted for the temple-architecture which bears their name, the earliest of the Grecian Orders, and in complete harmony with their political life. The inventions were, casting in moulds, ascribed to a Samian named Rhœcus, and soldering, in which Glaucus of Chios acquired fame. By means of these inventions, working in vessels was brought to much perfection. A third handicraft, though known before the time of Homer, deserves to be mentioned on account of its connection with the Plastic Art. It is that of pottery, which flourished as an important trade in Ægina and Samos; and at Athens and Corinth, where the potters were numerous from an early period. The elegant forms of the oldest Greek vases, still to be seen in the museums of Europe, attest the perfection of the art and the skill of the ancient plastes.*

During the latter part of this period metal statues of the gods were produced, such as the Zeus of Learchus, some works of the Samian school, and the colossal Zeus of beaten gold which was consecrated at Olympia by Cypselus or Periander.

These, however, were the mere beginnings of an art, in which the Greeks afterwards became unrivalled.

"Throughout this entire period Plastic Art appears to have been occupied chiefly in ornamenting vessels and in manufacturing idols for the services of religion, wherein it was not the object to represent externally the notion of the deity which floated before the mind of the artist, but only to reproduce an accustomed figure. The Plastic Art, therefore, long remained subordinate to a mechanical activity directed to the attainment of external objects, and the genuine spirit of sculpture existed only in the germ. That feeling for what is significant and beautiful in the human form, and which was so deeply rooted in the Greek mind, found its gratification in the food afforded to it by the orchestic arts. Design, therefore, long continued rude and ill-proportioned." †

The second period of art in Greece is included between the fiftieth and eightieth Olympiad, during which Plastic Art advanc-

* *Plastes* is here used in its primitive sense.

† Müller's Ancient Art.

Digitized by Google

ed with great energy. Instead of being confined to guilds or families, it became an object of enthusiastic pursuit to individuals, who, impelled by their love of art, devoted themselves to its culture. Sculpture in marble arrived at a high degree of perfection under Dipœnus and Scyllis of Crete, whose scholars went into the Peloponnesus and other parts of Hellas. At Argos and in Ægina, an island intimately connected with Samos, casting in brass was employed in statues of gods, heroes and athletes. Sicyon was likewise distinguished for its artists; and Athens, about the end of this period, commenced its career of unrivaled eminence in Plastic Art.

The freër cultivation of art, which marks this period, did not emanate from religious statues, the ancient form of which was maintained by the superstitious piety of the times. Colonies were careful to retain the form of the images of the metropolis; and when a new image was needed, an exact imitation of the old one was generally reproduced. Even the material of religious images gave way by slow degrees to the progress of art. This is seen in the prevalence of acroliths during this period — that is, of images with clothed or gilded bodies, and with heads, arms, and feet of stone or marble.

The changes which arose in the progressive development of Hellenic art, during the time under consideration, consisted chiefly in improved expression, in greater exhibition of strength, energy and activity, and in a display of elegance. The specimens of art, in which these qualities contrast with its original poverty and rudeness, are said to be executed in the old Greek style. Differences of style are to be expected in a formative period, especially in one of such activity as that which we are describing; but they may be accounted for by the difference in character of the Doric and Ionic races, and the want of a central point of development.

The third period, extending from the eightieth to the one hundred and eleventh Olympiad, or from the time of Phidias to that of Alexander the Great, is the era of the highest bloom of Grecian art. Before the commencement of this period Greece had been awakened, by means of her wars with Persia, to a consciousness of national power. Athens had become the leading state; and the great riches which flowed into her, by means of

Digitized by Google

the *phoros* assessed by the Confederacy of Delos — a tax originally intended to defray the expenses of the war against Persia — were principally spent in adorning the city with the most magnificent objects of art. It was thus that the city "on the Ægæan shore" became the central point of Grecian civilization, "the eye of Greece, mother of arts and eloquence."

This period was introduced by Calamis and Pythagoras of Rhegium, two celebrated artists, who "executed admirable works of various kinds — sublime statues of the gods, delicate and graceful women, and spirited chargers." The former of these was not entirely free from the archaic style; but the latter attained to great eminence in the representation of the muscles and veins, in the knowledge of proportions, and in lifelike expression.

But it was Phidias, the Athenian, who was the glory of this time. Under him Plastic Art attained to the highest order of ideal sublimity and beauty. His works were entirely free from the stiffness which had marked the archaic school, as well as from the meretricious grace that was introduced by some of his successors. They exhibited dignity and repose, fit qualities of the works of him who established a canon in sculpture for the statues of the gods.

Contemporary with Phidias were Polycletus the elder and Myron. The works of Polycletus were not of so ideal and elevated a character as those of Phidias, yet he attained to such eminence in executing statues of men, that on a certain occasion he was adjudged to have carried away the palm from his more celebrated contemporary. Phidias was the statuary of the gods; Polycletus that of men. The works of Myron were marked by great variety and versatility. His peculiar talent consisted in representing the most difficult and transient postures of the body; and he appears to have been the first eminent artist who devoted attention to the figures of animals, one of which, the statue of a cow represented as lowing, was especially celebrated.

We must not forget to mention, in this connection, Praxiteles, the master of the younger, as Phidias was of the elder, Attic school. He was also a sculptor of deities, wrought chiefly in marble, and chose his subjects from the cycles of Dionysus,

Digitized by Google

Aphrodite and Eros. His works exhibited much refined grace and sweetness; but they did not display the godlike majesty, which the earlier sculptors sought to express in the forms of the same cycle from which he chose his subjects.

A detailed account of the labors of these artists, in rescuing art from its antique stiffness, and in giving impulse and direction to it throughout Greece, would carry us beyond the limits of the plan that we purpose to follow in this brief historical outline of Hellenic Plastic Art. Other periods demand a short notice. The next in order is the fourth, which extends from the one hundred and eleventh to the one hundred and fifty-eighth Olympiad; that is, from the time of Alexander the Great to the subjugation of Greece by the Romans.

To this period probably belong the Laocoon and the Farnesian Bull, both works of what has been styled the Rhodian school. This school was an immediate offshoot of that of Lypsippus of Sicyon; and its chief founder was Chares, who executed the largest of the hundred colossi of the sun at Rhodes. In the productions of this school, if the two works mentioned above may be taken as representatives, may be seen a theatrical air and straining for effect, which Phidias and the masters of the preceding period would have rejected. Though the perfect models that were always present to the eyes of the Greeks could not fail to educate their taste, yet, after the age of Alexander, Grecian art commenced a period of decay. The successors of the great conqueror, who divided among themselves his extensive empire, affected a pomp and oriental magnificence which led to a meretricious style. There was a striving after dazzling effect. This was especially true of the Rhodian artists, who were perhaps more allied, in taste, to the Asiatic than to the Athenian school, in which, near the end of this period, a restoration of art was effected by the study of the earlier works. This restoration coïncided with the ascendency of Greek taste at Rome.

The next period of Grecian art begins where the preceding terminates, and ends at the commencement of the Middle Ages. Greece is now a Roman province, and her treasures of art are conveyed by degrees to Rome, where a new school arises, exhibiting in its general character its Grecian origin; but, at the same time, evincing the coarser taste of the Romans.

Digitized by Google

Grecian art was cultivated in Italy before this period, especially in the Southern part and among the Etruscans, whose vases display their love of plastic ornaments. But our limits forbid us to enter into any detail respecting this field of art, as also respecting the period just mentioned. It has been our aim to give a mere historical outline of Grecian Plastic Art, without a minute statement of facts and comprehensive generalizations. Such a statement of facts would fill volumes; and such generalizations we do not claim the power to make. The bare outline that has been given, we are quite conscious, must prove very uninteresting. It resembles a skeleton, which merely shows the articulations of the bones, a matter interesting enough to the anatomist, but not to the lover whose eye is charmed by the beauty and glow of a well-proportioned body animated by a living spirit within.

In the outline no reference, except incidentally, has been made to the different schools of Grecian Art, whose characteristics merit the attention of the artist. This omission is intentional, as the writer wishes to give an account of the abundance of Plastic Art in Hellas. And here we would state that Hellas does not designate any strictly defined geographical limits, but the land of the Hellenes. It comprehended the Grecian portions of Asia Minor and Italy, the islands of the Ægæan and Ionian seas; in a word, every organized Grecian community. Cyrene in Africa, Syracuse in Sicily, Tarentum in Italy, were as much parts of Hellas as Athens, Sparta and Corinth.

In the country of the Hellenes thus described, existed objects of art almost innumerable. Temples of the most graceful proportions and of the most tasteful ornaments rose in every direction. Statues met the eye on the streets, in places of public resort, and in every sacred enclosure. It is of the number of the latter that we design to speak: the former belong, with the exception of their adornments, to Architecture.

As Athens was the glory of Greece in everything that pertained to art, it is fitting to make her, in our brief survey, the point of departure. In this city the objects of Plastic Art were so numerous that it would require a large volume to give a complete delineation of them. "The historian Hegesias, having begun

Digitized by Google

to enumerate them, breaks off with the exclamation: 'All cannot be mentioned, for Athens is built by the gods and by ancestral heroes.' It is enough, here, to allude to the efforts of Cimon, who ornamented the public squares of the city from his private fortune, and the name of Pericles, which comprehends a long and famous history of brilliant achievements for art. As, in the earliest times, all the streets were filled with Hermæ, so after the Persian victories, markets and halls, temples and gymnasia, were adorned with innumerable statues from the hands of the greatest masters. But especially had the works of art become so crowded upon the Acropolis, that this height seemed to the astonished traveler like one holy offering, one great work of art. To this citadel, an earthly Olympus as it were, a gigantic flight of steps conducted him through the Propylæa, which opened, in five-fold gates, to a world of forms of gods and men, in the temples and halls. Here Phidias had erected the brazen statue of Minerva, whose helmet's plume flashed to meet the sailor approaching from the Sunian promontory; and that other brazen Pallas, which bore the name of "the beautiful," or the Lemnian; and a third, the "immortal maid," the protecting goddess of the Parthenon, that enormous Colossus of ivory and gold, forty feet in height. On her right hand perched the goddess of victory, itself an image of superhuman size, presenting to the goddess of war the symbolical fillet. After these works, it is useless to speak of others. It may be sufficient to state that, after the city had been so often plundered, Pausanias mentions by name towards three hundred remarkable statues still within the circuit of Athens; the rest, however, without fixing their number, he indicates only in the mass." *

The passage just cited refers to detached statues; but besides these, the metopes and friezes of the temples were filled with sculptures in *alto relievo*. Of these temples, the Erechtheum, Nike Apteros, and the Parthenon, stood on the Acropolis; in other parts of the city were the temples of Theseus and Jupiter Olympius; of Delphian Apollo, Boreas, and Diana Agrotera; the Odeon, and the monument of Lysicrates, sometimes called the Lantern of Demosthenes. These were all adorned, in the manner indicated

* Classical Studies, p. 75.

Digitized by Google

above, with figures, illustrating the mythology and religion of Greece. The most celebrated among them — indeed, the most perfect production of Grecian architecture — was the Parthenon, the temple of Athena Parthenos, a description of whose ornaments will convey some idea of the abundance of sculpture with which the temples were usually enriched. The tympana of the pediments were filled with about twenty-four colossal figures, one group of which, on the eastern end, represented the birth of Athena from the head of Zeus; and the other, on the western, the contest between Athena and Poseidon for the land of Attica. The metopes between the triglyphs in the frieze of the entablature were filled with sculptures in *alto relievo*, representing a variety of subjects relating to the protecting goddess, or to the indigenous heroes of the country. The frieze running along outside the wall of the cella was sculptured with a representation of the Panathenaic festival in *basso relievo*. This frieze was three feet four inches in height and five hundred and twenty feet in length, affording surface enough for many hundred figures. All this affluence of sculpture belonged to one temple: what, then, must have been the abundance within the limits of Athens, where temples were so numerous?

But works of art were not confined to the city; the whole country of Attica was filled with the exhibitions of artistic genius. Of these, however, we cannot make particular mention.

As we proceed north from this favored territory, we come to Bœotia, where we find Thebes, Thespiæ, and Mount Helicon, on whose summit were the grove of the Muses and the fountains of Hippocrene and Aganippe. These were adorned with images of the sacred Nine and with statues of gods and poets. At Thespiæ, Phryne the hetærist, a native of the place, caused the statue of Cupid, which she had received as a present from Praxiteles, to be set up. This master-piece of art added greatly to the prosperity of her native city, by means of the crowd of strangers who came to visit it.

West of Bœotia, at the foot of the southern side of Parnassus, stood Delphi, the centre of the Dorian religion, and the seat of the oracle of Apollo. The treasuries and the enclosure of the temple of this sacred city were filled with the offerings of wealthy

Digitized by Google

foreign princes and pious Hellenic cities. The statues of victors, some raised on four-horse chariots of shining bronze, were visible from afar. To the Celtic hosts of Brennus, whose cupidity they tempted, they seemed to be massive gold. Other plunderers were attracted by these wealthy treasures; and more than once they suffered from the flames; yet, after all these disasters, Nero carried off five hundred brazen statues, while he left behind, with many of less importance, some hundreds which Pausanias considered worthy of special mention.

Bordering on Phocis in part, on the west, lay the rude Ætolia, which was never much celebrated for the arts; yet when Philip the Third, of Macedon, gave up Thermus, the seat of the Ætolian Confederacy, to pillage, he defaced more than two thousand statues. Ambracia, too, in Epirus, according to the testimony of Livy, abounded with the rarest works of art, with statues of marble and bronze, and with numerous pictures, which adorned the triumph of Fulvius Nobilior.

At the western termination of the isthmus that connects Greece Proper with the Peloponnesus was wealthy Corinth, where luxury and art seemed to vie with each other. When this city was destroyed by Mummius, the Roman General, the number of statues that fell into his hands is almost incredible. Though many of them were doubtless destroyed by the flames that raged for several days, during the sack of the city, and by the rude Roman warriors who were incapable of appreciating works of art, yet many were dispersed by the Roman generals themselves among the cities of Greece; others became the property of the King of Pergamus; others were devoted as first offerings to the Olympian Jupiter and the Delphian Apollo; and with the remainder both Rome and Italy were filled. When Corinth rose again from its ruins art was cultivated as vigorously as ever; and after the lapse of a century, it could boast of the possession of a multitude of works by the greatest masters.

A short distance north-west of Corinth was Sicyon, of whose temples, statues, and pictures Pausanias has left a catalogue. In this city were bronze statues of Hercules and Jupiter, the works of the illustrious Lysippus, a native of the place; a figure of Pan in ivory and gold, the production of Calamis; a marble statue

Digitized by Google

of Hercules from the chisel of Scopas; and numberless compositions by Crato, Telephanes, Cleœtas, and Canachus, and by other artists of Sicyon, who rendered it the most famous among the ancient schools of painting and sculpture from the earliest period of Grecian art to the days of Alexander the Great.

We might mention other parts of the Peloponnesus — Argos, Epidaurus, Megalopolis, Tegea, and Phigaleia — which were rich in works of art; but we pass them by and wend to the banks of the Alpheus, in the territory of Elis. Here thick forests and groves were filled with Hermæ and statues. In the Altis, or sacred grove, stood the temple of Olympian Jove, a Doric edifice, hypæthral and peripteral, ninety-five feet in breadth, two hundred and thirty in length, and sixty-eight to the summit of the pediment in height. On its front pediment was the goddess of victory. The fore-court was filled with thrones and statues, brazen cars and tripods; in its interior was the colossal statue of Jupiter from the hand of Phidias, which surpassed every other work. Perched on the right hand of the god, the goddess of victory held out to him the olive crown; at his side, on the arm of the throne, were dancing the Hours and the Graces, as well as the goddesses of victory at his feet. His golden robe was broidered with flowers and with figures of animals, and all the spaces of the throne were filled with work in relief. Besides the colossus of Jupiter, Pausanias saw eighteen statues which were left by Nero, who had carried off a much greater number. A temple of Juno contained twenty statues of the gods, chiefly of ivory and gold, the works of eminent artists. In the Altis at the foot of the Cronian hill, stood an almost incredible number of statues of Jupiter, some of which were of colossal size; a group of Jupiter, Thetis and Day; another group, of ten champions; and a third, of the Son of Saturn, with Nemea, and five other heroines. In the same enclosure of the Altis could be seen a group of thirty-five boys; another, of nine heroes, a colossus of Hercules; several, of the labors of this hero; statues of Amphitrite, of Poseidon, of Hestia, of Persephone, of Aphrodite, of Ganymede, of Artemis, of Æsculapius and Hygeia, of Homer and Hesiod, of Bacchus and Orpheus, and of many others. Of combatants, Pausanias enumerates, in the same enclosure, about two hundred

Digitized by Google

and thirty statues, at the same time reminding us that he makes mention only of the most remarkable. There must, therefore, have been others of less importance.

Passing over the Ægæan sea until we come to Samos, near the coast of Asia Minor, we enter another treasury of art. In this fertile island — the birth-place of Pythagoras — was an ancient temple of Juno, a work of Rhœcus, which was filled with statues, of which three from Myron's hand were of colossal size. What the island itself contained we have no means of knowing; but during the time of Polycrates art flourished under his fostering care.

In the direction of south-east from Samos lay Rhodes, upon which, according to Homer, the Son of Saturn had poured down the fullness of abundance. Its magnificent harbors announced to every one approaching this island, a seat of great wealth and power. Its eminence in this respect was attained by commercial activity and the wise use of favoring circumstances. But its commercial renown was inferior to that acquired by the cultivation of art. So abundant were the treasures of art that the assertion was made by a Greek that Rhodes contained as many statues as all the rest of Greece. This, however, was an exaggeration. But Pliny, whose testimony no one would suspect, mentions three thousand statues. Among these, according to the same authority, besides the colossal statue of the Sun — the most celebrated of all colossal statues — were a hundred others, each sufficient to confer undying renown on its author and the place where it might stand.

To the places already mentioned, so justly celebrated for their art-treasures, we may add Cos, which contained the renowned temple of Æsculapius; the temple of the Branchidæ near Miletus; Cyzicus, said to have been filled with temples and statues of the gods; Ephesus and Aspendus; the sacred grove of Apollo at Antioch; Alexandria, the burial place of the great and accomplished conqueror, whose name it bore; the Grecian cities in Sicily and Italy, some of which rivaled those of the mother country, not only in commerce and riches, but also in their successful cultivation of Plastic Art. It is needless to mention Syracuse, Selinus, Agrigentum, Cumæ, Tarentum, Posidonia, and many other places,

Digitized by Google

known to every scholar as depositories of numerous statues and temple sculptures. A brief reference to all these objects of art would far exceed the limits of a single article. We can judge of their number from those that have been so partially enumerated; for every Grecian city had its statues and temples. Enough, we trust, has been said to show the wealth of the Greeks in works of Plastic Art.

The suspicion might insinuate itself into some minds that, considering the almost incredible abundance of Grecian art, much of it must have been of an inferior quality. Such a suspicion is altogether unsupported by history and by surviving monuments. Both these attest the superiority of the Greeks, in Architecture and Sculpture, to all other nations, ancient or modern. Painting was cultivated by the Greeks, neither at so early a period, nor to the same extent with the two arts just mentioned. For this obvious reasons existed. One, is the difficulties of the art itself; and another is that painting, in early times, was not connected with the worship of the gods. Architecture and Sculpture were indebted from the first for their development to religion; and under its auspices they attained a perfection in Greece, which has been the admiration of all civilized nations.

"Art, properly speaking," observes no mean judge, "is but the mirror of nature. Whenever it steps beyond what we see and know of the natural world, it seeks the superhuman, and, therefore, strictly speaking, the impossible. Still there are conceptions with which the artist may clothe his work that savor so directly of spiritual life, finding their being in his imagination, as to elevate our feeling above the ordinary range of creation, and bring us nigher to the throne of God. Yet even in these cases it will be found that all forms are borrowed of earth, and made typically or supernaturally beautiful, only through the ennobling power of imagination, seeking its ideal forms in realms of perpetual bliss. The ideal of earnest poetry consists in the union and harmonious melting down and fusion of the sensual into the spiritual — of man as an animal into man as a power of reason and self-government. And this we have represented to us most clearly in the plastic art, or statuary of the Greek; where the perfection of outward form is a symbol of the perfection of an inward idea; where the body is wholly penetrated by the soul, and spiritualized even to a state of

Digitized by Google

glory; and, like a transparent substance, the matter, in its own nature darkness, becomes altogether a vehicle and fixture of light, a means of developing its beauties, and unfolding its wealth of various colors, without disturbing its unity, or causing a division of the parts.

"The Greeks understood this spiritual portraying of their subjects, perhaps better than their mechanical execution. In their art there is a marked central point, to which the common interest and less individualities tend; a nice distribution of attributes, subtle discrimination of character, and all those higher artistic truths, which complete the unity and fix the attention upon the story."

But instead of dealing in vague generalities we must descend to particulars. And here we would remark, that as art is the natural language of the higher faculties of the mind, and is comprehended by every cultivated intellect, it must conform to certain laws having their foundation in the constitution of the mind itself. Whatever calls into exercise the powers of the mind delights us; and whatever is agreeable to all minds possessed of liberal culture must be the standard of the rules of art. That which is agreeable to a perfect mind is the standard of the laws of art.

The first and most essential of these laws is *oneness*, or *unity*. In all works of art there should be nothing superfluous, nothing to break the unity or confuse the identity; there should be one focus of attraction, or rather one radiating point, whence the interest should flow. We observe this in all works of the highest genius; and every cultivated mind admits it, at once, as a rule of art. Horace, whose eyes rested daily upon the captive relics of Grecian art, laid down as a maxim, from his observation of those relics:

"Denique sit quidvis, simplex duntaxat et unum."

Another rule of art is *truthfulness*, or *consistency*. A child should never be represented as reasoning like a sage; nor should a Juno, or a Venus, be represented as a Hercules, or an Apollo.

This truthfulness is twofold — *ideal* and *historical*. By the former we mean there should be no inconsistency of circumstances, nothing impossible in the nature of things as represented. If the painter lays his scenes in fairy-land, there must be nothing incon-

Digitized by Google

sistent with our conceptions of the character and habits of fairies. By the latter is meant, that historical pieces of art should conform, in the great outlines of their character, to the historical characters of the originals.

Another very important rule of art is *symmetry*, or *proportion*. Every part should have its due relationship to all the others, and to the whole, and should be made prominent and conspicuous in proportion to its importance. In this particular Grecian art excels all other. Symmetry was a striking characteristic of every thing about the Greek. It was seen in his education, a fundamental principle of which was to educate the body as well as the mind, which was done by gymnastics. The successful result of this physical education was called *euexia*, good habit. The education of the mind was called *mousike*, music, indicating that harmony was the grand result at which intellectual education aimed.

The nature of the climate contributed to that nice appreciation of symmetry of form, which so strikingly characterized the Greeks. Their climate was so serene and beautiful that they spent much more time in the open air than more northern nations are able to do. Hence their eyes were more accustomed to dwell upon the external forms of nature in all their rich variety. But the northern nations, more confined to their houses on account of their severer climate, far surpassed them in the depth of their domestic feelings, and in grand, grotesque and wild imaginings.

The principles of art which have been enumerated, were most strictly observed by the Greeks. There are other principles, in the application of which modern artists have surpassed them; but notwithstanding this partial superiority on the part of the moderns, the Greeks will ever retain the supreme excellence in all the higher principles of art, especially as applied to Architecture and Sculpture. C. E.

Digitized by Google

Art. VII. — *The Late General Assembly. — Church and State.*

In referring to the late General Assembly, at Philadelphia, we have in view only its action on the resolutions originally introduced by Dr. Spring; and as they are now so well known to our readers, it may not be necessary to spread them at large on these pages.

The General Assembly of 1861 will be a noted one in the history of the Presbyterian Church in America. No one ever sat — excepting perhaps the famous Assembly of '37 — whose action has affected so widely and so profoundly the general posture and power of the Church, as will the action of that of 1861. Time has proved, beyond the possibility of a doubt, the far-sighted wisdom of the venerable men now rapidly passing away to their rest, who abrogated the Plan of Union and adopted the exscinding resolutions; and who afterwards inaugurated a scheme of Church action in perfect accordance with the principles upon which their previous proceedings had been based, and under which the Church has attained so high a degree of efficiency and prosperity. That whole course of procedure was a necessary, righteous, and masterly policy, conservative of purity of doctrine, of presbyterial order in both principle and practice, and of the peace and unity and power of the Church. Calm and thoughtful men, of the three great parties concerned in the discussions and conflicts of the decade that covers the years '37 and '38, have become convinced that the division of the Presbyterian Church at that time, and upon the grounds assigned, and the course subsequently pursued by the Old School, have been promotive in the end of vast good, almost unmingled good, to the cause of truth and its propagation throughout this land and the world. The great practical question clearly evolved and settled and acted upon, was that the Church *as such* must do her own work — the work her risen Lord appointed, and for which he *organized* her; so that it is the sheerest folly, nay, an impeachment of His wisdom, to suppose she is not abundantly furnished with all the organs and appliances needed to fulfill her beneficent mission. Rescued from entangling alliances with extraneous organizations, or subservi-

Digitized by Google

ency to them, the Church set forward on a new career of high success. She was brought back to the primitive starting point in her practical life. Her subsequent progress has shown how the divine plan exceeds all plans originating in fleshly wisdom, however well intended. Under these plans of carnal wisdom, too, it must be remembered, heresy and the subversion of the Church's polity were introduced.

Great ideas clearly apprehended and reduced to practice soon work out astonishing results: but it is no less true that a line of policy once accepted and long persisted in without question, after a while may modify or even totally change our notions of the very nature of institutions themselves. This has been abundantly manifested again and again. The Presbyterian Church emerged from the exciting controversies alluded to above, thoroughly possessed of the grand idea that as organized — being modeled after the divine pattern — she was completely equipped for the Master's work. She realized that idea. She sloughed off associations and connections, and modes of thinking and doing, heterogeneous to her real nature and spirit, and took into her own hands the responsibilities divinely imposed on her. It was life from the dead. She awoke to her normal state; and ever since, quietly and healthfully, have her energies been developing on a vast and constantly increasing scale. Her scriptural doctrine and polity have been preserved in their beautiful symmetry; their benignant efficacy has been widely illustrated; and whatever friendly discussions may have obtained among her sons, have been occasioned by an earnest desire to attain the perfect realization of the idea, that she was complete in herself to accomplish the will of her Lord. An experience of almost a quarter of a century attests the truth of what has just been asserted.

All history shows the slowness of large communities in grasping and bringing into practical efficiency, those fundamental principles of things that finally shape and control their destiny. After these principles have been elaborated and wrought into form by the leading minds of an age, a considerable time elapses before they are understood and accepted by the mass of society; and a still longer time before they so pervade and influence the common thought of the organic whole, as to determine the di-

Digitized by Google

rection and end of its progress. For it is perfectly clear that all progress in society, whether good or bad, is determined by the nature of the principles that underlie its structure and constitute the main current of its life. They may be very obscure — may entirely escape the notice of the men whose destiny is involved in their working; but philosophic history detects them, or some superior mind evolves them out of a chaos of struggling opinions, and lifts them up as beacon-lights in the pathway of nations or of churches. But when they have once been distinctly apprehended, and apprehended as true and vital, they are never surrendered; or, if surrendered, along with them goes the life of the community. Now, we repeat, what the Presbyterian Church gained as the result of the strifes and division of 1837, was the recognition and practical possession of the fundamental principle of the Church's sufficiency; that the kingdom of Christ, as a spiritual organization unto spiritual ends, has in its own officers and assemblies all the human instrumentalities requisite for its work, and needs not and must not go outside of them in the discharge of its appointed duties. She has learned, too, that in holding fast to this principle, she holds fast her doctrine, her polity, and her life. She will not let it go. In the process she lost — if loss it may be called — from a third to a half of her apparent strength; but the gain was immense. She struck off the bonds that fettered her, and, like a giant released and refreshed, she started on her race anew. Her history since that period speaks for itself. Let others learn her lesson — go and do likewise. Henceforth in her spiritual work she allows no interference; she accepts no aids invented of man. The sufficiency of the Church has been realized.

The exact relation of the Church to societies purely philanthropic, professing no divine warrant and looking directly to no spiritual end — how far she may recognize them, if at all, and commend them to the support of the people of God — these and other like questions are still *sub judice;* the Church cannot be said to have reached as yet a settled conviction. Ample proof of this is found in the proceedings of the Assembly in 1859, touching the Colonization Society. It is, however, the duty of the Church to bear testimony against all false doctrine and sin, wherever

Digitized by Google

professed or committed; and consequently to discipline her members, when they violate the law of God through complicity with any such society, as well as otherwise.

But there is a great society as truly divine in its origin as the Church. This is the State. What relation does the Church bear to it, and to its institutions and ordinances? It has been the established doctrine since the time of the American Revolution, in this country at least, that Church and State ought to be entirely separate, and such has been the fact. They move in different spheres. Each is supreme in its own department except as restrained and directed by the law of God, but must keep within its own limits — the church having no authority in matters purely secular or civil, and the state none in matters purely spiritual. The state is bound to protect all its subjects or citizens in all their rights and privileges, religious as well as civil, without respect of persons; and so far at least to give aid and comfort to the church: it may lay no obstacle in the way of the progress of Christ's kingdom. The church is equally bound to recognize the state as an ordinance of God; to render to it a true allegiance and obedience; and to inculcate the same upon all as religious duties. Both are bound by the law of God. The one enforces its commands upon all within its pale, by civil pains and penalties; the other, by spiritual. The state knows men only as subjects of its lawful authority, whose civil and social interests it is its duty to defend and promote; and protects itself in the exercise of its just authority unto that end. In doing this, it must not, indeed, ignore the fact that man is a spiritual and immortal being. The highest statesmanship directs the whole civil polity of a community with this loftiest conception of man underlying its every movement: still it has to do directly only with the earthly and temporal. The church regards man primarily as spiritual and immortal. It has to do with his soul; with his relations to God, which are inclusive of all others; with his spiritual and eternal well-being. It does indeed advance the social and temporal welfare of man, and that in the very highest degree; for "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of *the life that now is*, and of that which is to come:" but this, though a necessary consequence, is altogether incidental and collateral.

Digitized by Google

The church is a spiritual institute. These things being so, we do not see any reason why a conflict should arise between church and state in a free country, where they are totally separate, and each keeps within its own sphere. It is quite possible, indeed, that civil and religious rights and duties may be involved in the same question; but as long as membership in the church, or the lack of it, does not affect a man's civil *status*, collision may be avoided. The state may legalize the slave-trade; may uphold a system of slavery which lodges in the hands of the master powers incompatible with any and every principle of justice, and deprives the slave of his highest privileges, and obstructs him in the discharge of his most solemn duties as a rational and responsible being; it may tolerate, nay authorize, the systematic violation of the Sabbath day, or any other species of iniquity; nay more, it may command what is directly in the face of divine law. Well, what of it? and what then? Why, the state has proved recreant to its trust, and is in rebellion against God. Let its citizens then, *as citizens*, reform their government — by peaceable means if possible; but if that cannot be, let them have recourse to the ulterior right of revolution — subvert it, and establish a better one in its stead. In such a revolution the members of the church, as other citizens, may lawfully take a part. But the church has no part to play in inaugurating or urging on civil revolutions. Her mission is not to overthrow governments and empires, save the empire of sin in the human heart. If in doing this she aids the progress of society, extirpates injurious customs, ameliorates human institutions, and in a thousand ways imperceptibly but most effectively promotes the temporal welfare of man, she does a good work; she becomes an invaluable coadjutor to the state.

But when the state connives at, authorizes, or commands sin, it rebels against God; and God himself testifies against it in his word. Now, the church must speak. Duty to God, to her members, to the state itself, requires her to speak. She is God's witness-bearer on earth: when iniquity comes in like a flood, she must lift up the standard of the Lord against it. She must instruct her members, giving them timely warning lest they become partakers of other men's sins. She must proclaim, and execute, within her own pale, the revealed will of God — come what may.

Digitized by Google

The flock of Christ must be protected; the honor of the church and of the divine law must be vindicated; the eternal principles of truth and righteousness must be made known to the world. If slavery, protected though it be by the state, be a *malum per se*, the church must say so, and act accordingly: the slave-holder must be excluded from her fellowship while he continues in the practice of his sin. But if the institution of slavery be recognized and tolerated in the Scriptures; if the relation of master and slave be not in itself a sinful relation, which is the established doctrine of our Church, then the church's responsibility in the matter ends when she requires both parties, members of her communion, to perform their respective duties; and this exercise of her authority will be beneficial to the state. As long as excommunication works no civil disability, all just ground of antagonism between church and state is removed. If, however, the state attempt to coerce the church, to interfere with her prerogatives and duties, then all the church has to do is to suffer patiently as in ages past. She must make no direct attack on the state; but her suffering will end in triumph. Her glorious destiny always is to win the crown through suffering. Her just and holy principles will eventually find a lodgment in the hearts of men, and reform or revolutionize the state. The weapons of her warfare are not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God to pull down strong-holds. While the church therefore keeps within the line of her calling, a collision can arise only from an unscriptural and tyrannical use of power on the part of the state. And while the church in her organized capacity as the kingdom of Christ, cannot take up carnal weapons, her sons are at liberty to join their fellow-citizens in revolutionizing the state when its tyranny becomes intolerable — running the same hazard of defeat or success, of penalty or reward, at the hand of the state, as other citizens. Now, granting the general duty of submission to the powers that be, and at the same time granting the right of revolution as a moral right when justified by outrageous oppression, what is the authority and duty of the church touching those members of her communion who engage in a revolution? We answer, she must admonish, suspend, excommunicate, or let alone, just as the circumstances of the case may demand, of which she is

Digitized by Google

sole judge under the divine law, and upon which she *must* pass judgment. The morality or immorality of the conduct in the case supposed depends upon the justifiableness or otherwise of the political revolution. If this be deciding a political question, then we say the church not only may but *must*, so far at least, decide a political question. In this case, indeed, as sometimes in others involving no political issues, peculiar prudence and wisdom are required to reach a righteous judgment. The tribunal itself is fallible. The case may be one admitting of a reasonable doubt, of which the accused should have the benefit. Great allowances are to be made for the weaknesses and vagaries of the human mind concerning political matters, especially in a free commonwealth where the people are trained to high ideas of freedom of political action; yet, on the other hand, in such a commonwealth, it is manifest that nothing but a most astounding condition of affairs could justify the dreadful resort to arms to overthrow the government, or to rectify the evils of a bad administration. Where the discussion of all questions is as free as the winds of heaven, and the ballot-box open to all, the presumption is extremely violent that that is a bad cause that cannot be carried by an appeal to the reason of men — of men familiar from childhood with the nature and working of their government, and the constitution of which they have been taught to revere as the palladium of their liberty. Still, revolution is not in itself sinful, as murder or adultery; and the revolutionist may plead conscience, and may really have not only a *good* conscience, but an enlightened one as well. Let it be carefully observed, however, that all we have said relates to a concrete case — a case made and brought before an ecclesiastical tribunal, the decision of which affects nobody but the accused, and him only in his relations to the church, and that after the commission of the act alleged against him as a crime. This is a very different thing from the church's undertaking to decide a political question *in thesi;* to determine *ex mero motu* that the "higher powers," by reason of faithlessness and oppression, or any other cause, have forfeited their claim to allegiance, and should be resisted and overthrown. Then would the church be brought into direct antagonism with the state. She would become a fomenter of rebellion, by assum-

Digitized by Google

ing an authority equal to that claimed by the apostate Church of Rome. She would arraign the state at her bar, and pronounce sentence of condemnation. She would be interfering directly in civil affairs in their most momentous aspect. Man would be regarded and dealt with as a citizen, as a subject of a kingdom of this world, not as a member of the mystical body of Christ. The earthly and temporal, not the spiritual and eternal, would be the immediate object of cognizance. The church may command obedience to the "powers that be," and enforce the command by spiritual penalties when moral guilt is contracted by disobedience. For this she has a divine warrant; but she may not go without the sphere prescribed in the charter of her prerogatives. That sphere is well defined in our Confession of Faith, Chap. 31, § 4:

"Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate."

The church and the state are coördinate jurisdictions under the same divine charter — analagous to the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of government, under the Constitution of the United States. Let each keep within its own province, and thus harmonize in promoting the temporal and spiritual good of mankind.

There is yet another way whereby this same political question touching civil allegiance, may come before an ecclesiastical court, and may have to be determined, at least, by implication — not for its own sake, indeed, but in order to determine the moral question under which it lies. The moral question depends upon the political one. It is likewise a case made, though not a judicial one. "It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially, to determine controversies of faith, and *cases of conscience*." Conf. of Faith, Chap. 31, § 2. Now, suppose a member of the Church living in South Carolina or Mississippi, had sent up an overture to the late Assembly, asking instruction on the following point: Is it my religious duty to uphold and render obedience to the authorities at Montgomery, or to those at Washington? Would

Digitized by Google

the General Assembly have been incompetent to act in the case? True, it might have been prudent in that venerable body to have refused to decide the question. It might have felt obliged to answer *non liquet*, and to say to the man, you must settle this matter for yourself. But surely it is a case of conscience; and if so, who can doubt the competency of the General Assembly? Again: "To the General Assembly also belongs the power.... of reproving, warning, or bearing testimony against error in doctrine, or immorality in practice, in any church, presbytery, or synod." Form of Government, Chap. 12, § 5. Under this clause of the Constitution, it may become the duty of the General Assembly to send down a pastoral letter to the people under its care: and at no time would this duty be likely to be more incumbent than in the midst of a great civil commotion, when the bonds of society are relaxed and immorality comes in like a flood; when the members of the Church are liable to turn aside with the multitude to do evil; when general doubt may well prevail touching the obligations of Christian men, and a word of counsel and instruction may be earnestly desired from those who are over them in the Lord, "to be used as a help" in practical life. See Conf. of Faith, Chap. 31, § 3. In discharging this duty aright, it may be indispensable to express the Assembly's opinion of the merits of a rebellion. This may be done wisely or unwisely; in the spirit of political partisanship, or with the sobriety and solemnity becoming the highest judicatory of Christ's Church. The Assembly may even determine that it is best to express no opinion on the merits of the question, and remit that matter to each man's conscience: this determination itself, however, implies the competency of the court to express an opinion, if it be considered advisable. The expression of opinion is a question of expediency, not of power.

We cannot accept, therefore, the broad, unqualified statement, that the General Assembly has no right to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterian citizens is due; and as to Presbyterians being all on one side, or divided in sentiment, we do not see what that has to do with the competency of the General Assembly. Right or wrong, as a matter of history, the supreme judicatory of the Presbyterian Church

Digitized by Google

has decided this question; but decided it in the regular course of ecclesiastical procedure, when forced to meet it — not *in thesi*. In 1775, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, providing for a day of "solemn fasting, humiliation, and prayer," appointed the last Thursday of June, with this proviso:

"But as the Continental Congress are now sitting, who may probably appoint a fast for the same purpose, the Synod, from respect to that august body, and for the greater harmony with all other denominations, and for the greater public order, if the Congress shall appoint a day not above four weeks distant from the said last Thursday of June, order that the congregations belonging to this Synod do keep the day appointed by the Congress, in obedience to this resolution; and if they appoint a day more distant, the Synod order both to be observed by all our communion." Records of the Presbyterian Church, p. 465.

Again, in 1776, the Continental Congress having appointed a fast, two days subsequent to the regular time of the meeting of Synod, the Synod approved of the conduct of the Moderator in postponing for one week the annual meeting, "in order that the ministers might attend with their congregations on said fast day." Records, p. 472. In the Directory for Worship, Chap. 14, § 4, it is said:

"And if at any time the civil power should think it proper to appoint a fast or thanksgiving, it is the duty of the ministers and people of our communion, as we live under a Christian Government, to pay all due respect to the same."

Here, then, is an implied recognition of the revolutionary Continental Congress as "the civil power." Again: In the noble Pastoral Letter issued in 1775, (well worthy of a careful perusal at this day,) in which the righteousness of an appeal to arms by the colonists is assumed throughout, the following paragraph, very significant just now, occurs:

"We have long seen with concern, the circumstances which occasioned, and the gradual increase of this unhappy difference. As ministers of the Gospel of peace, we have ardently wished that it could, and often hoped that it would, have been more early accommodated. It is well known to you, (otherwise it would be imprudent indeed thus

Digitized by Google

publicly to profess,) *that we have not been instrumental in inflaming the minds of the people, or urging them to acts of violence and disorder. Perhaps no instance can be given on so interesting a subject, in which political sentiments have been so long and so fully kept from the pulpit, and even malice itself has not charged us with laboring from the press;* but things are now come to such a state, that as we do not wish to conceal our opinions as men and citizens, so the relation we stand in to you seemed to make the present improvement of it to your spiritual benefit, and indispensable duty." Records, p. 467.

In 1777, the next meeting after the Declaration of Independence, there was no allusion to the Revolution. In 1778, the Synod recommended to all their congregations:

"To spend the last Thursday of every month, or a part of it, in fervent prayer to God, that he would be pleased to pour out his Spirit on the inhabitants of our land, and prepare us for deliverance from the chastenings he hath righteously inflicted upon us for our sins; that he would graciously smile on our arms, and those of our illustrious ally, by land and sea; and grant a speedy and happy conclusion to the present war." Records, p. 481.

In 1779, the 17th day of August was appointed as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer; and "the recommendation of former Synods to all their congregations, to spend a part of the last Thursday in every month in social prayer," was renewed. Among the reasons given, is the fact that the righteous God continued still to afflict the land "with the sore calamity of a cruel and barbarous war." Records, p. 483. In 1780, the same resolution, with a slight and very unimportant change of phraseology in two or three places, was adopted: and here ends the action of the Synod on the war, if the published minutes be authentic and complete.

We have now reviewed *all* the proceedings of the Synod relating to the war of the Revolution, unless something has escaped a pretty careful inspection of the Records. The whole may be summed up as follows: The Continental Congress is recognized as the civil power; the people of God are exhorted to offer prayer in its behalf, to adhere firmly to its resolutions, and to maintain the union of the colonies, so that the Congress may be able to

Digitized by Google

bring out the whole strength of the country to carry their resolutions into execution; the right of the colonists to secure their liberties by force of arms, is admitted; the war is characterized as cruel and barbarous; and finally, fervent prayer to God is recommended, that he would graciously smile on the arms of the revolutionists and those of their illustrious ally. In examining these venerable monuments of the past, we are struck with two facts; 1. The firm support they render to the position we have taken; 2. The remarkable prudence, judiciousness, and moderation of our fathers, in the midst of the exciting and trying scenes through which they were called to pass. They did not forget they were ministers of the gospel of peace, and when gathered together in solemn assembly, that they constituted a court of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. They exhibited an unwonted carefulness in watching over the flock of Christ, and at the same time in not intermeddling with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth. Their conduct in the latter respect has been greatly misunderstood. They were not ranting politicians, turning the pulpit into the stump; but judicious, faithful ministers of the grace of God. When we consider the state of the country in their day, their deliberation and caution seem marvellous. We have taken the liberty of italicizing some sentences in the extract from their Pastoral Letter, for the special benefit of their successors.

Considering, then, the relation of church and state, the teachings of the word of God, the powers vested in the supreme judicatory of the Church by the Constitution, and the deliverances made by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia during the Revolutionary war, the conclusion to which we come is this: It is *safe, scriptural, constitutional, and in accordance with the practice of the fathers,* for the General Assembly to decide the question of allegiance, or of obedience to the civil power — when that question comes fairly before it in the orderly discharge of its ecclesiastical duties, and the decision of it is necessary in order to discharge those duties faithfully and fully. But the necessity must be a real one; and the General Assembly, and every other Church court, will be wise to avoid, whenever possible, even the appearance of conflict with the ordinary authorities of the land.

Digitized by Google

We are now prepared to examine the resolution passed by the late General Assembly, which was debated so long and so zealously in the Assembly itself, which has been most keenly controverted since, and is now made an occasion of dividing the Church. We shall endeavor to do so dispassionately — according to our best judgment at the present; if hereafter convinced of error, we shall most readily correct the error, yielding present convictions to what may appear the better reason in the better light of the future. In the beginning of this article, an effort was made to estimate and to state what was gained by the Church, as she passed through the conflict that raged twenty-five years ago. Our hope is that the earnest discussions of this period will result in the establishment of just and well-defined principles, that will settle for all time the many and the very important questions now brought prominently before the minds of thinking men. The passionate excitement of the hour may indeed prevent due deliberation, and cautiousness of statement; extravagant opinions may be advanced, and long upheld, on this side and on that; but the calm hour will come at length. Sparks of truth divine will be elicited amid the heat of debate. Grains of gold will be found amidst the huge accumulation of *debris*, washed down while the storm raged. After a while, the pure light will shine forth; the gold will be gathered up, be refined, be minted, and pass into general circulation. This is our comforting hope as we sadly gaze on the scenes now presented to our view: — the array of hostile parties; the alienation of brethren who once walked together in unity; the severance of churches; and the attempted severance of states, whose union has been prolific of benefits. The King of Zion rules on high, head over all things to the church. The wrath of man, which worketh not the righteousness of God, shall praise him; the remainder thereof he will restrain. He directs the storm. Through mighty conflicts he lifts up his people from one platform to another still higher, enlarging from age to age the sweep of their vision. In the fullness of time, all the mists of error and of sin shall be swept away; their eyes shall behold the King in his beauty, and the land that is very far off.

The main clause of the resolution which has proved a rock of offense, is in these words:

Digitized by Google

"This General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligations to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage, the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution: and to this Constitution in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty."

This is the resolution protested against as unconstitutional. It is a flimsy evasion to say the Assembly in passing it did *not* "decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due." This it manifestly did do, and just as manifestly had a right so to do. The allegiance of Presbyterians is always due to the government under which they live. So says the word of God; so may the Assembly declare. But it may have made a grand mistake in affirming that the allegiance of all citizens, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, is now *unquestionably* due to the Federal Government. But more on this point by and by. Whatever may be true respecting matters ecclesiastical, we do deny the right of the Assembly to "handle or conclude" anything respecting matters political, *in thesi*. Even the Supreme Court of the United States, if we are not mistaken, will not take up a political question on this wise. An issue must be joined, a case made and brought before the Court in due form, before the question will be entertained. But "there are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule of political actions is to be sought, not in considerations of state policy, but in the law of God." Princeton Rev., p. 1, 1861. And when such occasions do arise; when the law of God does become the rule of action, who is the authorized expounder of the law of God? Whose duty is it to apply and to enforce that law upon those who profess obedience to it? Most assuredly this is the business of the church. When a political question enters the sphere of morals and religion, the church may be obliged to take cognizance of it in some one of the three ways already specified. In May last there was no judicial case before the Assembly involving the question of allegiance, nor a formal appeal from any

Digitized by Google

party for the solution of a case of conscience, in which that question was implicated; but there was a condition of affairs in the country, which imperatively required a deliverance on the part of the Assembly as a faithful guardian of the interests of the Church. Civil war was raging in the land; a large section of the country stood in hostile array against the Federal Government; Presbyterians were not only in arms against Presbyterians, but were among the foremost leaders in the strife; many of our most prominent ministers, on the one side and on the other, had been discussing the momentous political issues of the times, in the weekly and quarterly journals; one synod, at least, had uttered its voice; every vital interest of earth and of time, possibly of eternity too, was at stake; men's hearts were failing them for fear; no man could be indifferent; no man could stand neutral; by many the path of duty could not be seen; pious men, anxious to do right, knew not the way. What was the Assembly to do? Stand still like a dumb dog, totally indifferent to the awful realities at the door? Amid such a scene of havoc and confusion, has the Church no power to lift up a voice of warning, of counsel, of instruction? We do not so read the charter of her rights and of her duties. Has the law of God no applicability now? no authoritative voice to still the seething sea of demoniac passion? Must it bow in silence before the grim visage of the god of war? Let us be careful lest, pressed by the exigencies of a favorite argument, or our judgment hampered and biased by the peculiar nature of existing circumstances, we circumscribe the scriptural limits of the Church's powers, and thereby impair her efficiency. Though not the autocratic monster of Rome, still the Church is not a man of straw.

On the third day of the sessions of the Assembly,

"Dr. Spring offered a resolution, that a special committee be appointed to enquire into the expediency of this Assembly making some expression of their devotion to the Union of these States, and their loyalty to the Government; and if in their judgment it is expedient so to do, they report what that expression shall be. On motion of Mr. Hoyte, this resolution was laid on the table by a vote of 123 to 102." Minutes, 1861, p. 303.

It is manifest, therefore, a majority of the body were, in the

Digitized by Google

first instance, opposed to any expression of views on the national troubles. This feeling was shared by a very large part, perhaps a majority of the members and friends of the Church. It was hoped and believed by many that the Assembly would decline to notice the subject; and it was only under pressure that a deliverance was made at all. The change in the temper of the Assembly is striking. On Saturday, May 18th, the vote given above was taken. On the following Monday week, after a protracted discussion of the resolutions introduced by Dr. Spring on the 22nd, and of substitutes offered by Drs. Hodge and Wines,

"A motion was made, at length," by Dr. Hodge, (we quote again from the Minutes, p. 321,) "to lay this whole business on the table. On this motion the *yeas* and *nays* were ordered, and the following was the result: yeas, 87; nays, 153.

A great change, truly! Our opinion has always been, that the General Assembly was obliged to make a deliverance. It could not reputably ignore the state of the country. It would have been derogatory to its high character, and inconsistent with its duty and its history, to have kept silent. The error was not in *speaking*, but in speaking unwisely. The Assembly had a right to make a deliverance; the misfortune is, it made an erroneous one. It was constitutional for it to apply the law of God to the actual posture of affairs; the trouble is, it did not comprehend the realties of the case, or else allowed itself to be swayed by a miserable outside pressure. We say all this *modestly*, we trust, but with a perfect conviction of its truth. The Church, as already stated, has no right to inaugurate or to incite to a rebellion; it must submit and inculcate submission to the "powers that be:" but if a rebellion does occur, whether successful or not, it has a right to consider its justifiableness, when that question comes fairly up in an inquiry into the conduct of its own members; or when, in the progress of the rebellion, advice is sought, or fidelity requires it to be tendered. Now the Assembly in May last had no call to consider conflicting theories of the Constitution of the United States; but whether accepting or not what has ever been the doctrine of the overwhelming mass of the people of the whole country and of its highest judicial tribunal, and what was

Digitized by Google

indisputably the doctrine of at least *almost* every man in the Assembly, all it had to do was to deal with the actual facts patent to everybody. It did not make a whit's difference whether secession under the Constitution be a just or an unjust claim, a right or an impudent lie — the very meanest lie, if you please, whereby the devil has ever attempted to beguile men into a revolt — still the manifest fact was, a government over ten States, claiming to be independent of that at Washington, did actually exist. It may have been set up without sufficient cause; it may have been as bad as Nero's; it might prove permanent or not; no matter: it was a government. It had the officers, appliances, and power of a government. Its authority was acknowledged, or at least acquiesced in for the time being, by the people of those States. The power of no other common government was in exercise among them. Such was the actual state of the case; and such being the case, we do deny the scriptural or constitutional right of the Assembly to say to Presbyterians in those States, you ought to overthrow this government; for "to strengthen, uphold and encourage the Federal Government," is tantamount to that. We deny the authority of the General Assembly to pass this particular resolution, as the case stood; but not its authority to decide the question of allegiance in general, or the justifiableness of a revolution, when such a question comes fairly before it, in determining the moral conduct of any within its pale. If a great sin was committed in breaking up the government of the United States by the people of the South, and Presbyterians were partakers of that sin, there are spiritual courts competent to take cognizance of every sin; let them be impleaded, and justice be meted out according to the circumstances of every man's case. If they have really committed treason, we have yet to learn that treason is not a crime, or that a member of the Church is not amenable for *all* crimes to the courts of Christ's kingdom. If the case between the South and the General Government, touching the right of secession, is one of extreme doubt, let the accused have the benefit of the doubt; let him have the full benefit of all mitigating circumstances. If the Synod of South Carolina has encouraged rebellion against the "powers that be," bring that Synod before the bar of the Assembly, and deal with it according to the measure

Digitized by Google

of its sin; and if the case can be reached in no other way, exscind it, according to the precedent of 1837. The Presbyterian Church stood at that time the excision of five synods; perhaps it could now stand the excision even of the Synod of South Carolina. The people of the South may hereafter set up a counter-revolution — destroy the government *de facto*, and restore the former constitutional government. If so, and Presbyterians take part in the new revolution, let them be held responsible for their conduct. When the knowledge or wisdom of the court is at fault; when the difficulties of the case are too complicated for a fallible, human tribunal to explicate and decide; let the fact be acknowledged and the case dismissed. This is a plain, just, and sensible procedure; but to deny the competency of a spiritual court to deal with all sin, is simply preposterous.

Having presumed thus to criticise the action of the venerable Assembly, we shall take a step further in the same direction, and point out what ought to have been done. Appreciating the actual posture of affairs in the country, and resolutely resisting pressure from the world without, the Assembly ought to have issued a pastoral letter to the churches, rivaling in dignity, piety, and wisdom, that of their illustrious predecessors of the old Synod. A day of prayer should have been appointed — to the end that, among other things, all might receive from on high the wisdom profitable to direct in a crisis so full of hazard; the law of God should have been faithfully expounded in its application to the case in hand, without fear, favor, or partiality; the distinction between the relation of the Church to the civil power, and that of her members, *as citizens*, should have been clearly presented; the people of God should have been warned of the duty of subjection to the higher powers, "not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake;" the limits of the right of revolution should have been carefully pointed out, and the people besought to keep a good conscience therein; and great circumspection, moderation, forbearance, and brotherly love, should have been enjoined upon all.

The above is not, of course, put forward as a complete syllabus of all that might have been pertinent to the occasion, but may serve to indicate the general character of the deliverance

Digitized by Google

which the Assembly was allowed, and, we think, under all the circumstances was required, to make. Had such a course been pursued, no reasonable man can say it would have afforded even the shadow of a pretext for rending in sunder the visible body of Christ: whereas the resolution adopted by the Assembly — being unwarranted by the word of God, as we verily believe — does give a faint coloring of plausibility to the divisive steps taken by our rash and impetuous brethren. If the Church was to be divided, it was of the last importance that a division should not have had the semblance of justification in any indefensible act of the Church itself; and if a division was brought about at last by a permanent division of the country, it could have been effected in an orderly, peaceable, and decorous manner, by the harmonious action of the whole Church. For we have always believed that if the country were severed, it would be found best, all things considered, for each section to have a General Assembly of its own. But while the problem of a permanent division of the country was still unsolved, every consideration of prudence and piety demanded that the integrity of the Church should remain intact; that the few remaining ligaments that held the sections together, should be preserved unbroken till the last moment of the nation's existence. The great body of pious men all over the country still desired that the breach might be healed. This, we have not a doubt, was the heart-felt wish of the vast majority, however much the expression of it might have been suppressed by imperious necessity. And again: If the division of the Church were accomplished in the interim of the political struggle, and that should end in the restoration of national unity, a little reflection would have convinced every one that the restoration of the unity of the Church, so far from following as a matter of course, would be well nigh impossible. The professed ground of difficulty — the act protested against and made the basis of divisive measures — would remain unrepealed, after the political difficulty, out of which it grew, was adjusted; and it required no prophet's ken to tell, under all the circumstances of the case, that the day of rëunion would be far distant. The nature of man, the history of the past, the many conflicting interests likely to be developed during a period of separation, the complicated working of moral causes

Digitized by Google

in the heart — all gave warning that were the Church once divided, *its* reconstruction could not reasonably be anticipated, even if the States were brought together again under the old common paternal government.

What is scriptural is always the thing expedient to be done, when any thing at all ought to be done. What is unscriptural cannot be otherwise than inexpedient, at all times. The action unfortunately taken by the late Assembly, in view of the sad consequences, easily foreseen, and foretold again and again by brethren on the floor, was eminently inexpedient. Had no notice whatever been taken of the national troubles, it had been far wiser. Since the right thing was not done, far wiser that nothing had been done. The lack of practical wisdom, on the part of the leaders of the majority of the late Assembly, in dealing with a great crisis, is seen also in another not improbable result. Not only are their measures working out a division of the Church by a line running east and west, but the present indications are that the northern portion will itself be forced asunder by a line running north and south, separating the East from the West. Movements are already hinted at, and perhaps in progress, for uniting the Old and New School on the basis of a common anti-slavery sentiment. Intimations, by no means obscure, are thrown out that the sentiment of the mighty North-West must be respected; that the young giant is waking up to a sense of its growing power and importance, and will make the other portions of the Church give heed to its behests. Serious differences of doctrine, and every thing else distinctive of the parties, are to be ignored or compromised away; and a comprehensive union of diverse Presbyterial elements, is to be cemented by the cohesive power of a common and unscriptural opposition to slavery and the "*slave power.*" The attempt to carry into effect this scheme, will be resisted unto the death, by the conservative part of the Church all over the land. The East, with Princeton at its head, will rally almost to a man in defence of sound doctrine. Moreover, in the far South, where the New School are believed to be more orthodox than their brethren at the North, a union of old parties may be effected on the basis of a general agreement in doctrine, and a common purpose to uphold and magnify

Digitized by Google

the institution of slavery. Thus the one false step — the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* ratified at Philadelphia — is likely to be fruitful in divisions and in new combinations.

After all that has been said in opposition to the lamentable resolution passed in May last, it is only just to the Church to advert briefly to some considerations that may fairly be urged in extenuation of the action protested against. Candid and dispassionate men will admit their weight. Let it be remembered, in the first place, it was a period of intense excitement, when the best of men are liable to err, and who might reasonably be expected to correct their error when the opportunity was offered. In the second place, the questions themselves were new and intricate, and the principles controlling their decision had not been, and, at the moment, could not be clearly excogitated. It was to be anticipated, therefore, that if forced to a vote, the majority, composed as the Assembly was, would vote just as they did; and that, too, in perfect consistency with the sincerest desire to do right. In the third place, owing to a meagre representation from large sections of the country, a few shrewd and earnest men of abolition proclivities, or at least of remarkably strong anti-slavery views, were enabled to seize and hold the leadership of the Assembly. These good brethren now finding themselves in a very unusual position, and determined to strike their hitherto successful adversaries a blow, availed themselves of the favorable conjuncture; appropriated the influence of a venerable and influential member, unfortunately thrown at the critical moment within their grasp; mounted and rode the political storm, and directed it so as to subserve their bitter hostility to slavery. The wished for, the predicted hour had come, and they improved it. We acquit the many who voted for Dr. Spring's resolution of any ulterior covert purpose, but confess a strong suspicion that the leaders intended to drive the *domineering slave power*, as they call it, out of the Church; at least, they cared not, if such should prove to be the result of their action. The way would then be open to strike for a new combination at the North, the cherished purpose to do which was developed soon after the adjournment of the Assembly. Had one man from the West, who was providentially hindered therefrom, been in his seat, so as to unite

Digitized by Google

with his conservative brethren in stemming the tide of radicalism, we confidently believe the Church would have escaped the disaster which has befallen her. In the fourth place, the outside pressure was tremendous. The Assembly met in the bosom of a community prodigiously excited, and demanding that every influence, religious as well as civil and military, should be brought into the field to uphold the National Government; the house was crowded with ministers and members of other denominations as well as our own, from the city and the circumjacent country, urging the adoption of the obnoxious resolution; the populace demanded it with loud cries and threatening demonstrations of fearful import; the streets of Philadelphia were thronged with thousands of troops and vast trains of baggage and munitions of war, intensifying to the highest pitch the popular enthusiasm in behalf of the government. In a word, such was the strange condition of things in and around the Assembly, that no fair-minded man will hold the Church responsible for the act in question. The fact is, the General Assembly of 1861, *quoad hoc*, was not a free Assembly.

Least of all should they be quick to raise a hue and cry against the Church because of this odious deliverance, who are themselves in the same condemnation — seeing they yielded in like manner to an outside pressure, but in the opposite direction. It appears from the third exception to the minutes of the Synod of South Carolina, (which minutes, by the way, had not been submitted for review since 1857,) that the excellent brethren inhabiting the political "hub of the universe," preceded the Assembly in dabbling in the dirty puddle of politics. If the statement made on the floor of the Assembly is to be credited, that Synod approved in advance the act of secession which it was well known the State Convention would pass. They could not wait till the foul deed was done. They were so fondly anxious to baptize the cockatrice, they could not wait till the cock's egg hatched. They anticipated the monstrous birth, and sanctioned it by a decree of the Church. And yet no men have declaimed more eloquently against defiling the pure robes of the Bride of the Lamb by contact with the world, than these very brethren. So extreme have their views appeared to some, that they have

Digitized by Google

been charged with attempting to introduce a hyper-spiritual theory of the Church, utterly inconsistent with her true mission and her uniform action. "Sir," said the foremost man of them all and of the whole South, in the Assembly of 1859, — "Sir, the salt that is to save this country is the Church of Christ — a Church that does not mix up with any political party, or any issues aside from her direct mission." Yet the very Synod in whose midst he dwells, and of which he is the animating spirit, plunged headlong into the political whirlpool. They manifested an eager haste to soil the fair garments of the Church with the filth of the world. When the time came to test their allegiance to the principle that was to save the Church and the country, they were found wanting. Now what construction shall we put upon this conduct? That these brethren have been disingenuous in advocating an extravagant theory of the Church's spirituality? No. That they have less manliness or firmness than others? Not at all. They are candid, manly, Christian men — men of deep convictions and honest purposes. The simple truth is, the phrenzy that had seized upon all around them, had muddled their own brain. At every inspiration they inhaled secession. Secession stalked abroad over the land, and cried aloud in the streets. Secession knocked at the door of the sanctuary and demanded recognition. It beleaguered the Synod and carried it by storm. Yielding to the pressure from within and the pressure from without, they surrendered in an evil hour their cherished principle, and ratified a measure their cooler judgment will condemn. Time, if time itself shall not end speedily, will reinstate that excellent principle, not lost, but in abeyance.

Now let the same rule of charitable judgment be applied both to the Assembly and the Synod of South Carolina. The times are sadly out of joint; the country is in a whirlwind of excitement; a state of things exists, altogether anomalous, unexpected, dreadful: the ministers and people of God have been most powerfully, though most naturally, affected by the universal furor. In these circumstances, no rash, irretrievable step should have been taken. Moderation, forbearance, a patient waiting for the return of reason and the sway of established principles, might have saved the Church. Alas! alas! our virtue has not proved equal to

Digitized by Google

the occasion. Still we will hope against hope. The providence and the grace of God may be better to us than our fears. He may restore peace and unity to the land. He may restore the unity of the Church. The good day *may* come, (Oh that it may come soon!) when our hearts shall be softened, our errors realized, our sins repented of; when brotherly love shall rëassert its divine power, and so weld us together again, that our peace shall be as a river, and our righteousness as the waves of the sea!

In the former part of this article we had occasion to speak of the justifiableness of a revolution in the State. Let us now consider the justifiableness of the revolution in the Church, in full blast as these sheets pass through the press. Admitting the unconstitutionality of the Assembly's resolution, are the brethren of the South justifiable in separating from the Church of their fathers? Has the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America become so corrupt in doctrine or practice, so unscriptural and oppressive in the exercise of discipline, that the only remedy for uneasy consciences is to abandon her communion? We answer, *No.* We are forced to believe, and feel constrained to say, a more groundless and flagrant act of schism has not occurred in the annals of Christ's church. A more palpable instance of the temporary reign of the spirit of the world in the hearts of the Lord's servants — a more undisguisable and inexcusable attempt to play into the hands of politicians by bringing the movements of the Church into line with the movements of States — cannot be found in ecclesiastical history, — certainly nothing approximating it in our career. It is a most calamitous and wholesale yielding of a noble company of ministers and churches to the clamors of popular phrenzy. We write thus of their strange doings in sorrow, not in anger; for with all their faults we love them still. We have faith in their goodness and virtue. They are deluded now; they will repudiate hereafter these violent proceedings. But these are hard sayings: we acknowledge our obligation to make them good. Every item of the charge can be proved, and to that task we confidently address ourselves.

Let it be observed and kept in mind throughout the discussion,

Digitized by Google

that the sole ground upon which this schism is precipitated, is the passage of a resolution by the General Assembly, the pith of which is simply a declaration of our obligations to promote and perpetuate the integrity of the United States, and to uphold the Federal Government. It is an acknowledgment on the part of the Church, by her representatives for the time being, of the obligation of her ministers and members to pursue a certain line of political conduct; and that is the whole of it. It is not an act or injunction, commanding the ministry and membership of the Presbyterian Church to do thus and so, upon the penalty of forfeiting their ecclesiastical standing. No man can be tried under that resolution. The attempt could not and would not be made. No man would think of it. We have judicial tribunals, and the doctrine and law of God set forth in our standards; and by them alone can we be tried and condemned.

It is idle to say this resolution introduces a new term of communion. The fallacy of such a statement can easily be made apparent. Suppose the General Assembly should pass a resolution acknowledging and declaring the obligation of all men to desist from the manufacture, sale, or use of spirituous liquors, and there stop; and again, suppose it should pass an act requiring all in our communion to cease making, selling, or using spirituous liquors, and forbidding the sessions to receive any one who did either of these things. Would the action of our Church courts be the same in both cases? Would not every man of us feel perfectly free, in the former case, to say, "*The Assembly is mistaken — I do not believe a word of it*," and there to let the matter rest; in the latter, we would be bound to respect the act, or nullify it and risk the consequences. Again: The Assembly might declare a thousand times our obligation to support the Colonization Society, and we Presbyterians could do just as we pleased. But when the Church through her Supreme Court says we *must* support the Colonization Society, the only course is to submit, or else renounce her communion or be put out of it. The Legislature of Kentucky may pass, in the name of the good citizens of that commonwealth, the identical resolution passed by the Assembly, without affecting in one iota the conscience or the interests of either unionist or disunionist. But let the same Legislature

Digitized by Google

pass a bill requiring a tax to be levied, every citizen must obey or suffer the penalty of disobedience. The difference is palpable. The obvious distinction must be taken between the declaration of an opinion by the Assembly, and an authoritative act, legislative or judicial, applying the law of God to specific cases, or pointing out when, where, and how it must be applied.

It is a sheer mistake on the part of the protesters to affirm of Presbyterians in the seceded States — "They are consequently forced to choose between allegiance to their States and allegiance to the Church." (Minutes, p. 340.) No such alternative was presented. The Assembly passed an unscriptural resolution, and therefore an unconstitutional one; because amid the whirl of excitement and the pressure from without, they could not or would not recognize the actual facts before their eyes. Their error arose from the want of information. They made a faulty diagnosis of the case, and hence failed to apply the remedy the Book prescribes. *Their* folly may be compared to the persistent folly of the Federal Administration in refusing to recognize, by an exchange of prisoners, what the whole world knows to be true. No; the real alternative presented to our Southern brethren was this: To ease their consciences and proclaim their allegiance to their States by protesting against the stingless resolution, and then go quietly about their Master's work; or to fly into a passion and play the fool. They chose the latter, and erred exceedingly. (1 Sam. xxvi: 21.) The election of Mr. Lincoln was put forward as a reason for breaking up the Union, while yet the broad shield of the Constitution was over the South, and the National Congress and Judiciary in her hands. This resolution is put forward as a reason for breaking up the Church, while yet her Constitution remains intact — not a clause erased, not a word obscured. No man has lost his rights under it; no man is likely to lose them. The resolution is as innocuous as sweet cream; as bland as a zephyr, or the dew upon Hermon. It is just as incapable of doing harm to any man's rights, civil or religious, as was Mr. Lincoln with the South in the Union. Every well-informed Presbyterian knows the passage of it affected the interests of no member of the Church; and as for its faults of every kind and degree, they could be declared and impugned by a sub-

Digitized by Google

sequent Assembly. In the interim, a remedy is provided for an aggrieved party whereby he can relieve himself of all responsibility. The remedy is a sufficient one, and our brethren ought to have been satisfied with it. Instead of that, they have made a mountain out of a mole-hill, and committed the sin of schism.

But let it not be supposed we are unmindful of the distinction between an advisory council and a Presbyterian Assembly. We profess to sympathise with those views of Church polity, playfully characterized by one at Rochester, in 1860, as hyper-hyper-Presbyterianism. The second section of Chap. 31, Conf. of Faith, has long been familiar to us, and is heartily received in its length and breadth. But the following section is no less precious in our eyes. It is the foundation of our liberty of conscience, speech, and action:

"All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both."

They are not to be made the *rule of faith or practice*, but to be used *as a help in both:* and we protest against their being regarded as anything more than a help; and against so straining the other section as to bring us into subjection for a single moment to the doctrines and commandments of men. Furthermore, we protest against continued agitation of this subject, as inconsistent with the peace and welfare of our churches. For our humble self, we intend to lend no aid to an agitation which may result in completing, item after item, the parallel between the disasters of the country and the Church. The attempt to provision Fort Sumter precipitated a crisis; raised a terrific storm in the border Slave States, and drove some of them pell-mell into the vortex of secession. Let not this fangless resolution be magnified into a monster that shall cut in pieces the cords which have bound us all together ever since the nation had a being, and detach those still in the Union from the General Assembly. If our brethren in the seceded States are determined to desert the time-honored mansion-house of their fathers, and build a wigwam for themselves, we cannot help it; but we may avoid their folly and their sin.

Digitized by Google

Suppose, however, that we are altogether mistaken about the significance and bearing of this resolution; suppose it to be not only unwise, unscriptural, and unconstitutional, but as full of evils as Pandora's box — a tremendous usurpation of power on the part of the Assembly, an apostasy from a most sacred principle, a flagrant intrusion into the prerogatives of the state, an outrage upon the rights and liberties of the faithful, and whatever else in the black catalogue of crime a fervid imagination may conceive. Would the simple adoption of it, and that too by a coerced Assembly, justify the immediate disruption of the Church? Nay, more: Would the fear of an attempt to carry into execution every false and atrocious principle supposed to be involved in it, justify an immediate disruption? Without a moment's hesitation, we answer, NO. To rend asunder the Church upon such grounds, is to follow in the wake of the political precipitators. They rent asunder a mighty and happy nation, because *Lincoln* and his party might peradventure do some bad thing. Their Presbyterian imitators, right royal guardians of the Church's spirituality, rend her asunder, because, forsooth, the General Assembly did do a bad thing, and might do a worse. Did our lauded ancestors of Scotland, of distant or more recent times, separate from the old Kirk the moment Erastianism or Moderatism gained the ascendency? In the New School controversy, did the orthodox renounce the Church, though presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies protected preachers of heresy, and trampled under foot its government and discipline? On the contrary, they struggled long and valiantly for sound doctrine and presbyterial order. They did not go out of it, but saved and purified the Church. The conduct of our brethren now presents a sorry contrast. An unconstitutional resolution is of no binding force on the conscience. With a recorded protest they were free to remain and labor for the instauration of the right. No sane man will pretend it would have been a fruitless labor. It was morally certain the first free and full Assembly would annul the offensive deliverance. And surely they cannot assert, even with the faintest penumbra of the shadow of truth, that by remaining in their old connection they would have incurred the least personal risk, either from the constituted authorities, or from

Digitized by Google

unlawful combinations of violent men. They *know* their home is the home of freedom — absolute freedom in the expression of opinion and in the conduct of life. There is no reign of terror there. The Presbytery of the Western District affirms so, categorically:

"It appears to be generally believed at the North that a 'reign of terror' exists at the South. We desire to bear our distinct and pointed testimony to the contrary." They testify further: "We hear of numerous military arrests for opinion's sake. They have occurred by thousands in Missouri, Maryland, Virginia, and other States occupied by Federal troops, but such things do not occur among us."

No danger, then, was to be apprehended from their holding fast to their first love. Yet, if persecution had stared them in the face — persecution for fealty to right and the Church — they will not allege that as a plea for doing wrong. They are brave and honorable men. But it has been alleged that any other course than the one they have actually taken, would have destroyed their usefulness — that they would have lost the confidence of the South. That might have proved true, at least for a time. Some of them might have been obliged to abandon their fields of labor. But what if they had? Must they gain the ear of the people at the sacrifice of principle? Does the end sanctify the means? Must we do evil that good may come? This is paltry twaddle, unworthy of heroic men. The chivalric followers of the cross spurn the plea. "Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them." No, no; this is grubbing on the surface — merely sticking in the bark. If we would comprehend the strange phenomenon before us, we must go deeper. We must seek an adequate cause. The deliverance of the General Assembly of 1861, is not such a cause. It is but a pretext to cover up a purpose formed and settled before that Assembly met. It is laid hold of to rouse the popular mind. The division of the Church was a foregone conclusion. The States had seceded, — Presbyteries and Synods must follow suit. No link binding the South and the North must be left. The separation must be complete. Church unity might beget hereafter the desire of national

Digitized by Google

unity. The wily, arrogant, powerful politician shivered, like a potter's vessel, the beautiful, heavenly, spiritual theory of the churchman. The State entangled the Church in its own meshes, and carried it captive.

No man of ordinary intelligence now believes that the election of Mr. Lincoln, and consequent danger to slavery, constituted the cause of secession. The contrary is freely acknowledged. The Democratic Convention was burst in pieces for the express purpose of securing the election of a *Black Republican* sectional candidate. The plot was well known in the South before the meeting of the Convention. Of this we have direct and positive information. The breaking up of the Union had long been a settled thing in the minds of the leading Democratic politicians of the South. It was only a question of time. All that was waited for, was the fitting occasion and pretext. They came, and the deed was done. Ten years ago, Gen. Quitman, in writing to Col. John S. Preston of South Carolina, drafted the programme that has been followed out to the letter. See Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, vol. II., pp. 125–7. This work lifts the curtain, and opens right before the eye the gradual maturing of the scheme to form a Southern Confederacy, up to 1858, the year of Gen. Quitman's death.

Now, what is maintained is this: That there is an analogy, and that not a remote one, between the plans and purposes of the politicians of the South to divide the nation, and the plans and purposes of our brethren in that section to divide the Church; and that the deliverance of 1861 is seized upon as a pretext "to fire the Southern heart and precipitate a revolution." It is a pretext, and nothing but a pretext. The formation of a Southern Confederacy had been anticipated, and the way prepared for the formation of a Southern Church. The preparation of the minds of Christian people at the South for dividing churches, is seen in the action of the Southern Episcopalians. That denomination has been held together for years by the strength of their attachment to prelatical regiment, and fear of the sin of schism, — while all the while the bitterest feuds have raged in its bosom, and the most abominable of Popish heretical doctrines been preached and tolerated. So has it been in England. But how is it

Digitized by Google

now? The fiery political storm has entered and burst the temple of the Lord from top to bottom. The sin of schism has lost its terrors. The hooks of steel have melted in the glowing furnace. The wizard of secession has transmuted adamantine chains into cords of tow. Initiative measures have been taken to form a Southern General Episcopal Convention, without the shadow of a reason except what is to be found in political considerations. The doctrines of salvation might be obscured, and even denied; still the Church held together. What love for a pure gospel and the souls of men could not do in a generation, secession accomplished in a trice. To preserve the truth of God incorrupt, a new General Convention could not be formed; secession prepared the way for it, and called it into being at the needed hour. The same hot haste in the Christian public of the South, to sacrifice a sacred principle, and to prostrate the church of the living God at the dirty footstool of the state, is seen in the proceedings of the Synod of South Carolina, already referred to, and in those of the Baptist Convention of Alabama. The work of preparation in our denomination was quietly prosecuted in various ways. Efforts were made to detach the affections and interests of our people in the more southern parts of the country from things northern and *northward*. Let one instance suffice: For several years there were zealous endeavors, we will not say *sedulous manœuvres*, to separate all the Synods in the cotton and sugar growing regions from the support of Theological Seminaries established by the General Assembly, and to rally them as one man to the support of a synodical Seminary at Columbia, S. C. An agent of the Columbia Seminary also appeared in the Synod of North Carolina, and essayed to wheel it into line, while that Synod stood pledged in the most formal manner to another Institution. A large legacy devoted to theological education, was diverted from its original destination, and turned into the exchequer of the *peculiarly* southern Seminary at Columbia. Now, in this work of sectionalizing and consolidating the extreme South, so as to be all prepared at the nick of time to draw off and organize for themselves after the manner of the seceded States, we charge — and this is the gist of the iniquity — *that the pro-slavery string was skillfully played upon by nimble fingers*. If the charge is denied,

Digitized by Google

we bind ourselves to prove it by the testimony of respectable men who saw and heard for themselves. While this was going on, the men of the North, and of the upper tier of Slave States, were coöperating in good faith with those of the South, to strangle utterly the hydra of Abolition, and thus prevent a serious division of the Church by that pestiferous ism. Its powerlessness to do evil was demonstrated in the Assembly of 1859. Its chosen weapon was shivered when the whole Church took into its hands the North-Western Seminary. But what booted it to throttle abolitionism in one section, while in another pro-slaveryism was rearing aloft its crest and marshaling its forces to subjugate the Church? What booted it for the Assembly to prevent one Seminary from becoming an exponent and propagator of abolitionism, while another, wholly beyond its control, becomes the exponent and propagator of views equally hostile to the Church's moderate and scriptural views on the vexed question? While the spiritual theory is wielded to ward off the pest of abolitionism in one quarter, what is gained, if a public sentiment equally destructive of the peace and purity of the Church, is fostered in another? We are no less unwilling to see the Church, either by a formal deliverance or an unmistakable sympathy, made an instrument to "uphold, extend, and perpetuate" the State's institution of slavery, than to see it driven into the support of a wicked war on that institution. It has now come to pass that one who accepts *simpliciter* the deliverances of 1845 and 1846, is looked at askance in most of the Slave States, if not denounced outright as an abolitionist. Let the spiritual theory prove itself a *two*-edged sword.

In the South-Western Advisory Committee, at New Orleans, an agency was ready at hand wherewith to enter upon the work of Domestic Missions. In the Indian Territory was a mission which had been dropped by the American Board on account of slavery, and received by us. This mission furnished at once a foundation for the foreign work, and in behalf of which, for a very obvious reason, the affections and charities of the southern churches could be powerfully enlisted. In the fullness of time, a circular to the churches was issued from head-quarters, to send in their contributions for Foreign Missions. A former Secretary

Digitized by Google

of the old Board, who had resigned his office before the meeting of the last Assembly, and had had a large experience, was on hand to superintend the good work. (We give timely notice that not a word here uttered is intended to impugn the character or conduct of that excellent brother.)

An expensive establishment had been provided at New Orleans, and stored with the books of the Board of Publication, which could serve as a nucleus for that department of the new Assembly's operations. We do not, of course, intend to insinuate that all who had lot or part in these enterprises, did set them on foot with the intent to prepare the way for a division. We do *know*, however, that the brethren in the South and South-West desired an Advisory Committee and got it; and that the brethren in the North-West desired the same thing and did *not* get it. We do know further, that there is a striking analogy between the preparations made during the late Administration of the Federal Government for the great secession movement; and the preparedness in heart, and in outward appliances and arrangements, for a division of the Church at the South. At the same time, we do not assert that it was either unwise or wrong for those brethren, foreseeing that a division of the nation was inevitable, so to order their affairs that their new Church should enter at once and efficiently upon the whole work of the Lord; for we have already expressed the opinion, that upon a division of the nation, a division of the Church, if not absolutely necessary, would be found best. Had they chosen to separate from us in an orderly and decorous manner this present year, we might have thought and said it was premature; but nothing more. But when they hurry onward a violent separation, upon a totally insufficient ground, we demur, and affirm that the cause assigned is only a shallow pretext.

A plan was formed — we speak *advisedly* — a plan to divide the Church, originating most probably in the bosom of the Synod of South Carolina, was formed before the late Assembly met. A motion was to be made to rescind the deliverance of 1818, on the subject of slavery. On failing to carry that motion, which was known to be just as certain as fate, the Southern Commissioners were to secede from the Assembly. Nothing prevented this plan

Digitized by Google

from being carried into execution but the fact that certain persons failed to secure an election as commissioners, and others were kept away by the war. The secession of the Southern Commissioners from an *abolitionized* Assembly was to "startle" and fire the whole South. "Practical and simple issues" were to be presented, and would have to be met. What Gen. Quitman says of political movements, is equally true of ecclesiastical:

"Great political movements, to be successful, must be bold, and must present practical and simple issues. The secession of a Southern State would startle the whole South, and force the other States to meet the issue plainly."

Quitman was a keen southernized *Yankee* from New York. If our brethren were convinced their altered circumstances required a separate Church, why did they not send "Peace Commissioners" to the General Assembly, to arrange the terms of an amicable division, as the Confederate Government sent to President Lincoln? Was something needed to "startle the whole South," and force the Presbyteries and Synods in all the Slave States "to meet the issue plainly?" Were they unprepared to commit the sin of schism? One or two Synods, perhaps, were ready to take the dreadful plunge. Was a cunningly devised plan necessary to "startle" the rest? It would seem so. But the secession project miscarried: No matter, — the resolution of the Assembly in support of the Federal Government, has been made to "startle" reluctant judicatories from their propriety. A harmless, glimmering fire-fly, has been magnified into a blazing comet,

> "That fires the length of Ophiucus huge
> In th' arctic sky, and from his horrid hair
> Shakes pestilence and war."

Indicative of the same foregone purpose to be done with the old Assembly, is a deliverance of Dr. Adger, quoted by Dr. E. T. Baird in a spicy communication to the New Orleans *True Witness*. This communication, or a part of it, we find copied into the Louisville *Presbyterian Herald* of Aug. 22nd, and give the following choice extract from it:

Digitized by Google

"And even Dr. Adger, in all the pomp and circumstance of editorial ease, and gathering the robes of professional dignity around him, ventures to say to brethren who are every whit his peers: 'Southern men had no business to be in any such Assembly!' Who is this that affects to lecture Church courts composed of his coëquals, after this lofty style? By what authority does he announce his judgments, *ex cathedra*, on presbyters engaged in the serious discharge of solemn ordination vows?"

That's charming! We love Dr. Adger much, but nevertheless confess to a kind of malignant pleasure in giving currency to a castigation so well merited. Our old friend Dr. Baird has done the work so well, we are saved the trouble of getting into a passion over a sentiment unbecoming any Presbyterian — most of all, a professed teacher of Presbyterian Church Polity. "*Southern men had no business to be in any such Assembly!*" We simply call attention to this magisterial deliverance of Professor Adger, as indicative of the *animus* of brethren in high places. The impropriety of being in the Assembly cannot be predicated on a resolution passed near its close. (We guess — for to guess is not an acknowledged monopoly of the *Yankee* — we guess this kindly utterance of Dr. Adger is a *natural* development of the *spiritual* theory. Dr. Baird evidently does not think it a fruit of the Spirit called by Paul, in Gal. v: 23, *πραότης*.)

In proof, also, of a determination to divide the Church, totally irrespective of what might be done at Philadelphia, we cite the discussions upon that subject in the Southern religious newspapers, and particularly the strong advocacy of the measure in the *Southern Presbyterian*, published at Columbia, S. C. Here, at the central seat of Southern influence, with only a delicate tinge of modesty, was the cue given.

That to divide the Church was a foregone conclusion, may be deduced, too, from the haste and recklessness which characterized "the recent action of the Presbytery of Memphis, *initiative* of the division of our great and beloved Church." See Dr. Grundy's Protest and Appeal. We have neither time nor space to dwell upon these scandalous proceedings, but refer the reader to the exposé contained in Dr. Grundy's pamphlet. Six ministers out of twenty, and a representation of five elders from twenty-six

Digitized by Google

churches, at an adjourned meeting — few having "the remotest idea of even the probability of such action" — presume, in the name of all the ministers and churches of the Presbytery, to pass a solemn act of excision! and that, too, when at the very time of the meeting, most of the Presbytery were ignorant of what the Assembly had done! This out-herods Herod! The political precipitators are beat at their own game! "In all the history of Presbyterianism, it has no precedent for violence and haste." Now, we ask, who can believe this shameful outrage was perpetrated *because of* the action of the Assembly? When good men, straitened in conscience and acting solely from an imperative sense of duty, undertake a solemn work in the fear of God, they do not leave *such* a track behind them. But good men may do very strange and wicked things. There are mighty under-currents — but we forbear. The relations of the leaders in the audacious excision of the Presbytery of Memphis, are not unknown. To South Carolina belongs the glory or the shame of destroying the American Union: to South Carolina also belong the sin and the shame of bursting asunder the Old School Presbyterian Church.

Once more: The spleen and littleness exhibited in some quarters, point unerringly to a state of mind very unlike the dignity and gravity a great crisis inspires, when good men feel compelled to take an unwilling step. The ebullitions of passion are not consonant to such an occasion. But the mind already inflamed and watching for an opportunity to gratify its unhallowed instincts, scruples not at times or means. It is stated in the public prints that on the 8th of August the Presbytery of Nashville not only withdrew from the jurisdiction of the General Assembly, but also, "by an almost unanimous vote, dissolved its former connection with the *Danville Theological Seminary*."

> "—— Hic nigræ fucus coliginis, hæc est
> Ærugo mera."

It is news to us that the Presbytery of Nashville ever had any formal connection with the Danville Seminary. It is true most of its ministers and people once gave a cordial support to that Institution, and the Presbytery may have passed resolutions com-

Digitized by Google

mending it to the good will of their churches. But had not the same been done in behalf of the Boards? If "a large majority" could not wait till the stated meeting in September "to withdraw the support and countenance of this Presbytery from every thing connected with the General Assembly," why did they not include the Boards? Why single out the Danville Seminary? Why did they not withdraw their "countenance" from Princeton and Allegheny? Consistency is a jewel. Did the brethren of the Nashville Presbytery ever read or hear of the articles which appeared originally in the Danville Quarterly Review, on the state of the country and the war? And did it occur to them that the hasty withdrawal of their "countenance" from the Seminary at Danville, was only a venting of spleen at the distinguished author of those articles? Poor, weak, human nature! "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" But if the Lord smile, joy and gladness may still dwell in the halls of Danville, though the light of the "countenance" of the Presbytery of Nashville *be* withdrawn!

Our work is done. We have endeavored to point out the wrong on the one side and on the other. We have used plainness of speech, but in perfect charity with all men. The Church has been disrupted unnecessarily, recklessly, wickedly. We deplore it. The reason assigned for it is a beggarly pretext. But it has been done. The part of wise men is to let by-gones be by-gones, and address themselves to the work of the Lord. Our Southern brethren have our hearty wishes for abounding success in every work of faith and labor of love. God speed them in the good and right! E. E.

Note by the Publisher.—It was hoped, and public notice of its probability given through the press, that an Article reviewing the proceedings of the late General Assembly at Philadelphia would be prepared for this No. of the Review by the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, D. D., LL. D. For reasons not necessary to be stated here, we have been disappointed, and also the public. It is just, therefore, to all parties to say, that the Article above has been furnished by another hand.

Digitized by Google

ART. VIII. — *Bibliography.*

AMERICA.

The book trade has been inactive, in this country, for several months, on account of the state of public affairs. Notwithstanding this, a few good books have been recently published.

The Presbyterian Board of Publication have issued "Essays and Discourses, Practical and Historical," by Courtlandt Van Rensselaer, D. D.; being a collection of monograms published by the lamented author during his life on earth. The most remarkable piece in the volume is the discourse occasioned by the death of Bishop Doane, in which the thorough honesty and the unaffected kindliness of Dr. Van Rensselaer are displayed in a singular and curious combination. It reminds one of a portrait by Vandyke, which shows the hand of the master not less plainly than the countenance of the sitter.

The same Board have published the "Autobiography of the Rev. William Neill, D. D., with a selection of his Sermons." By the Rev. Joseph H. Jones, D. D., with a portrait. Dr. Neill was one of the venerable patriarchs of the Presbyterian Church. Though he died recently, he was the Moderator of the General Assembly in the year 1815 — before the most of our living ministers were born.

The "Memoir of the Rev. Jacob J. Janeway, D. D.," by Thomas L. Janeway, D. D., is a suitable memorial of a faithful servant of Christ and of the Church, whose ministerial life was extended through the period of about sixty years, and who has left a broad mark upon the generations through which he lived.

Dr. Leonard Withington, of Massachusetts, has published an elaborate and learned commentary on the Song of Solomon, with a new Translation. The author maintains the position which has been held by the Church with singular constancy, through the ages, that this Song is an inspired allegory, celebrating the divine love subsisting between Christ the Bridegroom and the Church the Bride, the Lamb's wife; and setting forth the personal love-union between the Redeemer and his people.

An interesting posthumous collection of Sermons has been is-

Digitized by Google

sued by R. Carter & Bros., from the pen of the Rev. William B. Weed, of Connecticut, who died before his prime.

The Rev. Dr. Charles W. Shields of Philadelphia, has printed a thin volume styled *Philosophia Ultima*, in which he strives to attain unto a final adjustment of all truth — scientific, metaphysical and revealed. The treatise is said, by competent judges, to be a remarkably able production. The author was, it may be remembered, the nominee to the last General Assembly by the Directors of the Princeton Seminary for the chair of Ecclesiastical History: and this volume may be taken as an ample vindication of the estimate which his brethren have formed of him.

C. F. Hudson has published, under the title of "Debt and Grace as related to the Doctrine of a Future Life," a new theory of future punishment by the annihilation of the wicked. The object of the work is in part to show how quietly and easily the whole thing may be done. The title of the book might have been, Annihilation made easy! The book itself has reached its "fourth thousand" on its way to Milton's Limbo.

Mr. Draper, of Andover, has in press a reprint of "Ellicott's Commentary on the Ephesians." He has published "Ellicott on the Galatians," and will complete the whole series, in uniform style.

He has in press new editions of Prof. Stuart on Ecclesiastes, on the Apocalypse, and on the Old Testament Canon.

E. P. H.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The sharp controversy which has arisen over the "Essays and Reviews" is due, not to the learning or the ability of the work itself — for it contains little more than a re-statement of German rationalism done into obscure, feeble and verbose English — but to the audacity and recklessness of its authors, six of whom were clergymen of the Church of England. About 20,000 copies of the book have been sold; and it is now in its ninth edition. A new society has been formed to defend the book, and Tract No. 1, defining the creed of the school, has been published by Alexander Allison. Rev. Geo. J. Weld, in a "Brief Defence of Essays and Reviews," attempts to show that similar views have been advanced by other Divines of the English Church: and another wri-

Digitized by Google

ter imputes similar opinions to Bishop Thirlwald, on the strength of a work published in 1825, and attributed to the bishop.

Elaborate criticisms upon the work have appeared in the Journal of Sacred Literature, and in the Westminster, London Quarterly, British Quarterly, Edinburgh and North British Reviews, the last of which is attributed to Isaac Taylor. Among the other publications in the discussion are "Neology not True, and Truth not New," by Rev. Charles Herbert: "Essays and Reviews examined," by Rev. Dr. Buchanan: "Idealism considered," by Rev. Wm. Gresley: "Negative Theology an argument for liturgical revision," by Charles Girdlestone: "The Dangers and Safeguards of Modern Theology," by the Bishop of London: "Skepticism," by Lord Lindsay: "Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. Davids," by Dr. Rowland Williams, one of the Essayists: "Bishop Thirlwald's Letter to Dr. R. Williams:" "Two Charges to his Clergy," by Bishop Thirlwald: "The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, Constancy in Prayer, "&c., by Charles Heurtley: "Rationalism and Deistic Infidelity," by the Rev. Dr. A. McCaul: "Some Notice of Prof. Baden Powell's Essay on the Study of the Evidences of Christianity," by J. L. Wheeler: "Bible Inspiration vindicated," by J. C. Miller: "Religio Laici," by Mr. Hughes, author of Tom Brown's School Days: "Specific Evidences of Unsoundness in the Essays and Reviews," by Dr. Jelf: "Two Sermons," by the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Wilberforce: Rev. T. Chapman's "Miracles the proper Credentials of Christianity." A counter work is in preparation, by Dr. Thomson of Oxford, Mr. Ellicott, Mr. Mansel and Mr. Rawlinson; and another work of similar character from Oxford, by Drs. Wordsworth, Rose, Goulburn, Heurtley, and Jones, with a preface by Bishop Wilberforce; and yet a third, by seven clergymen in seven volumes, is announced in London. An address condemning the work has been presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury, signed by 8,500 clergymen of the Church. Where are the other 10,000?

The Convocation is an ecclesiastical parliament, or an assembly in two houses of the Bishops and the inferior clergy. At the convocation of March 14, an overture, technically called a "gravamen," was presented by twenty members of the Lower House to the Upper, asking the Bishops to appoint a committee from

Digitized by Google

the Lower House to report on the subject to the Bishops. The proposal was debated, the Bishop of London, Dr. Tait, opposing; but it was adopted by a vote of eight to four. Archdeacon Davison, as chairman of the committee, soon after reported. But the powers of the Convocation over questions of heresy are indeterminate, and it is doubtful whether any judgment will pass or any decisive result whatever will issue from the proceeding.

The controversy has reached this country. The book has been reprinted in Boston, and has been noticed at large in the Critical and Theological Reviews. Some of the German periodicals have taken up the subject and have spoken in disparaging terms of the learning and ability exhibited in the book. The effect of the discussion in England will be to enlighten the clergy in Biblical science — a branch of learning too much neglected by them.

The important work of Count de Montalembert entitled "The Monks of the West, from St. Benedict to St. Bernard," containing a history of Monasticism from the Romish point of view, has been published in an English translation. 2 vols. 8vo. Price in New York, $6.00.

John Paget, the well known critic of Lord Macaulay, appears in The New "Examen," or an Inquiry into the Evidence relating to certain passages in Lord Macaulay's History concerning, 1. The Duke of Marlborough: 2. The Massacre of Glencoe: 3. The Highlands of Scotland: 4. Viscount Dundee (Claverhouse): 5. William Penn. Price in New York, $1.75.

An "Exposition of the First Epistle of John," by Rev. W. J. Hancock.

"The Inspiration of the Bible," by Dr. Wordsworth.

"History of the Ojibway Indians," with especial reference to their conversion to Christianity, by Rev. Peter Jones, ("Kahkenaquonaby,") Indian missionary, with a memoir of the author, is just published in London.

"A Correspondence between the Bishop of Exeter and Lord Macaulay" has been published, in which the bishop has clearly demonstrated that the historian has done injustice to the memory of Cranmer. Such has always been the conviction of multitudes of the best informed historical students, and that conviction appears now to be well established.

Digitized by Google

Volume VIII of the works of the late John Angell James.

The second volume of Dr. Vaughan's "Revolutions in English History" has appeared, discussing the Reformation from Henry VIII. to Elizabeth.

Mr. Buckle's curious work on the "History of Civilization in England" has advanced as far as the second volume. It is written in the interest of one of the modern schools of skepticism in England in which materialism is the controlling element, with such vitality as can be obtained from a cordial hatred for evangelical religion in author and reader. His pages are full of brilliant paradoxes, and of glittering and unsound generalizations. He will be admired by a certain class of very young men, but his day will be brief.

The scholarship of England has sustained a severe loss in the death of Dr. John William Donaldson of Cambridge. He died Feb. 10, aged 49, exhausted by study. He published two invaluable contributions towards the knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages, styled the "New Cratylus" and the "Varronianus," besides other important works. The Cambridge scholars were looking to him as the editor of a new Greek Lexicon, to compete with Liddell and Scott's published at Oxford.

The Rev. William R. Churton publishes a volume on "the influence of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament on the progress of Christianity."

Charles Knight has issued Volume VII of his popular History of England, coming down to 1814.

"Philosophy of the Infinite: a treatise on Man's knowledge of the Infinite. Being an answer to Sir William Hamilton and Dr. Mansel." By H. Calderwood.

Bishop McIlvaine's "Inner Temple" is republished, with an introductory essay by the Bishop of Carlisle.

"The Divine Covenants, their nature and design: or the Covenants considered as successive stages in the Development of the divine purposes of Mercy," by John Kelly. The title of the book indicates one of the primal principles in the doctrine of the Covenants, and if the idea is well worked out by the author he has made an advance on any previous treatise.

Dr. Candlish appears with a second edition of his work on the

Digitized by Google

Atonement, first published sixteen years ago. He adopts the idea of the Limited Atonement, and attempts to reconcile this idea with the unlimited offer of salvation, by the hypothesis that the application of the atonement may be postponed to the end of the world, when all the race will be called on to give their assent to it; and the atonement is made for those only who signify this assent.

Dr. William Smith, the editor of Classical and Biblical Dictionaries, has engaged to edit a new and complete Biographical Dictionary for Great Britain.

The publication of Dr. A. Carlyle's Autobiography has struck a new vein in the history of the Kirk and its ministry. Dean Ramsay of Edinburgh has published a second series of his entertaining "Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Character:" and now "The Life and Times of Thomas Somerville, D. D.," embracing the period of 1741–1814, has appeared. A fair inside view of Moderatism in the Kirk, is likely to be revealed in these and in similar works which are likely to follow them.

G. J. Holyoke is the name of the master in the type of Atheism known as Secularism, which appeared among the artizans and tradesmen of England, but which is nearly obsolete. He has recently published a work entitled the "Rudiments of Public Speaking and Debate; or Hints on the application of Logic." The attempt to instill the virus of irreligion into the public mind through the pages of works on Logic and Rhetoric and History needs to be watched. Mill's Logic led off in this stratagem. Holyoke's book has been reprinted in New York; but *caveat emptor.*

"Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury" is the title of a new work to be published in five volumes by Dr. Hook. The first volume is out; and combines with the biography of the archbishops, a view of the Church of England, and its progress from age to age.

The last Bampton lecture was delivered by Dr. Hessey, on "Sunday, its Origin, History, and present obligation." The treatment of the subject is superficial and insufficient. When shall we have a thorough, learned, and exhaustive treatise on the Lord's Day, from the point of view taken by the Scriptures and by the Westminster Standards as well? E. P. H.

Digitized by Google

THEOLOGY.

The Proper Names of the Old Testament, arranged alphabetically from the original text, with Historical and Geographical Illustrations: for the use of Hebrew Students, School-masters, and Teachers, with an Appendix of the Hebrew and Aramaic Names in the New Testament. Edinburgh: 1861. The authoress, a lady, acknowledges being assisted by Baron von Bunsen and some of his learned German friends in the explanation of the most difficult words, such as the proper names of foreign origin, Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian; and has combined the results of the latest discoveries.

Egyptian Chronicles; with a Harmony of Social and Egyptian Chronology, and an Appendix on Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities. By Wm. Palmer, M. A. 2 vols. London: 1861.

Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen. Eine apalogetisch-hermeneutische Studie. Von A. Tholuck. London: 1860.

Das Evangelium des heiligen Johannes erlaütert. Von E. W. Hengstenberg, Dr. und Professor der Theologie in Berlin. Erster Band. London: 1861.

Notice sur la Collection des Documents relalifs à la Définition du Dogme de l'Immaculée Conception de la Très-sainte Vierge qui sont conservès dans la Cathédrale de Notre-Dame du Puy. Le Puy: 1860.

Histoire du Merveilleux dans les Temps Modernes. Par Louis Figuier. Tome deuxieme. La Baguette Divinatoire. Paris: 1860.

Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, with an introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By Arthur Perrhyn Stanley, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. London: 1861.

The Progress of Religious Thought as illustrated in the Protestant Church of France; being Essays and Reviews, bearing on the chief Religious Questions of the Day. Translated from the French, and edited by John R. Beard, D. D. London: 1861. Among the articles in this volume are the following: "Views and Aims," and two others, by M. Colani, pastor at Strasburg and editor of the "Revue de Théologie;" "Modern Materialism and its Causes," by Prof. Scholten; three by M. Réville, "The

Digitized by Google

Future Life, a Critique of the Chapter thereon in the *Dogmatik* of Strauss," "The Authority of Jesus Christ," and the other attempting a reconciliation of Religion and Science on the ground of History; "Of the Notion of Revelation," by M. Grotz, pastor at Nismes; a sketch of "John Calvin," by Ernest Rénan; and four articles by Rev. Edmund Schérer, formerly Professor of Theology in the University of Geneva: 1. "Theological Conversations," 2. "The Errata of the New Testament," 3. "What the Bible is," 4. "The Miracles of Jesus Christ."

On the Origin and Credibility of the Four Gospels. By P. W. Perfitt. London: 1861.

The Facts of the Four Gospels. An Essay. By Frederic Seebohm. London: 1861.

Unitarian Missionary Papers, consisting of, 1. The Religious Condition of the People. By George Beaumont. 2. How to make Unitarian Christianity produce its due Effect on the Public Mind. By J. C. Street. 3. Unitarianism, its Mission and its Missionaries. By William Binns. London: 1861.

The Vedas: Opinions of their Authors, and of later Indian Writers, in Regard to their Origin, Inspiration and Authority: being Part III. of Original Sanskrit Texts on the Origin and History of the People of India, their Religion and Institutions. Collected, translated into English, and illustrated by remarks, chiefly for the use of Students and others in India, by J. Muir, D. C. L., late of the Bengal Civil Service. Edinburgh: 1861.

The Providence of God manifested in Natural Law. By John Duncanson, M. D. London: 1861.

The Contrasts of Christianity with Heathen and Jewish Systems; or, Nine Sermons preached before the University of Oxford on various Occasions. By George Rawlinson, M. A., &c. London: 1861.

Among the latest English works are: — An Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles, 3 vols., by Rev. I. Fawcett; The Authority of the Scriptures, by J. Fendal; and Recent Recollections of the Anglo-American Church in the United States, by an English Layman, in 2 vols. R. H. C.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY AND TRAVELS.

Notice sur la Colonie du Sénégal et sur les Pays qui sont en

Digitized by Google

relation avec elle. Par M. D. Faidherbe, colonel du génie. Paris: 1860.

Carte du Sénégal, de la Falémé et de la Gambie. Dressée, sous la direction de M. Faidherbe, par le baron Brossard de Corbigny. Paris: 1861.

Fouilles à Carthage. Aux frais et sous la direction de M. Beulé, Membre de l'Institut. Paris: 1861.

Carthage and her Remains; being an account of the Excavations and Researches on the site of the Phœnician Metropolis in Africa and other adjacent places. Conducted under the auspices of Her Majesty's Government. By Dr. N. Davis, F. R. G. S., &c. London: 1861.

Travels and Adventures of the Rev. Joseph Wolff, D. D., LL. D., Vicar of Ile Brewers near Taunton, and Late Missionary to the Jews and Mohammedans in Persia, &c. London: 1860.

The Russians on the Amur; History of Discovery, Conquest, and Colonization, up to the Treaty of Peking in 1860: with a detailed description of the Country, its Inhabitants, Productions and Commercial Capabilities, together with Personal Accounts of Russian Travelers. By E. G. Ravenstein, F. G. S., Corresp. F. G. S., Frankfurt. London: 1861.

Japan, the Amoor River, and the Pacific; with Notices of other Places: comprised in a Voyage of Circumnavigation in the Imperial Russian Corvette "Rynda," in 1858–60. By Henry Arthur Tilley. London: 1861.

L' Insurrection Chinoise, son Origine et ses Progrés. Paris: 1861.

Egyptian Sepulchres and Syrian Shrines, including some stay in the Lebanon, at Palmyra, and in Western Turkey. By Emily A. Beaufort. 2 vols. London: 1861.

Egypt, the Soudan, and Central Africa, with Explorations from Khartoum on the White Nile to the Regions of the Equator, being Sketches from Sixteen Years' Travel. By John Petherick, F. R. G. S., Her Britannic Majesty's Consul for the Soudan. Edinburgh: 1861.

Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa; with Accounts of the Manners and Customs of the People, and of the Chace of the Gorilla, Crocodile, Leopard, Elephant, Hippopota-

Digitized by Google

mus, and other Animals. With Map and Illustrations. By Paul B. Du Chaillu. London: 1861.

La Flotte de César, &c. Par Auguste Jal, Historiographe de la Marine Impériale, &c. 1861.

The Armenian Origin of the Etruscans. By Robert Ellis, B. D., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, &c. London: 1861.

Antiquarian, Ethnological, and other Researches in New Granada, &c. By W. Bollaert, F. R. G. S. London: 1860.

Anahuac: or Mexico and the Mexicans, Ancient and Modern. By E. B. Tylor. London: 1861.

The Punjab and Delhi in 1857. By the Rev. J. Cave Browne, M. A. London: 1861.

Fictions connected with the Indian Outbreak of 1857. Exposed by E. Leckey, Author of "Principles of Goojuratee Grammar." Bombay: 1859.

History of the Siege of Delhi. By an Officer who served there. With a sketch of the Leading Events in the Punjaub connected with the great Indian Rebellion of 1857. Edinburgh: 1861.

Histoire de la Révolution de 1848. Par Garnier-Pagès. 2 vols. Paris: 1861.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, according to the several original authorities. Edited, with a translation, by Benjamin Thorpe, &c. 2 vols. London: 1861.

The Early and Middle Ages of England. By Charles H. Pearson, M. A., &c. London: 1861.

The Constitutional History of England, from the Accession of George the Third, 1760–1860. By Thomas Erskine May, C. B. Vol. I. London: 1861.

Letters and Papers illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry the Sixth, King of England. Vol. I. Edited by the Rev. Joseph Stevenson, M. A., &c. London: 1861.

Das Preussisch-Englische Bündniss im Siebenjahrige Kriege. Ein Vortrag. Von Dr. Arnold Schaefer, Ord. Professor der Geschichte an der Universität Greifswald. London: 1861.

Geschichte der Freimauerei. Von J. G. Findel, &c. Erster Band. Erste Lieferung. London: 1861.

Digitized by Google

Ungarn' gutes Recht, &c. Von einem Magyar. London: 1861.

Camillo Benso di Cavour. Per Roggero Boughi. Torino: 1861.

Count Cavour, his Life and Career. By Basil H. Cooper, B. A. London: 1860.

Letters written by John Chamberlain during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited from the originals by Sarah Williams. Printed for the Camden Society. 4to. London: 1861.

Bunsen als Staatsman und Schriftsteller. Eine Gedächtnissrede gehalten am 3 Januar, 1861. Von Dr. Heinrich Gelzer, Professor der Universität, Berlin. London: 1861.

Menasse Ben Israel. Sein Leben und Wirken, &c. Von Dr. D. M. Kayserling. London: 1861.

Œuvres et Correspondance Inédites d' Alexis de Tocqueville. Publiées et précédées d'une Notice. Par Gustave de Beaumont, Membre de l' Institut. 2 vols. Paris: 1861.

Mémoires et Correspondance du Roi Jérôme et de la Reine Catherine. Tome premier. Paris: 1861.

La Vie Politique de M. Royer-Collard, ses Discours et ses Écrits. Par M. de Barante, de l' Académie Française. 2 vols. London: 1861.

Private Correspondence of Thomas Raikes with the Duke of Wellington and other distinguished Contemporaries. Edited by his daughter, Harriet Raikes. London: 1861.

Life of the Right Honorable William Pitt. By Earl Stanhope, Author of the "History of England from the peace of Utrecht." Vols. I. and II. London: 1861.

The Life of Richard Porson, Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge from 1792 to 1808. By Rev. John Selby Watson, M. A., M. R. S. L. London: 1861.

The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Edited by her great grandson, Lord Wharncliffe. Third Edition, with Additions and a new Memoir by W. May Thomas. 2 vols. London: 1861. R. H. C.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Allocuzione detta dalla Santita di N. S. Papa Pio IX. vel Consistoro Segreto del 18 Marzo 1861. Rome: 1861.

La Questione Italiana vel Novembre 1860; al Sommo Pontefice, Papa Pio IX. Asisi: 1860.

Digitized by Google

Documens Diplomatiques. Published by the French Government. Paris: 1861.

The Popular Education of France, with Notices of that of Holland and Switzerland. By Matthew Arnold, M. A. London: 1861.

Leben und Wirken Albrecht Dürer's. Von Dr. A. von Eye. Nördlingen: 1860.

Michel-Ange, Léonard de Vinci, Raphaël, avec une Étude sur l'art Italien avant le seizième siècle et des Catalognes raisonnés. Par M. Charles Clement. Paris: 1861.

La Fontaine et ses Fables. Par H. Taine. 3d edition. Paris: 1861.

The Sea (La Mer.) From the French of M. J. Michelet. Translated from the latest Paris Edition. pp. 405. New York: 1861.

The Book of Good Counsels: from the Sanskrit of the "Hitopadesa." By Edwin Arnold, M. A., of Univ. Coll. Oxford, late Principal of the Poona College. With illustrations. London: 1861. R. H. C.

Art. IX. — CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. — *Gildas Salvianus. The Reformed Pastor*; showing the Nature of the Pastoral Work, especially in private instruction and catechising; with open confession of our too open sins. By Rev. Richard Baxter. 8vo. pp. 560. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1860.

It is now more than two hundred years since this work was prepared: and it has been in constant circulation through that whole period: although in these last days its usefulness has been increasing. The publishers have done well in putting the work into a large legible type, upon firm white paper, and in substantial binding: so that our old ministers and people may be able to read it with real comfort. No minister of the word can read this book without being quickened in the divine life, and in his pur-

Digitized by Google

pose to make the salvation of sinners the great end of his ministry. No private Christian can peruse it without gaining a true insight into the difficulties of the pastoral work; and conceiving a warmer sympathy for his pastor. It is a matter of common observation in the House of God that faithful preaching to the impenitent is adapted to quicken the saints in the divine life; and on the other hand, plain dealing with the people of God not unfrequently awakens the impenitent. For similar reasons such a book as the Reformed Pastor may be put into the hands of the ruling elders, deacons and brethren with the best results upon their spirituality and their zeal in the work of saving men.

E. P. H.

---

2. — *An Exposition of the Book of Ecclesiastes.* By the Rev. CHARLES BRIDGES, M. A., Rector of Hinton Martell, Dorset. 12mo. pp. 389. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1860.

It is related of an eminent biblical teacher still living, that on being asked, "What is the best commentary on the Psalms," his reply was, "There is no best." The same remark might be applied to the extant expositions of the Book of Ecclesiastes. Among those who have labored upon it are Jerome and the two Gregories, among the Fathers; Luther, Mercier, Grotius and Le Clerc, among the older Protestant interpreters: Umbreit, Rosenmüller, Knobel, Hitzig, Heiligstedt, Keil, Vaihinger and Stuart among the more recent scholars: — and yet the *best* commentary remains to be written. Some of these writers have lost their labor, from their failure to apprehend the structure or argument of the book. Grotius supposed it to be without any coherent plan, and to consist mainly of miscellaneous observations, often contradictory, upon the condition of man on earth. Others regard it as the report of a discussion on human happiness, held in an assembly of which Solomon was the presiding officer. And yet others suppose it to be a dialogue between a discontented skeptic and an experienced sage; or a representation of the varying and capricious modes of a single mind.

Digitized by Google

Not less diverse have been the judgments of the critics in respect of the plan and object of the book. One finds in it the doctrine of fatalism — of a fixed and remorseless decree which consigned man to perpetual labor and toil ending in vanity and vexation of spirit. Another gives to it the Epicurean sense — as if its author had taught that sensual pleasure is man's highest good. On the other hand, Jerome found in it an argument for monasticism and self-mortification. Some suppose the chief doctrine of the book to be the future state and the final judgment: while others, as Knobel, deny that the author had any fixed persuasion of the reality of either a future state or a day of judgment; to this end rejecting as spurious ch. xii: 9–14. Such are the vagaries of the human mind, when not taught of God, in the interpretation of Scripture; leaving us in doubt whether the spirit of Ecclesiastes is that of the Fatalist, the Skeptic, the Epicurean, the Anchorite, the Free Thinker, or the Free Lover.

Among judicious and orthodox critics the judgment is unanimous, that the book is written upon a preconceived and coherent plan, and that it concludes also, with wonderful directness and power, to the truths revealed in other portions of the inspired and infallible Word. There is likewise a substantial agreement among them as to the theme of the work. Prof. Stuart states it thus: "The vanity and nothingness of all earthly efforts, pursuits and objects." Mr. Bridges thinks the purpose of the writer is "to bring out into clear view the chief good — the true happiness of man; *in what it does not consist* — not in the wisdom, pleasures, honors, and riches of this world; *in what it does consist* — the enjoyment and service of God." Hengstenberg says: "To further the fear of God and life in Him is the great purpose of the writer in all that he advances." But the Preacher himself states his theme better than any of his commentators. His starting point (at i: 2) is "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity." His conclusion (xii: 13) is: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man."

The work of Mr. Bridges is not a critical and learned commentary; but the author has made himself in a good degree familiar with the best learning on the subject, and furnishes his

Digitized by Google

readers with the fruits of his reading. He has given special attention to the practical bearings of the book, and has prepared a volume which cannot fail to be useful to the careful reader. His observations on difficult passages are generally judicious; and the general tone of his work is admirable. E. P. H.

---

3. — *Adam and his Times.* By JOHN M. LOWRY, D. D., author of "Esther and her times;" Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 291. 1861.

"The substance," the author tells us, "of lectures given to the congregation of which he is pastor." It was designed, therefore, for popular instruction. Both the historical and doctrinal topics of the subject are freely discussed. The volume is characterized by a reverence for the plain teachings of the Word of God, true principles of interpretation, and sound doctrine. Its publication is more than justified by the great, and we think deplorable, lack of pulpit instruction on these Old Testament themes. A.

---

4. — *True Manhood:* its Nature, Foundation, and Development. A book for young men. By WILLIAM LANDELS, minister of Regent's Park Chapel, London. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. pp. 260.

The author of this work informs us, in the preface, that it is "composed to a considerable extent of Lectures delivered by the Author to Young Men's Associations in various parts of the country." We think it admirably adapted to its purpose. The style is bold and direct, the tone that of earnestness and fidelity; there is a hearty appreciation of what is truly noble, and a hearty contempt for all that is merely conventional. What we most admire is the prominence given to Religion, and the force with which its claims are pressed, and yet in such a manner as

Digitized by Google

can scarcely be offensive to any ingenuous reader, however destitute himself of the spirit of piety. We heartily commend it to those for whose benefit it is specially designed. †. †.

---

5. — *Memoir of the Life and Brief Ministry of the Rev. David Sandeman*, Missionary to China. By the Rev. ANDREW A. BONAR, author of the "Memoir of Rev. R. M. McCheyne," &c. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. pp. 313.

In this volume we have an account of the life of one who, at the early age of thirty-two, was called away from his chosen life-work among the heathen. But brief as his life was, it was not without its results. The volume is made up of extracts from his journal, letters, essays and sermons, with an account of his travels, embracing a visit to Rome; together with the personal recollections of friends, and the narrative of the author. The work should be in the hands of students and candidates for the ministry. The cheerful piety, laborious zeal, and spirit of unreserved consecration which it exhibits, are most worthy of imitation. Rev. Mr. Bonar has been highly favored in being privileged to give to the Church a record of two such devoted men of God as Robert Murray McCheyne and David Sandeman. †. †.

---

6. — *Grapes of Eshcol;* or Gleanings from the Land of Promise. By JOHN R. MACDUFF, D. D., author of "Morning and Night Watches," "Memories of Bethany," &c. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. pp. 275.

The character of this delightful little work may be inferred from its words of dedication: "This little volume is dedicated to one whose calm submission to the hand of God under a lingering sickness, and her bright hope of 'a better country,' where 'the inhabitant shall no more say, I am sick,' have inspired not a few of its thoughts and musings." It is composed of thirty-one meditations on subjects pertaining to the heavenly world: a

Digitized by Google

few clusters of "Grapes gathered by Faith and Hope, the two spies from the true Canaan," for the comfort and support of God's suffering people. It is full of the consolations of the Gospel. †. †.

---

7. — *Annals of the Rescued.* By the Author of "Haste to the Rescue." With a Preface by Rev. CHARLES E. L. WIGHTMAN. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. pp. 263.

The writer of this volume is the wife of the clergyman whose name is given in the title page. It contains a record of her labors in the cause of total abstinence, which she prosecuted with much earnestness and self-denial, and a good degree of success, in her husband's parish in Shrewsbury, England. The book is written in an interesting style; giving mostly, in the language of the parties, a record of the conversations held in furtherance of her object. This dramatic form makes it a very readable book. The laborer in the cause of Temperance will find a potent auxiliary. We were glad to find the following declaration — "We do not care to establish Total Abstinence Societies as an *end;* that is not our object. We want to bring *sinners to* CHRIST." Would that labors for Moral Reform were always conducted in this spirit, and with this aim! †. †.

---

8. — *The Gospel Ministry*: in a series of letters from a Father to his Sons. By the Rev. WM. S. WHITE, D. D., Lexington, Va. Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 204.

In this little volume, which may be read in an hour or two, the Theological Student, or young minister, may find counsels and directions of the utmost value to him. These letters "were actually written," says the author, "to one son preparing for the ministry, and to another just entering upon that work." They have, therefore, all the point, earnestness, and practical wisdom,

Digitized by Google

which paternal solicitude, added to zeal for the glory of God, and long and faithful service in the ministry of the Gospel, can impart. They are worthy of a careful perusal. †. †.

---

9. — *Heavenly Watchwords:* or Promises and Countersigns. By L. B. J. Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 125.

This volume consists mainly of texts of Scripture arranged under different heads. These are set forth under the designation of "Promise," "Countersign," "Proof," — the first being God's voice speaking to the soul; the second, the voice of the soul expressing, in Scriptural language, its feelings, wishes, &c.; the third, the assurance that the promise will be fulfilled, in the case of all who have this "countersign." The work is intended for the closet, as a help to private devotion and self-examination.

†. †.

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

The Teacher Teaching: A Practical View of the Relations and Duties of the Sunday School Teacher. By the Author of "The Teacher Taught." Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. Cincinnati: Geo. Crosby. 1861. 12mo. pp. 371.

The Rock. With an Introduction by Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D. D. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. Cincinnati: George Crosby. 1861. 12mo. pp. 364.

The Young Organist; or the History of Abel Grey. By the Author of "Rest for the Weary," "The Silk-Winder," &c. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. Cincinnati: Geo. Crosby. 1861. 18mo. pp. 203.

The Gospel Ministry: in a Series of Letters from a Father to his Sons. By Rev. Wm. S. White, D. D., Lexington, Va. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861. 18mo. pp. 204.

Adam and his Times. By Rev. John M. Lowry, D. D., Author of "Esther and her Times," Pastor of the 1st Presbyterian Church, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861. 12mo. pp. 291.

Heavenly Watchwords: or Promises and Countersigns. By L. B. J. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861. 18mo. pp. 125.

The Child's Pilgrim's Progress: Parts 1st and 2nd. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861.

Henry Burney, or a Talk about Angels. By Mrs. C. A. Bradshaw. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861.

Tracts: No. 244–250. Also, Tracts: Soldier's Series, 120 pages. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1861.

Soldier's Health. By Dr. W. W. Hall, Author of "Consumption," "Sleep," &c. New York: H. B. Price. 1861. Pamphlet 16mo. pp. 128.

Health and Disease; A Book for the People. By Dr. W. W. Hall, Editor of "Hall's Journal of Health," and Author of "Bronchitis and Kindred Diseases," &c. 3d Edition. New York: Published by the Author. 1860. 12mo. pp. 298.

Digitized by Google

JUST PUBLISHED,

—BY—

SMITH, ENGLISH & CO.,

Publishers, Booksellers, and Stationers,

NO. 28 NORTH SIXTH STREET,

PHILADELPHIA.

1. THOLUCK ON THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. By DR. A. THOLUCK. Translated from the Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition, by the REV. R. LUNDIN BROWN, M. A., translator of "Ullmann on the Sinlessness of Jesus." 8vo. Cloth, $2 25.

2. LYONS' CHRISTIAN SONGS.

Christian Songs, Translations, and other Poems. By the REV. J. G. LYONS, LL. D. 12mo. Cloth, 80 cents.

The present volume contains all the Christian Songs hitherto published, together with eight sacred, and fifteen other poems not included in the last edition.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Hengstenberg on Ecclesiastes, and other Treatises. 8vo	$2 00
Fleming's Vocabulary of Philosophy. Second Edition. 12mo. Cloth	1 75
Pulpit Themes and Preachers' Assistant. 12mo	1 25
Kurtz's Church History. 12mo	1 50
Farrar's Science in Theology. 12mo	85
Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Diction. Second Edition. 8vo	3 00
Stier's Words of Jesus. 5 vols., 8vo	14 00
Tholuck on John's Gospel. 8vo	2 25
Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Diction. 8vo	3 00
Fairbairn's Hermeneutical Manual. 12mo	1 50
Religious Cases of Conscience. 12mo	1 00
Helps for the Pulpit. 12mo	1 25
Gerlach on the Pentateuch. 8vo	2 50
Coles on God's Sovereignty. 12mo	63
Schmucker's Popular Theology. 12mo	1 00
Luther on Galatians. Small 8vo	1 25
Bengel's Gnomon of the New Testament. 5 vols., 8vo	*Net*, 5 00
M'Ilvaine's Evidence of Christianity. 12mo	63
Litton on the Church of Christ. 8vo	1 25

The above can be had of booksellers in all parts of the country, or will be sent by mail, prepaid, by the publishers, upon receipt of the prices advertised—BENGEL'S GNOMON alone excepted, which will be sent, free of expense, for $6 50.

LATELY IMPORTED.

Vaughan's Hours with the Mystics. Second Edition. Revised and Augmented by the Author. 2 vols	*Net*, $3 50
Maclaurin's Works. Edited by REV. W. H. GOULD. 2 vols., 12mo	4 00
Dictionary of Scripture Parallels. 8vo	3 00
Aikman's Cyclopedia of Missions. 12mo	1 25

Digitized by Google

THE

Danville Quarterly Review.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION BY WHICH THIS PERIODICAL IS CONDUCTED:

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,
EDWARD P. HUMPHREY,
STEPHEN YERKES,
JOSEPH T. SMITH,
} Professors in Danville Theological Seminary.

JAMES MATTHEWS,
JACOB COOPER,
} Professors in Center College, Danville, Ky.

ROBERT W. LANDIS, Pastor, Somerset, Kentucky.
JOHN M. WORRALL, " Covington, Kentucky.
ROBERT L. BRECK, " Maysville, Kentucky.

☞ Original articles or letters in reference to matter for publication in the Review, should be addressed to DANVILLE REVIEW, Danville, Kentucky, or to some member of the Association.

The DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW will be issued regularly in the first week of the months of March, June, September, and December, and contain 176 pages a number.

TERMS:

For one copy, one year, payable in advance	$3 00
For one copy, two years, if paid strictly in advance	5 00
For four copies, one year, if paid strictly in advance	10 00
For five copies, one year, payable in advance, (the sender to receive the fifth copy for his trouble,)	12 00
For one copy of any single number, by mail, prepaid	80
For ten copies of any single number, by mail, prepaid	6 00
To Missionaries, if paid in advance, one copy per year	2 00

Remittances for the work, by mail, will be at the Publisher's risk, if in registered letters. Subscribers are requested to remit by mail, as it gives them the least trouble, and the money is received more promptly. Large amounts should be sent by check or draft.

This being a Quarterly Periodical, the postage, when paid by subscribers quarterly in advance, is THREE AND A HALF CENTS on each number, or FOURTEEN CENTS for the year, to all parts of the United States.

Remittances, and other letters on business, should be addressed to

RICHARD H. COLLINS,
Publisher Danville Review,
25 WEST FOURTH ST., CINCINNATI.

STATE OF THE COUNTRY.—The Article by Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, "*Our Country*," in the March No., and his two Articles in the June No., the "*State of the Country*," and his "*Fast Day Discourse*," were re-printed in three separate pamphlets. Price by mail, 12 cents, single, or a set for 25 cents.

Digitized by Google

TERMS, THREE DOLLARS A YEAR, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

THE

DANVILLE QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

EDITED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

DECEMBER, 1861.

Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.—2 TIM. I: 10

DANVILLE, KY., AND CINCINNATI, OHIO:
PUBLISHED BY
RICHARD H. COLLINS, 25 WEST FOURTH STREET, CINCINNATI,
AND SOLD BY
CROSBY, NICHOLS & CO., BOSTON; ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK; WM. S. & ALFRED MARTIEN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT S. DAVIS, PITTSBURGH; JOHN D. THORPE, ROBERT CLARKE & CO., GEO. S. BLANCHARD, AND RICKEY & CARROLL, CINCINNATI; A. DAVIDSON, LOUISVILLE; KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; WM. G. HOLMES, CHICAGO.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1861, by
RICHARD H. COLLINS,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

Postage, to all parts of the U. S., when paid Quarterly in advance, 3½ cents on each number, or 14 cents for a year

Digitized by Google

WHEELER & WILSON'S

SEWING MACHINES,

NOW, AS EVER, IN THE ASCENDANT.

PRICES JUST REDUCED.

Sewing-Machine Awards by the American Institute, N. Y., 1859-60.



We would ask the earnest and candid attention of the public, and *especially* of that public more immediately represented by the DANVILLE REVIEW, to the following discriminating award of the intelligent Committee on Sewing-Machines of the American Institute:

The Machines are arranged according to the stitch made, and the purpose to which the machine is to be applied, in four classes—First, Second, Third and Fourth; a classification indicating the order of importance and usefulness

Class First includes the Shuttle or Lock-Stitch Machine for family use, and for manufactures in the same range of purpose and material. The Committee assign to this class the highest rank on account of the *elasticity, permanence, beauty,* and *general desirableness of the stitching when done, and the wide range of its application.* At the *head* of this class they place the Wheeler & Wilson Machine, *the uniform award* for *this* Machine wherever it has been exhibited in competition in all parts of the country.

Class Second includes the Shuttle or Lock-Stitch Machines for heavy manufacturing purposes.

Class Third includes the *Double Thread Chain-Stitch* Machines. The Committee object to the stitch made by these, as it requires more thread than any other stitch, and leaves a ridge projecting from one side of the seam, which, in the Committee's opinion, must usually impair the durability of the seam, and the value and durability of the garments, or other manufactures put together with it, though *some of the machines* making this stitch can be used very well for the plain *line embroidering purposes*, and for garments that it may be desirable to alter, as the stitch may be *raveled* in the same manner as *knitting-work*. "At the head of this class the Committee place the Grover & Baker Machine."

Class Fourth includes the *Single Thread Chain-Stitch* Machines. The Committee consider the *tendency* of this stitch to ravel to be an objection so serious that they refuse to recommend the machine, making for it no reward or premium.

THE WHEELER & WILSON MACHINE

Still continues to hold the relative position given it by this award, which is sustained by more than one hundred COUNTY, STATE and UNITED STATES awards, and by all of the leading religious and secular journals of the country, together with the array of the most intelligent and influential clergymen, ladies, gentlemen, manufacturers, and professional seamstresses in all parts of the United States, Europe, British America, West Indies, Central and South America, Turkey, India, China, and Japan.

Awarded the highest premium at the UNITED STATES FAIRS of 1858, 1859, and 1860.

The stitch is *alike on both sides*, leaving NO CHAIN OR RIDGE on the under side.

The sworn report to Mr. Howe, to whom all Sewing-Machines pay a license, shows for 1859, that

Wheeler & Wilson sold	21,305	Machines.
I. M. Singer & Co	10,953	"
Grover & Baker	10,280	"

☞ All Machines warranted three years.

WM. SUMNER & CO., AGENTS,

Pike's Opera House, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Digitized by Google

DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. IV.

DECEMBER, 1861.

ART. I. — *Imputation.* *

PART II.

Antecedent Imputation, and Supralapsarianism.

We cannot more appropriately commence our second article than by repeating from the truly devout and learned Pareus, the following remark:

"I confidently affirm that the larger portion of ancient heresies, as well as of the present dissensions in the Church, have arisen principally from this cause, that Councils, and Bishops, and Doctors of the Church have, without any discrimination, put forth as articles of the Catholic faith whatever dogmas of the Schools and Universities they pleased; and imposed the belief of them upon the conscience as equally necessary to salvation; while they too readily denounced as heretical or schismatical every departure from the customary interpretation of the Scriptures." †

* Published with some reference to the tractates enumerated in the note at the beginning of our former article. See *Danville Review*, Sept., 1861, p. 390.

† The original is here appended, for the force of the passage can scarcely be preserved in translation: "Ausim enim confirmare, majorem tam veterum hæresium, quam præsentium dissidiorum partem, in Ecclesia, hinc præcipuè natam fuisse et esse, quod Concilia, Episcopi, Doctores Ecclesiæ nullo discrimine quævis Scholarum dogmata et Cathedrarum placita pro articulis Fidei Catholicæ venditarunt, parique ad salutem necessitate credenda conscientiis imposuerunt, ex quavis verò Scripturarum interpretationis discrevantia nimis facilè hæreses vel schismata fecerunt." *Irenici*, cap. IV.

Digitized by Google

Similar asseverations have been frequently made by men of loose theology, to prepare the way for their rejection of fundamental truth or for the advocacy of the worst heresies; but such proceedings are a misapplication of the facts referred to. Those facts are unquestionable. And no one who has any knowledge of the venerable, and illustrious, and eminently conservative divine of the Palatinate, could entertain the supposition that he would have thus adverted to them without reason.

We have already stated, that during the early period of the Reformation, and before all the leading principles of the speculative theology of the Church had been definitely traced, (if we may so speak,) to the *terminus à quo*, and the *terminus ad quem*, the influence of philosophy was allowed to operate even in selecting the stand-points from which to combat the deadly errors with which the Church found herself every where environed. And as regards the subject now under discussion, (and its manifold relations to divine truth,) some assumed that the infinite and uncontrolled will of God was the point from which the whole should be explicated; and others, that God's immutable justice was the only proper stand-point; while a third class could see no propriety in attempting to follow out any such distinction, or in regarding those points of explication as in any way antagonistic; and they attempt to reason alike from both. There is, indeed, a most important sense in which this position may be pronounced the true one; for the will of God can never be in conflict with His justice: and *vice versa*. The principle, however, is not true as it was then made to apply, as will be shown presently. * But

* The ground of this procedure was an insufficient appreciation of the difference between the principles involved in the question, Whether the objects of the decree of reprobation were to be considered as already created, fallen, and corrupt, or as uncreated and unfallen. The idea, involved as it was in the interminable fogs of the misty metaphysics of scholasticism, does not appear at the outset to have presented itself very clearly to the minds of some of the Reformers; and they finally began to philosophise upon it after the manner of the Schoolmen. The subsequent discussion, however, made the difference, as well as the vital importance of the distinction, perfectly clear. Reprobation viewed from the Supralapsarian stand-point, involves the creation of the Reprobate — that they may be damned in order to show forth the power and severity of God. And as this their creation, and such a disposal of them, could not of course be referred to the justice or moral nature of God, it was referred to his will.

Digitized by Google

this last class of divines assumed it in relation to the then existing discussion; and hence, upon a more full development of the two systems which were thus elaborated, and on a more rigid analysis of them in after years, it became somewhat difficult to assign to such theologians a definite position in relation thereto. Of this class were Calvin, Ursinus, Pareus, Danæus and others. And to illustrate by a single instance the position which they in general seem to occupy, we may refer to the fact that the Remonstrants in their *Confessio*, (anno 1618,) cap. 5. sect. 7, (see margin,) charge supralapsarianism upon Calvin: Whereupon the four Leyden Professors in their *Censura*, containing a reply to the Confession, pronounce the charge a calumny. But Episcopius in his *Apologia pro Confessione*, pp. 62–68, (written after his return from banishment, and published in 1630,) reiterates the charge; and after quoting somewhat from Calvin, proceeds to prove that Beza was a supralapsarian, which nobody ever denied. Here the matter would probably have ended. But Dr. Twisse, (subsequently Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly,) being a strong supralapsarian and having too high an opinion of Calvin to doubt that he too ought to be one, brought all the resources of his learning and singularly subtle intellect to sustain the position assumed by Episcopius. These, however, were the exceptions; for the concurrent and settled conviction of the intelligent in the theological world has long been, that the matured views of Calvin were like those of Augustine, infralapsarian. * And

But the Infralapsarian stand-point contemplates man as fallen, corrupt and condemned; from which corrupt mass God, of his mere good pleasure and will and without any foresight of faith and good works, selects the objects of his mercy, and leaves the rest to perish as the just desert of their sin. And so, too, with respect to the doctrine of imputation. The Supralapsarians claim that it is only *immediate;* and refer the imputation of both sin and righteousness to the mere will and good pleasure of God. While the Infralapsarians claim that it is *subjective*, also, in relation to guilt or sin, and regards man as already fallen and corrupt; and hence, that while the imputation of righteousness is gratuitous, and the work of divine mercy, the imputation of sin is the work of divine justice for subjective desert, — the sin of our first parents and our sin in them, or participation therein, being both justly imputed to us for condemnation. They accept the facts in the case on the testimony of God; and, in general, ignore all philosophical speculation in relation to them.

* In fact, the manner in which he strikes the great key note of the system can leave no ground for serious doubt on the subject. In his *Opuscula*, p. 785,

Digitized by Google

then, on the other hand, and as regards the doctrine of Original Sin, some of the earlier Reformers went so far in protesting against the antecedent imputation notions of those Papal theologues who followed Ockham, and whose views by clear implication denied to God the possession of moral perfections, that they proceeded to the opposite extreme. * Zuingle, for example, says that Original Sin "is no sin, but a misfortune, a vice, a distemper;" and he adds that nothing is more weak or farther from the sense of the Scriptures, than to say that Original Sin is not only a distemper, but also a crime." Such is his language in the Declaration on Original Sin sent to Francis I. And the same utterances are found in the correspondence between him and Œcolampadius, published at Basle in 1536 :

---

he says, "Quæ de absoluta potestate nugantur Scholastici, non solùm repudio sed etiam detestor: quia justitiam ejus ab imperio separant." So too Pareus, on Ps. cii: 27. "Æterna Dei veritas, quæ non magis est mutationi obnoxia, quàm ipsa Dei æterna essentia seu natura." One great reason of the confusion in respect to the real views of Calvin is the very common error of attributing to him the Tractate against Castalio, entitled *Responsio ad Calumnias Nebulonis.* Castalio, on the merest presumption, attributes it to Calvin: and the Socinians and Arminians have simply reiterated the charge; until even some Calvinists have believed it. See Turrettin, Loc. IX, Quæst. IX, Sect. 41. The tract, however, was written by Beza; which being taken into consideration, the very foundation of the argument proving Calvin a Supralapsarian is swept away.

* Ockham, (or Ochamus,) in perfect consistency with these views, says that Original Sin is, "*Reatus alieni peccati sine aliquo vitio hærente in nobis.*" To this he was led by his supralapsarian notion of the WILL of God; and the words express precisely Dr. Hodge's doctrine of antecedent imputation on the same subject. Bellarmine, too, opposes the doctrine of Calvin and the Reformed Church in these words: "Itaque peccatum in priore significatione unum est dumtaxat omnium hominum, sed in Adamo actuale et personale in nobis originale dicitur. Solus enim ipse actuali voluntate illud commisit: *nobis vero communicatur per generationem eo modo, quo communicari potest id quod transiit, nimirum per imputationem.*" De Amiss. Gra., lib. 5, cap. 17. Opp., Tom. III. p. 332; Leyden, 1598. These views the Reformed Church, as a body, except the Supralapsarians, rejected from the first. Though Dr. Hodge refers to this very passage of Bellarmine, and most strangely affirms that Turrettin "quotes it as containing a full admission of the *doctrine* of imputation." (Princeton Essays, I., p. 181.) Dr. Hodge, if the passage expresses his own views, has of course the right to say so; but he had no right to say what he here does respecting Turrettin. The whole matter, however, must come up again for a full examination in our next Essay. The passage in Turrettin to which Dr Hodge refers may be found in Loco XVI. Quæst. III. Sect. 15., Tom. II. pp. 572, 573.

Digitized by Google

"Quid brevius aut clarius dici potuit, quam originale peccatum non esse peccatum, sed morbum." "Sic ergo dicimus, originalem contagionem morbum esse, non peccatum; quod peccatum cum culpa conjunctum est, culpa vero ex commisso vel admisso ejus nascitur, qui facinus designavit." And still farther on he says, nostra sententia est, "vitium esse ac morbum, qui ceu mulcta primis parentibus inflictus est." pp. 54, 55, 61.

And thus, as is usual, one extreme begot another.

We should greatly err, however, if we supposed that those of either the Scholastic or Reformed divines who adopted the fundamental principles of the system now known as supralapsarianism, and which by the clearest implication divests the Supreme Being of all moral attributes, were actuated herein by any other aim than to exalt and magnify the Sovereignty of God, and to inculcate thereby the most devout and implicit obedience to his will: for such is undoubtedly the fact. Morality, said they, is not founded on immutable justice, but on the will. And it may be observed as remarkable that, while the excellent John Gerson (or Jarson) — who was of the sect of the Nominalists of which Ockham was founder, and who was the oracle of the Council of Constance, and the great antagonist of the spiritual monarchy of the Pope — reasoning from this principle, *was led to place religion in devout feeling;* Protagoras and Hobbes — who both took the ground that right and wrong were unreal and imaginary, and had no basis in the nature of things — endeavored *to explode and deride everything of religion but the form.* But in illustration of the readiness of the antagonists of the supralapsarians in the Reformed Church to concede to them piety and purity of intention, we shall adduce here the words of the infralapsarian Jurieu, (already referred to,) which, taking all the facts into consideration, assumes the aspect of the ludicrous, at least, if not of something far worse. The passage is of use, also, as containing a delineation of the system itself.

In his *Apology for the Reformed,* after having convicted Maimbourg of misrepresenting Calvin, he proceeds as follows:

"Besides, I say that his conclusion is wrong, and that there is nothing more absurd and less theological than the consequence which M. Maimbourg draws from the doctrine of those divines, viz.: *That it des-*

Digitized by Google

troys altogether the idea we ought to have of God, and leads directly to Atheism. There was never any thing said more inconsiderately. *Let us take things in the worst sense; if that doctrine destroys the idea we ought to have of God, it is because it represents God to us as being cruel, unjust, and punishing innocent creatures with everlasting torments;* and this is precisely what M. Maimbourg means, when he says that it destroys the idea of God, because the idea of God implies the attributes of mildness, justice, and equity. But how can a doctrine which gives us the idea of a severe and tyrannical God, who uses his authority with the utmost rigor, lead men to Atheism?" . . . . "It is a foolish thing to say that a hypothesis leads to Atheism, when it brings God into every thing, makes him the cause of all things, and the only aim of all his own actions, and raises him so much above his creatures as to be able to dispose of them in such a manner as seems to be unjust to carnal reason.* *That opinion of the supralapsarians is so far from leading to Atheism, that on the contrary it places the Deity in the highest degree of elevation and grandeur that can be conceived. For it does so much debase the creatures before the Creator, that the Creator, according to this system, is bound by no laws to his creatures,* but may dispose of them as he thinks fit, and make them subservient to his glory in such a method as he judges proper, and they have no right to contradict him. I confess that this opinion is liable to a great many inconveniences, *and is so harsh that it cannot be easily relished. And therefore St. Augustine's hypothesis is without doubt to be preferred to it.*" Part I., cap. 19. pp. 245, 246.

This, then, is the system. God is bound by no principles of eternal and immutable justice in the disposition he makes of his creatures; and may of his mere will or pleasure consign the innocent to everlasting torments. And it claims to thus place God in the highest degree of elevation that can be conceived. And yet even this ardent apologist finds it too harsh to be easily relished; and claims that *though it place God in the highest conceivable degree of elevation and grandeur,* there is another hypothesis (and one, of course, which does not thus elevate him,) which is,

* Cudworth, however, does not hesitate to class with Atheists that whole school of divines who maintain "that God may command what is contrary to moral rules; that he has no inclination to the good of his creatures; *that he may justly doom an innocent being to eternal torments; and that whatever God does will, for that reason is just because He wills it.*" *Eternal and Immut. Morality,* Sect. 11.

Digitized by Google

without doubt, to be preferred to it, and is more easily relished! Is this nonsense, or is it blasphemy?

Now as this system has become extensively incorporated with the Reformed theology; and as some of its fundamental principles are, by many of the foes as well as by some of the professed friends of Calvinism, still identified therewith; and as the doctrine of antecedent imputation rests on those principles, as is evident from the arguments by which its advocates endeavor to defend it; it will be timely to devote a few pages to as thorough an analysis of the subject as we can present in so brief a compass.

The doctrines of grace as advanced by Augustine, and controverted by Pelagius * and his followers, gradually lost their hold upon the Church, amidst its increasing corruptions, until they were well nigh lost sight of altogether; to such an extent, at least, that when Godeschalcus, in 847, gave them a fuller expression than was usual in his day, † he was at once condemned by Rabanus Maurus, the Moguntine Archbishop; and by the council of Moguntia in 848; as well as by bishops Hincmarus, Rhotadus, and others; (John Scotus Erigena also writing a book against him;) and finally, by another Council in 849, he was degraded from the priesthood, whipped with rods, and shut up in a monastery until released by death in 870. A very few ventured to apologize for him; but for the time his enemies triumphed, though it was only for a time; for in less than a century the great Anselm arose, ‡ through whom the doctrines taught by Augustine were revived, and again found favor in the Latin Church.

These doctrines were subsequently acknowledged and taught and commented upon in a very extraordinary manner by Thomas

---

* Augustine was born in 353, and died in 429. Pelagius died in 420, aged 90.

† His language is thus quoted by Lampe: "Dari Prædestinationem duplicem, aliorum ad vitam æternam, aliorum ad æternam mortem; nolle Deum omnes homines salvos fieri, sed tantum eos, qui salvantur: Christum non pro totius mundi redemtione esse mortuum, sed tantum pro iis, qui salvantur; esse quidem in homine Liberum Arbitrium, perditum tamen in Adamo quoad bonum, hinc requiri Gratiæ adjutorium et præventum ad singulos actus, quæ Gratiæ non detur secundum merita." *Hist. Eccles., lib. II.*, cap. 8, p. 222. But a very full account of the whole affair relating to this eminent man, may be found in *Vossii Hist. Pelag.*, lib. VII., parte IV., pp. 776–829.

‡ Anselm was born in 1033, and died in 1109.

Digitized by Google

Aquinas, (nat. 1224, ob. 1274); who — while he maintained that "Predestination [which term he uses as a synonym with election] is the cause (causa) of grace and glory;" and that "nothing can be regarded as the reason for predestination which is the effect of predestination," and also, plainly and directly, that the "præscientia meritorum nullo modo est causa prædestinationis divinæ," — appeared, nevertheless, to be unsettled in his views of the immutable justice of God; and sometimes seemed to think that justice depended on the will — as for instance, when he makes the will of God the standard of right and wrong. And John Duns Scotus, (nat. circiter 1285, ob. 1307,) his great rival, and who divided with him the applause of the scholastic world, agreed with him here; and boldly and unambiguously taught that "morality is founded on will;" and thus effected an entrance into the church to that most pernicious of all heresies — that the distinction of right and wrong depends not on immutable justice, but on the mere will of God, who first establishes an order or constitution, and then acts upon it. And, as we shall see, the church of God has ever since suffered from the bitter fruits of these unhallowed speculations. For the revival of the same in the Reformed Church brought with it similar results, as we shall have occasion to show presently.

Ockham, († 1347,) to the similarity of whose views to those of Dr. Hodge on the subject of antecedent imputation we have already referred, was a disciple of Scotus, and carried out this doctrine to its logical and legitimate sequences; and plainly asserts that "moral evil is only evil because it is forbidden by God;" and that "God in strictness and propriety of speech (in rigore et proprietate sermonis) is the cause of sin:" and likewise that "if God had commanded his creatures to hate Him, the hatred of God would be the duty of man, and even praiseworthy;" a sentiment substantially adopted by some supralapsarian divines of the Reformation. He thus referred the very existence of morality to the mere pleasure and will of God.*

* Cudworth remarks that, "certain it is that divers modern theologers do not only seriously but zealously contend, that there is nothing absolutely, intrinsically and naturally good and evil, just and unjust, antecedently to any positive command or prohibition of God, but that the arbitrary will and pleasure of

Digitized by Google

This doctrine — as Mackintosh, in his *Progress of Ethical Philosophy*, well remarks —

"By necessary implication refuses moral attributes to the Deity, and contradicts the existence of a moral government, and is practically equivalent to Atheism." "It would, if men were consistent, extinguish piety, or, in other words, annihilate all religion. Yet so astonishing are the contradictions of human nature, that this most impious of all opinions probably originated in a pious solicitude to magnify the sovereignty of God, and to exalt his authority even above his own goodness."

This is a charitable judgment, and we cannot but think it just; notwithstanding the difficulty of reconciling it with such sentiments as those of Rimini, (floruit 1350,) who taught that God may both lie and deceive; or with the sentiments of certain supralapsarian divines who maintained that some sinners are formally adjudged to hell because they would not believe a lie.

The School divines who followed Ockham, and, as already remarked, sought the aid of the ancient philosophy in support of their speculations, instead of adopting the philosophy of Plato, chose that of Aristotle; who, in his *Nicomachian Ethics* affirms that "things honest and just have so great a variety and uncertainty in them, that they seem to be only by law, and not by nature:" * a sentiment decidedly condemned by Plato in his *de Legibus*, lib. 10, and also in his *Theatetus*, and in other of his tractates. † The Schoolmen did not all, however, adopt these sentiments; and Ockham and his followers met with much disappointment in their efforts to support them. In fact, when treating upon the subject formally, the great majority took ground directly in opposition thereto, and taught that the eternal and immutable idea of right and wrong, as existing in the Divine intellect, is

God, (that is, an Omnipotent Being devoid of all essential and natural justice) by its commands and prohibitions, is the first and only rule and measure thereof." Works, vol. II., p. 871.

* Eth. Nicomach., lib. 1, cap. 1, and lib. 5, cap. 10.

† To save space, and render a fuller citation of testimonies unnecessary on this point, we beg leave to refer our readers to Book I, Chapter 1, of Cudworth's tract on *Immutable Morality*, in the second volume of his Works, where the subject is fully and satisfactorily presented.

Digitized by Google

the foundation of the immutable nature of morality. Aquinas himself had expressly affirmed that "though God wills what is just, yet nothing is just merely because he wills it." But we cannot here dwell longer upon the supralapsarianism of the Schoolmen: and shall now proceed to consider the results on theology of the adoption of these principles by sundry divines of the Reformed or Calvinistic Church.

Calvin in his Institution (see lib. III., cap. 21,) was the first to call the attention of the churches of the Reformation to the great *practical* importance of the doctrine of Divine predestination; and at first appeared, to some extent, to base not only election, but reprobation also, upon the mere will of God, without reference to the question whether man was regarded as fallen or unfallen; and at times seemed to lose sight of the obvious truth that, while election is the operation of Divine mercy which precludes desert on the part of those elected, reprobation is the operation of Divine justice, and proceeds upon the ground of the actual desert of the reprobate. His views subsequently, however, became more definite and accurate. But his ardent follower Zanchius, in 1561, took on this whole subject the highest supralapsarian ground, and maintained it with great strength of argument. Beza and Bucer did likewise; and soon all the churches, Swiss, Lutheran and Reformed, became engaged in the discussion. It is in point here, also, to refer to what may be called an incidental advantage which the supralapsarian divines had in the argument at the very outset; and which will explain why so many appeared at first to be favorable to that scheme, who yet abjured all connection with it on its fuller development. I allude to the manner in which, from the very beginning of the Reformation, the WILL of God was almost constantly referred to in both speculative and practical theology. For example: Luther in his *De Servo Arbitrio*, written against Erasmus (1525,) says:

"Hic est fidei summus gradus, credere illum esse clementem qui tam paucos salvat, tam multos damnat; *credere justum qui suâ voluntate nos necessario damnabiles facit*, ut videatur, ut Erasmus refert, delectari cruciatibus miserorum, et odio potius quam amore dignus."

Such expressions in relation to the Divine WILL were very

Digitized by Google

current, and were regarded to a great extent, as conveying unquestionable truth. And even to intimate that the Divine Will should not, so to speak, absorb the Divine Goodness and Justice was a species of heresy, and not to be tolerated. The ideas became also deeply associated with the pietistic element, and were inculcated in manuals containing directions for a religious life.

In the discussions which thus arose in the churches, the first reference was, of course, to the word of God. But finding clearly announced therein that God worketh all things according to (κατὰ) the counsel of his own will; and also that Justice and Judgment are the habitation of his throne; each, but especially the former, was regarded as a starting point for philosophical speculation; which, as it proceeded, only widened the distance between the parties, until the points themselves were brought into apparent juxtaposition, and the schemes finally into irreconcilable antagonism. Many of the disputants, instead of conceding that, as both announcements were found in the Word of God, they must necessarily be reconcilable and consistent with each other, persisted thus to call in the aid of Philosophy. The former class reasoned, with some of the Stoics, that the Divine Will is the efficient cause of all things, even of human actions themselves; and affirmed that it were absurd to suppose that God would grant free-will to men, when he foresaw that they would abuse it so perniciously as they have done; for liberty, in such a case, said they, is not a blessing but a curse.* The latter claimed that man is an accountable being, and therefore free; and that the Providence of God is administered, not on the basis of mere will, but on the principles of holiness, justice and truth; affirming, too, that the opposite sentiment made Him the author of sin. Their antagonists replied to this that God is made the author of sin by as fair an implication, by supposing him to permit when he could prevent the existence of moral evil — which shallow sophism was of course denied by the respondents; and they reïnsisted on the moral

* Such ratiocination as that found in *Cicero*, De Natura Deorum, lib. III., near the end: and in the De Officiis, lib. I, cap. 14, was frequently resorted to. See also the argument in *Seneca*, de Beneficiis, lib. II., cap. 14, beginning with, "Sunt quædam nocitura impetrantibus, quæ non dare, sed negare beneficium est;" which was applied in a similar manner.

Digitized by Google

agency and accountability of man, even though fallen; and on the strict propriety and accuracy of the distinction between decrees which are simply *permissive* and those which are *effective*, which they illustrated abundantly; and finally claimed that in treating the whole subject of Predestination, Providence, and Grace, the Will of God and the Justice of God should never be supposed to be thus in antagonism.

"Non tenemur," said they, "ad quæstionem hanc curiosam magis, quam fructuosam respondere. Sufficit nobis voluntas Dei, cujus decreta et decretorum causæ, licet nobis ignotæ, *semper tamen justæ sunt.*"

It was thus that the system of Supralapsarianism was ultimately developed in the Protestant church.

It was, moreover, with the view to destroy Pelagianism (which they found still existing in the Roman Church *) more effectually than they supposed could be done on the basis of the infralapsarian theology of Augustine, that those of the Reformers above referred to adopted, from the Schoolmen (mainly,) the philosophy that the Will of God and not his justice is the foundation of moral obligation. Hence originated the early views of Luther and Melancthon, and also of Zanchius; destroying the freedom of the will, and wholly subverting the moral accountability of man. In fact, they went so far as even to deny that, in the strict sense, there ever had been free-will in either men or angels; though they endeavored to reconcile this idea with the doctrine of accountability, but with what success may be easily imagined. In the broad assertion of these views Beza was no whit behind even Luther himself. Adam fell, said they, because God had predetermined his fall; and whatever portion of the human race perish, perish because they were predestinated and created to be damned. In their view the Will of God settled the whole matter without reference to his moral perfections; for the idea of desert in the reprobate, any more than in the elect, was scouted as fundamentally at variance with the whole doctrine of the sovereignty of

* Bossuet, in his "*Variations*," petulantly denies this well-known and indisputable fact.

Digitized by Google

God.* We shall, in the sequel, offer a few remarks on this principle itself, after we shall have briefly referred to some of the results of its adoption—*first* as affecting Calvinistic theology, and *then* as affecting the peace and welfare of the Church itself.

The question (though it never, so far as we recollect, came up in this form for discussion,) which presents the real and practical issue on the subject, may be stated thus: *Is Redemption a remedial, or is it an original, institution?* For if it be remedial, then, of course, the whole supralapsarian scheme is false. If, on the contrary, it be the original institution, then the whole scheme is true; since, in that case, all things (even creation itself,) become subservient to God's eternal purpose or will to elect and to reprobate. For, having from eternity determined to elect to everlasting life and to reprobate to everlasting death (without reference to desert in either case) both angels and men, He proceeded at length to accomplish his purpose. They would need a dwelling place; and hence the heavens and earth were made: for, as Dr. Gomar taught, *creatio est via electionis et reprobationis.* A rule of life was required, and hence the law was enacted. Mankind, not to speak of angels, violated that law: (and how could they do otherwise? They could not be redeemed unless they had sinned; and they were created for the express purpose of being, in part, redeemed;) and then for the purpose of fulfilling the decree of election, God sent his Son to redeem the elect. Such is the scheme which would make the Gospel, instead of the Law, an original institution. And a narrower and more contracted view of the redeeming love and mercy of God, never entered a serious and intelligent mind. We cannot, however, examine this aspect of it in the present connection; but it is singular to observe how extremes meet in recognizing the principle which fundamentally underlies the scheme; for that principle is adopted as common ground on which to explicate their

* Precisely the same sophism runs through the speculations in which the doctrine of antecedent imputation is affirmed. The imputation of righteousness, says Dr. Hodge, is antecedent, and not in consequence of subjective desert; and *therefore* the imputation of Adam's first sin is also antecedent, and depends not on the subjective character of those to whom it is imputed. Thus, in like manner, ignoring the goodness and compassion, not less than the justice of God, and making his mere will the rule of his actions.

Digitized by Google

peculiar views, by the Supralapsarians and Socinians, and also by the Restorationists, and the still later type of Universalists; while we find it also thoughtlessly assented to in certain speculations by some evangelical divines, who entertain and express the utmost abhorrence of the system which the Supralapsarian school has erected upon it. * Nor do they appear in the least degree conscious of the utterly irreconcilable nature of the principle to the theology which they regard as divine.

The extent to which the speculation was carried by the Supralapsarians can be satisfactorily illustrated only by adducing instances. Twisse, after stating his celebrated argument to demonstrate that sin is not the cause of the decree of damnation, (peccata non sunt causa decreti damnationis,) affirms that he does not believe the devil himself can answer it. Polanus, on Hos. xiii: 9, says, "those that God predestinated to eternal destruction, he created for eternal destruction." Beza, on Rom. ix: 21, asserts the same. So also does Perkins, † who likewise adds that "God by his absolute sovereignty makes the vessels of wrath, and does not find them already made." And even Musculus ‡ says, "The reprobate can neither obey God's call, nor repent, nor believe, nor be justified, nor be saved." Gomar sustains this, in the fullest manner, in the earlier issue (an. 1604) of his *Disputatio de Prædestinatione.* Ursinus || fully coincides therewith, and says, "Reprobationis effecta sunt, 1. Creatio Reproborum; 2, privatio gratiæ divinæ seu desertio." And Zanchius also, "Deseri in peccatis perpetuo, excæcavi, indurari, ac denique damnari, effecta sunt reprobationis propria impiorum." § See, also, a full and clear exhibition of the whole idea on this topic, in Polani Syntag. Theol., lib. IV., cap. 10. The perfect identity of the principle underlying all this, with the principle

* See for example the Articles under the head of "Angels" in President Edwards' "Observations." Also Dwight's Theology, vol. I., pp. 331, 336, 345, compared with vol. II., p. 70; and Payson's Sermon on Col. i: 16. "All things were made by him and for him;" and Bushnell's "Nature and the Supernatural," chap. VII.

† De Prædest. et Gratia Dei, p. 16. Perkins died in 1602.

‡ Loc. Com. de Reprobatione. Musculus died in 1568.

|| Explic. Cat. Part II. de Prædestinatione, Quæst. 4.

§ Tractat. de Prædestinatione.

Digitized by Google

which underlies the doctrine of antecedent imputation, must be obvious to all.

Dr. Twisse carried his speculations so far in this direction as even to assert, substantially with Socinus, that "had not God appointed otherwise, he could forgive sin without a satisfaction" — thus making every thing depend upon the mere will of God irrespective of his moral attributes; while Szydlovius, his cotemporary, a learned and able divine, and an associate of Maccovius at Franeker, published in 1643 his *Vindiciæ Quæstionum aliquot difficilium et controversarum in Theologia*, in which he logically carries out the principle to its legitimate results — justifying all the enormities to which Ockham had previously conducted it, and to which we have already referred. We present a few specimens of his language — in his own words, for we cannot consent to offer them in translation. To begin with the Preface:

"Dico hic ingenuè," says he, "semper hactenus speciosè magis ad placitum intellectus et captus nostri, quàm verè et ad rei naturam, plerosque Theologos dum phrases quæ ipsis duriores videntur refugiunt, Arminianismum si non promovisse, saltem confirmasse: *tergiversando cum Scriptura loqui, quòd* SCILICET *Deus et possit unius peccatum alteri imputatum morte æterna punire,** et possit ad interitum ordinare, obligare

* Here immediate imputation is asserted to be an essential feature of the system, by this its leading advocate — who assumed its defence about the time when Twisse and Gomar died. And it is but an act of simple justice to Dr. Baird, in this same connection, to present the following passage from his "*Rejoinder*" to Dr. Hodge: "The Reviewer charges us with joining with Placæus, Remonstrants, Pelagians, and Socinians, in assailing the doctrine of immediate imputation. We pray the reader to compare the above with the following statement of Turrettin: 'At first the Remonstrants spake ambiguously, so that it was uncertain what position they assumed. But afterward, in their Apology, chap. VII., they plainly show themselves to favor the Socinians; retaining, indeed the name of imputation, but taking away the thing itself, whilst they declare 'the sin of Adam to be imputed by God to his posterity; *not as though he held them to be guilty of the same sin and crime with Adam*, [non quasi revera censeat reos ipsos ejusdem cum Adamo peccati et culpæ,] but as he willed them to be born subject to [obnoxios nasci voluit] the same evil to which Adam rendered himself obnoxious [obnoxium] by sin.' The designation of Adam's sin as, to us, *peccatum alienum*, originated with Pelagius; in reply to whom Augustine says, that 'it was indeed another's, when those, who when born were to bear it, did not yet exist; but now, by carnal generation, it belongs to those to whom it has not yet been forgiven through the spiritual regeneration.' The Pelagian phraseology was adopted by the Remonstrants (see their Apology, &c.) and repu-

Digitized by Google

hominem ad impossibile, et ob non præstitum hoc quod ei dare non decrevit eundem punire; quòd velit peccatum; quòd prohibendo aliquid contrarium ejus facere ipsemet possit; *quòd quæ velit, ideò justa sint quia vult*, non verò ideo velle quia justa sint, &c. *Quæ omnia cùm verissima sint, ideò tantò periculosius negare fuerant, quantò propius (ut sic dicam) Dei potestatem extenuabant et enervabant*," &c.

Then, in the body of the work itself, we have the following from cap. 8:

"Quæritur, An detur aliquid antecedenter bonum ad voluntatem Dei; sive, An res sint ideò justæ et bonæ quià Deus eas vult, vel, an ideò eas velit quia justæ sint? Negatur dari aliquid antecedenter bonum ad voluntatem Dei, et affirmatur res ideò esse justas et bonas, quia eas Deus vult; non contrà, ideò eas velle Deum quia justæ et bonæ sint."

And then in answer to the objection, that according to this principle God can enjoin blasphemy, perjury, falsehood, &c., he says:

"Even in those things which pertain to God's worship, man is not otherwise obligated than by precept and law; and that if God so willed, he could enjoin any other mode upon his worshipers:" and he adds, "Certum igitur est Deum potuisse contrarium modum cultus sibi jubere præstari. *Nam quæ semel liberè præcepit, ea potuit aliter præcepisse.*"

In the next chapter we have the following:

"Quæritur, An Deus possit præcipere contrarium ut omnibus præceptis Decalogi, ita potissimum primò, secundò et tertiò? Quidam eximius Theologus rejicit affirmativam sententiam aliquot Scholasticorum, qui dicunt peccata contra Decalogum, ideò solum esse mala quia Deus ea prohibuit, adeoque posse Deum in omnibus Decalogi præceptis dispensare. Ego tamen fateor, non solum me nullam rationem firmam videre in Disputatione illa Clarissimi Viri, *verum etiam in contrarium*

---

diated by the Reformed writers. According to the Westminster divines, the sin is not *peccatum alienum*, but *commune*. 'We sinned in him.'" pp. 24, 25. Dr. Baird is fully entitled to this retort. And our readers will notice that the clause of Turrettin which we have taken the liberty to italicise, (subjoining likewise the original words,) *expresses his own view as distinguished from the views which he is refuting.*

Digitized by Google

solidas rationes et principia posse produci, quibus sententia illius oppugnetur."

One more extract will suffice. In cap. 10, he says:

"Fateor et ipse, quod ad communem sentiendi consuetudinem crudum nimis hoc videri; Deum posse blasphemiam, perjurium, mendacium, etc., imperare: item posse jubere ne colatur, ametur, honoretur, etc., *quod tamen verissimum est in se, et ex quæstione nostra generali hoc speciale necessario sequitur, nec potest negari sine multorum absurdorum admissione.*"

Comment here would be useless; yet the whole is of a piece with the aforesaid logical sequences of the doctrine.* Twisse might well maintain, according to it, that God could have dispens-

* It will be in place, however, to furnish in this connection an illustration of the manner in which Dr. Hodge, on this whole subject, trifles with the authorities of the Calvinistic Church. True to his instincts and to the scheme which he has adopted, he selects as the representative men of that Church, those who are either Supralapsarian, or largely tinctured with the leading principles of the system. For instance, in the Princeton Review for April, 1860, p. 362, he says, "The *constant* answer to the objection to the doctrine of creation derived from the transmission of sin, made by the Reformed (or Calvinistic) theologians, is that original sin is propagated NEQUE PER CORPUS, NEQUE PER ANIMAM, SED PER CULPAM." The same is repeated substantially on p. 367. The sentiment is purely supralapsarian; and Dr. Hodge should have known that Supralapsarianism never has been and never can be identical with Calvinism. In fact, the foregoing statement looks as though it might have been quoted from Szydlovius himself. But our readers shall judge of this for themselves. In cap. 7 of the above cited work Szydlovius says, "Peccatum originale ab Adamo *non propagatur in nos per corpus;* quia illud contradistinctè ad animam non est capax peccati: *nec per animam;* quia illa pura à Deo creatur, nulloque modo à corpore, utpote spiritus, infici potest. *Ergo per imputationem.*" Dr. Hodge, moreover, should not have said that such is "the constant answer of the Reformed." Such language is never found amongst the Infralapsarians; and rarely indeed do the Supralapsarians fully employ it, from the apprehension that it may symbolize their doctrine too nearly with that of Bellarmine and the Nominalists of the Papal School. And we may here remark, once for all, that Dr. Hodge, almost throughout his whole discussion of the subject, (see e. g., Princeton Essays, I., pp. 128–217,) makes a most unwarrantable use of the term *imputation;* employing it as equivalent to *antecedent* or *immediate imputation.* This usage is unfair; and though courtesy has seemed to require that we should on several occasions conform to it, in considering his arguments, we protest against any such use of the term by our antagonists. It is, in fact, taking for granted the very point to be proved.

Digitized by Google

ed with a satisfaction for sin; and it was on this ground that the doctrine did originate, that the sufferings of our blessed Redeemer for sin were only a penal example, and were accepted by God in lieu of a full satisfaction to the demands of justice; since He could, by a mere act of the will, dispense with those demands. In fact, it was in reference to such unauthorized speculations that the excellent Dr. Meisner († 1630,) of Wittemberg remarked, that —

"They gave occasion to Socinus to reject the merit and satisfaction of Christ." And he adds, "Si enim sola et absoluta Dei voluntate [that is, in the Supralapsarian sense of those terms,] homines sunt electi ad vitam æternam, non opus fuit merito et satisfactione Christi."

Gomar and Beza, and others, gave just occasion for this remark by subordinating both creation and redemption to election.

Another illustration of the effect upon theology of the adoption of this principle, is the following: The aforesaid notion — that God created a large portion of the human race merely "to display his glory in and through their damnation," and that therefore, while he ordained the end, he likewise effectively ordained the means — the infralapsarians met by the objection, that it would then become necessary for us to believe that God in his offer of salvation to all men, and in his threatenings against those who refuse to believe, or to accept that offer, designs to condemn and punish them because they would not believe a lie. For the reprobate being through their creation appointed to eternal death for the glory of God, as fully and as truly as the elect are to eternal life; and the merit of Christ being sufficient only for the elect; it is plain that, if those who are damned for their unbelief had believed that they could have been saved by accepting the Gospel offer, they would have believed what was false. To punish them, therefore, for their unbelief, is to punish them for not believing a lie. The difficulty seemed truly formidable, but the Supralapsarians met it without flinching. Piscator in his Reply to Vorstius, cap. 7, says, "God orders all whom he addresses (in his word,) to believe that Christ died for them; *quod ipsum tamen falsum est.*" Maccovius in his Loc. Com., cap. 71, says, "We prove our position by these arguments: 1. Adam was required to believe that he should have

Digitized by Google

eternal life in a state of integrity; *at hoc falsum: ergo tenebatur credere aliquid falsum.*" Maccovius, with his notion that Redemption was the original institution, could not, of course, believe that Adam could possibly have persisted in his state of integrity. Again, he says, "Abraham tenebatur credere Deum velle ut filium suum immolat: at hoc erat falsum; *ergo tenebatur credere aliquid falsum.*" By such preposterous and unworthy means did they endeavor to save their scheme, by proving that God could require the reprobate to believe a falsehood, and then consign them to hell for not believing it, since, as they maintained, his mere will and good pleasure alone were concerned therein. And were it not for the necessity of exposing in its true colors the wretched and God-dishonoring philosophy which, upon the aforesaid baseless assumption, has sought to identify itself with the truth of God, I should most certainly have let these things pass in silence.

The points concerned in this whole scheme, therefore, relate not to matters of mere speculation, but to the very foundation of all morality and religion. For, if we claim that the will of God, without respect to his justice or other moral attributes, may dispose of his creatures; and that his infinite power so elevates him above all laws and ordinances by which morality and virtue are known amongst his creatures, that he may utterly disregard them — then, it is infinitely certain that his justice does not engage him to punish evil at all, or to reward obedience; and, on the contrary, that he may really be the author of sin in the creature, and yet punish it; and, at the same time, do nothing herein that is at all inconsistent with the perfections of the Supreme being, even though what he does is contrary to all those ideas of virtue and morality and justice which he has announced as the rule for his creatures.* But the Supralapsarians did not balk at this

*"While He manifests Himself clearly as a Moral Governor and Legislator, by the witness of the Moral Law which He has established in the hearts of men, we cannot help feeling, at the same time, that that Law, grand as it is, is no measure of His Grandeur, that He Himself is beyond it, though not opposed to it, distinct, though not alien from it. *We feel that He who planted in man's conscience that stern, unyielding Imperative of Duty, must Himself be true and righteous altogether; that He from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed, must Himself be more holy, more good, more just than these.*" Mansell, Limits of Religious Thought, p. 202.

Digitized by Google

consequence, but admitted it; and we, too, must admit if we adopt their leading principle. This principle led Szydlovius legitimately to the aforesaid diabolical conclusions; and Twisse, as above remarked, to asseverate that if God had not appointed that an atonement should be made for sin, he could pardon and save the sinner without an expiation. It has led to the governmental notion of the Atonement, that the sufferings of our adorable Redeemer were not a satisfaction to Divine Justice, but merely a penal example accepted by God in lieu of such satisfaction. And it led to the open avowal (adopted by Tillotson and some others) that God may dispense with the execution of his absolute threatenings, and so rescue the finally impenitent, and even devils themselves, from the just desert of sin; and has sought to justify that infamously false maxim that *the theologically true may be philosophically false:* * which, if admitted, must render it impossible to know truth in itself; since it would consist only in a mutable relation to the dispositions of our mind. But we cannot here dwell longer on this branch of the argument, for not only was the theology of the church perplexed and disgraced by these godless speculations, but her peace was repeatedly destroyed by persistent efforts made to enforce them in various ways upon her members. On this point we shall now offer a few brief remarks; and then proceed to a more full analysis and examination of the principle which fundamentally underlies the whole.

The conception that the Divine justice depends not upon *the nature of God*, but upon his mere will and good pleasure, was, as we have shown, adopted by Beza, Gomar, Maccovius, Szydlovius, and other Reformed divines; and that from it was developed the whole system of Supralapsarianism. It was tolerated, but never adopted by the church; although it came into great prominence under Gomar and Maccovius, who claimed that it was the true Calvinistic theology. And it was just here that the breach occurred between Gomar and Arminius, his associate Professor in Leyden University. † It has been, for some time past, the fashion

* "Multa in Theologia sunt vera, quæ in Philosophia sint falsa, et contra." Luther, at one time, actually maintained this.

† Grotius avers, as a simple matter of fact, that though Gomar (in a conver-

Digitized by Google

to attribute to Arminius all the errors subsequently inculcated by the Remonstrant school: which is in all respects as unrighteous a procedure as it would be to charge upon Calvin and Calvinism all the forementioned errors of the Supralapsarian school. Arminius found no difficulty in sustaining and teaching the doctrine of predestination, as really entertained by the Reformed Church; his difficulty was with the supralapsarian view of that doctrine, as taught by his colleague Gomar, and by Beza. In illustration of this fact, I will here present a single brief extract from his *Examen Thesium Gomari*, p. 74, showing the very language he employed while treating this doctrine in the University, but in which Gomar found great heresies, because it did not recognize the supralapsarian view. He says, in language which he often substantially repeats:

"Quod aliqua sit abjectio seu reprobatio Dei, secundum quam ab æterno nonnullos, à vita æterna rejiciendos, et morti æternæ et ignominiæ adjudicandos constituit, 'ut notam faciat iram et potentiam suam, adversus vasa iræ præparata ad interitum,' *verissimum ex Scripturis:* quodque hujus actus caussa sit Dei voluntas liberrima et justissima *eædem Scripturæ testantur abundè, ideoque de eo hic mihi nulla est cum thesium authore controversia.*" *

---

sation with himself,) chiefly insisted on the doctrine of Justification, as the important point in his controversy with Arminius, yet most of the members of the States of Holland (plerique ex Senatu,) had determined that the dispute between them on this point was little more than a mere dispute of words (λογομαχιαν.) The obvious ground on which they so regarded it, was that. Gomar's views, on this point, differed as widely from the admitted views of Calvin, Ursinus, Pareus, Tilenus and others, (as is shown in the American Biblical Repository for April, July and October, of 1838,) as they did from the views entertained by Arminius. Gomar insisted on the imputation of the active obedience of Christ for justification, as a touchstone of orthodoxy; while the others refused to admit the validity of any distinction between his active and passive obedience in the justification of a sinner. The distinction itself, though now generally recognized in Calvinistic theology, was new in the time of Gomar; Kargius, as already stated, having first suggested it.

* The editors of the "Collected Works of Arminius," both in this country and in England, have, for some reason, omitted to refer to this treatise, or to give it a place in their edition; though in that edition they profess to republish *all his recognized writings*. This is a matter of no little moment; and the public are entitled to some explanation of so remarkable a procedure. It should be furnished not only for the sake of the editors themselves, but for the sake of an impor-

Digitized by Google

Can any real Calvinist object to this as a statement of the doctrine of reprobation? We think not. And then, further, (and we solicit particular attention to this fact,) the very arguments, and almost the very words, by which Arminius in this Examen opposes the supralapsarian scheme of Gomar, are subsequently employed by Turrettin as furnishing the grounds on which he himself professes to reject the same scheme. (See Loc. 9, Quæst. 9, and Opp., Tom. I., pp. 555, seq.) And yet mainly on the ground of these proffered reasons, Gomar denounced his colleague as a heretic, and destroyed the peace of the church. *

It was just here, therefore, that the breach occurred between these two great and good men. Gomar insisted on the supralapsarian view of the doctrine in question; while Arminius denied that that scheme was either scriptural or Calvinistic. He died nine years before the Synod of Dort was convened; Gomar lived upwards of twenty years after that period; but neither his influence nor the influence of his favorite scheme, could survive its decision. "Even Mosheim allows that the triumph of the Synod

tant portion of Divine truth which the professed followers of Arminius are now too much disposed to caricature and denounce.

* In fact, Arminius evinces on other points a willingness to approximate some features of the Supralapsarian scheme rather more nearly than is now deemed advisable by Infralapsarians themselves. For though a portion of them formerly believed that infants might be damned, he appears to have had no doubt on the subject. For example, he says in his reply to Perkins, "But you present, as a proof that the foreseen neglect of grace is not the cause of rejection, the statement that 'infants, dying out of the covenant of the gospel, have not neglected this grace, and yet are reprobate and rejected of God.' *I affirm that they rejected the grace of the gospel in their parents, grand-parents, great-grand-parents, &c., by which act they deserved to be abandoned by God.* I should desire that some solid reason might be presented to me why, since all his posterity have sinned, in Adam, against the law, and, on that account, have merited punishment and rejection, *infants also, to whom, in their parents, the grace of the Gospel is offered, and by whom, in their parents, it is rejected, have not sinned against the grace of the Gospel. For the rule of the divine covenant is perpetual, that children are comprehended and judged in their parents.*" Works, vol. III., p. 368. 1853. Dr. Breckinridge, in the thorough and admirable criticism on John i: 29, presented in his Theology, has clearly shown that such a conclusion in relation to the future condition of those who have not attained to moral accountability, is wholly unsupported by the recognized principles of Infralapsarian doctrine. And in this he is most amply sustained by the Synod of Dort, as may be seen in our next marginal note.

Digitized by Google

was that of the Sublapsarians, not only over the Arminians, but over the Supralapsarians also." * During the fifteen years previous, the Reformed church in the Seven Provinces had been divided into Gomarists and Anti-Gomarists; and Gomarist, Genevan or Calvinist, were claimed to be terms of equivalent import. But the mistake was thoroughly rectified by the Synod; though principles were specified, and not names, as with the Synod of Charenton, which condemned the errors attributed to Placæus. Yet it is somewhat remarkable, that the very feature of Supralapsarianism which involves and gives expression to all the others, should now — in our own church and country, and by professed infralapsarian divines also — be insisted on as the very touchstone of true Calvinism! But let us trace the history of this distinguished divine a little further.

Gomar continued at Leyden two years after the death of Arminius; and then, to avoid having Conrad Vorstius († 1622) for a colleague, resigned his professorship. Subsequently, in 1614, he accepted the theological chair in Saumur, where he continued till 1618, teaching his supralapsarian doctrines — to the great detriment of the peace and prosperity of the church. About the time he left Saumur, and while the reäctionary influence against his scheme was in operation, Placæus became a student of theology there; and subsequently Professor; and the principles which had driven Arminius into antagonism to Gomar, on the question *An sit creatio via electionis et reprobationis?* subsequently drove Placæus into antagonism, when they were applied to the doctrine of Original Sin. In considering the position of Placæus, therefore, candor requires that we should ever regard it from this point of view. Gomar returned to Gröningen, where he died in 1641.

---

* Scott's "Synod of Dort," p. 3. The words employed by Mosheim are the following: "His judicibus Arminiani caussa ceciderunt, et germanæ religionis proditores judicati sunt: Genevensium vero illi, qui *Infralapsarii* nominantur, triumpharunt." Hist. Christ., Tom. II., p. 629. (an. 1741.) Wendeline more justly explains it as follows: "Constans nostra sententia hæc est: ut neminem in tempore damnat Deus, nisi propter peccatum: ita neminem quoque ab æterno decrevit damnare, nisi propter peccatum: *quæ in Synodo Dordracena solemniter promulgata est.*" Christ. Theol., p. 177. See also the note on page 414 of our former Essay.

Digitized by Google

A single remark is all that need be here added. We have seen that Dr. Gomar's unreasonable course — in denying the theological soundness of those who could not endorse his supralapsarian views, and in denouncing them as heretics—led to incalculable trouble in the church; and yet, that the Synod of Dort rejected utterly the doctrine of Gomar, on the very point on which Arminius had refused it his assent; and that Turrettin likewise rejects it on the same ground. *Hence we learn that, so far as heresy is concerned, Dr. Gomar himself was the heretic, and the actual troubler of the Church.* And this little item of history will, we trust, suggest a useful thought to our Princeton brother; who having, like Gomar, fallen into a theological mistake, has long been engaged in throwing out suspicions against all his brethren who reject his supralapsarian doctrine of antecedent imputation. We trust there may be no more of this; for the time and energies of Dr. Hodge can be much better employed than in proving brethren to be heretics, who have less claim to that title than he himself has; and when, if there be any actual heresy in the matter, he, according to all just rules, is himself the heretic.

The position of Camero * ought to be referred to, in this same connection. He succeeded Gomar as theological Professor in Saumur, in 1618; and though his appointment was opposed by the Synod of Poictou, it was simply on the ground that he favored the views of Piscator of Herborn, respecting the imputation of the active obedience of Christ. The opposition, however, was annulled by the national Synod of Alez, in 1620. In the next year he left Saumur, because the government of the place was taken from Du Plessis. And it is a little remarkable that the controversies which now became associated with the name of Camero, may be mainly traced, as in the case of Arminius, to the attempt of Gomar to inculcate his peculiar views as Calvinism. Should any venture to charge that Camero was not at that time regarded as sound in his doctrine, it is sufficient to refer them to the fact that the exposition which he gave of Calvinistic theology — in his discussion with Tilenus (who had become an Arminian,) at L'Isle, near Orleans, in April, 1620, and which

* Born in Glasgow, Scotland, in 1579. Died while Divinity Professor at Montaubon, in 1626.

Digitized by Google

was reported for publication by Capellus and Milletiere — was highly approved and published at Leyden. He came to Saumur immediately after Gomar had left, and found it necessary to meet his supralapsarian notions respecting predestination and grace. He did so; and, as is usual in the excitement of controversy, went, in some respects, to the opposite extreme. He taught that the death of Christ opened the way for the offer of salvation, not only to the elect, but to all men, and that all would be saved if all would believe; *and hence, that it is not predestination that destroys or damns men, but their own sin and rejection of the Gospel offer.* He taught, too, that the grace of God could be resisted by the sinner, but that in the case of the elect it would not be; that the will follows the dictates or judgment of the understanding, and was depraved only in the absence of an enlightened judgment. Hence arose the notion of moral suasion in regeneration. Some of these ideas are not to be countenanced any more than the views of which they were designed by him as a refutation. One extreme begot the other; and both extremes were wrong. And yet this eminent man has often been harshly judged, as though he had deliberately set out to oppose the recognized theology of the Reformed church, when it was obviously his aim to arrest the progress of a grievous error, which, in the guise of that theology, was doing incalculable injury to the souls of men. While we shun his errors, we may remember his services with gratitude.

The same remarks apply substantially to Placæus, and the position which he occupied. He was no wanton troubler of the church, as Dr. Hodge seems to intimate; but was obviously actuated by a like desire to relieve the Reformed theology of the false position into which it had been brought by the supralapsarian doctrine on the subject of imputation. The Synod of Dort had condemned the leading principle of that scheme in its application to the doctrine of Reprobation; but it was now endeavoring to struggle into renewed life and vigor under the guise of a zeal for the doctrine of Original Sin; and Placæus sought to arrest its progress. He had commenced the study of theology at Saumur, about the time when Gomar resigned. Three years afterward the institution there was dispersed. But finally, upon

Digitized by Google

its full restoration in 1633, he was appointed Professor of theology, and was inaugurated on the same day with his colleagues, Lud. Capellus and Amyrald. After his views had been assailed in the National Synod in 1644, Amyrald appeared before that body at Charenton in order to plead the cause of his colleague, and argued that the doctrine *really held* by Placæus was not at all dangerous. (See our former Essay, pp. 398, 399.) The theological position of Amyrald in relation to the whole matter may be learned from Turrettin, I., p. 568, (Loc. IX., Quæst. 9, Sect. 45,) and from Princeton Essays, I., p. 181; and from the fact that, during the preceding year, he had published a labored defence of Calvin on the doctrine of Reprobation, to which Curcellæus, († 1659,) afterwards the theological successor of Episcopius, († 1643,) attempted a reply. The defence of Calvin by Amyrald is contained in the 2d of his *Quatuor Dissertationes*, and is entitled *De Jure Dei in Creaturas*. Yet such was his deliberate judgment as to the doctrine really held by Placæus; which may be explained by the fact that he knew the real aim and intention of his colleague. There is no evidence, therefore, that Placæus wished to compromise the Reformed theology; his aim was to relieve it from the aspersions cast upon it by a false philosophy. We may honor his motives, while we sacredly avoid the errors which were attributed to him.

But it is time to proceed to the discussion of the leading principle upon which the whole scheme of Supralapsarianism is based; and we shall introduce it with the following illustration of the thorough method adopted by the Synod of Dort to put that scheme in its true position before the church. Maccovius, already referred to, was a member of the Synod of Dort from the University of Franeker, where he was professor of theology from 1615, until his death in June, 1644. Cocceius was his colleague during the latter part of the time. He had a dispute with Lubbertus, another colleague, which came before the Synod; and as Lubbertus had accused him of heresy, commissioners were appointed to examine into the matter; one of whom, it is worthy to note in the connection, was Ab. Scultetus, († 1625,) deputy of the Palatinate, and Associate Professor of theology with Pareus at Heidelberg. Nothing of great moment was found against

Digitized by Google

Maccovius; but as he had attempted to carry out his supralapsarian notions, the commissioners in their judgment of the case, while they free him from the imputation "of Paganism, Judaism, Pelagianism, Socinianism, and any other heresy," caution him against using the obscure and ambiguous phraseology of the schools, saying that he had offended in this matter; and,

"*That he was to blame for saying that the distinction between the efficiency and sufficiency of the death of Christ was futile; for denying that fallen man was the object of predestination;* (quod negaverit humanum genus lapsum esse objectum prædestinationis;) *in saying that God wills and decrees sin; and in saying that God by no means wills the salvation of all men;* (quod dixerit Deum nullo modo velle omnium hominum salutem,)" &c.

*This judgment of the commissioners the Synod approved:** and so once more gave the Supralapsarians to understand that their principles could obtain no indorsement from that body. And the fact that there was laid to the charge of Maccovius the whole category of heresies, including the *trivialities* of "Paganism, Judaism, Socinianism and Pelagianism" — taken in connection with some extracts from his writings given by us on a preceding page, and with the aforesaid lucubrations of the Franeker preacher, Szydlovius — may tend to illustrate how indefinitely and sublimely extensive in its application, is the leading principle which underlies the supralapsarian scheme. There is something about it, in the matter of suggesting heresies, which reminds us of geometrical progression. †

* Mosheim's chronic hatred of the Synod, and his petulance every time he is obliged to refer to it, have led him to present a very garbled account of this whole proceeding. See *Instit. Historiæ Christianæ, Sæc.* 16, § 3, cap. 2. Tom. II., pp. 254–256.

† Even our Princeton brother also occasionally furnishes an illustration of the baneful effects resulting from a connection with the scheme. For it has not only led him to the conclusion that we are subjectively as deserving (or *undeserving;* either way will do;) of justification through Christ, as of condemnation through Adam; and *vice versa;* but in his defence of antecedent imputation, he is actually driven (see P. Essays, I., 158, 159,) to the admission of that exploded but most pernicious heresy, *that the punishment of sin, even in hell, may be its natural effects or consequences;* on which point see Bellamy's True Religion Delineated, Disc. I., Sect. 5, and an Essay by the Rev. M. Cochran, in Bibliotheca Sacra, for April, 1854. But Dr. Hodge seems to have abandoned the idea, of late; for in

Digitized by Google

In his "Dissertation on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy," (note O.,) Sir James Mackintosh refers to Supra and Infralapsarianism in the following judicious and discriminating manner:

"The writer of this dissertation was led, on a former occasion, by a generally prevalent notion, to confound the theological doctrine of Predestination with the philosophical opinion which supposes the determination of the Will to be, like other events, produced by adequate causes. † More careful reflection has corrected a confusion common to him with most writers on the subject. What is called 'Sublapsarian Calvinism,' which was the doctrine of the most eminent men, including Augustine and Calvin himself, ascribed to God, *and to man before the Fall*, what is called 'free-will,' which they even own still to exist in all the ordinary acts of life, though it be lost with respect to religious morality. The decree of election, on this scheme, arises from God's foreknowledge that man was to fall; *and that all men became thereby with justice liable to eternal punishment.* The election of some to salvation was an act of Divine goodness, and the predestination of the rest was an exercise of holiness and justice. The sublapsarian predestination is evidently irreconcilable with the doctrine of necessity, which considers free-will, or volitions not caused by motives, as absolutely inconsistent with the definition of an intelligent being — which is, that he acts from a motive, or, in other words, with a purpose. *The Supralapsarian scheme, which represents the Fall itself as foreordained,* may indeed be built on necessitarian principles. *But on that scheme Original Sin seems wholly to lose that importance which the former system gives it as a revolution in the state of the world, requiring an interposition of Divine power to remedy a part of its fatal effects. It becomes no more than the first link in the chain of predestined offenses.*"

1. According to the Supralapsarian scheme, God determines first to elect and to reprobate, and then to create; and that his power and severity may be glorified, the same effective decree

---

the Princeton Review for 1860, p. 340, he censures Dr. Baird for advancing it. The πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the error, however, is in allowing the distinction at all; or in attempting to separate the natural consequences from the supernatural visitation. *The Scriptural representation includes both.* The statements of Mansell, (Limits, &c., pp. 196–199,) from his not having sufficiently regarded this fact, are unsatisfactory. Compare also Butler's Analogy, Part II., ch. 5.

† See the Criticism on Mr. Stewart's Dissertation, Edinburgh Review, vol. 36, p. 225.

Digitized by Google

comprehends the means as well as the end, * so that sin shall ensue as the necessary means to secure the damnation of the reprobate; sin being only the necessary means for effecting the accomplishment of the decree. † The distinction of *negative*, or the denial of grace, (or, as they name it, *præterition*,) and *affirmative*, or predamnation, (which is a destination to punishment,) amounts to nothing: for as Molinæus, in a passage already cited, remarks, "To reprobate and to will to condemn are the same, (reprobare ac velle damnare idem esse,) as to elect is the same as to will to save:" and he very properly adds that it is the same thing whether God destines a man to damnation, or effects that from which damnation necessarily results.

2. While, therefore, we may expect to find in some of the writings of the later Reformers, that diversity which these antagonistic principles could not but develop; the duty of the Calvinistic church in our day, and in view of the emphatic decisions of the Synods of Dort and Westminster, is, we think, not to be mistaken. It should regard those only as its true and proper representatives who taught those doctrines which it recognizes as the constituent elements of its system; *and so far alone as they did teach them*. But if, on the contrary, Supralapsarianism is to be claimed, either in whole or in part, as the doctrine of our church, let it be done openly and frankly, and by a fair endorsement: let it be done under its own flaunting banner. Nor let it, while aiming to entangle us again in the yoke of bondage, profess to bear with it the sacred and acknowledged Ark of the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. It has its own well-defined and distinguishing principles: but let them not be insisted on as the compass and square for the admeasurement of orthodox doctrine, while the real issues involved in the question of their acceptance as such are disingenuously ignored. Those principles have their history; and no assumption of claims to superior soundness, and no threatened imputation of heresy against those who may venture to call them in question, shall hinder our dealing with them frankly and plainly. And we say, therefore, that if we are to regard those divines of the Reformed church,

* See Gomar, De Predestinatione, Thesis 23. (an. 1604.)

† Ibid Thesis 91; and see, also, his remark on p. 411 of our former Essay.

Digitized by Google

however learned and excellent in other matters, who have, either in whole or in part, adopted the Supralapsarian scheme, as the accredited expounders of the doctrinal views we entertain on the same subjects, let us do so openly and fearlessly. But let us not lapse into the preposterous absurdity of acting as though there is, in this essential matter, no important difference between the distinguishing views which they advocate, and the doctrines entertained by the Calvinistic church, (which, as a body, has always repudiated those views;*) and thus, while professing to be Infralapsarians, take the Supralapsarians as the true expounders of our philosophy and theology. Princeton during the last thirty years has not been as careful in this matter as she should have been; and her procedure therein has tended too often to suggest the somewhat analogous course of the late New Haven School, which, while it existed, was famous for explaining Calvinistic theology by Arminian philosophy. But we here take and abide by our position, and most emphatically deny that, in any true sense of the term, Supralapsarianism is Calvinism; and we affirm that its distinguishing feature is nothing less than an unsightly branch from Pagan philosophy, which philosophising theologues have endeavored to engraft upon the system. *We denounce it as utterly false in its philosophy; false in its distinguishing theology; and false in the exegesis by which it would support that theology; and false in the claim alleged on its behalf that it is the true Reformed doctrine.* It is proper, however, to remark, in this same connection, that though it is necessary to speak in these terms of strong disapprobation of the distinguishing tenet of the Supralapsarian scheme, and of every attempted application of it for the elucidation of the doctrines of Calvinistic theology; we yet yield to no man in sincere admiration of the eminent divines who have been regarded as more or less favoring that scheme. More learned and purer-minded men than Luther, Bucer, Ursinus, Beza, Polanus, Gomar, and Twisse, (to speak of

* Turrettin himself clearly announces this fact. Referring to Calvin as inculcating the received doctrine respecting election and reprobation from "*the corrupt mass*," he adds, "In quo summi Theologi judicio, quod respondet Articulo XII. Confessionis Gallicanæ, ut et Synodi Dordracenæ decreto, *omnino acquiescimus*, et omnibus quibus placet sapere sobrie, acquiescendum esse putamus." Loco IV., Quæst. IX., Sect. 30.

Digitized by Google

no others,) have scarcely ever been numbered among the sacramental host of God's elect, and their aim in adopting the speculation referred to was to exalt, in the estimation of man, the God whom they loved and adored. We reverence and deeply sympathize with them in the motive, while we deplore and denounce their error. And neither can nor ought their great and venerable names to either consecrate that error, or rescue it from the execration of the church of God.

3. If Supralapsarianism, therefore, be discarded as the exponent of the doctrines of grace, or the Calvinistic system, no words are needed to show that, on those points, at least, with which its peculiar philosophy and theology are most intimately concerned, its supporters cannot be regarded as representing, in any proper sense, the Calvinistic system. And it is also obvious that for any theological teacher of admitted ability and learning, now to plead the authority of such, and to claim on such authority that a doctrine which is a peculiar and distinctive feature of the scheme, (while the scheme itself, moreover, is formally disclaimed,) is a doctrine of Calvinism, is not to act ingenuously. Turrettin, two centuries ago, and others, both before and since, may have fallen into this incongruity; but surely such examples can hardly be pleaded as deserving of imitation. But there will be occasion to refer to this topic more at large hereafter; and we only add, in the present connection, that a man may receive and acknowledge a principle, without formally recognizing its logical sequences;* though it should never be forgotten that while we give our sanction to a principle, our authority must go to support it, and so to sustain others who, while they in like manner receive it, will carry it forward to its legitimate conclusions. To illustrate: — Twisse, Szydlovius, Tillotson, Edwards, Dwight, Payson, Hodge, Thornwell, Bushnell, along with Socinus, E. Winchester, T. Southwood Smith, Petitpierre, Ballou, Whittemore and others, all speculatively adopt the principle above referred to, by making the will, rather than the immutable justice or moral nature of God, the stand-point of certain theological explications. They, of course, arrive at infinitely divergent conclusions; but

* De Moor (III., p. 264,) has handsomely said "Neminem consequentiis gravare volo, quas ipse ex suâ sententiâ profluere nec videt, nec agnoscit."

Digitized by Google

all reason alike, and thus far agree in relation to the principle itself. Now that principle may be applied so as to sustain the supralapsarian doctrines of Absolute Reprobation and Antecedent Imputation; and also to show, as Edwards, Payson and Bushnell do, that men were created to be in part redeemed; or it may be taken a step further, and be applied as Twisse applies it, to show that God could have dispensed with the demands of justice without a satisfaction for sin; or with Socinus and his school, to show that God did dispense with those demands, and accepted in lieu thereof a merely penal example; or still further, with Tillotson and Winchester and others, that he can or will repeal his absolute threatenings, and rescue the finally impenitent from hell; or with the later Universalists, who interpret the Divine will according to their crude conceptions of benevolence, and claim that there is no hell, and that all sinful creatures will be made partakers of everlasting happiness. *

4. The Divine attributes are, of course, *impersonal*, and the contrary idea, though still apparently a favorite with some, is nothing short of absurd and ridiculous. Hence, to say that the moral and natural perfections of the Divine Nature should not be confounded with the Divine Essence, is not only allowable, but eminently proper; nor does it, in any true sense, involve the absurdity of attempting to conceive the Infinite and Absolute: but it involves simply the belief of what HE has declared respecting himself. The old notion of some of the Scholastics, that the De-

* Well has Le Blanc, Professor of theology at Sedan, and one of the clearest and most discriminating theologians of the 17th century, remarked that, "Et enim quemadmodum falsum ex falso sequitur, et absurdum unum ducit ad alterum, vix est in Religione error ullus tam levis, qui si consequentia nectatur non evertat tandem aliquem Fidei articulum et quoddam Religionis dogma." *Theses Theolog.*, Prefatione, p. 2. (*folio.*) London, 1675. Our Princeton brother, *in thesi* at least, endorses the same: "How far the assumption of the fundamental principles of a system has a tendency to lead to its thorough adoption, every man must judge for himself. *For ourselves, we fear the worst: because, we think consistency requires an advance, and because history informs us that when men have taken the first step, they or their followers soon take the second.*" P. Essays, I., p. 132. And we trust that we may in this connection, and without offence, commend to Dr. Hodge a reperusal of his own admirable remarks in the concluding paragraph of his article on Original Sin, published in the Repertory for 1830, and republished in P. Essays, I., pp. 109–127. They are both true and impressive, and should be deeply engraven upon the heart of every minister of Christ.

Digitized by Google

cree of God is God, and that the Will, &c., of God is God — a notion favored also by some supralapsarian divines — cannot be maintained, and is really blasphemous. Gomar, at first, favored it in part, in his controversy with Arminius; but in the later and complete edition of his works,* we find that he has essentially modified his views on the subject. In his *Disputatio de æterno Dei decreto*, he refers to the question *an decretum Dei sit Deus?* as *gravis illa et ad veri Dei notitiam ac cultum pertinens controversia*, and refutes the affirmative assumption with very great ability, (See vol. II., pp. 25, 26, Theses 28–34,) and, without hesitation, adopts the view of the subject entertained by his ancient colleague; and which is repeated likewise by Curcellæus † and Limborch. ‡ The notion, and the unintelligible jargon by which its advocates have endeavored to sustain it, are now pretty generally abandoned. Neither the decrees of God, nor any of the attributes of God, are to be regarded as God; the language is no more intelligible as applied to God than it would be if applied to man himself. Nor can those attributes be regarded as in any intelligible sense of the term *personal*. God is personal, and not impersonal. He is the eternal source of all other personality, existence, life, and intelligence. But on what principle can his attributes also be regarded personal? And if his justice, goodness and truth are personal, what is meant by the Justice of God, the Truth of God, and the Goodness of God? But there can be no greater absurdity than to pretend to conceive of God as possessing personal attributes, or attributes which separately have a will, intelligence, &c. The idea is unintelligible respecting God, or any other rational or moral agent.

5. We therefore speak intelligibly when we speak of God's impersonal justice — a justice which depends not on the will, but which belongs to his nature; and which, like that nature, is, of course, immutable and eternal. To that nature is to be traced, and in that nature is to be found, the eternal and immutable basis for the distinction between right and wrong, good and evil.

* We use the second issue of this edition, published at Amsterdam in 1664, *folio*. The first was published in 1645.

† Instit. Relig. Christ., lib. III, cap. 3, sect. 7, p. 91.

‡ Theol. Christ., lib. II., cap. 18, sect. 4, p. 104.

Digitized by Google

And hence the falsity of the notion which would attribute any freedom to the Will that may impinge upon his truth, his goodness, or his justice: since these attributes are, in the nature of the case, prior to will, and must be its rule. The idea, therefore, that freedom of will in God consists in his being able to will any thing, without regard to his nature, is the most ineffable, and in every way the least supported, of all absurdities. The reasons for the exercise of his will are always consistent with his holiness, justice, goodness and truth; or, in other words, with the demands of his moral nature. Hence of Law, it may be said with Hooker:

"Her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power: both angels, and men, and creatures, of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all, with uniform consent, admitting her as the mother of their peace and joy." *

And if the law be but the expression of the Moral Nature of God, which is infinitely Holy and Just and True, on what principle can it be rationally claimed that he can will any thing inconsistent therewith; and reverse the precepts of the decalogue; or require his creatures to hate Him? as supralapsarians have found it necessary to maintain in order to sustain their theory. If He possess a moral nature, that nature cannot be otherwise than the rule of his will.

6. When the question, therefore, is raised as to what God is able to do, it is a plain absurdity to pretend to decide it by a mere reference to the fact that he is omnipotent, unless the question refers only to that with which omnipotence alone may be concerned. And so with respect to any other of the divine attributes. While we concede that God may, and can, do any thing which is consistent with his moral attributes; it is in no sense limiting him, but is, on the contrary, perfectly consistent with the highest freedom to admit, also, that he can neither will nor perform any thing inconsistent therewith. Whatever he may be supposed either to will or to do, must have respect alike to all his

* Works, vol. II. New York and Philadelphia, 1845.

Digitized by Google

moral attributes; and must be consistent not only with his power to will or to do, but likewise with his holiness, justice, goodness and truth: and it is not limiting his wisdom and power to claim that he can do nothing which is not in perfect consistency therewith. Hence we say, with entire propriety, that he cannot forgive sin, unless in consistency with his holiness, justice and truth; and that he cannot impute it, except on grounds which are in strict and perfect accordance with the principles of eternal and immutable justice. And it is the greatest inconceivable absurdity, and leads to the most pernicious of all errors, to claim that he can do either without a direct regard to the eternal and unchangeable principles of his moral nature. *

7. To maintain that all things are the same to God — that is, that with him there is no distinction between vice and virtue, right and wrong, moral good and evil — is plainly to set our philosophy against the clearest dictates of the whole Bible, against the convictions of our moral nature, and against all the admitted dictates of right reason. We can conceive nothing, as Dr. Samuel Clarke somewhere truly remarks, without, at the same time, conceiving its relations to other things. God has established these relations in perfect consistency with the demands of his nature, and, of course, knows, and forever knew, of their existence; and He alone can comprehend them in all their fullness. The whole of these relations constitute Truth. These eternally conceived, and now actually existing relations, involve, of necessity, an eternal fitness or unfitness, in the application of things one to another; with regard to which the Will of God is always exercised; and which, when announced by Him, ought to determine the choice of all his rational creatures; not, however, of the

* "God did not *create* Absolute Morality: it is coëternal with Himself; and it were blasphemy to say that there ever was a time when God was and Goodness was not." Mansell, *ubi supra*, p. 187. And while it is true that we cannot conceive absolute morality at all, either as dependent on or independent of the Divine Will; or the Divine Will itself, either as absolutely indifferent, or necessarily determined: we yet are competent to believe the Divine testimony that the creation of man's moral nature was not identical with the creation of morality itself; and that the great principles of all that is holy and righteous existed in God before they assumed their finite form in the heart of any of his creatures. See ibid, pp. 189, 330.

Digitized by Google

fitness or unfitness of things supposed to be wholly antecedent to, independent of, and without reference to, His will — as the late Dr. James P. Wilson so strangely reasons in his attempt to repudiate the idea: * but of that fitness or unfitness as existing in exact conformity to and consistent with his own will and nature, as all things of course did originally exist. His intelligent creatures, therefore, are bound to regard these differences, as recognized and announced by himself. And this being so, it is no more reasonable to maintain that God may disregard these differences in his treatment of his creatures, in respect to moral obligation and to their moral nature; than that he should disregard them in respect to their intellectual nature, by altering the relation of numbers, or the properties of mathematical figures; and require us to believe that six and ten are equal; or that twice two make nine; or that a circle and square are one and the same figure; and refer us to our intellectual faculties to verify the same, and punish us if we did not admit it. Surely this would be doing violence to the intellectual nature he has given us. And yet it would be doing no more violence to our intellectual convictions, than it would do to our conscience and moral nature to require us to believe that there is no essential difference between truth and falsehood, innocence and guilt, right and wrong, virtue and vice. For it will scarcely be denied that we perceive a distinction between Right and Wrong as clearly and as really as between a circle and a square. † And if God, therefore, cannot

* Essay on the Probation of Fallen Man, pp. 90, 91, Philadelphia, 1827. Dr. Wilson, though he had no sympathy with the Supralapsarian scheme, seemed, nevertheless, to have become entangled in the web of one or two of its sophisms, if we might judge from his language here referred to. A favorite argument with them is the following: "Si aliquid esset justum et bonum antecedenter ad Dei voluntatem, tum Deus ex obligatione et officio illud velle et facere teneretur." And again: "Si ita res habet, tum sequeretur dari bonum et justum, quod à primo summo bono et justo non flueret: daretur enim effectus, qui in primam causam resolvi non posset." In fact, Dr. W. employs some of these very terms. But the sophism, though subtle, consists in confounding the will of God with his nature. His nature is, of course, prior to his will, and is its rule. So that should we even affirm that justice and goodness, &c., were antecedent to the will of God, this would not be saying that they are prior to or distinct from his nature.

† "As principles in the abstract, the laws of morality are as unchangeable as the axioms of geometry." Mansell, p. 186.

Digitized by Google

disregard these distinctions, then any theory which presupposes him to disregard them is necessarily false and absurd, and is entitled to no serious consideration whatever. But the antecedent or immediate imputation scheme does suppose him to disregard them, as really and as truly, and to all intents and purposes, as the creabilitarian notion of the supralapsarians. Indeed, the principle involved is, as we have shown, but one and the same, and the schemes must stand or fall together: since, if God confessedly cannot *create* man to be tormented in hell forever, "for the glory of his power and severity," then, of course, he cannot by the mere legal fiction of antecedent imputation constitute them morally guilty and corrupt, and so render them fit subjects for endless torment; for his moral nature is necessarily as much opposed to the one as to the other, the moral character of the act being in both cases the same. Condemnation cannot in any case produce guilt in the guiltless; for it is merely the utterance of a judgment based upon things as they are. And it is, moreover, contrary to the very nature of God to suppose the contrary, and it would be a reversion of the order of things established by him, and recognized and announced in his word. Actual guilt alone, either inherent or assumed, can bring condemnation under the righteous administration of God; and of course it must precede the condemnation in the order of nature no less than of time. And when God assures us that the posterity of Adam are guilty of his sin, and that the children of Achan and of the Amalekites were guilty of their parents' sin, we believe the fact; nor is it for us to say that the mere declaration produced the guilt, or that they were guilty by a mere arbitrary act of the Divine will. It is not for us to refuse to believe the fact because we are unable to explain it. We are not required to explain it, but simply to believe it on the testimony of God. Nor is it for us to say, as Dr. Thornwell does, that it makes no difference whether the guilt is supposed to precede the imputation and condemnation, or whether it flows from and is produced by the imputation. The assertion is false. * It does make a difference; for God

* "A strictly moral theory requires ..... an exactly graduated proportion between guilt and suffering, virtue and happiness. If, on the other hand, we maintain that there is no moral fitness in either case, we virtually deny the

Digitized by Google

acknowledges the former, but disowns and in every possible way disclaims the latter. We may not be able, in a given case, to define wherein precisely the difference may be traced; but this alters not the fact. We can see, however, that the difference involves the whole question as to the foundation of morality, as above shown — the question whether the justice of God is immutable and eternal, or whether it depends merely upon his will.

8. To maintain, therefore, that God has no reason, aside from mere will, for treating his creatures as guilty and condemned, rather than otherwise, is a grave and pernicious error; which, if conceded, would plainly imply the entire accuracy of the supra-lapsarian dogmas of absolute reprobation and antecedent imputation — since, in that case, immutable holiness, justice and truth, and all the moral perfections or attributes claimed to belong to the Divine nature, can be demonstrated to be the merest figments of the imagination. But, on the contrary, if God be by nature holy and just and true, then he is, of course, immutably so; and consequently he has regard to these attributes in every act of his will pertaining to the creature; and acts not as he does merely because he wills to do so, and not otherwise; but because it is holy and just and right that he should do so, and not otherwise.* The idea, therefore, that without reference to the claims of his moral nature, he may, by mere arbitrary enactment, so constitute the guiltless guilty and morally corrupt as to bring them into antagonism to his law or retributive justice, and so abolish their innocence as to secure their condemnation and endless rejection from happiness and eternal life — is an idea that is worthy only of execration. It is a slander on his character, and at utter variance with the clearest announcements of his word. "Will the

existence of a moral Deity at all; we make God indifferent to good and evil as such; we represent Him as rewarding and punishing arbitrarily and with respect of persons." Mansell, p. 191.

* This is true, also, in respect to the salvation of sinners. For though the objects of mercy, or the "seed" given to Christ in covenant, were selected from the corrupt mass according to the mere good pleasure and will of God, they are yet forgiven, or justified and saved, by the faithfulness and justice of God in view of the atonement effected by Christ. "If we confess our sins, *he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins*, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

Digitized by Google

Lord destroy the righteous with the wicked? that be far from thee. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" And then, moreover, he does nothing without reason. In every act he has some end for which he acts; and this end is the reason why he wills or performs the act. This rule holds good, of course, in all his actions. When he elects one sinner to eternal life, and reprobates or adjudges another to ignominy and eternal death; though it be from his mere good pleasure, the exercise of that pleasure, if we may so speak, results not from indifference, but from the most just and holy reasons: for he worketh all things "according to the counsel of his own will" — that is, not simply according to his own will, as Hooker observes, but according to the counsel of his own will. * And whatever is done with counsel, or wise resolution, has, of course, some reason why it should be done — even though that reason be so utterly incomprehensible as to lead us to exclaim, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"

9. Should the question arise whether there can be any difference between creating a morally corrupt and sinful being, and constituting a sinless creature morally corrupt; what would the advocates of antecedent imputation reply? We are unable to find any ground of essential difference; and, so far as justice and holiness are concerned, we maintain that there is none, and that the two are morally the same. But we know, from the character of God as revealed to man, and from the express declarations of his word, that he could not directly create a rational and accountable being in a state of moral corruption and sin; and in this our antagonists profess to agree with us, and concede that he could not. How then can he, by the mere fiat of his will, constitute the guiltless guilty of moral corruption? He cannot. And the principle, therefore, upon which the whole notion is based — that God can, *by the mere fiat of his will*, change the nature of moral right and wrong, and make the right wrong and the wrong right, or the just unjust and the unjust just — is to be rejected as the most pernicious of all heresies. † In fact, it would likewise imply that

* See Hooker's Works, vol. I., p. 158.

† And yet Dr. Hodge insists that — if the prerogative here referred to be de-

Digitized by Google

He could make the performance of the same act by his creatures both right and wrong, at one and the same time; so that it could be, in one and the same sense of it, both just and unjust, as having been both commanded and prohibited by God. *

10. It would be difficult, indeed, to tell what absurdity, in a moral point of view, this principle might not be made to justify. Protagoras, the cotemporary of Socrates, and to whom we have already referred, maintained that right and wrong were unreal and imaginary, and had no basis in the nature of things; and his sophisms were not without effect, even upon the mind of Aristotle. Hence, too, certain Manichæan theologues in the fourth century, improving upon the idea, affirmed that it would argue imperfection in the power of God to suppose that he could not lie and deceive: and they maintained that he was able so to procure the non-existence of that which exists or which has existed, as to render certain that it never did exist. Augustine disputes against them, and shows that the argument involves also the conclusion that God could make the true false and the false true. †

---

nied to God; and if it is, on the contrary, alleged that His judgments must be according to the subjective desert of those whom they affect; and that it is a denial of his moral nature, and even atheistic, (as Cudworth so pointedly declares it to be, see *ubi supra*,) to say that he can pronounce the just unjust and the unjust just; that the only legitimate ground of judgment are character and works; and, moreover, that community in a propagated nature involves all the partakers of it in the criminality and pollution of their progenitor—*then* "*the whole Gospel is destroyed, and every scriptural ground of salvation of sinners is renounced.*" (See the citation in our former Essay, pp. 407, 408.) Surely, then, no one in view of this can deny that the issue pending is both plain and palpable. For if God can thus by mere will constitute the just unjust, and the unjust just, the conclusion of Twisse (expressly repudiated even by Turrettin, Loc. III., Quæst. 19, Sect. 9,)follows, of course, that had He not appointed otherwise He could save the sinner without a satisfaction to justice. Socinianism comes next, and with no halting pace.

* Amyrald, in the work above mentioned, well observes: "Et video nonnullos ab Anaxarcho non multum dissidere, cum Deo adscribunt, ut nullam actionum suarum causam habeat ipsius voluntatem antecedentem. Nam si legum à Deo nobis positarum nulla causa est in ipsa rerum natura, et in legibus ipsis: si, inquam, ex illius arbitrio mero pependerunt, et sunt (ut loquuntur) ex jure positivo; potuit ille certè alias non modo discrepantes, sed planè contrarias leges hominibus constituere."

† His words are: "Quisquis ita dicit, si Omnipotens est Deus, faciat, ut quæ facta sunt, facta non fuerint; non videt se hoc dicere: Si Omnipotens est, faciat

Digitized by Google

The connection is, indeed, sufficiently obvious either way; for to attempt to extend thus indefinitely the power of God, is, in effect, to overturn the whole doctrine respecting it. And so, too, the attempt to extend the prerogatives of the Divine will indefinitely, and without regard to his moral perfections, must result in a like overthrow of the doctrine in its practical relations to man. The distinction between right and wrong ceases, and with it departs the certainty of his fulfillment either of his promises or threatenings; and all manner of falsehoods and absurdities may become true. But how different from all this is the language of the Holy Ghost? "God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie," &c. (Heb. vi: 17–19,) Crellius, the celebrated champion of Socinianism, has, with great force, refuted these absurdities. * Dr. Hodge reasons on the subject precisely as Crellius does; or as Wendeline, (Christ. Theol., p. 107,) or as any sound and judicious mind, when unwarped by theory, must reason upon it.

"*Guilt*," says he, "cannot be removed by power. If a man commits a crime, he is guilty, and even Omnipotence cannot undo the deed. If it is true that we apostatized in Adam, Omnipotence cannot make it untrue." †

And this is certainly so. And it is equally true and obvious that by no exercise of his power, or fiat of his will, can God render truth falsehood, or falsehood truth; or constitute guilt innocence, or innocence guilt, in a moral agent or accountable being; nor attribute to any such being guilt which is not really and already his, on holy, righteous, and sufficient grounds, and according to the dictates of eternal and immutable justice. And to claim, therefore, on behalf of God, any power or prerogative

---

ut ea, quæ vera sunt, eo ipso, quo vera sunt, falsa sint." *Contra Faustum*, lib. 26, cap. 5.

* See his *De Deo ejusque Attributis*, cap. 22, pp. 51, 52.

† See *Princeton Review* for April, 1860, p. 366. On pp. 763, 764, (referred to in a previous note,) Dr. Hodge appears, however, to have forgotten what he has here so truly averred.

Digitized by Google

involving the contrary, is to claim for him that which he not only does not claim for himself, but that which He utterly and most emphatically disclaims.

11. The question as to *where the ground is*, upon which God may attribute guilt in a specific case in which he does attribute it, is not to be raised in relation to any such matter of fact. We may not be able to discover the ground of the charge, or the relation asserted to exist between the individual and the guilt or offense itself; but all this proves nothing, where the fact of such a connection is established by the Divine averment. God affirms the fact in the case; and from this affirmation we know, not only that the fact exists, but that the reasons why he recognizes its existence, and so adopts it as a basis for the operation and administration of his Providence, are holy and just and true, and perfectly consistent with eternal and immutable righteousness. If God treats his creatures as sinners, as guilty and as corrupt, it is not from any supposed prerogative of mere will or pleasure; but because there is a holy and just and true sense in which they are to be so regarded and treated. And even in the case of our adorable Redeemer, who was no creature, but God manifest in the flesh, there is a just and holy and true sense in which he was regarded and treated as a transgressor, for thus alone could he have become a curse for us. Our guilt was justly imputed to him, because he voluntarily assumed the office of its expiation. It was an imputation, therefore, which was perfectly consistent with the eternal principles of immutable righteousness. And both the providing and acceptance of that substitution — though God was perfectly free either to do so or not, and was prompted therein solely by his love and compassion for our fallen race — were in no way incompatible with the same principles of his moral nature. And we have only to apply to this case (we trust that there is no irreverence in the allusion) the supralapsarian dogma of antecedent imputation, in order to see the enormity of the principle which underlies that whole scheme. We shall not attempt to draw out the illustration in form, but only suggest it for reflection. And in view of the whole matter we therefore affirm that this doctrine, teaching as it does that the antecedent declaration of a non-existing fact constitutes or produces the fact itself, or causes it to

Digitized by Google

exist where it had not existed — that is, that the antecedent imputation of guilt to the guiltless produces, (either penally or otherwise,) depravity and moral corruption, so as to constitute the sinless guilty and corrupt, and bring them under the displeasure of God — is at war with the whole revealed character of God, and with all the declarations of his word.

12. God, in establishing the constitution and course of nature as they originally existed, established on the basis of immutable righteousness the connection, moral and natural, between Adam and his posterity; and it is a connection, therefore, which is based not upon positive law, or a constitution established by mere will or arbitrary enactment, but upon the principles of eternal rectitude and justice. Consequently, the results of that connection, as exhibited in the effects of his transgression, arise not from mere arbitrary enactment which might as well have had it otherwise; but they arise in strict accordance with the principles of eternal and immutable holiness and justice. To represent this connection, therefore, as a mere arbitrary constitution or arrangement, depending upon or originating in the mere will or pleasure of God, without reference to his eternal and immutable justice; and to argue, as some of our own divines, along with Professor Park and many other New England theologues, do, that there was no reason for it, aside from his mere will, is, at least, to speak without reason and without knowledge.* Nothing can jus-

* On this point Dr. Hodge seems cheerfully to concede that both he and Professor Park occupy the same ground: In illustration of which statement we present from the Princeton Repertory for 1851, p. 680, the following sufficiently explicit admission. The language is that of Dr. Hodge: "Professor Park himself says — '*Our calamities hang suspended on the sovereign purpose of heaven; we say directly; he* [Dr. Hodge] *says indirectly; we say, without any intervening links; he says, with the intervening links of imputation, guilt,*' &c. When we first read this sentence [continues Dr. Hodge] we could hardly believe that Professor Park had been given up *to speak the truth thus simply and clearly. It is precisely as he states it.*" Both Professors, therefore, confessedly agree in explicating the matter from the mere will or sovereignty of God: for this sovereignty, according to the express and repeated declaration of Dr. Hodge, supplies the intervening links referred to. This supralapsarian principle makes strange bed-fellows. That Dr. Hodge, however, had, in the course of twenty-one years, made considerable progress in the development of the scheme, is apparent from his language in P. Essays, I., p. 159. "For ourselves, however, (says he,) we are free to confess that we instinctively shrink from the idea, that God in mere sove-

Digitized by Google

tify any such representation. Depravity, corruption and guilt are inherited in strict and exact accordance with the immutable principles of truth and righteousness, whether man can explain the matter or not. They come upon us not by the mere will and pleasure of God, as the supralapsarians and antecedent imputationists affirm, but in strict accordance with our subjective desert, according to his unalterable holiness and truth and justice. And consequently God could not have willed them otherwise in consistency with those attributes. And when Dr. Thornwell, therefore, speaking in a tone of very great assurance, and of triumph over the theory of traduction, which he is reviewing, and with which we have not a particle of sympathy, * affirms that —

"No matter how called into being, he (man) is a separate, indivisible moral agent, and he is either mediately or immediately the creature of God. Generation is but the process through which God creates him, and whatever causes independently of himself, condition his being, are ultimately to be referred to God. *If it were wrong to create him under guilt it, is wrong to permit him to be generated under guilt.*" †

He, (as already stated,) in common with the whole supralapsarian school, who have always employed such language, affirms what he has no means of knowing to be true. And in opposition to it we aver that — while it is utterly irreconcilable with the holiness and justice of God to create man immediately under guilt, or under the antecedent and unavoidable penalty of moral corruption, (which would clearly infer that he could without injustice create him to be eternally damned,) — it may be perfectly consistent with His moral nature to permit him to be generated under guilt. The old *law maxim* (qui facit per alium facit per se,) which Dr. Thornwell strangely attempts to apply to the case

reignty inflicts the most tremendous evils upon his creatures, while we bow submissively at the thought of their being penal inflictions for a sin committed by our natural head and representative," &c.

* It might not, however, be amiss in this connection to apprise Dr. Baird's Reviewers of the fact (which will be apparent, also, from our citations hereafter,) that when the Reformed divines do attempt to philosophize on the subject, the philosophical theory of Dr. Baird finds incomparably more favor with them than the philosophical theory of antecedent imputation: which is logically subversive of the fundamental principles of their acknowledged theology.

† Southern Presbyterian Review, April, 1860, pp. 181, 188, 189.

Digitized by Google

has no bearing on the subject, and even if its application were admitted, it could in no way help his assumption. For while God is the author of the constitution and course of nature, and established it at the outset — according to the principles of his unalterable holiness and justice, and for reasons entirely in harmony therewith — its practical development, so far as his rational creatures are concerned, is not determined by his direct and positive agency or efficiency; for they were created free. And the development (so to speak) of their moral status is not, therefore, to be attributed to his direct and efficacious operation. Dr. Thornwell will certainly concede this, for he most emphatically denies that God is the author, or, in any true sense, the originator of sin or moral evil. Now the results or consequences of that development, either for good or for evil, as they relate to the rational and accountable creature, do not either depend upon or originate from the mere will of God; but are results which accrue to the creature in exact accordance with the principles of eternal justice and holiness. This, too, we presume will scarcely be questioned; for in whatever way the will of God may be supposed to be concerned in the production of those results, it is not only because God, of his own will and pleasure, would have them so, but because it was perfectly consistent with immutable Justice and Truth and Goodness that they should be so. The production of the sinful posterity of Adam "instrumentally," therefore, is by no means to be considered as attributable to God's positive agency, in the same sense as the creation of our first parents, or as the creation of angels. For example, and speaking hypothetically: God might or might not create them. But having called the race into being, the disposal of it depends not on the mere *will* of God, but is determined, also, by his eternal rectitude and holiness. And while, according to those principles, therefore, the sin of our natural and covenant head and representative could not but result as it has resulted; and could not but lead to the production of a polluted and guilty and doomed race under the instrumentally creative hand of God himself; those same principles forbid the direct creation of a polluted and guilty and doomed creature. We think Dr. Thornwell will hardly deny this. And if so, where is the force of his fervid declamation on the subject?

Digitized by Google

13. It is an admitted principle of sound philosophy that upholding in existence requires the exercise of the same power in continuance which first called into being the object created. Dr. Thornwell will doubtless recognize the soundness of the principle. And if so, we would ask him, whether he would regard it as equally consistent with the holiness, justice and goodness of God to have, by his own immediate fiat, created the world and its inhabitants as they now are, as to have created them in their original condition? He admits the validity of the distinction in this case; and why not in the other? But suppose an individual were to press him with his own argument; and affirm that upholding and creating are in all practical respects one and the same, and proceed alike from God; and that as there is, therefore, no practicable difference between creating and upholding, God is, consequently, as truly the efficient and direct author of the world as it now exists, and of its present fallen and sinful condition, as he was of its original and holy condition? and that it makes no difference whether it has been brought into its present state *mediately* by the creature, or *directly* and efficiently by God himself, he is as fully the author of it in the one case as in the other—would Dr. Thornwell assent to this conclusion? If he would, let him do it frankly and openly; and assume an appropriate position amongst the advocates of the rejected and heretical supralapsarian scheme; or if he would not, then let him cease to employ such argumentation. But we are assured that he never would assent to any such conclusion. And for the same reason that he would not assent thereto, we cannot assent to his own conclusion above stated. And in direct opposition to that conclusion, therefore, we affirm it to be untrue that "if it were wrong for God to *create* man under guilt, it is wrong to *permit* him to be generated under guilt." * So that this prop in support of antecedent imputation must be abandoned; or, if it be retained, it must be in connection with the whole supralapsarian scheme, of which it is an essential part.

* This whole speculation, as is obvious from the very terms themselves employed by Dr. Thornwell, is based upon an utter ignoring of the distinction recognized in all true Calvinistic theology, between the *effective* and *permissive* decrees of God. The Supralapsarians have always ignored the distinction.

Digitized by Google

14. The following remarks of Dr. John Dick * are so in point in this connection that we must lay them before our readers. Speaking in reference to God he says:

"Absolute justice is defined to be the rectitude of his nature, by which all his proceedings are regarded. All his acts are conformable to his infinite purity and perfection. Those who maintain that he may subject an innocent creature to the greatest sufferings, are chargeable, in the first place, with transmuting rectitude into mere power, which is not a moral attribute; and in the second place, with forgetting that power is not His only perfection. In respect of power, God might do any thing, because he is omnipotent; but there are other properties of his nature, by which the exercise of power is limited. I do not mean to insinuate that creatures have any claim upon their Creator, and hold it to be high presumption to make use of any expression which imports that he is bound to bestow any favor upon them, prior to his own voluntary engagement. But God, if I may speak so, is a debtor to himself; that is, he will never do anything which does not become him, which is not agreeable to his infinite perfection. Now, in the case which we are considering, his power is limited by his wisdom and goodness. As a wise Being, he would not inflict everlasting sufferings upon an innocent creature, *because this would lead to the conclusion that righteousness was not more pleasing to him than unrighteousness, and that the punishment of the guilty was rather an effect of arbitrary will than justice. As a good Being, he would not render his own offspring miserable without a cause; and to suppose that he might subject them to misery, and still be good, is to confound the ideas of malevolence and benevolence, as the hypothesis we are combating confounds those of justice and power.* It is strange that some men should take an unnatural pleasure in giving awful and forbidding representations of God, and should imagine that they do honor to him by exalting one attribute at the expense of another, and exhibiting him in the character of an Almighty Despot."

15. Turrettin, unless greatly misunderstood, has most absurdly confused the Reformed theology by commingling the supralapsarian scheme with infralapsarianism, † so much so, that notwith-

* Lectures on Theology, vol. I., p. 254. Philadelphia, 1841.

† Such commingling, though scarcely avoidable in the early discussion of the fundamental principle of that scheme in the Reformed church, (that is, during the first century of the Reformation,) is wholly inexcusable since its

Digitized by Google

standing his formal rejection of the former, he may be fairly cited in support of both. And the same confusion is apparent in the theological system of all who claim to receive him throughout as the accredited exponent of Calvinism. Absolute reprobation and antecedent imputation, as sometimes asserted by him, cannot, as integral parts, be associated with infralapsarian theology. And we do not hesitate to say that any such association is, both logically and on Scriptural grounds, utterly impossible. This antecedent imputation, if admitted, must be regarded as the procuring cause of sin and moral corruption in the subjects of it, as really as the creabilitarian or supralapsarian decree of election and reprobation was admitted to be the procuring cause of the sin and fall, and of the salvation and damnation of men. In fact, and as already shown, it is only the extension of the same principle to another point of the same system. For if the human race have become guilty and corrupt — not because they sinned in and inherited the fallen nature of their federal and natural Head; but because God so accounted or constituted them; and because his accounting them so was penally the procuring cause of their actually becoming so — then, this imputation is as really and veritably the procuring cause of their guilt and sin, as absolute reprobation was admitted to be by the supralapsarian school. And hence, if that dogma be admitted, we must admit that God may, by arbitrary enactment and without regard to the immutable principles of goodness and justice, treat the innocent as penally guilty, make them partakers of moral corruption, and punish them forever in hell; which at once leads us back to the supralapsarian notion that morality is founded not on immutable justice, but on will. To such conclusions does this speculation lead, by claiming that holiness and justice, and the distinction between right and wrong,

full development, and the condemnation of supralapsarianism by the Synod of Dort; since which time every man in the Calvinistic church, who lays any claim to intelligence and consistency in theology, is bound to avoid it entirely. Any accurate analysis of the principles which give character to the respective systems, evinces them to be irreconcilable. And a full recognition of the revealed doctrine pertaining to the Divine Justice and the Divine Will, so far from admitting any such commingling, shows, on the contrary, that it is wholly inadmissible. Twisse and Szydlovius saw and acknowledged this, and acted consistently.

Digitized by Google

truth and falsehood, are not, as existing in the Divine Mind, eternal and immutable. And it thus becomes the most pernicious of all heresies; destructive alike of all morality and religion.

16. The plea that these things are mere speculation, and relate to the philosophy of the understanding rather than to the science of morality, we have refuted already. And if such principles become the settled convictions of the understandings of men, men will act from those convictions. The illustrative instance given by Plutarch, in his life of Alexander of Macedon, is quite in point. After that monarch had, in a drunken revel, murdered his friend Clitus, and through the horrors of remorse consequent thereupon, was about to destroy his own life, Anaxarchus applied this philosophy of Protagoras to console him, and assured him (as Hobbes since has likewise maintained,) that a ruler could do no wrong; that his will was the rule for his subjects, and was the supreme law; and that, consequently, every thing he saw proper to do was right, and fit to be done. The application was legitimate; but was there ever a more atrocious principle asserted by either men or devils!

It were easy to furnish other instances, not very dissimilar, evincing the practical operation of this same principle. And such illustrations may serve to show how unfounded is the plea that a speculative error respecting the foundation of morals is of no practical account. *We* may adopt, and inculcate it, simply as a speculation with which the intellect alone is concerned; but what should hinder others, who may receive it at our hands, from thus reducing it to practice?

17. In Rom. v: 19, the Apostle, summing up the argument in vs. 12–18, clearly announces that "by the disobedience of one the many were constituted sinners;" ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοὶ.* This he announces *as a fact.* In the statement of the argu-

* It would be amusing, were not the subject of so serious a nature, to observe Dr. Hodge citing this passage, and referring to the analogy therein presented between Adam and Christ, to prove that men become *sinners* by antecedent imputation *in the same mode* in which they become righteous through Christ; and then, in the same connection, asserting that "to be guilty of another's sin *constitutes no one a sinner;*" and citing both Owen and Turrettin to sustain the asseveration: "To be *culpæ alienæ reus* makes no man a sinner." (*Owen.*) "Christus propter imputationem . . . . . *non potest dici peccator, quod importet corruptionem*

Digitized by Google

ment itself, however, (that is, in giving the premises,) he states also the explanatory fact, that "so death passed upon all men, *because all have sinned.*" * That is, *the reason or ground of the imputation or condemnation is subjective also, and must, of course, exist antecedently to the imputation or condemnation itself. How* it may exist in the case, is a matter of no practical moment, since we are assured of the fact that it does exist. Thus, for illustration, the reason for reprobation, (which is the exercise of Divine justice,) must exist antecedently to the reprobation itself; and must be found in the creature reprobated and doomed to death, and not only in mere will, or in the power to dispose of creatures without regard to their actual character and subjective desert. Nor is it true, as above shown, that this would, by parity of reason, require that the ground for election must likewise be found in the creature elected. Election is the exercise of mercy, while reprobation is the exercise of justice, as all infralapsarians affirm. And for the same reason, moreover, it is equally obvious that the reason for imputing guilt (for we assume that, of course, God never acts without the best and holiest of reasons,) must also exist antecedently to the imputation itself, at least in the order of nature. This, we presume, no one will dispute. Nor can the reason be found in the supposed prerogatives of will alone, which

---

inhærentem." (*Turrettin.*) Surely, then, antecedent imputation, as asserted by Dr. Hodge, can have little to do with the Apostle's argument here: *for even admitting such imputation, it cannot constitute men sinners,* according to Dr. Hodge's own explanation. And then, as a further illustration of the impossibility of uniting the distinctive principles of the supra and infralapsarian theology, let it be noted, that the Apostle maintains a constant antithesis between the *gift by grace, or free gift,* and the *judgment* or *condemnation.* But Dr. Hodge makes *the condemnation itself a free gift* — as free as the gift of righteousness, instead of an actual and subjective desert; as though the exercise of vindictive justice with God were equally irrespective of subjective desert as the exercise of mercy. There never was a more remarkable error fallen into, as we shall show in our next essay, than that of Dr. Hodge in claiming that the exposition which he has given of the analogy in this passage, is, or ever has been, fundamental to Calvinistic Theology.

* If this fact is likewise admitted, on what principle is it that Dr. Hodge asserts that inherent corruption is the penal consequence of Adam's sin alone? The words are πάντες ἥμαρτον. And so essentially active is ἁμαρτάνω in its very nature, that it has neither a middle nor passive voice: though in Hebrew the words FOR SIN include not only acts, but habits and defects.

Digitized by Google

could indiscriminately assign either righteousness to the sinner, or moral corruption to the sinless; since moral corruption, or spiritual death, is, by the Apostle in the above passage, plainly and emphatically declared to be a *judgment*, or *condemnation*— which thus connects it with the justice or moral nature of God, on the one hand, and, on the other, with the subjective desert of those upon whom it comes. The ground for the imputation of guilt must, therefore, be found in the subject to whom the guilt is imputed; since it is God's moral relation to the subject, and his relation to God as an infinitely good and holy and righteous Sovereign, that are concerned in the whole procedure. This rule or principle is universal in its application. The reason for the imputation of guilt to our blessed Redeemer existed antecedently to the imputation, and was found solely in our Redeemer himself; otherwise, as all must concede, it would have been an act of infinite injustice to impute it to him. It was found in His voluntary assumption of our suretyship. And the reason for the imputation of Adam's sin or guilt to his posterity, is found in the fact that the guilt was common; or, in other words, that he was their natural and federal head, and that they all sinned in and fell with him. The imputation, therefore, resulted not from a mere arbitrary will, which was at liberty either to impute or not impute in such a case; but the circumstances by virtue of these existing facts were such, that the holiness and justice and goodness of God demanded the imputation. We are not authorized to go beyond, or around, or under the fact; but must receive it in its simple fullness as announced by God. All admit freely that to have imputed the offense of Adam, or even of Satan himself, to the holy angels; and to have inflicted moral corruption as the penalty of such imputation; would have been utterly irreconcilable with what God has proclaimed respecting his moral nature. But why irreconcilable? Simply because there was no natural or moral headship, and no participation in the offense; and the mere imputation of guilt could neither have constituted such a relation, nor have rendered them partakers of the offense. In other words, there existed no antecedent reason or subjective ground why it should be done; and hence it were unjust to have based the reason on mere arbitrary will, or in the imputation it-

Digitized by Google

self. Imputation can never, of course, thus furnish a reason for itself. There must be a reason for it; and that reason, when guilt is imputed for condemnation, is to be found, not in the supposed fact that God, without any reason save his mere good pleasure or will, saw proper to impute; but (as Dr. Witherspoon remarks in a passage cited from him on page 426 of our former essay,) it must be found in the subject to whom the guilt is imputed; and must, of course, exist antecedently to the imputation itself — for otherwise it were absurd to name it a reason. Nor can it of itself, as above remarked, furnish the reason: that is, it cannot allege guilt to the charge of an otherwise guiltless creature, and then make that alleged guilt a ground for punishing him by an infliction of spiritual death, and then of treating him as a miserably corrupt and hell-doomed creature; for this, as is evident from the supposed case aforesaid respecting the angels, would be wholly unjust. *How* the posterity of Adam partake of his guilt, (and sinned in him, or when he sinned,) it is folly for any man to pretend to say.* The *fact* that it is really and subjectively theirs, is all that we either know or need now know on the subject; and God will, at the proper time, make all the rest sufficiently plain. The knowledge of the fact has satisfied the vast

* "Moral evil, *in the only form in which we are conscious of it*, appears as the direct transgression of a law whose obligation we feel within us; and *thus manifested*, it is an act as real and as positive as any performed in the most rigid compliance with that law. *And this is the utmost point to which human research can penetrate.* Whether, in some absolute mode of existence, out of all relation to human consciousness, the phenomenon of moral evil is ultimately dependent on the addition or the subtraction of some causative principle, is a question, the solution of which is beyond consciousness, and therefore beyond philosophy. To us, as moral agents, capable of right and wrong acts, evil is a reality, and its consequences are a reality. *What may be the nature of the cause which produces this unquestionably real fact of human consciousness, is a mystery which God has not revealed, and which man cannot discover.*" Mansell, p. 338. And the fact that we have by nature this consciousness of guilt, and a consciousness that our nature itself is alienated from holiness and from God; viewed along with the declaration of the Apostle that *all sinned*, may, while it exposes the folly of human philosophy in attempting to penetrate the veil, teach us that we have not yet learned all that eternity will disclose to us even respecting ourselves. God has announced what facts of the case it is important we should know; and has also taught the use which should be made of them. Let us be content to learn and to practice the lesson.

Digitized by Google

majority of the great and good amongst the followers of Christ in all ages; and it should be sufficient for us. God speaks of things as they are, according to the eternal principles of rectitude and truth. It is in accordance with these principles that he justifies the believing but penitent soul. When justified, such a soul is really and truly just in His sight. Its sins are blotted out, it becomes the partaker of a new nature, and is received into everlasting favor. Nor is there any propriety in attempting to avoid the force of this great truth, by objecting that such a soul is only formally and not inherently just; for it is legally and truly just in the sight of God, according to the principles of eternal truth and righteousness; is received and treated as just, according to those same principles; and is rescued from its inherent ungodliness, by regeneration and sanctification through the operation of the Holy Ghost; and becomes truly a child of God, and a member of his own family. The law has no claim, and never can have any claim, against it on account of transgression; and on the unalterable principles of eternal rectitude God recognizes such a soul as really just, and can never regard it in any other light. And so, too, in respect to the posterity of Adam. They are really depraved, guilty, polluted and condemned, and their guilt is imputed to them according to precisely the same principles of eternal truth and rectitude.

18. It is universally conceded that God does not approve of that moral corruption which leads to the formal perpetration of crime, whatever may be supposed to be the connection which he may have with it under the providential government of his creatures: as, for example, in the case of the brethren of Joseph selling him into Egypt; or that of the Jews putting to death our blessed Lord. But if the imputation of sin be antecedent, then, as must be conceded, it depends for its production upon his will, in the same sense precisely as the Supralapsarians assert in respect to the efficient production of sin by the decree of reprobation. Thus Adam sinned, say they, because God willed that he should sin. And the execution or accomplishment of this will is seen in the effect produced; showing it to be not permissive, but efficacious, positive and direct. This has been abundantly evinced by the citations which we have presented from their approved

Digitized by Google

writings. The antecedent imputation of sin, therefore, (which is a direct penal infliction of moral corruption upon a creature otherwise free from it,) must depend solely upon the will of God, as is conceded — for it is admitted that it is not according to the principles of justice in the sense of retribution for subjective ill-desert; for there is no ill-desert prior to said infliction, except a merely putative ill-desert, asserted to be based on the mere pleasure and will of God; and to admit any other would, of course, destroy the whole doctrine of antecedent imputation. In what sense, therefore, can it be claimed by the advocates of this scheme, that God does not approve the moral evil which he of his mere pleasure thus freely bestows upon creatures otherwise free from it and from all actual ill-desert? He gives it freely, and where it is not deserved, as Dr. Hodge admits; and thus, of his own mere will, causing it to exist where it had not existed; and why not approve his work in this instance as well as in any other instance? He approves of the mercy which he freely bestows; and why not, then, of the moral corruption which, according to our antagonists, he bestows with equal disregard of subjective desert? Will the advocates of antecedent imputation please to say? To *claim* that such a procedure is in accordance with the principles of justice announced in the word of God, and practically recognized by the moral nature of man, is to deny the whole theory of antecedent imputation, since that justice obviously is concerned with subjective or actually existing desert, and not in any sense with the antecedent and efficacious production of such desert: and to admit that it is not according to justice, is to concede that the principle is unjust and false.

19. But on what principle is it to be pleaded that God imputes to or inflicts upon the guiltless creature moral corruption? Such a principle is nowhere found in the Bible. Of course, we admit that He may and does inflict suffering and calamity upon the righteous, even in love: but in such a case He never forsakes nor forgets them; and His love and presence sustain them therein. But this is not to be confounded with the doctrine that He may so charge guilt upon guiltless creatures, as to bring upon them the penalty of moral corruption, and leave them forever to the fearful and unavoidable consequences of such imputation. On

Digitized by Google

what ground, then, is such a principle to be asserted? Is it to glorify his Justice? But this cannot be; for justice deals with subjective character and desert; and not in their antecedent production. Is it to glorify his severity? and to evince the illimitable prerogatives of his almighty and sovereign Will? But can glory be derivable from such a source — the exercise of endless severity against the guiltless? or from a prerogative to disregard all subjective character in His creatures? What might become of the holy angels themselves, and of the redeemed, under its exercise? The design of God in revealing himself to his creatures is to draw forth and retain their affections, and to influence and develop their moral nature. And can this design be accomplished by such means — by thus leading them to believe that he is indifferent to the exercise of their affections, and to their moral character and desert? and also to believe that he may, after all, disregard all the principles of holiness, truth, and righteousness, which he has enjoined for their observance? This cannot be. Does the imputation, then, proceed from indifference? If so, what becomes of the moral nature of God? A moral nature cannot be indifferent to moral character, so as to pay no regard to it, and treat innocence as guilt, unless where innocence has voluntarily assumed the legal responsibilities of guilt. If it proceed not, therefore, from indifference; and cannot proceed from justice, (which is forbidden by the very terms of the argument,) nor from a desire to glorify the severity of God; from what can it proceed? Surely not from love or compassion; for this can scarcely be pretended. Could it proceed from hate? The thought is horrible; but let them who are responsible for it explain how the conclusion is to be avoided. This antecedent imputation severs the creature from innocence and from God, and brings him into a condition in which he will unavoidably hate God and holiness, and rebel against him; and continue to do so forever, unless where Mercy interposes and saves. The mere will and good pleasure of God, therefore, according to this dogma, brings the creature into this condition without regard to his subjective character: and as this Will or Good Pleasure is not herein actuated by indifference, or by severity, or justice, or love, what is the actuating principle? The sinless creature is treated as an enemy;

Digitized by Google

and through a wasteless eternity his whole existence is thus made an insupportable burden; and why? Let our antagonists answer; and in their answer let them likewise show that, while it might be proper for God to do this, it would not be proper for him to create men in order that they might be damned. And if the two are morally equal, let not the advocates of antecedent imputation any longer deny their adherence to the Supralapsarian scheme.

20. The Scriptural view of imputation is of the plainest and simplest character. It is declared to be gratuitous, and without any personal or subjective desert of the creature in every instance where the mercy of God is concerned; and what is thus adjudged is a pure and gracious gift of God. But, on the contrary, it proceeds upon the creature's personal or subjective desert in every instance where the justice of God is concerned; that is, where that justice expresses itself in condemnation. The same thing also is true in the analogous case of predestination to life and death. Predestination to life is always gratuitous and immediate; that is, it is the bestowment of a gift, without any reference to subjective merit on the part of the elected: nay, it excludes all such merit or desert; while predestination to death is always mediate, and proceeds upon the subjective desert of the reprobate. The one is the operation of mercy, and the other of justice. The one is inconsistent with subjective desert; the other demands it. And this is alike true in the case both of imputation and predestination.

21. And (if I may be allowed a brief digression,) here is the appropriate stand-point from which to contemplate the different principles underlying the conflicting theologies of Supralapsarianism, Pelagianism, and Infralapsarianism or Calvinism. Supralapsarianism avers that, in regard to both mercy and judgment, or the salvation and damnation of men, God acts without regard to subjective desert. Neither election nor reprobation, neither the imputation of sin nor the imputation of righteousness, has reference to subjective or personal desert; but to the mere will and good pleasure of God alone.

In contrast with this, the Pelagian school, with its endless concatenation of Remonstrants, Semipelagians, Socinians, &c., assumes that election and reprobation, the imputation of sin and

Digitized by Google

of righteousness, are in neither case to be referred to God's sovereign will and pleasure, (except so far as he accepts the good and rejects the bad,) but simply to the subjective desert of the creature in both cases: — that election is not unto faith and good works, but on account of foreseen faith and good works: and that as reprobation is for sin and impenitence, so election is for obedience and penitence. In other words, that it depends upon the creature himself whether he shall become a subject of the converting and regenerating grace of God, or whether he shall be the subject of retributive justice. But the Infralapsarian or Calvinistic theology, in direct contrast with both, teaches that as election is the work of God's goodness and mercy, so reprobation is the work of his justice and holiness: and so also with respect to the imputation both of sin and righteousness. The one is without, and (in its very terms) contrary to subjective desert, for it depends upon the free mercy of God whom he will elect, or to whom he will impute the righteousness of Christ; and hence, it depends upon his mere good pleasure and will, without any foresight of faith or of good works. But reprobation, and the imputation of sin to condemnation, do not, in any such sense, depend upon his mere will; for in this case the subjective demerit or desert of the creature is taken into the account. In other words, no creature is reprobated, or has sin imputed for condemnation, unless he is subjectively guilty; and on account of that subjective guilt deserves such reprobation or imputation. The one is of mercy, the other is of justice. This is the Calvinistic system as distinguished from both the foregoing. And it will be observed, moreover, that — while both the Scriptures and the Reformed theology attach two distinct meanings to the word impute, (as we have shown in our former Essay, pp. 395, 396 and 418,) the one mediate and subjective, the other antecedent and immediate — the supralapsarian scheme admits of but one in its explication of the doctrine; and in the imputation of both sin and righteousness merges the two meanings into one, by making the imputation immediate alone. The Pelagian scheme in like manner merges the two meanings into one, by making the imputation in both cases purely mediate and subjective. And thus both schemes, by separating what God has joined together, not only

Digitized by Google

fail to meet the conditions of the meaning of the term as expressly given in the Scriptures, but are obliged to wrest and pervert the Scriptures themselves in their support. But Calvinism, on the contrary, recognizes both meanings in explicating the doctrine, as above shown; and so meets and fulfills the conditions required.

22. The repeated asseveration of Drs. Hodge and Thornwell, that no view of imputation can be accepted as true which will not apply to the elucidation of the three points — to-wit, the imputation of Adam's sin to us; of our sins to Christ; and of his righteousness to us — is without any foundation. * The whole work of Christ in assuming our legal responsibilities, is, confessedly, supernatural, and unlike any thing that has ever occurred under the Divine administration. As to this point, therefore, there is no such analogy whatever, (as we have shown in Essay I., p. 424;) and there can be no ground for claiming such analogy to exist. On the other points, however, it may be conceded, if not *in modo* yet *in re:* that is, it must be received as a fact, that the sin of our natural and moral head is imputed for condemnation to all his natural seed, and the righteousness of Christ for justification to all his covenanted seed. But we are not constituted sinners by the imputation of Adam's sin alone, but by our sin in him; or, in other words, by that union with him which involves a participation of his guilt and corrupted nature. The two are inseparable. And we are not constituted righteous by the imputation alone of Christ's righteousness; but also by virtue of that union which constitutes us legally one with him. † In other words, no soul is ever condemned under the lasting displeasure and curse of God, merely on account of the disobedience of Adam; and no soul is ever saved merely on account of the obe-

* Our attention has been directed to this thought by a learned and valued friend, whom we should be gratified to be permitted to name in the connection.

† It is sad to contemplate the fact (though it is precisely what may be legitimately expected,) that this precious doctrine of the believer's union with Christ, is already beginning to be disparaged and set at naught by some of the loudest advocates of Dr. Hodge's exposition of Rom. v: 12–21. We know that *he* does not undervalue the doctrine, and why then should they? May not the solution be found in a passage (already referred to) in Princeton Essays, I., p. 127,

Digitized by Google

dience of Christ. Something more is, in each case, necessary. These points are, we believe, fully conceded by our brethren. So that the imputation of either the one or the other does not, in either case, save or damn without a vital union between the representative and the represented. The one must be a partaker of the fallen nature of his Representative, and so become a subject of condemnation before he is condemned; and the other must, by a vital union with his Representative, become a partaker of his unfallen nature by the power of the Holy Ghost, (comp. Luke i: 35,) before he can be saved: and he must thus become both legally entitled to salvation, and fitted for it through this union: which, in other words, involves not only justification, but regeneration as completed in sanctification. To confound justification with sanctification is an error; and to separate them so as to suppose that (in relation to fallen man) one may exist without the other is also an error. In the economy of redemption the existence of the one always supposes the existence of the other. So in regard to original sin. To separate imputation from moral corruption so as to make the first *causative* of the second is an error; for the one presupposes the other, and they ought always to be so regarded and treated.* And the doctrine of Original Sin, therefore, can never be scripturally explicated except on the ground of a full recognition both of the federal and natural headship of Adam; or of both imputed and inherent sin. By ignoring the first we sink helplessly into Pelagianism, and, ultimately, into Socinianism; and by ignoring the second, we rush headlong into the Supralapsarian scheme.

23. Turrettin, singularly enough, resorted to the scheme of antecedent imputation (when he does resort to it, which is not

* Dr. Hodge (Princeton Essays, I., p. 149,) endeavors to make much of the remark of the Leyden Professors, that "Imputation being denied, inherent corruption cannot be just:" and he adds, "So Turrettin and Calvinists generally argue; *of course imputation is antecedent to corruption.*" But Dr. Hodge should have likewise stated that those divines equally held *that inherent corruption being denied, imputation cannot be just:* for such is the fact. And if we should argue from this that they held that imputation was only mediate, we should treat them as unfairly as Dr. Hodge has done. He is equally unfair to "Turrettin and Calvinists generally," as we shall fully show in our next Essay.

Digitized by Google

always,) in order to vindicate the justice of God; as the Schoolmen resorted to the notion that morality is founded on Will, to exalt and magnify the power and sovereignty of God. He was a man of deep and undoubted piety, and deeply imbued with the literature of his age. He regarded a native disposition to sin in the light of a penalty or punishment; and assuming that this could not be consequent upon subjective demerit or sin, he regarded it as the result of antecedently imputed sin; and thus he felt that the justice of God was vindicated. * But it should have occurred to Turrettin that, having admitted the immutable rectitude and justice of God as an element into his argument, he was bound so to respect it as to carry it consistently throughout the argument: for, assuredly, if it militate against Divine justice to cause mankind to inherit moral corruption without guilt, it militates against it equally to constitute them guilty in order that they may inherit such corruption, and so become obnoxious to retributive justice. If our own moral nature and convictions of right ought not, as Turrettin concedes, to rest satisfied with the former hypothesis, the same, or equally valid, reasons evince that we should not be satisfied with the latter. The admission, therefore, that the justice of God should be vindicated in the view of rational creatures, (which is here taken for granted by Turrettin, †) is as fatal to his own scheme as it could possibly be to any scheme to which he takes exception. In fact, he has attempted to vindicate it by a theory which, as it appears to us, is wholly at war with all that God has taught respecting his justice; and as utterly irreconcilable to all human jurisprudence, and to all the dictates of sound reason. And the only proper resort, therefore, is to leave the whole matter just where God has left it; and to accept the facts in the case on the Divine testimony. That testimony announces that mankind have become veritably polluted and guilty, both by the disobedience of Adam, and by their own participation therein; and that, therefore, God justly treats them

* His procedure herein strikingly resembles that of Gomar at the Synod of Dort, who sought to vindicate the justice of God in absolute reprobation by saying that he first predestinated men to sin, and then predestinated them to death in consequence of sin. See our former Essay, p. 411.

† See Instit. Theol., Loc. 9, Quæst. 9, Sec. 21. Works, vol. I., p. 562.

Digitized by Google

as polluted and guilty. It explains not how they participate, but only states the fact that *all sinned*, and there leaves the matter. We may believe the fact, or we may disbelieve it, if so disposed. But God has communicated to us all that he will communicate on the subject, in the present stage of our being.

24. Every attempt to philosophize on the subject — of which we have such signal instances and failures in the late work of Dr. Baird; and in the Reviews of it by Drs. Hodge and Thornwell — ought to be utterly and forever discountenanced by the Church of God. It is a fact with which Philosophy has nothing to do, for it is as far removed from her province and scrutiny, as any other mystery in the Providence of God. And to introduce now the philosophical dogmatisms which every where pervade the work of Dr. Baird on the subject; and also the speculations of his Reviewers; can lead only to the perplexing of the Church — for in every sense of the terms it is "a darkening of counsel by words without knowledge." The Realists and the Nominalists have already had their day; and it was a long one. But it is past, and has long been passed: and in surveying the scenes of their boasted conquests, we find that they have settled nothing, except that it is absolute folly for human philosophy to attempt to obtrude herself with her vaunted dogmatisms into the sacred province of Revealed theology. This point they have settled, as we might reasonably have hoped, forever; until the discussion referred to awoke the apprehension that our most gifted men may, after all, be too wise to profit by the unhappy experience of the past: and that perishing souls may again have their attention called away from the contemplation of their own lost estate, and of the proffer of mercy through a crucified Saviour, to questions and strifes, which, while they edify not, exhaust the energies, and impair the piety and christian spirit of the Church of God. And as the only available preventive we have wished, by the present discussion, to place the whole question upon its legitimate basis, and to invite attention to the real issues involved.

In another Essay we shall conclude the argument, and lay before our readers the views entertained by the Reformed church on the subject of *Imputation and Original Sin.* L.

Digitized by Google

Art. II.—*Cometary Astronomy.*

The phenomena of comets have ever been regarded with a high degree of interest. The sudden appearance, vast dimensions, and extraordinary aspect of these celestial wanderers, together with their rapid and continually varying motions, have never failed to excite the attention and wonder of all observers. Nor is it surprising that in former times, when the nature of their orbits was wholly unknown, they should have been looked upon as omens of impending evil, or messengers of an angry Deity. Even now, although modern science has reduced their motions to the domain of law, determined approximately their orbits, and assigned, in a number of instances, their periods, the interest awakened by their appearance is, in some respects, still unabated.

The special points of dissimilarity between planets and comets are the following: The former are dense, and, so far as we know, solid bodies; the latter are many thousand times rarer than the earth's atmosphere: — the planets *all* move from west to east; many comets revolve in the opposite direction: — the planetary orbits are but slightly inclined to the plane of the ecliptic; those of comets may have any inclination whatever: — the planets are observed in all parts of their orbits; comets only in those parts nearest the sun.

Zeno, Democritus, and other Greek philosophers, held that comets were produced by the collection of several stars into clusters. Aristotle taught that they were formed by exhalations, which, rising from the earth's surface, ignited in the upper regions of the atmosphere. This hypothesis, through the great influence of its author, was generally received for almost two thousand years. Juster views, however, were entertained by the celebrated Seneca, who maintained that comets ought to be ranked among the permanent works of nature, and that their disappearance was not an extinguishment, but simply a passing beyond the reach of our vision. The observations of Tycho Brahe first established the fact that comets move through the planetary spaces, far beyond the regions of our atmosphere. The illustrious Dane, however, supposed them to move in circular orbits. Keppler, on

Digitized by Google

the other hand, was no less in error in considering their paths to be rectilinear. James Bernouilli supposed comets to be the satellites of a very remote planet, invisible on account of its great distance; such satellites being seen only in the parts of their orbits nearest the earth. Still more extravagant was the hypothesis of Descartes, who held that they were originally fixed stars, which, having gradually lost their light, could no longer retain their positions, but were involved in the vortices of the neighboring stars, when such as were thus brought within the sphere of the sun's illuminating power again became visible.

COMETS SEEN IN THE DAY-TIME.

I. Comets of extraordinary brilliancy have sometimes been seen during the day-time. At least thirteen authentic instances of this phenomenon are now known. The first is the comet which appeared about the year 43, B. C., just after the assassination of Julius Cæsar. The Romans called it the *Julium sidus*, and regarded it as a celestial chariot sent to convey the soul of Cæsar to the skies. It was seen two or three hours before sunset, and continued visible for eight successive days. The great comet of 1106, described as an object of terrific splendor, was seen simultaneously with the sun, and in close proximity to it. Dr. Halley supposed this and the Julian comet to have been previous returns of the great comet of 1680. In the year 1402 two comets appeared, one about the middle of February, the other in June, both of which were visible while the sun was above the horizon. One was of such magnitude and brilliancy that the nucleus and even the tail could be seen at midday. The comet of 1472, one of the most splendid recorded in history, was visible in full daylight, when nearest the earth, on the 21st of January. This comet, according to Laugier, moves very nearly in the plane of the ecliptic; its inclination being less than two degrees. Its least distance from our globe was only 3,300,000 miles. The comet of 1532, supposed by some to be identical with that of 1661, was also visible in full sunshine. Its nucleus had an apparent magnitude three times greater than Jupiter. The comet of 1577 was seen with the naked eye by Tycho Brahe before sunset. It was by observations on this body that Aristotle's doc-

Digitized by Google

trine in regard to the origin, nature, and distance of comets was proved to be erroneous. It was simultaneously observed by Tycho at Uraniburg, and Thaddeus Hagecius at Prague; the points of observation being more than 400 miles apart, and nearly on the same meridian. The comet was found to have no sensible diurnal parallax; in other words, its apparent place in the heavens was the same to each observer, which could not have been the case had the comet been less distant than the moon. The comet which passed its perihelion on the 8th of November, 1618, was distinctly seen by Marsilius when the sun was above the horizon. The great comet of 1744 was seen without the aid of a glass at one o'clock in the afternoon, only five hours after its perihelion passage. The diameter of this body was nearly equal to that of Jupiter. It had *six* tails, the greatest length of which was about thirty millions of miles, or nearly one-third of the distance of the sun from the earth. The spaces between the tails were as dark as the rest of the heavens, while the tails themselves were bordered with a luminous edging of great beauty.

The great comet of 1843 was distinctly visible to the naked eye, at noon, on the 28th of February. It appeared as a brilliant body, within less than two degrees from the sun. This comet passed its perihelion on the 27th of February, at which time its distance from the sun's surface was only about one-fourth of the moon's distance from the earth. This is the nearest approach to the sun ever made by any known comet. The velocity of the body in perihelion was about one million two hundred and eighty thousand miles an hour, or nearly nineteen times that of the earth in its orbit. The apparent length of its tail was sixty-five degrees, and its true length one hundred and fifty millions of miles. The first comet of 1847, discovered by Mr. Hind, was also seen near the sun on the day of its perihelion passage. That discovered by Klinkerfues on the 10th of June, 1853, and which passed its perihelion on the first of September, was seen at Olmütz in the day-time, August 31st, when only twelve degrees from the sun. After passing its perihelion it was again observed, *at noon*, on the second, third, and fourth of September. Finally, the great comet of 1861 was seen before sunset, on Monday evening, July 1st, by the Rev. Henry W. Ballantine, of Bloomington,

Digitized by Google

Indiana. It was again detected on the following evening just as the sun was in the horizon.

Besides the thirteen comets which we have enumerated, at least four others have been seen in the day-time; all, however, under peculiar circumstances. Seneca relates that during a great solar eclipse, sixty-three years before our era, a large comet was observed not far from the sun. "Philostorgius says that on the 19th of July, 418, when the sun was eclipsed and stars were visible, a great comet, in the form of a cone, was discovered near that luminary, and was afterwards observed during the nights." * The comet which passed its perihelion on the 18th of November, 1826, was observed by both Gambart and Flaugergues to transit the solar disk; the least distance of the nucleus from the sun's surface being about two million miles. A similar phenomenon was witnessed on the 6th of June, 1818. The second comet of 1819 and the comet of 1823 are both known in like manner to have crossed the sun's disk. Unfortunately, however, the transits were not observed.

HALLEY'S COMET.

II. As comets are subject to great changes of appearance, one can never be identified by any description of its magnitude, brilliancy, &c., at the time of a previous return. This can be done only by a comparison of orbits. If, for example, we find the elements of an orbit very nearly corresponding in every particular with those of a former comet, there is a degree of probability, amounting almost to certainty, that the two are identical. Sir Isaac Newton, in his *Principia*, published shortly after the appearance of the comet of 1682, explained how the periods of those mysterious visitors might thus be ascertained, which directed the attention of astronomers to the subject. Dr. Halley soon after undertook a thorough discussion of all the recorded cometary observations within his reach. In the course of his investigations he discovered that the path of the comet observed by Keppler in 1607 coincided almost exactly with that of the one which passed its perihelion in 1682. Hence he concluded that they were the same. He found also that the comet of 1531, whose course had

* Hind.

Digitized by Google

been particularly observed by Apian, moved in the same path. The interval between the consecutive appearances being nearly seventy-six years, Halley announced this as the time of the comet's revolution, and boldly predicted its return in 1758 or 1759. The law of universal gravitation had at this time just been discovered and announced. But although its application to the determination of planetary and cometary perturbations had not been developed, Halley was well aware that the attractive influence of Jupiter and Saturn might accelerate or retard the motion of the comet, so as to produce a considerable variation in its period. During the interval from 1682 to 1759, the application of the higher mathematics to problems in physical astronomy had been studied with eminent success. The disturbing effect of the two large planets, Jupiter and Saturn, was computed with almost incredible labor by Clairaut, Lalande, and Madam Lepaute. The result as announced by Clairaut to the Academy of Sciences, in November, 1758, was that the period must be 618 days longer than that immediately preceding, and that the comet accordingly would pass its perihelion about the 13th of April, 1759. It was stated, however, that being pressed for want of time, they had neglected certain quantities which might somewhat affect the result. The comet, in fact, passed its perihelion in March, within less than a month of the predicted time. When it is considered that the attraction of the earth was not taken into the account, and that Uranus, whose influence must have been sensible, had not then been discovered, this must certainly be regarded as a remarkable approximation.

But during the next interval of seventy-six years, the theory of planetary perturbations had been more perfectly developed. The masses of Jupiter and Saturn had been determined with greater accuracy, and Uranus had been added to the known members of the planetary system. A nearer approximation to the exact time of the comet's perihelion passage in 1835 was, therefore, to be expected. Prizes were offered by two of the learned Societies of Europe — the Academy of Sciences at Turin, and the French Institute — for the most perfect discussion of its motions. That of the former was awarded to Damoiseau — that of the latter to Pontecoulant. The times assigned by these distin-

Digitized by Google

guished mathematicians for the comet's perihelion passage were very nearly the same, and differed but a few days from the true time. Had the present received mass of Jupiter been used in the calculations, Pontecoulant, it is believed, would not have been in error as much as twenty-four hours. It may be proper to remark that, during the entire period from 1759 to 1835, the position of Neptune was such that it could produce no considerable effect on the motion of the comet.

This interesting object will again return about 1911.

The visit of 1531 was the earliest that Halley succeeded in determining with any degree of certainty. Peter Apian, by whom it was at that time observed, was the first European to ascertain the fact that, as a general thing, the tails of comets are turned from the sun.* To confirm this discovery, he carefully followed the body in its progress through the constellations. By means of his recorded observations Halley was enabled to identify this comet with that of 1607 and 1682. The great comet of 1456 he *conjectured* to be the same, from the date of its appearance. Pingré subsequently confirmed this suspicion, by a careful examination of the few trustworthy records that could be collected from the writers of that period.

From the earlier descriptions of this comet we infer that its brilliancy is gradually diminishing. In 1456 its tail, which was slightly curved like a sword or sabre, extended two-thirds of the distance from the horizon to the zenith. The appearance of such an object, in a grossly superstitious age, excited throughout Europe the utmost consternation. The Moslems had just taken Constantinople, and were threatening to advance westward into Europe. Pope Callixtus III., regarding the comet as confederate with the Turk, ordered prayer to be offered three times a day for deliverance from both. A special excommunication was also composed, in which the Devil, the Turk, and the Comet were daily anathematized. But with aspect no less threatening, despite these maledictions, the celestial stranger pursued its onward journey. At length, after causing long dismay among the nations, it gradu-

* The Chinese, however, as appears from Biot's researches, had observed the same fact seven hundred years earlier. See Humboldt's Cosmos, vol. IV., (Bohn's Ed.,) p. 544.

Digitized by Google

ally receded from the sun; its sword-like form diminished; and finally, to the great relief of Europe, it entirely disappeared.

The perihelion passage of 1456 was, until recently, the earliest known. It was shown by Laugier, however, in 1843, that among the notices of comets extracted by Edward Biot from the Chinese records, were observations of a body in 1378, which was undoubtedly the comet of Halley. Further researches among these annals enabled the same astronomer to recognize two ancient returns, one in 760, the other in 451. Mr. Hind has shown that the comet mentioned by Dion Cassius, which appeared in the year 11, B. C., and which was closely observed by the Chinese, was almost certainly that of Halley. He also finds evidence nearly conclusive that the comets of 218, 295, and 1145, were returns of the same body.

The mean of the five periods of Halley's comet since 1456 is seventy-five years and three hundred and twenty-four days. The period from 1378 to 1456 was seventy-seven years and two hundred and fourteen days; and the mean length of the eighteen periods previous was seventy-seven years and ninety-four days. Laugier suggests that the shortening of the period may possibly be due to a diminution of the comet. Bessel found that in certain given conditions the period would be diminished three years by a loss of the twenty-three-thousandth part of the comet's mass. It is worthy of remark, however, that when the comet was in aphelion, about 1418, Neptune was nearly in the same longitude: hence the former must have suffered considerable perturbation.

The motion of Halley's comet is retrograde, or from east to west. The point of its nearest approach to the sun is situated within the orbit of Venus. The distance of the remote extremity of the orbit is almost twice that of Uranus, or about thirty-six times that of the earth. The comet is, consequently, subject to extraordinary changes of temperature. When nearest the sun its light and heat are almost four times greater than the earth's; — when most remote, they are twelve hundred times less. In the former position, the sun would appear much larger than to us — in the latter, his apparent diameter would not greatly exceed that of Jupiter, as viewed from the earth. It would be difficult to conjecture what the consequences might be, were our planet trans-

Digitized by Google

ported to either of these extremes of the cometary path. In the perihelion, the waters of the ocean would undoubtedly be reduced to a state of vapor; in the aphelion, they would be solidified by congelation.

ENCKE'S COMET.

It was formerly supposed that all comets have their aphelions far beyond the limits of the planetary system. In 1818, however, a small one was observed (by Pons,) whose orbit was subsequently found to be wholly interior to that of Jupiter. In 1819 the elements of its path were presented by Bouvard to the Board of Longitude at Paris. These were immediately observed to correspond with those of a comet seen by the European astronomers generally in 1805. Hence they were at once regarded as identical. Its elliptic orbit was calculated by Encke, who found its period to be only about three years and four months. Its least distance from the sun is five-sixths of the mean distance of Mercury. Its greatest distance is four-fifths that of Jupiter.

Encke's comet is invisible to the naked eye, except in very favorable circumstances; it has no tail; its motion, like that of the planets, is from west to east; and its orbit is inclined more than thirteen degrees to the ecliptic.

BIELA'S COMET.

The discovery of Encke's comet of short period was followed, in 1826, by that of another, whose revolution is completed in about six years and eight months. It was observed on the 27th of February, by Mr. Biela, an Austrian officer; accordingly it has since been known as *Biela's comet.* On computing its elements and comparing them with those of former comets, it was found to have been observed in 1772 and 1805. Damoiseau having calculated the dimensions of the comet's elliptic path and the time of its return, announced as the result of his computations the remarkable fact that the orbits of the earth and comet intersect each other, and that the comet would cross the earth's orbit on the 29th of October, 1832. This produced no little alarm among the uneducated, especially in France. Even some journalists are said to have predicted the destruction of our globe by a collision with the comet. When the latter, however, passed the

Digitized by Google

point of intersection at the predicted time, the earth was distant about fifty millions of miles.

At the return in 1845–6, Biela's comet exhibited a most remarkable appearance. Instead of a single comet, it appeared as two distinct bodies moving together side by side, at a distance from each other equal to about two-thirds of that of the moon from the earth. Although a number of hypotheses have been suggested in regard to this mysterious phenomenon, no satisfactory explanation has been offered. At the return in 1852 the distance between the parts was found to have increased. At the time of the last perihelion passage, May, 1859, the comet was so completely lost in the solar light as entirely to escape observation.

FAYE'S COMET.

On the 22nd of November, 1843, Mr. Faye, of the Paris Observatory, discovered a comet, which was shown by Dr. Goldschmidt to revolve in an elliptic orbit, the perihelion of which is exterior to the orbit of Mars, and the aphelion immediately beyond that of Jupiter. The eccentricity is, therefore, less than that of any other known comet. Its period is about seven years and five months.

It is possible that a comet moving in a parabola or hyperbola, with the sun in the focus, may be thrown into an elliptic orbit by the disturbing influence of Jupiter or one of the other large planets. The celebrated Leverrier undertook to determine whether the comet of Faye had in this manner been recently fixed as a permanent member of the solar system. He found that it could not have been so introduced since 1747, and, consequently, that it must have completed at least thirteen revolutions anterior to its discovery.

This comet was again observed during its perihelion passage in 1850–51, and also in September, 1858.

DE VICO'S COMET.

On the 22nd of August, 1844, De Vico, of Rome, discovered a comet whose orbit is included between those of the earth and Jupiter. Its period is 1996 days, or about five years and a half. Leverrier regards this comet as identical with that which passed its perihelion in August, 1678.

Digitized by Google

BRORSEN'S COMET.

On the 26th of February, 1846, Mr. Brorsen, of Kiel, discovered a faint comet, the mean distance and period of which are found to be almost identical with those of Hygeia. This comet was not observed during the perihelion passage in 1851, on account of its unfavorable position with respect to the earth and sun. At the next return, however, it was fortunately detected, by Dr. Bruhns, of Berlin, who first noticed it on the 18th of March, 1857.

D'ARREST'S COMET.

Dr. D'Arrest detected a comet on the 27th of June, 1851, which was found to move in an elliptic orbit, with a period of about six years and a half. It entirely escaped observation, both in Europe and America, during its perihelion passage in 1857. It was observed, however, at the Cape of Good Hope.

WINNECKE'S COMET.

The second comet of 1858 was discovered on the 8th of March, by Dr. Winnecke, of Bonn. This proved to be identical with the third comet of 1819, whose period was computed by Encke to be about five years and a half. It must, therefore, have returned unperceived a number of times in the interval of thirty-nine years.

TUTTLE'S COMET.

A faint telescopic comet was discovered at the Observatory of Harvard College, on the evening of January 4th, 1858, by Mr. H. P. Tuttle. The same body was independently found one week later by Dr. Bruhns, of Berlin. From observations made at Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Ann Arbor, Michigan, its elements were computed by different astronomers; the result in each case coinciding so closely with the elements of the second comet of 1790, as to place its identity wholly beyond doubt. Its period is nearly thirteen years and eight months. It has returned, therefore, without detection in the years 1803, 1817, 1831, and 1844. Its next return may be looked for in August or September, 1871.

Digitized by Google

COMETS SUPPOSED TO BE PERIODIC.

III. Only eight comets, namely, those of Halley, Encke, Biela, Faye, Brorsen, D'Arrest, Winnecke, and Tuttle, have been *certainly* observed to return. The periodicity of De Vico's, however, may be regarded as fully established; while that of others is rendered highly probable by the approximate determination of their orbits. Five of these appear to be members of the interesting group of small comets whose times of revolution, like those of the asteroids, are included between the periods of Mars and Jupiter. They are the comets of 1585, January 1743, April 1766, 1783, and November 1819.

"The fact that these comets have not been reöbserved on their successive returns through perihelion, may be explained, either by the difficulty of observing them, owing to their unfavorable positions, and to the circumstances of observers not expecting their reäppearance, their periodic character not being then suspected; or because they may have been thrown by the disturbing action of the larger planets into orbits such as to keep them continually out of the range of view of terrestrial observers." *

Lexell's comet, of 1770, is the most remarkable instance known of the change produced in the orbits of these bodies by planetary attraction. This comet passed so near Jupiter in 1779, that the attraction of the latter was 200 times greater than that of the sun. The consequence was that the comet, whose mean distance corresponded to a period of five years and a half, was thrown into an orbit so entirely different, that it has never since been visible.

PETERS' COMET.

A telescopic comet was discovered by Dr. Peters, on the 26th of June, 1846, which continued to be observed till the 21st of July. Its period, according to the calculations of the discoverer, is about thirteen years, or rather less than that of Tuttle's comet. It was expected to return in 1859, but escaped detection; owing probably to the fact that its position was unfavorable for observation.

---

* Dr. Lardner.

Digitized by Google

COMETS WHOSE PERIODS ARE NEARLY EQUAL TO THAT OF URANUS.

Within the last half century five comets have been discovered, which form, with Halley's, an interesting and remarkable group. The first of these was detected by Pons, on the 20th of July, 1812; the second by Olbers, on the 6th of March, 1815; the third by De Vico, on the 28th of February, 1846; the fourth by Brorsen, on the 20th of July, 1847; and the last by Westphal, on the 27th of June, 1852. The periods of these bodies are all nearly equal, ranging from 68 to 76 years; their eccentricities are not greatly different; and the motions of all, except that of Halley, are direct. These striking coincidences will be referred to hereafter.

THE FOURTH COMET OF 1857,

Discovered by Dr. C. H. F. Peters, then of the Dudley Observatory, was found to have an elliptic orbit, the inclination of which to the plane of the ecliptic is aboat thirty-two degrees. Its motion is direct, and the estimated period about 250 years.

THE GREAT COMET OF 1858

Was one of the most remarkable of the nineteenth century. It was discovered on the second of June, by Donati, of Florence, and first became visible to the naked eye about the last of August, or nearly three months after its detection by the telescope. The comet attained its greatest brilliancy about the tenth of October; when its distance from the earth was fifty millions of miles. The length of its tail rather exceeded this distance. If, therefore, the comet had been at that time directly between the sun and the earth, the latter must have been entirely enveloped for a number of hours in the cometic matter.

The observations of this comet during a period of five months enabled astronomers to determine the elements of its orbit within small limits of error. It completes a revolution, according to the computations of Newcomb, in 1854 years, in an orbit somewhat more eccentric than that of Halley's comet. This would make its visit in 1858 its fourth appearance since the epoch of man's creation; the first having been in the time of Adam, the second in the time of Abraham, and the third about the commencement of the Christian era. It will not again return before

Digitized by Google

the commencement of the thirty-eighth century, and will only reach its point of greatest distance from the sun about the year 2,800. Its motion per second when nearest the sun is thirty-six miles; when most remote, only two hundred and thirty-four yards.

COMETS WHOSE ASSIGNED PERIODS EXCEED THAT OF NEPTUNE.

It may aid us in forming a conception of the vast extent of some of the cometary orbits, to be reminded of the corresponding periods as given by astronomers. Halley assigned a period of 575 years to the comet of 1680. If this determination be correct, the body must recede from us more than 130 times the distance of the earth from the sun. From the most remote part of its orbit, therefore, not a single planet of our system would be visible, and even the apparent diameter of the great central luminary would be less than that of Venus as seen from the earth. Both Encke and Pingré make the period of this comet much greater even than Halley. The comet which passed the sun in October, 1822, has a period, according to Encke, of 1550 years; that of September, 1827, according to Cluver, 2611 years; that of September, 1811, according to Bessel, 3383 years; Burckhardt assigns to the comet of 1763, a period of 7334 years; and Cluver gives 75,000 years as the period of the comet of September, 1780. It must be remarked, however, that some of these results are liable to much uncertainty.

A comet of extraordinary brilliancy appeared both in Europe and China, in April, 1066; passing its perihelion about the last of May, O. S. The similarity of its elements as computed by Pingré, to those of the comet of 1677 as determined by Halley, renders it probable that the latter was a return of the former. The intervening period is about 611 years: another appearance of the body need not, therefore, be expected before A. D. 2288. It is proper to remark that Hind's elements of the comet of 1066 differ widely from those of Pingré, and that the former regards the comet as probably identical with that of Halley.

In October, 1097, a comet was seen both in Europe and China, which was noted for the fact of its having two distinct tails, making with each other an angle of some forty degrees. From a discussion of the Chinese observations, (which extended through

Digitized by Google

a longer period than the European,) Laugier has concluded that this body is identical with the third comet of 1840, which was discovered by Galle on the 6th of March. If, therefore, it has made no intermediate return without being observed, it must have a period of about 743 years. There is also a remarkable similarity between the elements of the comet which passed its perihelion on the 5th of June, 1845, and those of the comet of 1596. The former was probably a reäppearance of the latter; the period of revolution being about 249 years. The elements of the great comet of 1843, as calculated by different astronomers, are in some respects very discordant. There is a probability, however, of the identity of this body with the comet of 1668. This would make the last period almost exactly 175 years.

IV. It remains to describe some of the most remarkable comets of which we have any record, but of which we have no means of determining with certainty whether they move in ellipses, parabolas, or hyperbolas.

In the year B. C. 468, a large comet appeared simultaneously with the famous fall of meteoric stones near Ægos Potamos. The former was supposed by the ancients to have had some agency in producing the latter phenomenon. Another of extraordinary magnitude appeared in the year B. C. 373. This comet was so bright as to throw shadows, and its tail extended one-third of the distance from the horizon to the zenith. The years 156, 136, 130, and 48, before our era, were also signalized by the appearance of very large comets. The apparent magnitude of the first of these is said to have equaled that of the sun himself; while its light was sufficient to diminish sensibly the darkness of the night. The second is said to have filled a fourth part of the celestial hemisphere. The comet of 130, B. C., sometimes called the comet of Mithridates, because of its appearance about the time of his birth, is said to have rivaled the sun in splendor. That of 48, B. C., presented a terrific aspect; and it is said to have greatly lessened the darkness of the night. It ought to be remarked, however, that some of these descriptions are probably much exaggerated.

In A. D. 178, a large comet was visible during a period of

Digitized by Google

nearly three months. Its nucleus had a remarkably red or fiery appearance, and the greatest length of its tail exceeded sixty degrees. The most brilliant comets of the sixth century were probably those of 531 and 582. The train of the latter, as seen in the west soon after sunset, is said to have presented the appearance of a distant conflagration.

In March, 837, a comet appeared, which continued visible over a month. About the middle of April its train extended from the horizon to the zenith, and the appearance of the comet was extremely grand. The interval between its perihelion passage and that of Halley's comet in 1378, was 541 years and eight months, which is equal to seven periods of seventy-seven years and one hundred and thirty-nine days. This is less by only 73 days than the period of Halley from 1378 to 1456. Its motion, like that of Halley's comet, was retrograde. The inclination, least distance from the sun, and longitude of the perihelion of the two bodies, are also nearly the same. These facts would seem to render it probable that the comet of 837 was an ancient return of Halley's.

The year 895 was signalized by the perihelion passage of a comet whose apparent magnitude has rarely been surpassed. The tail is said to have exceeded one hundred degrees in length. Great comets appeared in the years 975, 1264, and 1556. Of these, the comet of 1264 had the greatest apparent magnitude. It appeared about the first of July, and attained its greatest brilliancy in the latter part of August, when its tail was one hundred degrees in length. It finally disappeared on the third of October, about the time of the death of Pope Urban IV., of which event the comet, in consequence of this coincidence, was considered the precursor. These comets, on account of the similarity of their elements, were until quite recently believed to be the same, and to have a period of about three hundred years. In the case of identity, however, another return should have occurred soon after the middle of the present century. As there has been no such reäppearance, we may conclude that the comets were not the same, and that their periods are wholly unknown.

The comet discovered on the tenth of November, 1618, was one of the largest of modern times. Its tail is said to have ex-

Digitized by Google

tended over an arc of the heavens equal to one hundred and four degrees. The comet of 1652, so carefully observed by Hevelius, is said to have almost equaled the moon in magnitude; it shone, however, with a lurid, dismal light. We have already mentioned that the huge comet of 1668, which was observed at San Salvador, in Brazil, and at Bologna and Lisbon, in Europe, has been supposed, with some probability, to be identical with the great comet of 1843. The tail of the comet of 1680 was ninety degrees in length. This comet is also remarkable for its near approach to the sun; its least distance from the solar surface having been only 147,000 miles. It will always be especially memorable, however, for having furnished Newton the data by means of which he first showed that comets in their orbital motions are governed by the same principle that regulates the planetary revolutions.

Of all the comets which appeared during the eighteenth century, that which passed its perihelion on the 7th of October, 1769, had the greatest apparent magnitude. It was discovered by Messier on the 8th of August, and continued to be observed till the 1st of December. On the 11th of September the length of its tail was ninety-seven degrees. The comet discovered on the 26th of March, 1811, is in some respects the most remarkable on record. It was observed during a period of sixteen months and twenty-two days — much the longest period of visibility on record. On account of its situation with respect to the earth, the apparent length of its tail was much less than that of some other comets; its true length, however, was at one time 120 millions of miles; and Sir William Herschel found that on the 12th of October the greatest circular section of the tail was fifteen millions of miles in diameter. The same astronomer found the diameter of the head of the comet to be 127,000 miles, and that of the envelope at least 643,000. As a general thing, the length of a comet's train increases very rapidly as the body approaches the sun. But the perihelion distance of the comet of 1811 was considerably greater than the distance of the earth from the sun; while its nearest approach to the earth was one hundred and ten millions of miles. Its true magnitude, therefore, has probably not been surpassed by any other observed; and had its perihelion been very near the sun, it must have exhibited an appearance of

Digitized by Google

terrific grandeur. We have already mentioned that this comet is thought to have an elliptic orbit, and that its computed period is over 3,000 years.

The comet first generally observed on the evening of June 30th, 1861, was the most brilliant that has appeared for centuries, and one of the most remarkable on record. The evening of its appearance was, for an hour after sunset, somewhat cloudy; but before nine o'clock the atmosphere had become perfectly clear. * The nucleus, which was in the Lynx, had an apparent magnitude much greater than Jupiter. The tail crossed the Camelopard, Little Bear, Dragon, and Hercules, terminating in the Bull of Poniatowski. Its apparent length, therefore, was one hundred and twenty degrees — more than one-half of which was very brilliant. Its greatest breadth was not less than seven or eight degrees.

The apparent lengths of the trains of the most remarkable comets that have appeared since the Christian era have been as follows: —

A. D.	Degrees.
133	50,
178	50,
1456	60,
1689	60,
1843	65,
837	80,
1769	97,
390	100,
1264	100,
1362	100,
1618	104,
1861	120.

The train of a comet seen in China near the close of the ninth century is said by some of the Chinese historians to have been nearly two hundred degrees in length; but this is perhaps a great exaggeration. That of the comet of 1861 was the longest of which we have any *authentic* record.

We have already mentioned the fact that this comet is one of

* At Bloomington, Indiana.

Digitized by Google

the few that have been seen by the naked eye when the sun was above the horizon.

When the comet crossed the plane of the ecliptic, about the 28th of June, a portion of the earth's orbit was actually included within its train. At the same time the earth was very near this enveloped section of her path; so that we barely escaped a journey through this enormous cometary appendage. As to the effect of such an immersion we are entirely ignorant: it might perhaps have been wholly insensible.

The elements of this comet are so dissimilar to those of all others hitherto determined, as to justify the conclusion that it was not the return of any one which had been accurately observed. It passed its perihelion about the 11th of June — 19 days before its appearance in this country. Its perihelion distance is about 77 millions of miles, and the plane of its orbit is nearly perpendicular to that of the ecliptic. As the comet approached its ascending node, its train must have presented to the inhabitants of the southern hemisphere a most magnificent appearance. On the 30th of June the distance of the nucleus from the earth was about 9,500,000 miles.

V. Although astronomers have not yet been able to reach any very definite conclusions as to the physical constitution of comets, their researches in regard to cometary phenomena have not been fruitless. We proceed to specify some of the most important results hitherto attained.

(1.) Comets were regarded by the ancients as supernatural prodigies sent to portend wars, plagues, or other great calamities; consequently their appearance produced general consternation. Modern observation and research, by showing that their motions are controlled by law, determining the orbits in which they move, and predicting the times of their reäppearance, have dispelled these superstitious fears; so that now the return of a comet is hailed as a matter of universal and lively interest.

(2.) The mean temperature of the year 1811 was unusually high, and in Europe the harvest and vintage were abundant. These facts were ascribed by many to some mysterious action of the comet of that year. In order to decide the question as to

Digitized by Google

cometary influence on the weather and vegetation, Arago compared the mean temperature and the number of comets through a long series of years, but could find no connection whatever between them. In 1831, for instance, in which no comet appeared, the mean temperature was three degrees higher than in 1808, when there were four. *It may be regarded as settled, therefore, that no sensible effect upon the weather need be expected from the agency of comets.*

(3.) Comets have proved the existence of immense quantities of nebulous matter in the celestial spaces. The number of comets belonging to our system was estimated by Arago at seven millions. Assuming that the perihelions of these bodies are uniformly distributed in space, it must follow that the number of comets which approach within less than the distance of Uranus from the sun, exceeds the number which approach within less than the distance of Mercury, in the same ratio that the cube of the former distance exceeds that of the latter. Now, Arago found that of the comets whose orbits had been calculated up to 1832, thirty have approached within less than Mercury's mean distance. The above proportion, therefore, gave three million five hundred and twenty-nine thousand four hundred and seventy, as the number of comets. Arago supposed, however, that on account of unfavorable circumstances one comet of every two escapes detection. Hence he inferred that the number which frequent the planetary regions cannot be less than seven millions. But the number that have passed within the sphere of which Mercury's orbit is the circumference has now (1861) increased to forty, and since the date of Arago's calculation the dimensions of the planetary system have been extended by the discovery of Neptune. Introducing these corrections into the estimate, we find a total of over thirty-seven millions. This calculation, it must be admitted, rests on insufficient data. Perhaps many of the comets which visit our system do not properly belong to it, but pass off never to return. But however this may be, their numbers and volume indicate the wide diffusion of the cloud-like masses from which they are derived. This chaotic matter in the interstellar spaces may be, in some instances, nearly motionless, until the sun in its orbital course approaches it so nearly as to

Digitized by Google

compel it to fall towards the center of our system. The form of the orbit described by such masses would depend to some extent on the perturbing influence of the planets.

(4.) *The phenomena of comets have made known the existence of a cosmical force of repulsion;* that is, of a force directly opposed to gravitation. Sir John Herschel and other astronomers found that gravitation alone could not account for all the appearances presented by the comet of Halley in 1835. The same is true in regard to some of more recent date, and particularly that of Donati.

(5.) The occasional near approach of Encke's comet to Jupiter and Mercury has enabled astronomers to correct the evaluations of the masses of those planets. Encke, soon after his discovery of the short period of this body, found that its observed perturbations could not be reconciled with the value of Jupiter's mass which was then universally received. The mass of that planet was accordingly recomputed by different astronomers, and by various methods, each resulting in a value considerably greater than that which had been adopted by Laplace. On several accounts this correction is one of great importance.

(6.) The motions of this comet have indicated, moreover, the existence of a resisting medium. After taking into consideration the disturbing effect of all the known members of our planetary system, the comet has been found at each successive return to anticipate its predicted perihelion passage. In other words, its period is gradually diminishing. This result might seem, at first sight, directly the reverse of that which would result from the comet's moving through an ethereal medium. Such a resistance, however, by diminishing the tangential velocity, diminishes also the centrifugal force. The comet is therefore drawn nearer to the sun; that is, its mean distance is gradually diminished, and consequently its period shortened. The amount of this diminution has been about two days in half a century. If we admit the existence of an ether diffused throughout the planetary spaces, the views which have been entertained by some astronomers in regard to the perpetuity of the solar system must be abandoned. It is true that, during the period which has elapsed since the commencement of accurate astronomy, its resistance has had no ap-

Digitized by Google

preciable effect in contracting the orbits of the planets. But as the vaporous mass of the comet is constantly approaching the sun, ultimately to fall upon it, so likewise the planetary members of our system must, from the same cause, gradually converge — slowly indeed at present, but through the lapse of ages continually accelerating — until at successive epochs, Mercury, Venus, the Earth itself, and finally the exterior planets, shall plunge into the fiery bosom of the great central luminary.

VI. But, although investigations in cometary physics have already produced important results, questions of much interest in this department of research are still waiting for solution. A few of these will now be considered.

(1.) Different views are entertained by astronomers in regard to the *origin* of comets; some believing them to enter the solar system *ab extra;* others supposing them to have originated within its limits. The former is the hypothesis of Laplace, and is regarded with favor by many eminent astronomers. It seems to afford a plausible explanation of the paucity of large comets during certain long intervals of time. In one hundred and fifty years, from 1600 to 1750, sixteen comets were visible to the naked eye; of which eight appeared in the twenty-five years from 1664 to 1689. Again, during sixty years from 1750 to 1810, only five comets were visible to the naked eye, while in the next fifty years there were double that number. Now, according to aplace's hypothesis, patches of nebulous matter have been left nearly in equilibrium in the interstellar spaces. As the sun, in its progressive motion, approaches such clusters, they must, by virtue of his attraction, move toward the center of our system; the nearer portions with greater velocity than the more remote. The nebulous fragments thus introduced into our system would constitute comets; those of the same cluster would enter the solar domain at periods not very distant from each other; the forms of their orbits depending upon their original relative positions with reference to the sun's course, and also on planetary perturbations. On the other hand, the passage of the system through a region of space destitute of this chaotic vapor would be followed by a corresponding paucity of comets.

Digitized by Google

(2.) Mars and Venus being destitute of satellites, the determination of their masses has been a problem of great difficulty. The near approach of the comets of De Vico and Winnecke to the orbits of these planets may enable astronomers to correct the evaluations of those masses, in the same way as Encke's comet has led to an approximate estimate of the mass of Mercury.

(3.) It has been supposed by some astronomers that the density of the ethereal medium must be increased in the vicinity of all bodies of great magnitude. The careful observation of such comets as approach very near the center of our system, promises interesting results in regard to this question, as well as in respect to the extent and density of the solar atmosphere.

(4.) Before the invention of the telescope, the appearance of a comet was a comparatively rare occurrence. The whole number visible to the naked eye during the last three hundred and sixty years has been fifty-five; or a mean of fifteen per century. The recent rate of telescopic discovery, however, has been about four or five annually. As many of these are extremely faint, it seems probable that an indefinite number, too small for detection, may be constantly traversing the solar domain. If we adopt Laplace's hypothesis of the origin of comets, we may suppose an almost continuous fall of primitive nebular matter toward the center of the system — the *drops* of which, penetrating the earth's atmosphere, produce *sporadic* meteors; the larger aggregations forming comets. The disturbing influence of the planets may have transformed the original orbits of many of the former, as well as of the latter, into ellipses. It is an interesting fact that the motions of some luminous meteors — or *cometoids*, as perhaps they might be called — have been decidedly indicative of an origin beyond the limits of the planetary system.

But how are the phenomena of *periodic* meteors to be accounted for, in accordance with this theory?

The division of Biela's comet into two distinct parts suggests several interesting questions in cometary physics. The nature of the separating force remains to be discovered; "but it is impossible to doubt that it arose from the divellent action of the sun, whatever may have been the mode of operation." *

* Grant.

Digitized by Google

"A signal manifestation of the influence of the sun," says a distinguished writer, "is sometimes afforded by the breaking up of a comet into two or more separate parts, on the occasion of its approach to the perihelion. Seneca relates that Ephoras, an ancient Greek author, makes mention of a comet which before vanishing was seen to divide itself into two distinct bodies. The Roman philosopher appears to doubt the possibility of such a fact; but Keppler, with characteristic sagacity, has remarked that its actual occurrence was exceedingly probable. The latter astronomer further remarked that there were some grounds for supposing that two comets, which appeared in the same region of the heavens in the year 1618, were the fragments of a comet that had experienced a similar dissolution. Hevelius states that Cysatus perceived in the head of the great comet of 1618 unequivocal symptoms of a breaking up of the body into distinct fragments. The comet when first seen in the month of November, appeared like a round mass of concentrated light. On the 8th of December it seemed to be divided into several parts. On the twentieth of the same month it resembled a multitude of small stars. Hevelius states that he himself witnessed a similar appearance in the head of the comet of 1661." *

Edward Biot, moreover, in his researches among the Chinese records, found an account of "three dome-formed comets" that were visible simultaneously in 896, and pursued very nearly the same apparent path.

Another instance of a similar phenomenon is recorded by Dion Cassius, who states that a comet which appeared eleven years before our era, separated itself into several small comets.

These various examples are presented at one view, as follows:

I. Ancient bipartition of a comet. — *Seneca, Quæst. Nat., lib. VII., cap. XVI.*

II. Separation of a comet into a number of fragments, 11 B. C. — *Dion Cassius.*

III. Three comets seen simultaneously pursuing the same orbit, A. D. 896. — *Chinese records — Comtes Rendus, tom.* XX., 1845, p. 334.

IV. Probable separation of a comet into parts, A. D. 1618. — *Hevelius, Cometographia*, p. 341. — *Keppler, De Cometis*, p. 50.

V. Indications of separation, 1661. — *Hevelius, Cometographia*, p. 417.

VI. Bipartition of Biela's comet, 1845–6.

* Grant's Hist. of Phys. Astr., p. 302.

Digitized by Google

In view of these facts it seems highly probable, if not absolutely certain, that the process of division has taken place in several instances besides that of Biela's comet. May not the force, whatever it is, that has produced *one* separation, again divide the parts? And may not this action continue until the fragments become invisible? According to the theory now generally received, the periodic phenomena of shooting stars are produced by the intersections of the orbits of such nebulous bodies with the earth's annual path. Now there is reason to believe that these meteoric rings are very elliptical, and in this respect wholly dissimilar to the rings of primitive vapor which, according to the nebular hypothesis, were successively abandoned at the solar equator; in other words, that the matter of which they are composed moves in *cometary* rather than *planetary* orbits. May not our periodic meteors be the *debris* of ancient but now disintegrated comets, whose matter has become distributed around their orbits?

(5.) On a previous page we specified six comets which constitute a group whose times of revolution are each nearly equal to the period of Uranus. Professor Stephen Alexander, LL. D., of Princeton, N. J., supposes the members of this cluster to have had a common origin. He finds various facts indicating that in the early part of the fourteenth century a large comet approached very near to Mars, if indeed there was not an actual collision of the two bodies. The comet, he supposes, was thus separated into several fragments. This hypothesis awaits the test of future investigation.

(6.) The aphelion distance of each member of this group is considerably greater than the distance of Neptune. If the solar system, therefore, contains a trans-Neptunian planet of considerable magnitude, its existence may possibly be made known by its disturbing some of the motions of this cometary group.

In conclusion we may remark, that while the whole number of observed comets of which we have any record is nearly eight hundred, we know nothing in regard to a large proportion, except simply the time of their appearance. We have no positive knowledge as to the mass of any. No observed comet has ever produced any sensible perturbation in the planetary system. It

Digitized by Google

is quite possible, however, that the sum of such nebulous masses within the solar domain may be very considerable, and that the volumes of the sun and planets may receive minute increments by the fall of cometary matter. D. K.

Postscript. — The preceding pages were written in July, soon after the appearance of the great comet of 1861. Subsequent notices and observations, received from various sources, * enable us to add the following interesting facts: —

The comet was first observed on the 13th of May, by Mr. John Tebbut, jr., of Windsor, New South Wales. At Victoria, Australia, it was first noticed on the 4th of June, one week before its perihelion passage. The appearance of the body when near the sun was very remarkable.

"It was not so bright, but was of greater magnitude than Donati's comet. The nucleus was at first imperfectly defined, but gradually assumed a fan shape. On the 4th. the tail measured four degrees, and it gradually lengthened until the 18th, when it measured forty-two degrees, making a tremendous arc. On the 20th, a double tail appeared, but was visible only that morning. From that time the tail widened, and on the occasion of the last observation, (28th June,) the appearance presented by nucleus and tail to the naked eye was that of a red ball of fire with wings."

Professor Secchi, Director of the Collegio Romano, states the length of the tail, as observed by himself, on the night of June 30th, to have been 118 degrees. This accords very well with the writer's observation on the same night. The length as seen by Professor Bond, Director of the Observatory of Harvard College, on the evening of July 2nd, was 106 degrees. On the following evening, July 3rd, the length was observed by Stillman Masterman, Esq., of Weld, Franklin county, Maine, to be 103 degrees.

The inclination of the comet's orbit to the plane of the ecliptic is nearly 86 degrees. This orbit, according to the most recent investigations, is an hyperbola: consequently the comet is now passing off from our system never to return. D. K.

* See Brunnow's Astronomical Notices, Nos. 25 and 26; The American Journal of Science Arts, for September, 1861, &c.

Digitized by Google

ART. III. — *The Civil War: — Its Nature and End.*

I. The Restoration of Peace shown to be impossible, except on the condition of the Preservation of the Federal Union and Constitution.

II. The Power of the Nation shown to be complete, and its Duty imperative, to crush this Rebellion, and preserve the Federal Union and Constitution.

III. The Internal State of the Country, as affected by the War.

IV. The External Relations of the Country, considered with reference to the War.

I. The Restoration of Peace shown to be impossible, except on the condition of the Preservation of the Federal Union and Constitution.

I. For what are we fighting, on one side, and on the other? What are the interests at stake, so immense and so opposite, that justify either party to this war in embarking in it at first, or in prosecuting it with the terrible earnestness everywhere manifest? What is the present aspect of it, generally considered — what is its probable future course — what the conclusion that must be reached, at last? What are to be its probable effects — directly upon ourselves, indirectly upon the other nations of the earth, and in both ways upon the immediate future of the human race, and possibly upon generations to come? How much of what either party is fighting for is really attainable, and of that which is attainable, how much is worth what it will cost? These are questions which every enlightened man — every free citizen — is bound to ask himself. The answer to them involves our lives and fortunes and liberties; nay more than even these, our *duty* as citizens, as patriots, and as Christians. It is to render such aid as we may be able, to all who will accept our aid, in deciding these vast questions, that we now attempt to develop still further the great truths we have discussed several times heretofore, and to apply them to the posture of public affairs now existing.

There are considerations of various kinds, and of the most decisive force, which render it impossible for peace to be restored to the country, except upon the condition of a single National Government, common to the whole American people, and embra-

Digitized by Google

cing every loyal and every revolted State. As a question of national strength in the presence of all foreign nations — and therefore of national independence; as a question of permanent national life struggling against anarchy in the form of secession; as a question of law, and government, and constitutional freedom, measuring its strength against an immense and utterly profligate political conspiracy; as a question of personal freedom, and popular institutions, in conflict with a class minority possessed of vast wealth, and reckless of everything but its own aggrandizement; as a question of the universal domination of this daring class, not only in the Slave States, so many of which it had temporarily subjugated, but over the nation itself, which it betrayed, plundered, insulted, and to which it claimed to dictate ignoble terms of composition, at the head of a military force threatening the capitol; as a question of the duty of the nation to its loyal citizens, constituting at that time the actual majority in the fifteen Slave States — but suddenly and by fraud and violence reduced to a state of helpless degradation : we attempted, from the beginning, to show that there was no course, either of honor, or duty, or safety left to the nation, except to meet force by force, and to maintain the institutions of the country, and enforce the laws of the land, by the whole power of the American people. Nor do we suppose there is a single loyal person on this continent, who does not now look with contempt, or with execration, upon the conduct of Mr. Buchanan and his Cabinet, during the last year of his administration: nor a single one who does not applaud the vigor and determination which the Congress of the United States, under the lead of Mr. Lincoln, have manifested in maintaining the integrity of the Union. But what we have now to urge goes beyond the state of the question heretofore discussed, and briefly recapitulated above. Influenced by such considerations as these, the nation accepted the war as unavoidable. What we maintain is, not merely that those considerations forbid the nation to terminate the war forced upon her, except in its complete success, but that in the very nature of the case, of the country, of all our institutions, and of the war itself, permanent peace is impossible, except upon the condition of a single national government. We will endeavor to illustrate this idea.

Digitized by Google

Whoever will look at a map of the United States will observe that Louisiana lies on both sides of the Mississippi river, and that the States of Arkansas and Mississippi lie on the right and left banks of this great stream — eight hundred miles of whose lower course is thus controlled by these three States, unitedly inhabited by hardly as many white people as inhabit the city of New York. Observe then the country drained by this river, and its affluents, commencing with Missouri on its west bank, and Kentucky on its east bank. There are nine or ten powerful States — large portions of three or four others — several large Territories, in all a country as large as all Europe, as fine as any under the sun, already holding many more people than all the revolted States — and destined to be one of the most populous and powerful regions of the earth. Does any one suppose that these powerful States — this great and energetic population — will ever make a peace that shall put the lower course of this single and mighty natural outlet to the sea, in the hands of a foreign government far weaker than themselves? If there is any such person, he knows little of the past history of mankind; and will, perhaps, excuse us for reminding him that the people of Kentucky, before they were constituted a State, gave formal notice to the Federal Government, when General Washington was President, that if the United States did not acquire Louisiana, they would themselves conquer it. The mouths of the Mississippi belong, by the gift of God, to the inhabitants of its great Valley. Nothing but irresistible force can disinherit them.

Try another territorial aspect of the case. There is a bed of mountains abutting on the left bank of the Ohio, which covers all Western Virginia, and all Eastern Kentucky, to the width, from east to west, in those two States, of three or four hundred miles. These mountains stretching southwestwardly, pass entirely through Tennessee — cover the back parts of North Carolina and Georgia — heavily invade the northern partof Alabama — and make a figure even in the back parts of South Carolina and the eastern parts of Mississippi; having a course of, perhaps, seven or eight hundred miles, and running far south of the northern limit of profitable cotton culture. It is a region of 300,000 square miles — trenching upon eight or nine Slave States, though near-

Digitized by Google

ly destitute of slaves itself — trenching upon at least five cotton States, though raising no cotton itself. The western part of Maryland and two-thirds of Pennsylvania, are embraced in the northeastern continuation of this remarkable region. Can anything that passes under the name of statesmanship, be more preposterous, than the notion of permanent peace on this continent, founded on the abnegation of a common and paramount government, and the idea of the supercilious domination of the cotton interest and the slave trade, over such a mountain empire, so located, and so peopled?

As a further proof of the utter impossibility of peace, except under a common government, and at once an illustration of the import of what has just been stated, and the suggestion of a new and insuperable difficulty; let it be remembered that this great mountain region, throughout its general course, is more loyal to the Union than any other portion of the Slave States. It is the mountain counties of Maryland that have held treason in check in that State; it is forty mountain counties in Western Virginia that have laid the foundation of a new and loyal commonwealth; it is the mountain counties of Kentucky that first and most eagerly took up arms for the Union; it is the mountain region of Tennessee that alone, in that dishonored State, furnished martyrs in the sacred cause of freedom; it is the mountain people of Alabama, that boldly stood out against the Confederate Government, till their own leaders deserted and betrayed them. Now, is the nation prepared, under any imaginable circumstances, to sacrifice these heroic men, as a condition of peace conquered from them by traitors? Will the nation sell the blood — we will not say of a race of patriots — but of even a single one of them? The Representatives of these men sit in Congress; their Senators are in the capitol. Will the rebel States dismember themselves, that cotton may have peace? Will the nation turn its back on the five Border Slave States — deliver over Western Virginia to the sword — and cover its own infamy under the ruins of the Constitution? Never — never! Our sole alternative — is victory. To know this, is to render victory certain.

Again: Consider the question of boundary, as preliminary to peace. We have shown, on a former occasion, that the States

Digitized by Google

of Maryland and Missouri stand in such relations, geographical and otherwise, to the nation, that they must necessarily share its fate. Since we gave expression to that opinion, much has happened to strengthen it, and increase the difficulties of any peaceful division of the country. Amongst other things, Congress has openly recognized the revolutionary Government in Western Virginia — and received Senators and Representatives from States in open rebellion: the armies of the Confederate States have invaded Western Virginia, Missouri, and Kentucky: and to *conquer a boundary* extending to the Chesapeake, the Ohio, and the Missouri, is one of the avowed objects of those invasions. Whatever may have been the state of public opinion in any of the five Border Slave States, at an early stage of our national difficulties, at present there is not, probably, a single loyal citizen in either of them, who would entertain, for a moment, the idea of being attached to the Southern Confederacy — or who would not denounce as atrocious, on the part of the General Government, any suggestion that looked toward the surrender of those five States to the Southern Confederacy, as a condition of peace. On the opposite side, it is most probable that every secessionist in those five States would greatly prefer the continuance of the war, to peace, accompanied by such a division of the nation as would attach the Border Slave States to the Northern portion; while the more violent portion of them would, probably, prefer the continuance of the war, to the complete restoration of the Union on any terms. But these Border Slave States are, and must continue to be the chief theater of the war, so long as the issue of the war hangs in the least suspense. We say nothing, here, of the absolute necessity of the conquest of the secession party, and the restoration of the Union and the power of the National Government, as the solitary condition upon which the peace or safety of the whole country is possible. What we say is, that in the actual condition of the country, of the war, and of the avowed aims and recognized obligations of both parties, the question of boundary renders peace impossible, even if both parties desired peace upon every other ground. We readily admit that there is hardly an imaginable contingency, in which the Confederate Government can ever conquer, or the nation ever concede, any

Digitized by Google

boundary — that ought to be an allowable basis of peace. But this only shows how clear it is that the nation can contemplate no alternative but triumph or ruin; and that the conspirators against its peace and glory have madly plunged into a wicked rebellion, which could have no result but the subjugation of the whole nation, or their own destruction. At first, their pretext was — the *right* of each State to secede. Now, they seek to *conquer* States that refuse to secede. Perfidious, at first, to all the States; perfidious, now, to each separate State.

There are difficulties of a kind different from any of those yet suggested; and so aggravated by the conduct and principles of the secessionists, that there seems to be no possibility of even so much as finding a basis on which to negotiate. Take, as an example, their conduct toward the Indian Tribes which occupy, thinly, at least one-half of the whole area within our national boundaries — and some of the most civilized of which are settled upon the finest lands adjoining our inhabited borders, and were bound, by treaties highly advantageous to them, to the United States. As far as the public has information, it appears that the Confederate Government has made diligent efforts to excite these savages to war against us, along the whole Indian frontier, and along all the emigrant routes to the Pacific States. Thus much is certain, that the Tribes of the Southwest have taken up arms, that many thousands of them are boastfully declared by the Confederates to be ready to join their armies, and that a considerable force of their warriors is now with the troops invading Kentucky. We do not say they are unfit allies for the refugee Kentuckians who are leading them to the slaughter of their kindred, and the devastation of their country. Nor do we say that either the savages or the refugee marauders are unfit instruments of traitors, who first subvert every principle which holds society together in installing their rebellion — and then subvert every pretext on which they revolted, by banding with savages and parricides in an atrocious attack upon the only sovereignty they pretended to revere. We leave to others to depict these enormities as they deserve, and confide to a just posterity the retribution of such crimes. What we demand now is, what figure are these savage allies of traitors to cut, in the preliminaries of

Digitized by Google

peace? What stipulations are the Confederate States to demand — what guarantees are the American people to give, as the price of peace — concerning its future Indian policy, and concerning recompense for past Indian perfidy and outrage?

The question of slavery offers us another example, in the same category with the preceding one, of the madness of the whole secession conspiracy; and another proof that the restoration of permanent peace to the country by means of its division into two confederacies, or by any other means except the restoration of the Union and the maintenance of a single national government coëxtensive with the whole nation, is totally impossible. Upon the supposition that all parties were willing to divide the nation on the slave line, *provided* the new confederacies could make mutually satisfactory agreements, and could be mutually made to keep them in regard to negro slavery; such a basis of peace would rest on this childish absurdity — that the obligations of a treaty between hostile States are more effectual than the obligations of a government over the different portions of its own citizens — notwithstanding governments have the sanction of force in a hundred-fold greater degree than treaties can have, and have, in addition, ten thousand sanctions which no treaty can have. We think we have demonstrated, on a former occasion, that the profitable continuance of negro slavery anywhere on this continent, and its continuance at all in the Border Slave States, depends absolutely upon the existence of a common national government embracing both the Free States and the Slave States; and it seems to us that the developments of the war add continually to the force of what we then said. The preservation of the Union and the Constitution preserves at the same time, in all its integrity, the national settlement of the question of slavery made at the adoption of the Constitution itself; which was effectual for all the purposes intended, through more than seventy years of unparalleled prosperity; and is competent still through all coming time to give peace and security, if anything under heaven is competent to do so. On the contrary, forfeiting that settlement as soon as we subvert the Constitution and destroy the Union — it may be confidently asserted that the new confederacies which are to arise will find themselves incompetent to set-

Digitized by Google

tle even the preliminary basis of a treaty concerning their mutual rights and obligations touching the negro race on this continent; and that, even if they should be able to come to some uncertain and temporary understanding on the subject, stable peace between the parties, much less stable security to slave property, would be impossible. Our political system, made up of sovereign commonwealths united under a supreme Federal Government, affords not only the highest, but the only effectual protection for interests that are local and exceptional — and at the same time out of sympathy with the general judgment of mankind. And of all possible interests, that of the owners of slaves, in a free country, stands most in need of the protection of such a system. It is extremely difficult to say what effect, precisely, this war and its possible results may have upon the institution of slavery in America. So much at least is certain — that the total suppression of the present revolt, is hardly more important to any class of American citizens, than to the slaveholders of the country: and that the obstinate continuance of the war, by the South, will do nothing more surely than drain the slaves, owned by secessionists in the Border States, farther south — and leave the slave interest in the restored Union, a far weaker political element than it was when they sought to strengthen it by revolution.

We need not press any further the proof of the great truth we are asserting. The service we are doing is not so much to disclose new truths, as to make a clear statement of the grounds of a common and fixed conviction, which the public mind has widely and instinctively adopted. It is a conviction just in itself, and noble both in its origin and impulses. We will not agree to the ruin of our glorious country; and so we are not grieved to see that we cannot do it with any hope of peace thereby. We will not allow the Constitution to be subverted, the Union to be destroyed, and the nation to be divided; and so we are glad that in the order of God's Providence, the alternative to which the nation is shut up — is victory. If the people in the States which have taken up arms against our national life, will rise up in their might, recover their liberty, and put an end to the traitorous dominion of the cruel and perfidious class minority which is de-

Digitized by Google

grading and oppressing them, the nation has no further cause of war with them. If they will not do this, or if they cannot do it in their present miserable condition, it must be done for them — and it will be. The American people have not sought this war; they were led to the brink, not only of ruin, but of infamy, in the attempt to avoid it. The American people have neither approved nor participated in the injuries or the insults, inflicted on any portion of the nation by any other portion of it. On the contrary, their whole national history attests that, whatever factions and sections may have done or attempted, the nation has been faithful in its lot, and true to its sublime mission. And now, in this great crisis, if God will own our efforts, we will retrieve our destiny — and teach mankind a lesson which after ages will be slow to forget.

II. The Power of the Nation shown to be complete, and its duty imperative, to crush this rebellion, and preserve the Federal Union and Constitution.

II. The *Art of War* — for even those who are the most devoted to it as a pursuit, hardly venture to call it a *science* — has probably produced a smaller proportion of individuals who have, in the settled judgment of mankind, deserved supreme eminence, than any other reputable calling to which the human race has addicted itself, or to which its progress has given rise. And notwithstanding the perpetual slaughter of the battle-field, during the whole life of the world, it would probably be impossible to designate as many as twenty pitched battles, in the whole history of mankind — concerning which it can be made apparent that the destiny of our race would have been materially changed, if they had never been fought, or if they had resulted differently. There is no adequate evidence that any man now lives, who is competent to wield, with the highest efficiency, an army of the largest class; and we are free to risk public ridicule, by expressing the opinion that if Napoleon, or Wellington, or Marlborough, or Cromwell — not to mention a few more ancient names — had been placed in a day's march of Manassas, ten days before the bloody and resultless battle, with a force equal to the smallest, and provided no better than the worst, of the two armies that fought there; he would probably have cut both of them to pieces within

Digitized by Google

the ten days. From generation to generation, the art of war progresses slowly, and gradually establishes itself upon certain axioms and certain results: and then some great genius suddenly appears, and, despising the axioms and setting at nought the results, creates by his conquests new ideas and a new school of the art. And then the old process of codifying his campaigns into the body of the art of war, is renewed, till another great genius appears. And so on, — till our own day: in which, if God shall be pleased to point out the man — and the nation shall have sense to recognize him — the end will have come. Till such a captain appears — one of God's most uncommon gifts — we must content ourselves with such judgments as can be formed, from the common causes and the common course of events. Or if he should appear on the side of our rebellious countrymen — and no match for him on ours — we must put forth as much additional force and courage, as will counteract the excess of skill against us. It seems to us to be plain — upon any supposition that can be made short of the effectual interposition of God for the total change of the course and destiny of this great country, and as a necessary consequence of the whole order and result of human affairs — that this nation is not only perfectly competent to crush this rebellion, and extinguish the doctrine and practice of secession; but that there is no ordinary possibility of any other result. It is this which we now desire to illustrate.

If the five Border Slave States (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri) had stood firmly by the Union — the ten remaining Slave States could hardly have made a show of military resistance to the overwhelming power of the nation, even if they had all seceded, and been unanimous. The white population of the whole ten may be stated, in round numbers, at about four millions, against twenty-four millions in the remaining twenty-four States. In fact, however, but for the treasonable conduct of the secession minorities in the Border States, and especially but for the outrage perpetrated in Virginia, by means of which the secessionists usurped the control of that State, and suddenly threw it into a condition of war with the Federal Government; it is in the highest degree probable, that neither North Carolina, Tennessee, nor Arkansas would have seceded. Moreover,

Digitized by Google

if the State Governments in Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, had been loyal, their influence — backed, as it undoubtedly would have been, by the mass of the people in those States — would, at the very least, have placed the loyal population in North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas in such a position as to have kept the traitors in check in all those States — even if they ventured to secede. The very worst that can happen, has already occurred: four of the Border States are the chief theater of the war; three at least, if not four, of those States, are for the Union; one, possibly two of them, may be considered against it. For the purposes before us let all five be omitted, in reckoning the strength of either party. Let it be supposed that their whole white population, which may be stated at about four millions, is equally divided — and will add as much, taking the five States, to the military force on one side as on the other side. What follows is, that the war is to be decided by the relative force of the nineteen Free States, and the ten most southerly Slave States. But the case is far stronger, in favor of the General Government, than this statement would make it appear. For by making these Border States the theater of war, however much the ten Southern States may gain, the nineteen Northern States gain far more, in every way. They gain physically, by gradually drawing, as the war progresses, a greater and greater proportion of Union men into the Federal army; while to the whole extent that these States are occupied by Federal troops, the secession element is greatest at the first violent military movement, and becomes relatively less and less available afterwards. They gain morally, by the whole effect produced upon the Union people of the Border Slave States, fighting side by side with the Northern soldiers, in a common and glorious cause; and by the whole effect produced on the Northern troops, by seeing for themselves, who and what the loyal people of the South are. But they gain also, in a military point of view. To menace Nashville, is a very different thing from being menaced at Cincinnati. A victory at Springfield in Southern Missouri is widely a different thing from a victory at Springfield in Central Illinois. When the theater of war passes out of Virginia and Kentucky to the South — the beginning of the end to rebellion is reached. If it

Digitized by Google

were to pass out of Virginia and Kentucky to the North, it would only mean the annihilation of whatever Confederate troops might venture across the Ohio River. The Confederate armies will find their attempt to invade Kentucky a very serious matter before all is over; though there is only an air line in their rear, and a million of people — one-third of whom are disloyal — immediately before them. What could they expect, north of the Ohio River — with that broad and generally difficult stream in their rear, and six or seven millions of loyal and warlike people, in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, in point blank range of them? The secession gasconade about wintering in Cincinnati — with which the air of the West has been laden for some months — when last heard of was making good time, with a strong force, through the north-eastern mountains of Kentucky, hurrying toward Virginia, out of the way of a small column of raw troops, under a navy Lieutenant, (NELSON,) who has lately become an amateur General.

Upon the whole, therefore, the case against the nation is not quite so bad as we before admitted — when, counting out the Border Slave States, it seemed to stand about twenty millions in the nineteen Free States, against about four millions in the ten secession States of the South. In both clusters of States, we leave out all but the white population; and every one will judge for himself how far the leaving out of a few hundred thousand free negroes may be unjust to the stronger side, and the leaving out of some three millions of slaves, several hundred thousand free negroes, and an indeterminate quantity of Indian savages, may be unjust to the weaker side. There certainly are conditions in which this vast body of slaves may be considered a very powerful element in the military strength of the South: the chief of which conditions are — *first*, that the military force of the United States should not be able to penetrate the heart of the disloyal slave region, — and, *secondly*, that after penetrating that region, the General Government should be weak enough to treat slave property, in the hands of rebels and traitors, as if it were sacred. On the other hand, there are conditions in which this Indian and slave population may become fatal to the weaker party; as, for example, if the Indian savages who have been enlisted

Digitized by Google

against us were required, as the condition of peace and protection to their tribes, to ravage those who have engaged their scalping knives against our women and children; and if the slaves were supported from the estates of their disloyal owners, and made to labor upon every species of military work — the number, variety, and extent of which needed by a hostile force, in such a country as the South, and in the present state of the military art, are so great. Still, however, omitting these populations altogether — as neither a weakness nor a strength — there remain the abiding elements, face to face, twenty millions against four millions. It is certainly true, that no one can tell beforehand how a particular battle may eventuate — or how a particular campaign may end. No one can guess how many cowards a few brave men may conquer — how many fools a man of genius may set at nought — how many advantages may be gained over numbers, by superior activity, intelligence and daring. Oliver Cromwell conquered Great Britain, Ireland, and Scotland, with a handful of men: Bonaparte annihilated three Austrian armies, each greater than his own, in one of his brief Italian campaigns: Alexander the Great conquered the whole known world with thirty thousand men. And to come to our own times — *somebody*, we don't exactly know who, has held Manassas, and menaced Washington City, during this whole war, in defiance of the whole power of the nation: and, what seems to us really a marvelous achievement — *somebody* has virtually blockaded the Potomac River from one of its shores, in defiance of our whole naval power, and in the face of probably a hundred and fifty thousand good troops, in his front, and upon his flanks. Still, however, here are our twenty millions against four millions — any four millions of the former, equal to the latter four millions — and we having every possible advantage which they can possess, and many besides of the greatest importance, which they do not possess. This is the undeniable state of the case, considered as a whole. Upon it, there is no ordinary possibility of but one final result. Concerning it, whatever is known to be out of the ordinary course of human affairs, is, in the aggregate, more for us than against us. With regard to it, no motive that can operate upon a rational mind or a patriotic heart, is wanting to impel us to do

Digitized by Google

with our might, what has been now shown to be completely in our power; — what, it was before shown, involves our national ruin if we fail; and what, we must add, covers us with ignominy if we omit.

In one of our former papers, published in the month of March last, we endeavored to point out the method in which the national peril at that dark period could be averted, and to designate the elements, few but immense and decisive, in which the triumphant deliverance of the country lay. Nine or ten months of herculean efforts on the part both of the nation and of the rebels, have passed since that paper was published. The whole field lies far more clearly open before us now than it did then. Public opinion, everywhere, has been consolidated in one direction or another, and is far more comprehensible. The whole continent has passed into a state of war, military operations have been conducted on the most gigantic scale, and the nation and the rebels have reached a position in which their relative strength must be fairly and speedily measured. It seems very clear to us, that all the indications, taken together, are in a high degree favorable to the country; and that this can be made apparent in the shortest manner, by a slight recapitulation of the points in which our national safety seemed to us to lay at the darkest period, and a general view of the tendency and present state of public affairs, with reference to them.

It seemed to us, in the *first* place, that the salvation of the country depended upon the Federal Government's recognizing and assuming its great position as the true and only representative of the nation, and as the supreme authority in these United States: that so acting, its highest mission was to save the nation — to that end putting forth the whole strength of the country — rallying every loyal citizen to its support — and crushing treason everywhere. Whoever will compare the state of the national administration and of the country, as left by Mr. Buchanan and as found by Mr. Lincoln on the 4th of March, with the present aspect of both; will not need any detail by us, to be convinced that what we then declared to be the first condition of our deliverance, has been completely realized, and has produced all the effects that we anticipated. The nation was betrayed by the

Digitized by Google

Federal Government, and was virtually lost on the 4th of March, 1861. The Congress of the United States, under the lead of Mr. Lincoln, and by means of a sublime outburst of national patriotism, has retrieved the ruin elaborately prepared for us, through long years of perfidy, conspiracy, and treason. The whole difference between the two positions of the country may be clearly estimated, by picturing to ourselves, on one hand, five hundred thousand brave and loyal men under arms; and by picturing to ourselves, on the other hand, a traitorous faction everywhere shouting "*no coercion*," to a betrayed and stupefied people.

In the *second* place, the deliverance of the country seemed to us to depend upon a vigorous, and, as far as possible, successful effort, to arrest the spread of secession, at the cotton line — and if that failed, then at the Southern boundary of the Border Slave States. It was always our opinion, frequently expressed, that a national movement of the whole fifteen Slave States, against the Union, could not be defeated. It was our opinion for thirty years, that a growing school of Southern politicians, had no other object but the production of this result — an opinion, the truth of which no one, we suppose, now doubts; and we have personal knowledge that the support of Major Breckinridge for the Presidency, in Kentucky, was largely given to him under the delusion — countenanced, at least, by himself — that the designation of himself as the candidate of the Southern wing of the Democracy, meant that they had definitely abandoned this conspiracy and all schemes of disunion, and would risk their fate as a party and as a people, in the Union. Yes, we perfectly well know that under this delusion, and because of the decisive influence of this pretended change in the South upon the perpetuity of the Union, multitudes of men — who never saw a moment in which they would not willingly have laid down their lives for the Union — supported him for the Presidency who, in effect, was the representative of disunion. Such is treason. The effects which have been produced by the course of events in Virginia, plainly show what might have been expected, if all the Slave States had cordially united in the revolt: while the effects that have been produced by the course of the intrepid Union men of Kentucky, under the most difficult circumstances, as

Digitized by Google

plainly show what might have been expected, if all the Border Slave States had cordially espoused the cause of the Union. The pestilence was not arrested at the cotton line — nor even fully stayed at the Southern boundary of the Border States. But enough has been done to show how just and important the opinion we expressed in March was; to show how fatally the vacillation and timidity of the nominal Union party in most of the Border States, has operated; and to show how certainly these five States will be preserved to the Union, and how decisive that fact must be, upon the fate of the revolt.

In the *third* place: About the time of Mr. Lincoln's inauguration, and in full apprehension, on one side, of the terrible fact that Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet had sold the nation to the Southern conspirators, and that they were preparing to seize it; and, on the other side, with the profound conviction that the state of public feeling and opinion throughout the North was incompatible, in the existing temper of the times, with the continuance of the Union, or the steadfast loyalty to it of a single Slave State — we did not hesitate to declare that a revolution in opinion and feeling at the North must promptly occur, or all was lost. We ventured to predict that it would occur; — that the extreme principles of the party which had carried the Presidential election, would not be, could not be carried out; that new, better, and more exalted ideas, would supersede the vehement and exaggerated principles of the newly triumphant party; and that the people of the North would stand by the Union, and by every man, everywhere, that was loyal to the country. And now we confidently assert, that no more illustrious instance of patriotic ardor, no more striking proof of the warlike spirit of a free people devoted to the pursuits of peace, has been exhibited in modern times — than is to be found in the conduct of the people of the North, at this terrible crisis of their country. We have felt obliged, many times in the course of many years, to condemn certain tendencies in the Northern mind, and various acts which seemed to be approved by the mass of the Northern people, hostile to the rights of the Southern States, and incompatible with their own duty as citizens of the United States. In the same spirit of fearless justice, we now give expression to our grateful

Digitized by Google

and confiding admiration of conduct on the part of the North, full of high and multiplied proofs of wisdom, magnanimity and heroism. We solemnly believe, this day, that the North is willing to do for the loyal States of the South, more, in every way, than any magnanimous Southern man would have the heart to ask. What a shame — what a burning shame — that men should be betrayed by villains, to seek each other's lives — who, if they did but know one another, would rush into each other's arms.

The *fourth* necessity asserted by us, was such a counter revolution — throughout the more southerly States that had then seceded, or were then deeply agitated on the subject — as would put down the secession movement, and bring the loyal party of the South into power, everywhere. Our hope, at first, was that this counter revolution would manifest itself in the most powerful of those States — as for example, in Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee — by means of popular elections, and other ordinary peaceful means; and that the weight of an irresistible public opinion — the comparative weakness of the disloyal States — and the effectual but forbearing interposition of the Federal Power, would deter the leaders of the conspiracy, and give the patriotism and common sense of the people space and opportunity for reäction, concert and triumph. Under any but the most extraordinary circumstances, that would have been the course and result of affairs. To state and explain these circumstances fully, appertains to the historian of these eventful times: we have heretofore given a brief and general account of them. We still await, still confidently expect, the counter revolution throughout the South — which, under ordinarily wise and courageous treatment, would have crushed the secession conspiracy as soon as it had developed its nature, spirit and designs — but which must now extinguish it when its course is run. The grounds upon which we expect it, instead of being removed, are every way confirmed by the progress of events. It is more certain now than it was at first, that the conspirators have reason to dread, and that loyal persons may confidently rely on, the resolute purpose of the American people to uphold the Union, the Constitution and the laws: so that the assurance of unavoidable failure to the one, and of speedy and complete deliverance to the other,

Digitized by Google

becomes day by day the very nourishment of the reäction which is inevitable in its set time. That which is thus unavoidable, in the nature of the case as it exists, cannot be called in question, by any one who believes that there are such human endowments as patriotism and common sense; by any one who confides in the capacity of mankind for self-government; by any one who knows that to deceive a people, and then betray them, and then oppress them, and then impoverish them, are crimes which no people ever forgive; by any one who understands that the indignation of mankind is relentless, in proportion as the sacrifices have been costly and bitter which the folly of corrupt rulers forced them to make, to no end but ruin and ignominy; by any one who accepts the assurance of God, that civil society is an ordinance from heaven, and is incompatible with the permanent reign of anarchy. Nor do the innumerable facts, which, in a thousand ways, reach us from the whole area covered by the usurped power of the Confederate Government, fail to confirm, in the public mind, the conviction already stated. On the one hand, there comes up a subdued but incessant wail of a loyal people groaning for deliverance; on the other, a fierce cry for blood and plunder, mixed with a wild clamor about cordial unanimity. The nation pities and heeds that wail of our brethren, and, by God's help, will make it audible throughout the earth, as a lesson to all conspirators. And so far is it from being credible that their deliverance cannot be accomplished except by the slaughter of vast populations—nor maintained afterward except by immense standing armies; all the facts of this sad case show, that what has happened in all ages and countries, will happen again here; and *the mass of the people* speedily and joyfully return to their allegiance, as soon as the military force of the rebels is broken, and society is allowed to return to its ordinary condition. These are terrible episodes in the history of nations. No people has escaped them: it is the feeble only that perish by means of them: the great survive them, and become greater.

The Internal State of the Country, as affected by the War.

III. Supposing what has been said to be worthy of serious consideration, as pointing out the single condition on which the

Digitized by Google

restoration of peace is possible — and as showing the complete ability, and the clear duty, of the American people to enforce that condition, and conquer peace: it becomes all the more important to observe with candor, the actual state of the country, as that is influenced by the war, or as it may, in turn, influence its progress and end; because, according to our apprehension, the indefinite continuance of the war can be arrested only by the triumph of the nation. Classified in an orderly way, the Civil and Military condition of the country is sufficiently though incidentally brought to light, for our present design, in the course of the two preceding divisions of this paper. What remains, relates, therefore, more particularly to the Moral, Political, Financial, and Industrial condition of the country — considered with relation to the war. It is to some general consideration of this aspect of the case, in relation to our general course of thought, that we now proceed.

When we speak of the Moral condition of the country, we do not intend, especially, its spiritual state, as in the sight of God. We mean that moral state which is the sum of all the good and all the evil, presented in our mixed and confused probationary state — and presented to us now and amongst ourselves, as characteristic of our condition, and as decisively influential upon the future. This rebellion begins in an outrage upon many of the clearest obligations of Natural Religion — loyalty, love of country, fidelity to public trusts, gratitude for honors bestowed, truth and manhood in the discharge of obligations voluntarily assumed, nay, eagerly sought. How many of the leaders of this rebellion are free from the stain on their personal honor, of deliberately transgressing some or all of those natural obligations, which no contingency under heaven can justify any one in violating! We speak not of the mere fact of treason, as defined by human laws. What we speak of is the perfidy, in every revolting form, which has marked this treason, in its birth, in its growth, and in its present frantic struggle: men seeking to overthrow monuments, cemented by the blood of their immediate ancestors; men dishonoring names, illustrious through many generations; men betraying their friends, their neighbors, their kindred; men seducing children to take up arms against their parents — and then band-

Digitized by Google

ing them with savages to desolate their own homes with fire and sword. It is a madness — a fearful madness. No madness can be greater, except the madness that could induce this great nation to suppose that God allows it to let this go unpunished.

Perhaps the most dangerous, as well as the most universal form, in which this characteristic perfidy has made itself manifest, is the suddenness with which thousands of *spies and informers* have appeared throughout the nation, the tenacity with which they have everywhere followed their degrading employment, and the alacrity with which honors and rewards, almost to the very highest, have been lavished upon them by the rebel government and people. In the States which have seceded, the mass of the loyal people, overwhelmed by force, have quietly acquiesced. In the loyal States, the mass of the disloyal people — wherever opportunity offered — seem to have given themselves up to a regular system of espionage, by means of which the rebel authorities, civil and military, have been kept perfectly informed of all they desire to know. All ranks of society, persons in private life and those in every kind of public employment from the lowest to the highest, persons of every age and of both sexes; appear to make it the chief business of their lives to obtain secret and dangerous information for the benefit of the rebel authorities. Betraying their country, they break with indifference every tie that binds human beings to each other. The humiliated parent doubts whether his own disloyal child will not betray him; the husband may not safely confide in his disloyal wife; and as for the obligation of civil or military oaths, or the honor which should bind every one in whom trust is reposed, no loyal man in America any longer believes that the mass of secessionists scattered through the loyal States, recognize the validity of these sacred bonds. It is, we suppose, certain, past doubt, that every important military movement since the war began has been betrayed to the enemy before it was made; and nine-tenths of the evils and miscarriages we have suffered have been occasioned by *spies and informers* in our midst.

Such a state of affairs as this cannot be endured. The danger of it renders it intolerable. The enormity of it justifies any remedy its extirpation may require. And they who are innocent of

Digitized by Google

such turpitude themselves, instead of raising a clamor at the use of any means by which society seeks to protect itself, ought to be thankful for any opportunity to clear themselves from the suspicion under which they may have fallen. And they who are guilty, and expect to silence public justice by clamor about irregular proceedings against them, ought to bear in mind, that a people outraged past endurance, has much shorter processes than any that imply infallibility in corrupt judges, or writs out of chancery. It does not appertain to us to argue and determine nice and doubtful points of criminal law — concerning which men who ought to be competent to decide, are pleased to differ and to dispute; and which the present Chief Justice of the United States is alledged to have decided in two exactly opposite ways. The boundaries between the civil and military authorities, in time of war, under the Constitution and laws of the United States — may be sufficiently obscure, to serve the turn of those who habitually transgress both. And the boundaries between those powers which can be exercised, in war, by the President alone, and those which must be exercised jointly by the power both of Congress and the President, may be liable to grave questioning by persons, amongst others, who are not very desirous to have their career of mischief cut short. Spies, and other persons who may be justly considered liable to military punishment, can look, we suppose, with very small hope to honest civil tribunals, for deliverance from military authority; and it is very certain that all the prisons in the United States would not hold the tenth part of those, who have made themselves liable to punishment for such offenses. As for offenses of other kinds, especially for the highest offense known to the laws of all civilized countries, *Treason* — these, when added to the highest military offense, that of being a *Spy*, (and no one can be a *spy* in *this* war without being a *traitor* also) — the public authorities are certainly inexcusable if they punish innocent men, when so many are flagrantly guilty — and are hardly excusable when they punish insignificant men, when so many of great distinction have been allowed to escape, or are still unquestioned. The legality of particular modes of arrest, the proper legal treatment after arrest, and the whole doctrine about the writ of *habeas corpus;* are matters, no doubt, of

Digitized by Google

great importance in their place. As for us, we are ready to stand by the chief law officer of the Government, the Attorney General of the United States, who, as we understand the matter, has given the explicit sanction of his high professional standing, and that of his great office, to the course which the President has taken. And we suppose all loyal men will agree with us, that — if the American people can endure the pretended violations of law, which their enemies say are daily perpetrated in the arrest and detention of suspected, and indicted, Spies and Traitors — it is no great thing to ask of those who declare the Constitution to be already a nullity, and all lawful government at an end, that they will bear with composure irregularities which loyal men do not complain of. And, perhaps, all earnest patriots would agree, that, at the worst, the salvation of the country from the reign of anarchy and the despotism of traitors, is worth all the human laws and constitutions in the world. We can make governments; for society is supreme over them. But we have only this one country. And it is audacious hypocrisy, for those who are seeking alike the overthrow of our government, and the degradation of our country — to revile us about some pretended irregularity, in our attempt to subject them to punishment, for their crimes against the existence of society.

The financial condition and prospects of the country — the cost of the war in money, the questions of public credit, taxes, currency, public debt, and the like — are of great importance in themselves; and the use which is made of the popular ignorance on such subjects — by exaggerating whatever is evil and suppressing whatever is favorable, and by both means shaking the public constancy in pushing the war to a complete triumph — adds greatly to that importance. They who are familiar with such topics can do no greater service to the country than to remove all mystery from them, and disclose with precision our condition and prospects with reference to them. For ourselves, we readily admit that, in our judgment, the end demanded — namely, the independence of the nation, the freedom of the people, the security of society, and the glory of the country — ought to be achieved, let the pecuniary cost and the financial result be what they may. After our triumph, the country will remain, and it will be-

Digitized by Google

long to our posterity; and no one need doubt that the triumphant people will make the glorious country worth all it cost us to save both; nor that posterity will venerate, as they should, the heroic generation that sacrificed all, to save all. There is, however, no ordinary possibility that very great pecuniary sacrifices will be required of the loyal portion of the nation; and it is not out of the reach of probability that they may, as a whole, derive considerable pecuniary advantage from the aggregate result of this unnatural war. We will explain ourselves in as few words as possible.

So far as the great losses, if not the total ruin, of large numbers of people in a nation, are necessarily pecuniary misfortunes to the whole population; we do not see how the restored nation is to escape very great loss by this war. For it seems to us impossible for the Southern States, even if the war could be arrested at once, to extricate themselves from their deplorable financial condition, without extreme sacrifice; just as it seems to us certain that the main source of their affluence, in their own opinion — their virtual monopoly of cotton in the market of the world — is forever ended. If they protract this war to their utmost power, the Confederate Government, and every State government connected with it, will come out of the war utterly bankrupt. The creditors of all those Governments will be so far ruined, as the loss of some thousand millions of dollars due to them by those Governments, can ruin their creditors. Some thousand millions more will be sunk in individual losses, unconnected with the Governments. Every species of property will fall, say one-half or more, in its merchantable value. The whole paper currency, after falling gradually till it ceases to be competent for any payment at all — will fall as an entire loss on the holders of it; the precious metals having long ago ceased to circulate. In the meantime, if the country is not speedily conquered, it passes over from the hands of the present usurpers, into the hands of three or four hundred thousand armed men — whose only means of existence is their arms. This, in every item of it, means desolation. In the aggregate, it presents a condition, which all the statesmen in the world have not the wisdom to unravel into prosperity, without first passing through multiplied evils,

Digitized by Google

the least of which is infinitely greater than the greatest of those for which they took up arms against the Union. No such revolution as that attempted in the South can succeed; and its inevitable failure draws after it, always, a revolution in property. The present disloyal race of cotton and sugar and rice planters of the South — its great property holders, who ought, above all men, to have put down this rebellion — will, as a class, disappear, beggared, perhaps in large proportion extinct. when the war is over. It is a fearful retribution; but we do not see how they can escape it.

In effect, therefore, the Federal Government and the loyal States of America have no alternative but, besides maintaining their own financial solvency and credit during the war, to retrieve the ruin of the Southern States, as a part of the nation, after the war is done. No enlightened man ought to have any doubt of their ability to do both. At the present moment, we will enter no farther into the question of the national ability to do the latter, after the war is over; than to desire the reader to make, for himself, a full and just comparison of the present financial conditions of the United States, and the Confederate States — and satisfy himself of the true causes of the immeasurable difference between them. It is, just now, the other point — our financial ability to carry the war triumphantly through, without great pecuniary sacrifices to the loyal people of the nation — that interests the public mind; and about which we have a few words to add.

A nation, like an individual, can spend its entire annual accumulations, within the year, without being a cent the poorer, or a cent in debt. It can do this forever; and it can do it in carrying on war, as well as in any other way. If all the people of the United States would put the whole of their annual accumulations in the hands of the Government, *as a gift*, their boundless wealth might be spent on war, forever, and nobody be any poorer — and the Government owe no debt. If they will not let the Government have it *as a gift*, there are two other modes by which the Government may obtain the whole of it — and still no one be any poorer. It can be done by taxation; — limiting the taxes — at the highest — to the available annual accumula-

Digitized by Google

tions; and distributing the taxes so that they shall fall only on the accumulations: both very nice operations, which few public men have ever understood, and few nations have willingly endured. It can be done also, by means of *Public Credit;* which is at once the highest product of civilization, and its greatest safeguard. There is a third method by which, emphatically, in wars like this, conquering nations are accustomed to relieve themselves: *first* by making the conquered party pay, in whole or in part, the expenses of the war; and *secondly*, by confiscating the property of enemies, and especially of rebels. The equity of these latter methods cannot be questioned; and they have this high justification, that they discountenance all rash, needless, and criminal wars. It was a madness in the Confederate States — as the weaker and the aggressive party — to set us the example of the most sweeping confiscations; for it pointed to a fund, in the hands of traitors, too large to be stated with even approximate truth, out of which we might conquer them without costing any loyal man a farthing.

The Congress of the United States has resorted to both of the two expedients first stated above: Taxation and Loans to the Government. To state the matter in other words, this generation agrees to take on itself its fair share of preserving the country; and this share is expressed in the form of taxes and interest upon money borrowed by the Government. It justly proposes to cast on future generations, some portion of the cost of that which concerns them as deeply as it does us; and this share is expressed in whatever amount of debt and interest this generation may leave unpaid. Let us observe, however, that the nature of wealth is such, in the present state of human civilization, that the surplus capital of the world, to an almost boundless extent, is constantly seeking for safe and easily convertible investments; amongst the most eagerly desired of which, are such as are the most likely to be perpetual. The debt we may leave to posterity, therefore, may be truly said to be no more than the interest in perpetuity, on the amount unpaid, and which posterity may prefer not to pay, when it shall enter upon the most glorious inheritance in the world, charged with a very small comparative annuity, created in defence of the inheritance itself. If

Digitized by Google

this war should last five years, at a cost of five hundred millions a year, over and above the income from direct and indirect taxes, we should make our children the foremost nation on earth; and oblige them to pay, therefor, one hundred and fifty millions a year. This is less, a good deal, than the yearly interest paid on the present national debt of Great Britain: and it is extremely probable it could be raised, in a prosperous condition of the country, by indirect taxes, without detriment to a single one of its great interests, and with great advantage to many of them. But, in truth, we may say, the war will not cost so much as five hundred millions a year, over and above the ordinary income; nor will the war last five years; nor will there be any difficulty, under a wise and economical administration of public affairs, for the same generation that makes the war debt, to pay its interest, and gradually redeem the debt itself. Nay; a previous limitation stated by us, is theoretically true, only in a certain sense. For any man, or any nation, in good credit, can borrow, from other men and other nations, and do so borrow continually, immense sums of money, on the credit not of surplus accumulation, nor even of gross income — but of the capital itself; — nay, often to the value of an enormous credit beyond the value of the capital itself. We were originally a thrifty people, economical in paying salaries, averse to high taxes, and shy of public debts; some indulgence in which latter, in later years, has not made us more favorable to them. But of all absurdities, none can be more palpable than the idea of any inherent pecuniary difficulty on the part of the American people, in carrying out this war to complete triumph. Undoubtedly, this is on the supposition of competent skill, in the raising and disbursement of such immense sums of money. And, so far as we are informed and are competent to judge, there is much reason to ascribe the highest capacity to the present Secretary of the Treasury. Undoubtedly, also, it is on the further supposition that this vast fund is neither stolen, nor perverted, nor used wastefully and fraudulently; but that it is skillfully, faithfully, and economically applied to its right use, by the agents of the Government, through whose hands it passes. To this end, it is probable, further legislation by Congress is needed — as well as a sleepless vigilance on the part of

Digitized by Google

the public — and the condign punishment, without respect to persons, of all official corruption.

There are some other topics of much interest, touching which we had designed to say something — as, for example, the question of paper currency, whether furnished by the Government or the Banks, in its relation to the circulation of the precious metals and the possible drain of them from the country — and the bearing of the actual management of the public finances upon these questions, and upon the internal trade of the country, by means of the substitution of cash payments, instead of credits, both in public and private transactions. But great as the bearing of these topics is, upon the general questions we are discussing, the topics themselves are too much beside the common knowledge of mankind, to be very clearly stated in the remaining space allotted to this portion of this paper. We content ourselves, therefore, with saying that, in our opinion, an incompetent Secretary of the Treasury had it completely in his power to have placed the public finances in a condition out of which immediate and ruinous discredit to the Government would have sprung — and, as a consequence, the general circulation of a depreciated paper currency, the disappearance of the precious metals, a ruinous fall in the value of property, the impossibility of active trade, and the gradual impoverishment of the country, in the midst of the war. Instead of calamities so untimely and dreadful, it seems to us perfectly clear that the course taken by Mr. Chase has had a most powerful influence in maintaining the public credit at a very high point; in opening to the Government, as a favored borrower, the whole unfixed wealth of the nation; and in aiding, in a very high degree, the rapid development of that prosperity which the industrial condition of the country exhibits in all the loyal States. There are, no doubt, other causes — some of them greater than was foreseen by most persons, others which were not foreseen by any one — to which we must attribute the chief influence in producing the universal industrial activity, and the substantial industrial prosperity, which the loyal States enjoy; instead of the starvation to which the mad conspirators of the South expected to reduce those States. It is a great lesson — this unexpected working of this civil war upon the industrial condition

Digitized by Google

of the two sections of the Union. We would willingly enter into some exposition of the causes, which have warded off so many heavy calamities from one section, and hurled them with such crushing force upon the other. But we content ourselves, as in several previous instances, with suggesting the great fact to the reader, and urging him to verify it for himself. Its bearing is most decisive on the course and end of this war. And its just exposition throws great light on the true interests of the whole country, and on the real sources of its power.

The External Relations of the Country, considered with reference to the War.

IV. The secessionists would have mankind believe, that their conduct is prompted by the most elevated principles, and directed by the noblest instincts. In illustration of these pretensions, those who were in the highest civil stations, plundered the Government under which they were Senators, Members of Congress, and Cabinet officers: those who were in the naval and military service, betrayed the flag of their country, and delivered up, not only strong places, but the troops confided to them: those who had the opportunity, robbed the Government of money: those who were on foreign diplomatic service, used their positions to the greatest possible injury of the nation: and if there were any exceptions of honorable conduct amongst them (we do know of a single one) they occurred amongst those of subordinate rank, and have been concealed by their comrades, as marks of weakness. All these degrading evidences of the total demoralization of the party, occurred in that stage of the conspiracy, immediately preparatory to the commencement of open hostilities by them. At first, they seemed to have supposed that the nation would make no serious attempt to reduce them by force, and that a great people, betrayed and sold, would accept the ignominious fate prepared for it. When they awoke from this stupid dream, their first resort was, very naturally, to an exhibition of the quality of their heroism; and their wail of "*No coercion*" resounded through the land — echoed back by the concerted cry of their secret allies in the loyal States, "*Peace, on any terms, with our brethren.*" Their next resort, just as naturally, was a manifestation of the reality of their boasted confidence in themselves,

Digitized by Google

in their resources, and in their cause. This, also, they exhibited in a manner perfectly characteristic. Emissaries were despatched to all foreign nations, embracing even the distracted Governments south of us, and not forgetting even our Indian tribes, or the Mormon kingdom. Everywhere, under the sun, where the least help seemed attainable, by whatever means they supposed might be effectual, they eagerly sought it. Sometimes by menaces, sometimes by solicitations, sometimes seeking alliance, sometimes protection, sometimes offering everything, sometimes begging for anything — even for a King, if they could get nothing better. But always, and everywhere, help was what they wanted! Help, against their own country, which they had betrayed. Oh! patriots! Help, against their own people, whom they professed to have terrified, and to be able to subdue. Oh! heroes! A more shameful record does not disfigure the history of sedition.

The United States have had three foreign wars, in eighty-six years; two with Great Britain, one with Mexico; the whole three occupying less than one-seventh part of their national existence. Peace is emphatically the desire and policy of the nation; for peace offers to it conquests, well understood by it, far greater than any nation ever obtained by war. To treat all nations as friends, to treat them all alike, to have alliances with none, to have treaties of peace and commerce with all, to demand nothing that is not just and equal, to submit to nothing that is wrong: this is the simple, wise, and upright foreign policy of this great country. Seated, so to speak, on the outer margin of the world, as the world's civilization stood at the birth of this great nation, the fathers of the Republic understood and accepted the peculiar lot which God had assigned to their country; and their descendants, to the fourth and fifth generation, had steadily developed the noble and fruitful policy of their ancestors, beholding continually the increasing power and glory, in the fruition of which, in our day, they constituted one of the chief empires of the world. Whatever else the nation may have learned, or left unlearned, in a career so astonishing; it has learned at least that the career itself is not yet accomplished, and that it must not be cut short. It must not be; for we dare not allow it, as we would answer to God, to the human race, to the shades of our ancestors, and to

Digitized by Google

the reproaches of our posterity. The very idea of forcing us, by means of foreign intervention, besides the indignation it begets, shows us how indispensable it is to our independence as a nation, that we must preserve the power by which to defy all such atrocious attempts. The true interpretation for a wise nation to put on such a menace, is that it already behooves it to become more powerful. In the present condition of the chief nations of the earth, invincible strength is the first condition of national independence. And we, who are out of the European community of States, and out of the scope of their fixed ideas of European balance of power, which has, for so long a period, regulated that continent; are, beyond all other nations, pressed with the necessity of augmenting, instead of diminishing our power, if we would preserve our freedom. Two nations of moderate force made out of ours — and the continent is at the mercy of every powerful European combination: and this is the idea of freedom and glory, that characterizes the Confederate Government. One mighty nation — and the United States may defy all Europe combined; and this is the American idea of American independence. Let the fact, therefore, be taken as final, that any foreign attempt to support the secession rebellion, is not merely tantamount to a declaration of war — but to war against the future independence of the United States. And let the Federal Government clearly understand, that this is the deliberate sense of the American people. And let all foreign Governments be made fully aware that this is the sense in which such an attempt will be taken.

We do not ourselves believe that any foreign Government will interfere in our unhappy civil war. The doctrine of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of nations, is not only the settled international law of Europe; but it has been of late thoroughly and generally enforced, and its present breach would completely tear in pieces the web of diplomacy that involves the European system of peace. Nor do we see what any European nation could gain by assailing us, comparable to the risk it would run. They certainly would get but little *cotton* by it, if that is what they seek — for some years to come, if ever. Cotton is a product of the plow and the hoe — not of the sword and the gun; and commerce means peace, not war. We do see, moreover, how

Digitized by Google

any serious injury to the United States, might fatally affect one and another European nation; and we can hardly imagine the overthrow of our national power to be attempted by any European combination, under existing circumstances, without producing a general European war — if not immense European revolutions. France, it is clear, has the highest interest in preventing the destruction of the only maritime power in the world, besides herself, that can even keep in check the dominion of England over the sea; a dominion which, for seventy years, France has been diligently preparing to dispute. England, whatever may be the wishes and feelings of certain classes, is still more thoroughly restrained. For — to say nothing of the probable loss of her American possessions, nothing of the ruin of her commerce throughout the world — her fierce population, educated for a whole generation to a fanatical hatred of slavery, and having hardly finished paying a hundred millions of dollars to extinguish it in their own cotton and sugar colonies; would be slow to indulge in the spending of two or three thousand millions more, in a war which they would understand to be for the maintenance of the very cotton and sugar slavery in foreign States, which they have so lately bought out, at home. They are a people, besides, that when driven to extremity, have small faith in royal dynasties — and have, before now, despatched kings in the closet, on the battle-field, and upon the scaffold. Spain is hardly worth speaking about in this connection, except as the owner of some desirable islands in the Gulf of Mexico; *mare nostrum* (*our sea*) as the Romans proudly called the Mediterranean. And these are the chief maritime powers of Europe — certainly the only ones we need take into this account. We will add nothing concerning the friendly dispositions of all other European Governments; nothing concerning the public opinion of Europe, before which even Governments must bow; nothing concerning the traditional and vehement sympathy of those masses of European population who make revolutions, whose hearts are with the United States even against their own sovereigns, and so many thousands of whose near kindred and friends are to-day amongst the best officers and most effective troops in our armies. Enough, it seems to us, has been said to direct the thoughts of the reader toward

Digitized by Google

those considerations, which ought to satisfy the public mind on this particular topic. With ordinary prudence, courage, and fair dealing, on the part of our Government, with foreign States, it does not appear to us that there is any ordinary possibility of a serious rupture with any of them, growing out of this war.

If, however, contrary to our judgment of the facts, war should be forced upon us by any foreign nation — or should occur from any untoward accident; there is no reason to doubt our ability to put down the rebellion in the South, and maintain the Union, notwithstanding the utmost aid the greatest foreign nation could give to the rebels. We will not now discuss the subject, in that aspect. Such a war as we have said, will, probably, not occur in our day. If it ever does occur, either it will wholly fail in its avowed object — or its effects will be far greater and more lasting, than they who bring it on expect or intend. Let mankind, at length, receive the sublime truth, that great nations do not die; that great peoples do not perish. Let them accept, at last, the astonishing fact — more palpable in the developments of our age, than ever before — that nationalities once established, are, according to any measure of time known to history, really immortal. And then let them remember, that this is, in truth, a great nation, and that the nationality shared by the American people, is not only thoroughly established, but one of the most distinct and powerful that ever existed.

It seems proper, in this connection, to make some general allusion to the Naval arm of the public service, and to the Naval power of the United States. Proper in some part of this paper; because that element of our national power, must be considered decisive of the contest with the rebel States, even if they were in other respects as strong as the nation itself. Proper in this place; because it is the supremacy of the Navies both of France and Great Britain over ours — that exposes us to the degradation even of a menace, from either of those poweas — and that begets the wild hope in the Confederate Government, that either of them will interfere in this war, on its behalf. If the Navy of the United States bore any fair comparison with that of either of the two powers that rank with us, as the great maritime States of the world; no one ever would have heard a whisper about the

Digitized by Google

armed intervention of either of them, in our domestic troubles: And if, at the commencement of this rebellion, the military marine of the United States, even such as it then was, had been promptly and skillfully used, the revolt could have been suppressed at the tenth part — perhaps the hundreth part — of the treasure and the blood it may cost. It is, unhappily, true that the conspiracy against the country embraced a large number of the officers of the Navy, as well as of the army; and that the ships and Navy Yards, as well as the Forts and Regiments, had been carefully disposed, by a corrupt administration, in such a manner as to render them as little serviceable as possible. But, besides this, both arms of the service, and especially the Navy, were shamefully inadequate to the safety, the power, and the dignity of the nation; and both arms, but especially the Navy, came utterly short, at first, of what might have been justly expected of them. It is to be hoped that the time has fully come, to retrieve errors which have cost us so much.

From the remotest antiquity, the maritime powers of the world have exerted an influence over human affairs, altogether disproportionate to their relative strength, as compared with other nations. The Phœnicians, the maritime cities of Greece, the Greek cities of Asia Minor, the Carthagenians, the Italian Free Cities of the Middle Ages, more recently Holland, and, for nearly two centuries past, Great Britain: everywhere, in all ages, the same truths are palpable — commerce is the parent of national wealth — and a military marine is, relatively to all other means of national power and security, by far the cheapest, the most effective, and the least dangerous to public freedom. The United States are fitted, in every way, to become the first maritime power in the world. And some of the best fruits of the terrible lesson we are now learning, will be lost; unless our statesmen of the present age, and of future generations, comprehend more clearly than hitherto, that the mission set before the American people cannot be accomplished, either in its internal completeness, or its external force, except by means of a military marine equal, at the very least, to the greatest in the world.

The liberty and glory of the Greeks were altogether personal. The freedom and power of the Roman Republic were altogether

Digitized by Google

public. The great problem yet to be solved, is the transcendent union of both. It belongs to the American people, if they see fit, to give and enjoy this sublime illustration of human grandeur. The indispensable elements of success, are, *internally*, the perfect preservation of our political system, in its whole purity, its whole force, and its whole extent: and, *externally*, the complete independence of the nation, of all foreign powers. In maintaining the former, our immediate necessity is — to extinguish, at whatever cost, this civil war. In preserving the latter, our immediate necessity is — to repel, amicably if we can, with arms if need be, and at every hazard, all foreign interference in support of this rebellion. We are able, if God requires it at our hands, to do both, by His help. Our star is set, when we fail of doing either. With nations, there is a great choice in the way of dissolution — the choice between the contempt, and the veneration, of the human race.

* *
*

Digitized by Google

Art. IV. — *Identity of the Church.*

In all ages of the world there has never been but one way by which mankind could be saved. The outward administration of the Church has been changed, so as to adapt itself to the peculiar exigencies of the times; but the absolute conditions of salvation have ever been, and ever will be, the same. "There is no other name given under heaven whereby we can be saved; neither is there salvation in any other." To this truth "gave all the prophets witness." Abel, Abraham and Paul, the prototypes of the several administrations which began in their day, were each alike saved by grace, through faith in Jesus Christ.

It is said that the atonement was made for the world; but with greater propriety may it be said, that the world was made for the atonement. "All things were created by him, (Christ) and *for* him; — [they were created for him as Christ, *the Messiah*,] —all things that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers." (Col. i: 16.)

The more perfect exhibition of himself, in the wonderful work of Redemption, was the great central idea in the mind of God from the beginning — ere he brought forth any of the works of his hands, and laid the beams of his chambers in the waters, and bent his sky over our earth. Christ was to him "a Lamb slain before the foundations of the world." And in order to execute the work of redemption, he chose out this revolted province, and here erected his Church, composed of those who were the actual and living monuments of this stupendous scheme of love and mercy. And hence it is only in, and through, or by means of, the Church that this "manifold wisdom of God is seen."

"And having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him. . . . And to make all see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." [The Apostle then

Digitized by Google

proceeds to show what was God's intention in so doing:] — "To the intent that now unto principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known, by [means of] the Church, the manifold wisdom of God. And this was all according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Jesus Christ our Lord." (Ep. i: 9, 10; iii: 9–12.)

The very important question which we wish at present to consider is — When did God first institute his great Church arrangement for the salvation of men? Was it not until the day of Pentecost? We read of holy men — multitudes of whom were taken to heaven! (Heb. xi.) How were they saved? Has the plan of salvation been altered since their day? Is Christianity another and a new religion? Has it changed the great fundamental principles of the divine government? Is not the nature of God, and our relations to him, the same in all generations? Did Paul preach any other gospel than that which had been preached before to Abraham? (Gal. iii: 8.) Have not the conditions and requirements, promises and rewards of the Gospel been always the same? The *essence* of religion must always remain unchanged; the *forms* of it may be altered, without affecting its nature or essence.

But was there an organized church in existence before the day of Pentecost? This is, by some, strenuously denied. Did Abraham, and Moses, and Isaiah, and Christ, live and die without being connected with God's visible Church? Moses was in the Church which was in the wilderness. (Acts vii: 38.) The Israelites were baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. (1 Cor. x: 2.) "To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and *the service of God*, and the promises." (Rom. ix: 4.) In the gloomiest period of their history God said, "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed their knee unto the image of Baal." (Rom. xi: 4.)

When Christ came, he found the temple standing, and the whole land of Judah full of churches, or synagogues, where the Law was read and expounded every Sabbath day, "and the service of God" was mingled with prayer and praise. They had their priests, and elders, scribes, rulers, deacons and prophets.

If we go back to the days of Malachi, the last of these proph-

Digitized by Google

ets, we hear him saying, "Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another, and the Lord hearkened, and heard it: and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels." Mal. iii: 16, 17. Jeremiah compares the Church to a "green olive tree." Jer. xi: 16. David talks much like a modern Christian about "going up to the house of God."

What is the Old Testament but a history of God's Church? What was the use of all those altars, tabernacles, temples, synagogues, sacrifices, ablutions, rites and ceremonies? Why was one whole tribe set apart for the especial purpose of offering up sacrifices, and the performance of other various religious duties, if there was no Church in that day? Were these only "national rites, and national privileges?" Christ labored, through his whole ministry, to explain the spiritual import of those ceremonies. He did not hesitate to call the Church of his day "the kingdom of God." He threatened to take it away from the Jews and give it to the Gentiles. Mat. xxi: 43. He told them that publicans and harlots were going into the kingdom of God before them. Mat. xxi: 31. Now it will be remembered that "Christ was a *minister of the circumcision* for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." Rom. xv: 8. We consider the question as settled, that there was at least *a* church in existence before the day of Pentecost.

Now we propose to show that the Christian Church is no new church, and the Christian religion is no new religion, but only a continuation of this same Church, under a different form of administration. Its outward rites may be changed, especially when there is an absolute necessity for such an alteration, without destroying its whole nature — unless the very essence of a church resides in its rites and ceremonies. The rites of the former dispensation pointed forward to a Saviour to come, while those of the latter point backward to a Saviour that hath already come, as the finger board shows the traveler the direction of the village to which he is going, but after he has passed it, the hand points in the opposite direction.

So it was necessary that the signs of religion should be chang-

Digitized by Google

ed — her ritual simplified, and altered to adapt itself to the new order of things — the passover for the eucharist — the priest for the preacher — the synagogue for the church — the altar for the pulpit — circumcision for baptism — the sabbath for the Lord's day. But these do not affect the great fundamental principles of the Church. You may change the seals affixed to a charter; but that Great Magna Charta which God gave to his Church from the beginning can never be annulled. Gal. iii: 15. Any government, as our own, may see fit frequently to change rulers, and its regulations; but so long as the fundamental principles of the constitution are preserved, the government remains the same.

In Eph. ii, the Apostle Paul compares the Jewish Church to a "commonwealth:" The Gentiles "being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise; . . . . . but now, in Christ Jesus, ... they are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple unto the Lord." Here we see that Jews and Gentiles — prophets and apostles — are "all builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." The Christian church was not a new building — for its foundations were laid by apostles and *prophets*. The old Church was not detroyed — only the middle wall of partition was removed — that it might be enlarged, so as to admit the Gentiles as fellow-heirs to the covenants of promise.

In his Epistle to the Romans, (chap. xi,) this same apostle compares the Church to an olive tree. This comparison is borrowed from Jer. xi: 16. The old tree, with its root, trunk, and "some of its branches" still remained; part of them were broken off in unbelief. The Jews, many of them, had rejected their Messiah. "He came to his own, and his own received him not." They crucified him, and said, "let his blood be upon us, and our children." But the election stood, as natural branches, on their own olive tree. The Gentiles are compared to the wild olive tree; not that they were worse by nature than the Jews, for in

Digitized by Google

this respect the apostle had shown there "was no difference between the Jew and the Greek." These were grafted among the natural branches upon the good olive tree. According to nature we graft the good limb on the bad stock, and the fruit partakes, not of the root or stock, but of the graft. But this was *contrary to nature.* The Gentile graft partook of the root and fatness of the good olive tree: "thou bearest not the root, but the root beareth thee." The Gentiles were grafted in upon the very limbs that were broken off.

Does Paul mean by the good olive tree the politico-ecclesiastical state of the Jews? But were the Gentiles grafted into that? Were not the Jews broken off from it by *unbelief*, and the Gentiles grafted into it *by faith?* But was faith the absolute condition upon which the Gentiles were to be made partakers of the blessings of the civil polity of the Jews?

But, the Jew is to be grafted back again into his own olive tree — when "they shall be brought back with the fullness of the Gentiles;" "when ten men, out of all nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you. Zach. viii: 23. Jesus compared the Church of his day to a sheepfold. John x. It will be remembered that he was a minister of the circumcision, and according to the theory of Anti-pedobaptists, the Christian Church was not organized until the day of Pentecost. "I am," said he, "the true shepherd"— the only door to the sheep. "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; these must I bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be *one fold* and one shepherd."

It is a groundless assumption to maintain that Christ commissioned his disciples to organize a new church after his decease. Their commission was to go and preach the gospel, to evangelize the nations by baptizing and teaching them. The Christian church doubtless existed before the day of Pentecost. "In those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, (the number of the names together were about a hundred and twenty,) Men and *brethren.*" As a church they made choice of an apostle in the place of Judas. Acts i: 15–26. "When the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in

Digitized by Google

one place." They were baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire. Those converted on that day were *added to them.* "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized; and the same day there were *added to them* about three thousand souls." Acts ii: 14. Here we have a church prior to the day of Pentecost. Neither the apostles, nor these hundred and twenty disciples, had ever received Christian baptism. The three thousand were added to a church already in existence, before the day of Pentecost. That church and the Christian church are one and the same Church, although the one initiated by circumcision and the other by Christian baptism. The new branches were grafted upon the old stock, and not the old upon the new.

The Church has been called to pass through various dispensations, yet she has never lost her identity, changed her constitution, or forfeited her chartered rites.

In the beginning God claimed the whole world for his people. But the whole race rejected him. "God looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside," &c. Ps. xiv: 2. The Lord then fell back upon the family relation — a relation which ever has, does now, and ever will, constitute the basis of all order in society, in government, in either Church or State. "It is heaven's appointed means of filling earth with righteousness, and heaven with earth's redeemed millions." This is called the Patriarchal Dispensation. Religion was confined to the *family.* This dispensation served to unfold the primary truths of the gospel. It set forth the doctrine concerning the *being, nature,* and *relations* of God towards us: that he was God — a sovereign; a holy God; and our God — a Father.

But other great truths remained to be developed concerning the Messiah. To this end the Church must be organized, and assume a visible form. But, for the time being, and for special reasons connected with the incarnation of the Messiah, it must be confined to one *race,* instead of one family. Hence the gospel was preached unto Abraham, who stood at the head, as the spiritual father, and representative, of the Church — the father of the faithful. This was the *Messianic Dispensation* — which closed when He ascended on high.

Digitized by Google

Then the Church passed out of that into the "more glorious ministration of the Spirit;" and is now called the Christian Church. But it is not any more the Church of Christ now, than it was when the Messiah was in the world, its incarnate and visible Head. All along God has been enlarging his tent, so that, as at the beginning, he may include within its folds "all nations." Surely this does neither destroy the nature nor identity of the Church. That she should change, or shed off entirely, certain rites peculiar to a former dispensation, that she might more happily adjust herself to the new order of things under the New Testament economy, is just what we ought to expect.

In order to prove the identity of the Church under the Old and New Testament dispensations, we propose to enquire — *What are the essential elements of the Christian Church?* The following embrace all the essential particulars of that Church:

1. God is the Founder of it.
2. It must be a permanent covenant.
3. Its parties — God and believers, of all nations.
4. Its provisions — the Son and the Spirit.
5. Condition of salvation — faith, a righteousness.
6. Its requirement — holiness.
7. Its promise — eternal life.

These are *essential* to the Christian Church. And if all these elements do not enter into the Abrahamic covenant, the identity is destroyed. If they do we shall consider our point maintained.

The external rites of the Church we do not regard an essential part of it. The Church is not confined to a frame work of ceremony. It is essentially a spiritual kingdom, and does not reside in forms — "in meats and drinks;" and even since the day of Pentecost she has, in all her denominations, varied her outward forms, but this does not destroy her essence. Just as a government may change its mode of administration, and yet preserve its constitution — or an individual his costume, and yet preserve his identity — so may the Church. If this be impossible, then the Christian Church is never the same for any two centuries together. Not distinguishing between what is essential, and what is not, has been the fruitful source of much unprofitable discussion concerning the Church.

Digitized by Google

*1. God is the Founder of the Old Testament Church, or Abrahamic covenant — Gen. xi, xv, xvii.

2. It is a permanent covenant. "I will establish my covenant between me, and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant." Gen. xvii: 7. "This covenant was not confined to Abraham, for it extends to his seed; nor only to the Patriarch's children, for it extends to his seed in their generations; nor to any limited number of generations, for it is established with Abraham and his seed in their generations for an everlasting covenant."

This covenant was renewed to Isaac and his seed, and to Jacob; and repeated, nine hundred years afterwards, to David. "Be ye always mindful of his covenant, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant." 1 Chr. xvi: 15–17; Ps. lxxxix: 3–6; Isa. xxiv: 5, lv: 3, lxi: 8; Jer. xxxii: 40; Ez. xvi: 60; Mal. ii: 10.

Abraham stood in a peculiar relation to the Church. It is not said of any other of the Patriarchs that he is the "father of the faithful," or that Christ took on him any but Abraham's seed. Heb. ii: 16. God made no such covenant with any other. It was only renewed to Isaac, &c. Hence, all the families and nations of the earth are blessed with faithful Abraham. And this covenant cannot pass away until its conditions are fulfilled.

I know it is objected that the term everlasting is to be understood in a limited sense — as coëxisting, and co-terminating with the Levitical dispensation. To this we reply that the covenant with Abraham was made four hundred and thirty years before the Mosaic covenant. Paul argues that the law cannot destroy the promise; "that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." Gal. iii: 17.

The Sinaitic covenant became a part of the Abrahamic covenant, or was added to it; and hence could disannul or destroy it. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was *added* because of transgressions, till the seed [of the Abrahamic covenant] should

* See Presbyterian Quarterly Review, p. 530.

Digitized by Google

come, to whom the promise was made; .... For if the inheritance be of the law, [*i. e.* of Sinaitic covenant,] it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Gal. iii: 19, 18.

God never gave two covenants, or constitutions, to his Church. True, what is called the covenant of works was given to Adam before the fall — contemplating him as a righteous being, and making no provisions for his recovery from an estate of sin and misery. This covenant is still binding on his race, as a rule of duty — but no longer as a condition of life. In this sense "we are not under the law."

But there never has been, or can be, but one covenant of salvation given to a fallen race, and that is the Christian covenant — which was the covenant intimated to Adam, but formally established with Abraham; for "it was confirmed of God *in Christ* with Abraham. And the law, or Mosaic covenant, came in, not as a substitute but only a temporary addition — a shadow of good things — "*until* the promised Seed should come." If the addition of that covenant to the promise made to Abraham could not make it of none effect, the "taking of it away" could not. The addition of a scaffold to a building does not destroy the building, but only facilitates its erection; and when it is thrown down it relieves the building of that which stood in the way, calculated to mar the effect produced by its simple, but grand and sublime proportions.

This idea the Apostle beautifully illustrates and enforces in Gal. iv: 22–31:

"As it is written: Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-maid and the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh: but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants, the one from the mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children..... Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise..... Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son; for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free."

Digitized by Google

Here the two covenants, the Abrahamic, and the Sinaitic, are brought in direct contrast. The one is spiritual, and permanent; the other fleshly, and temporal. All true believers are Sarah's seed. The Agar, or bond-woman, covenant — *i. e.* the covenant of Sinai, with Moses — being national, cortical, fleshly, temporary, and in due time fulfilled, was cast out; as a scaffolding, thrown down; while the spiritual house, the true temple, the Abrahamic covenant or Christian Church is left standing. Sarah, the mother of all believers, (as Abraham is their father,) with Isaac, (the Christ — the seed of Abraham, by the free woman — "if ye be in Christ then are ye Abraham's seed") was never cast out, and never will be. Isaac — with whom all true believers are identified — can never be disinherited. Hence it is a permanent covenant.

Should it be said that this covenant is called a "*new covenant*," we reply: that this has respect only to its administration and developments. It was new to the Jews, many of them, in that it was to be extended "to all nations," "that all should know him," etc. The covenant made with Moses "waxed old and vanished away;" not because of its age, but because it had fulfilled its mission. The covenant with Abraham, though it has existed in fact from the foundation of the world, and in form was 430 years older than the one made at Sinai, is never said to be old. Like the New Song in heaven, it will be forever new. Like the kingdom of heaven at that time existing, and of which Christ said "every man presseth into it" — though as to its fullness and power it is yet to come — so was this covenant to "be set up," according to Daniel; and to be "made new," according to Jeremiah; "*in power and great glory*," according to Paul. To prove that this is beyond all doubt the true interpretation, the Apostle assures us it was not a covenant to be made with a *new church;* but already confined to the old church — "with the *house of Israel and with the house of Judah.* Heb. viii: 8. This will appear more evident, when we consider —

3. The parties — God, and Abraham, the father, head, and spiritual representative, of believers — not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. If the covenant was made with Abraham for the Jews only, then it were only national, fleshly, and tem-

Digitized by Google

poral; and our analogy would fail. If circumcision, which was the seal of that covenant, was a "badge of national privileges only," entitling those who wore it to temporal blessings merely, then the parties to that covenant were only circumcised persons. But, taking this view of the matter, how is it that thousands of those who complied literally with the conditions of that covenant — *i. e.* were circumcised — never were put in possession of the land of Canaan, to which this rite entitled them? The fallacy of all this consists in making circumcision a seal of a national covenant, when the Apostle tells us "it was a seal of the righteousness of faith" — a sign of regeneration of heart and life. If the reader will take his Bible, and wherever the word circumcision occurs substitute the definition, "badge of national privileges," in the place of it, he will be at once convinced that the definition is false; as, for instance, "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that" a badge of national distinction "which is outward in the flesh," &c. Rom. ii: 28.

The fact is, the Apostle Paul especially guarded the Jews against such a false construction. Abraham actually enjoyed the blessings of the covenant of circumcision before that rite was given him:

"Cometh this blessedness on the circumcision [Jews] only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. But how was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? . . . . . And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also." Rom. iv: 9–11.

Hence the titles which are given to Abraham. Abram, "high father," is changed to Abraham, "father of a multitude;" "father of *many nations*;" "father of that which is of the law, and that which is of faith;" "father of all them that believe," "of the faithful," "of them that walk in the steps of his faith;" "heir of the world;" "father of us all," Jew and Gentile; "the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father

Digitized by Google

Abraham which he had being yet uncircumcised. For the promise that he should be heir of the world was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. iv: 12, 13.

As further proof that the covenant of circumcision was not national and temporal merely — (though like the gospel at the present time, it included these, "having promise of the life that now is, as well as that which is to come") — but spiritual and universal, its benefits did not flow to the Jews only, and by reason of the connection with the Patriarch by natural generation. We know the Jews in their blindness thought so. But John the Baptist and Jesus sternly reproved them for so thinking: "Think not to say, we have Abraham to our father, for God is able of these stones [Gentiles] to raise up children unto Abraham." Mat. iii: 9, John viii: 39. The blessings of Abraham did not follow the line of natural generation, but of supernatural regeneration. "For if they which are of the law be heirs, [*i. e.* the Jews as such,] faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." Rom. iv: 14. "Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." Gal. iii: 7. "Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children..... That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Rom. ix: 7, 8. "And if ye be in Christ — [*i. e.* a Christian] — then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. iii: 29. A true believer, then, whether he be Jew or Gentile, is the seed of Abraham; than which nothing can be more clearly established.

4. The provisions made for the Abrahamic covenant and the New Testament Church are identical; these are Christ and his Spirit. If these were put into the covenant of circumcision, then that covenant could not be merely national, and limited to the Jews only. As Christ was David's Lord, and David's son, so is he Abraham's son, and Abraham's Saviour. He told the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it." The gospel — of Jesus and him crucified — was preached unto Abraham. "Neither is there salvation in any other." "Abraham believed God, and it [his faith] was counted unto him for right-

Digitized by Google

eousness." Rom. iv: 3. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Gal. iii: 16. But all believers are included in Christ, are one with him, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ. They stand in that "covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ." He is "the Mediator of the new covenant." All the fathers, from Abel to Simeon, were justified by faith in his blood. "The gospel was preached unto them as well as unto us." It profited only those whose hearing of it was mixed with faith. Christ, as a Saviour, was then put into the covenant made with Abraham. See Luke i: 68–74.

So, also, the Holy Spirit as a sanctifier was put into this covenant. As many as are saved by the atonement of Jesus Christ, are converted by the influence of the Holy Spirit. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: .... that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." Gal. iii: 13, 14. The Psalmist prayed that the Holy Spirit might not be taken from him; that he might be upheld by His free Spirit. Ps. li: 11, 12. The authors of the books of the Old Testament were moved and inspired by the Holy Ghost. 2 Pet. i: 21. In fine, the gospel is but a full and complete development of what is contained in the Old Testament. The law is not against the promise. The gospel fulfills the law. The law contained the first principles or rudiments of the gospel, until the fullness of time should come. Christ came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them. They did all testify of him, (see Luke xxiv: 27,) and also of the Holy Spirit. (see John iii: 1–7.)

The Abrahamic covenant and the Christian Church are identical, in that they both alike provide the same Saviour and Sanctifier — which proves that the former can neither be human in its origin, national in character, limited in extent, nor transitory as regards its duration.

5. The proximate condition of salvation under the gospel economy, is faith in Christ. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." John iii: 14, 15, 16, 36. Acts xiii: 38, 39. This

Digitized by Google

faith is of course connected with repentance towards God, producing all the fruits of holy obedience; and all flow from a regenerated heart.

Such, precisely, were the conditions of salvation under the Abrahamic covenant. "Abraham believed God, and it [his faith] was counted unto him for righteousness." Rom. 4: 1–3. His justification was unto good works — not on account of them. Good works did not go before, but came after his justification, and could not, therefore, be the ground of it.

If Abraham our father were justified by works, according to James, it was only *before men* — *i. e.* his offering up his son Isaac, twenty-five years after he was a justified person, did not *make* him, but only *proved* and *declared* him to be, a just man; but he was a justified man "*before God*" before his circumcision, or the offering up of his son. Rom. iv. Jas. ii. His offering up his son did not make him a just man, but his being a just man made him offer up his son. "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." "For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Gal. ii: 21, and iii: 21. The Apostle proves that Abraham and his seed are all justified upon the same condition: "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness; therefore they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." Gal. iii: 6, 7. "For it was not written for his sake alone, that his faith was imputed for righteousness, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed if we believe," &c. Rom. iv: 23, 24. "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also." He was a father to those only who "walked in the steps of his faith." "The promise that he should be heir of the world was not made to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. iv: 11–13.

If any man, or angel, preach any other doctrine than that all men, in every age, are saved by faith alone in Christ, let him be accursed. "To him gave all the prophets witness" — martyrs,

Digitized by Google

apostles and saints — "that through his [Christ's] name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts x: 43. The saints in heaven, and on earth, ascribe their salvation to Christ: "These are they who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne." Rev. vii: 14, 15. The Apostle Paul lays out his whole strength upon this point in his several Epistles, especially in those to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Hebrews.

6. The requirement of the gospel is perfect holiness. But in this, the gospel is but a summing up of the law, which was part of the Abrahamic covenant: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself. On these two hang all the law and the prophets." Mat. xxii: 37, 39, 40.

Let it be remembered that the Gospel dispensation was not (fully) set up until after Christ's resurrection — at which time he ascended on high, and took full possession of his throne in the heavens, and commissioned his Spirit to take his place upon earth. The whole of his public ministry while in the world, was spent in explaining and enforcing the spiritual nature and claims of the "kingdom of heaven" that *then existed.* His memorable Sermon on the Mount, in which he removed the rubbish which had been heaped upon the "gospel preached unto Abraham" by the tradition of the elders, his conversation with Nicodemus, (John iii.) and with the woman at the well of Samaria, (John iv.) were all designed to show the spiritual nature of that kingdom or dispensation which was now about to close; or, rather, give place to the one which should succeed it, and exceed it only in its fullness of power and glory.

7. The blessings promised in the covenant with Abraham — everlasting life. The promise to Abraham also included many temporal blessings — the land of Canaan, a numerous seed, &c. But these did not, by any means, exhaust the covenant made with him. These were but "shadows of better things to come." The true seed was — Christ and all believers. Gal. iii: 16.

The land of Canaan was desirable chiefly as a type of heaven; for many who were circumcised never entered the literal Canaan; and those who did, looked beyond it to "a city that hath foundations." They saw the promises afar off, and confessed that they

Digitized by Google

were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. Their faith still had respect to the recompense of the reward. Heb. xi: 10, 13, 26. "Let us fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them; but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. For we which believe do enter into rest," &c. Heb. iv: 1–3.

This covenant, as we have seen, is spiritual and permanent. God did put himself into it, as a part of it, and a party to it. It included Christ and his Spirit, as the executors of it; its condition — faith, a righteousness; its requirement — holiness; its reward — eternal life. "I will be a God unto thee, and unto thy seed after thee." "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, that thou mayest live." Deut. xxx: 6. It is of faith, in righteousness; "of God, in Christ;" eternal and unchangeable; unto salvation and eternal life.

These seven particulars, as we conceive, are the essential elements which enter into the constitution of the Church of God. Like the Book of God, we cannot take anything from or add anything more to it. We think we have shown, by an argument as irrefragable as the word of God, that all these elements enter just as fully, and not more so, in the Abrahamic covenant, as in the Christian Church. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." If you be the children of Abraham, you are such, not by birth or blood, or natural generation — but by faith — regeneration; if children — then heirs of the promise to Abraham, "not by the law;" if heirs — then joint heirs with the seed of Abraham, which is Christ. You cannot be in Abraham, and out of Christ or the Christian covenant; you cannot be in Christ, and not be an heir of the promise, or covenant with Abraham. The two must then be identical.

Now, because this same great Church covenant has been put under distinct administrations, by many it has been supposed that this fact destroys its identity. Why so? When there is a necessity for it, may there not be a change in the law regulating the forms of worship, without destroying the very essence of the

Digitized by Google

Church? As Christ condensed the ten commandments into two, "without destroying the law," might he not cause circumcision and sacrifices and "their divers washings" to cease, and substitute baptism and the Lord's supper in their room, without annihilating the fundamental principles in the constitution of that Church which he labored, through his whole public ministry, to prove to be the true "Kingdom of God?"

We are accused of an attempt to engraft the Christian Church on to Judaism — whereas Judaism was engrafted on to the Christian Church by the hand of God, four hundred and thirty years after it was organized, and so continued "until the seed should come," who fulfilled and abolished it. This Levitical covenant was added to and became a part of the Christian Church, *for the time being.* "The law was added because of transgression" — a pattern of good things — "a figure for *the time then present.*" It was given, not as a hindrance, but a help — "to bring us to Christ." Now, if Christ's blood and atonement belong to the covenant of grace, and he be the Mediator of *that* covenant, it is plain, that all the types, and figures, and shadows which point to him, must belong to the same constitution of mercy. This is still further evident, when we consider, that Christ and his apostles preached "none other things than those, which the prophets and Moses did say should come." Acts xxvi: 23. Luke xxiv: 26, 46.

In establishing the identity of the Church under both dispensations, it will not be necessary to show that the passover and the Dominical supper are in all respects the same, for they are not; nor that circumcision and baptism are identical, for they are not: else there would have been no necessity for a change in the law. And when our opponents tax their ingenuity in finding out points of differences between them, it is all labor lost. These (the passover and circumcision) were given, not as the *permanent* sacraments of the Church, but only of *one dispensation* of that Church. The law was added, (including these) "*until* the seed should come." Gal. iii: 19. Then would the great Lawgiver to the Church "find fault with them," not from any defect in them; but "made them old, and ready to vanish away," because they had answered their desired end. Then he would "make" — or "*establish,*" confirm — without any further altera-

Digitized by Google

tions, the "new covenant" (new in that it never would grow old, and pass away) — "established on better promises, and sealed by the simpler sacraments of the Christian Church, baptism and the Lord's supper.

That the passover terminated on the night in which the supper was instituted, and that the latter has displaced the former — yet both substantially and sacramentally embodying the same great truth concerning the Messiah — is, we believe, nowhere disputed. This sacrament has especial reference to the *official* work of Christ in *reconciling God to man.*

But one thing remains to be proven; and our argument for the identity of the Church will have been completed: That circumcision under the Old, and baptism under the New Testament dispensations, have reference to the Messiah *in his spiritual work, in reconciling man to God* — a type of purification, and "seal of the righteousness of faith;" that

> "Water seals the blessings now,
> That once were sealed with blood."

We have abundantly shown that the Abrahamic covenant and the Christian Church are identical; that believers of all ages are the seed of Abraham — not by natural generation, but by faith in that covenant, confirmed of God in Christ, which never has been, nor can ever be annulled; and therefore is still in full force. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Circumcision was a seal of that covenant, under the former dispensation, from the time of Abraham until the coming of the seed — the Messiah. It was, therefore, for the time being, the seal of the Christian Church.

Elder Campbell, in his debate with Dr. Rice, contends that there were two covenants made with Abram; * that God's nation was built upon one, and Christ's Church upon the other; that circumcision was *the sign* to all the Jews of the first covenant, which guaranteed all manner of temporal benefits, under a special providence; the other covenant secured all "spiritual and eternal blessings, under a mediatorial dispensation." Whether this covenant had any seal at all, he does not say. "The one,"

* Debate, p. 294.

Digitized by Google

he says, "is founded on *flesh*, the other on spirit; the one received by sight and sense, the other by faith and hope." According to his theory, circumcision was *a seal* to the faith of Abraham *alone* — "to the faith which *he had;*" it did not seal the faith of any one of his seed, at all; but was a perpetual "*sign*" to them of "temporal benefits" and "national privileges." To all this it will be sufficient to reply, that when God gave the covenant to Abraham, "God's nation" did not yet exist, by four hundred and thirty years. The national covenant was made with Moses, who borrowed the rite of circumcision, and made it to include "national privileges," at Mt. Sinai. The Israelites had been held under bondage till then; and such was the state of the Church, until, at Horeb, it became *the Church of the State.* Circumcision did not originate with Moses, but with Abraham.

Besides, God made but one covenant with Abraham. The New Testament speaks of but one. The promises contained in Gen. xiith and xvth chapters, are all included in the xviith, with the seal of circumcision affixed; and this seal was to be applied to all the seed of Abraham. It contained "temporal benefits" — the land of Canaan; "national blessings" — a numerous seed; and "all spiritual and eternal blessings." "I will be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee." Gen. xvii: 1–10.

Paul, (Rom. iv: 12, 13,) says that the blessings of circumcision are not through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. They were not confined to the circumcised only, (the Jews,) but to the uncircumcised also, (the Gentiles.) But if circumcision secured only national blessings — a numerous seed, and the land of Canaan — it must have secured these to the Gentiles also, though not circumcised.

Again, if it were the *sign* only to all but Abraham, to whom alone it was "both a sign and a seal," what does the Apostle mean when he says "that is *not* circumcision which is outward in the flesh?" It is surely "a sign" — but still it is not real circumcision. And why did the Jews depend upon circumcision for salvation, if it were merely a sign of temporal benefits? And why did Christ, the heir of the world, submit to it? Was it to insure him a title to the land of Canaan? Did he not fulfill the law of circumcision, and abolish it forever? And does that abol-

Digitized by Google

ish all title which the Jews have to the land of Canaan, and to all national privileges? He that was circumcised was thereby made a debtor to do the whole law; and that law required him to love the Lord his God with his whole heart. The law (including circumcision) was added, "until the seed should come." Then it was to be abolished — and, if Mr. Campbell's view be correct, the national existence of the Jews is abolished with it.

We conclude, then, that circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he (Abraham) had, *as the father and representative of all true believers.* It was to all pious Jews "a sign and a seal of the circumcision of the heart;" in other words, it was the seal of God's great Church covenant.

INFERENCE.

We think that we have most conclusively proven, (1.) that the Abrahamic covenant and the Christian Church are identical; that they are not "two religions," but one and the same under different administrations. (2.) That a change in the *forms* of the Church's administration does not destroy this identity. (3.) That circumcision was the sign and seal of that Church covenant, until it was fulfilled and abolished by Christ, "who is the end of the law."

Therefore, the infant children of believers were, by positive law of God, put into the Christian Church when it was first organized; and unless that law has been "annulled" — which is impossible — they are still, and of right ought to be, members of the visible Church of Christ.

And if they are entitled to a place in the house of God, there can arise no dispute among those who differ from us as to the duty of Christian parents in presenting their children for baptism — the sign and seal of the righteousness of faith of the Church as it is in our day. If they are identified with their parents in their Church relations, there can be no question as to their right to the ordinance of baptism.

But infant children are identified with their parents in every relation of life, whether civil or ecclesiastical. Not only is this truth written with a pencil of light on every page of Revelation, but deeply engraven with the point of a diamond, in the constitution of our nature. In every covenant that God ever made with

Digitized by Google

man, parents and their children are identified; they stand, or fall together. This is true of the covenant of works with Adam, before the fall — of the covenant with Noah — and with Abraham, which is the development of the Christian covenant. The keeping of that covenant consisted, in part, in applying the sign and seal thereof to the person of the seed. "This is the covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every male child among you shall be circumcised. And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." Gen. xvii: 10, 14. Such is the organic unity existing between parents and their children, that this relation lies at the foundation of all government, both in church and state. By this irrevocable law of nature, they stand together in every relation of life. According as the parents are aliens or citizens, either in the spiritual or civil commonwealth, so are their children.

Out of the relation which *by nature* the parent and his child sustain toward each other, and both toward God, arises the obligation on the part of the parent to consecrate both himself and his child unto the Lord. We are bound to love God, not because we are *Christians*, but because we are *human beings*. The consecration of ourselves and our children does not impose any new obligations upon us; it is only an acknowledgment of those which already existed, and that by a law which is infinitely, eternally, and unchangeably binding. The innocent child, therefore, even of the unbelieving parent, has a right to its place in the house of God, by virtue of this fundamental law of nature. But the "unbelieving" parent abridges both himself and child of this glorious birthright, by refusing to make the consecration of, first, himself, and then his child, to the Lord. For the virtue of the ordinance of baptism does not consist in the outward application of the element, either to the infant or the adult; but in discharging the duties growing out of this covenant relation. By being circumcised or baptized, the believer becomes a debtor to do the whole law; and if he keep the law, then verily he is profited by the rite — else not. Rom. ii: 25. Hence God gave to Abraham, for himself and seed, the rite of circumcision: "For I know him,

Digitized by Google

that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord," &c. Gen. xviii: 19.

Here arises, to the mind of some, an objection regarded as fatal to this view of the subject — in that only *male children* were circumcised.

Dr. Carson says that circumcision "was given as a badge of national distinction, which all male Jews, whether pious or wicked, were required to possess." It was not given to the Jews as a badge of national distinction, for at that time they had no such existence; and if they had, it would fail to distinguish them from other nations who practiced circumcision. "It was a seal of the righteousness of faith" — of spiritual blessings mainly, as all the word of God abundantly shows. Neither did God require it to be bestowed on wicked Jews, for he did not require them to be wicked at all.

Circumcision surely meant something. The Jews rested in it as a condition of salvation — wickedly it is true. What then does it mean? What blessings does it convey, or is it a sign and seal of? "Temporal benefits, and national blessings?" If females could not be members of the Church for the want of circumcision, then, according to the objector, they had no title to the land of Canaan, nor any of those temporal benefits. The objection recoils with as much force against one theory as the other.

Why it was that the Lord required that only the males should appear before him three times every year, (Deut. xvi: 16, Ex. xxiii: 17,) we may not be able to determine. He has not explained the reason why he put between them a difference which is now removed by the gospel — "where there is neither male nor female." The probable reason was this: circumcision has respect to the incarnation of Christ. The male was to be cut off from the privilege of being the progenitor of Christ. The Messiah was conceived in the womb of the Virgin, by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost. The Messiah was the seed of the covenant with Abraham. This painful rite was imposed upon his spiritual seed, to denote their depravity and exposedness to Divine wrath — the necessity of pardon, regeneration of heart, to be effected by the promised seed. The sign and seal of this regeneration of heart was put upon the male organ of generation —

Digitized by Google

to show that it was not by blood or by birth, but by the overshadowing and regeneration of the Holy Ghost. John i: 14, and iii: 1–7.

Hence it was, that circumcision then had (as baptism now has) for its spiritual import, the regeneration of the spiritual seed, by the Holy Ghost. Hence the Apostle Paul compares the baptism of the Holy Spirit, or spiritual baptism, to the circumcision of Christ made without hands. Col. ii: 11, 12. The idea that circumcision was a fleshly ordinance — a mere carnal rite, without any spiritual significance — is directly in the face of both the Old and New Testaments. If baptism is an ordinance of spiritual import, so also is circumcision. They both are a sign and seal of spiritual blessings — of the regeneration and sanctification of the heart. They both refer to Christ, not in his official work, in procuring and imputing a justifying righteousness; but in his spiritual work, imparting to us a sanctifying righteousness — what he does in us, and not what he does for us. In proof of this, let the candid reader examine the following passages; Deut. xxx: 6; Rom. ii: 28, 29, and iv: 11; Col. ii: 11; Jer. iv: 4; 1 Cor. vii: 18, 19; Gal. v: 7; Phil. iii: 8; Rom. iii: 1, and xv: 8.

As we have already shown, circumcision had reference to the spiritual work of Christ, as it was connected with his *incarnation*. Hence it was applied only to males. But as he could not continue in the flesh, by reason of death, so circumcision must cease at the time of his death. But baptism had reference to the spiritual reign of Christ, in his exalted state — because, when ascended on high, he would send down the Comforter, with all his spiritual "gifts to men." Circumcision was given to the Jews, because Messiah would be a Jew and a minister of circumcision. But baptism was given also to the Gentiles; inaugurating the glorious reign of the Spirit; including, as did the covenant with Abraham, "all nations;" enlarging the boundaries of the Church; taking away the middle wall of partition; and breaking down all distinction between Jew and Gentile, bond and free, male and female.

Baptism is to be a permanent ordinance, because it is the seal of a covenant which will not be consummated until the knowl-

Digitized by Google

edge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters do the great deep; until all shall know him from the *least* unto the greatest. This is evidently what we are to understand as to what Daniel (ii: 44) means, when he speaks of the kingdom of God as being still in the future: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to others, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." The plain meaning of the prophet is, that the Messiah would "cause to stand up again," and establish permanently, his kingdom; it should not be swallowed up as the other great empires of earth, and left to other people, but would stand forever.

If the kingdom of heaven, or the Christian Church, was not organized until the day of Pentecost, then the Messiah did not set it up at all. And if he did set it up in the days of his flesh, why did he teach his disciples to pray for its coming? In what sense did he say it was near at hand?

In one sense the kingdom of God had already come. Many centuries before that, it had been organized. But the Jews as a nation had rejected their Messiah. The building had nearly fallen into ruins. It would be rebuilt upon the same foundations, with vastly increased splendor. But that it had a real existence while Christ taught his disciples to pray "thy kingdom come," is evident from the fact that thousands "were pressing into it," "taking it by force." "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." Luke xi: 20.

But it was still to come with power and great glory. We all still offer that petition, "Thy kingdom come." In this sense, it is still future; and yet who doubts its present existence? For the Saviour told his disciples that when they should "see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory, know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." Luke xxi: 31. So when Satan shall be overthrown, a loud voice is to proclaim, "Now is come salvation, and the kingdom of our God." Rev. xii: 10.

But it is objected that circumcision did not cease at the death of Christ. The objection is forcibly put by Mr. Booth. He says:

"That baptism did not come in the place of circumcision, we have

Digitized by Google

the strongest presumptive evidence. If baptism succeeded in the place of circumcision, how came it that both of them were in full force at the same time — from the commencement of John's ministry to the death of Christ? If one institution succeeds in the place of another, we are unavoidably led to consider the other as having vacated its place. . . . . Admitting the succession pretended, how came it that Paul circumcised Timothy after he had been baptized? . . . . . Had the supposed succession been a fact, not only the Apostles, but all the Apostolic churches must have known it. What was the reason, then, that so many of the Jewish converts were highly disgusted at the thought of circumcision being laid aside? Why such warm endeavors to support the credit of an ancient economy, which they themselves must have known to be obsolete, and for this very reason: *Baptism came in its room?*"

All that we have cared to prove is, that circumcision was the seal of God's Church covenant, from Abraham unto Christ; and that baptism is his seal of the same Church covenant, from Christ till the present. We have no need to prove that the one succeeded and corresponded in all respects to the other. It is probable that baptism, at least as a ritual ceremony, is much older than circumcision. Gen. xxxv: 2. It was in vogue in the days of Moses. 1 Cor. x: 1, 2. The Jews had their divers baptisms. The baptism of John did not take them by surprise as a new thing. They did not readily give way to innovations; and for this very reason they clung to circumcision for several centuries after the death of Christ. But this does not prove that it *was right* to have done so. Circumcision *ought to* have terminated at the day of Pentecost. It *has* ceased as a religious ordinance. And why did it not cease *at once?*

We answer: First, because there was no real antagonism between the two rites. They coëxisted before the death of Christ; why may they not afterwards? The Hebrew Christians, more or less strictly, adhered to the law of Moses during the second century. They kept both the Jewish and the Christian Sabbath. There was nothing really wrong in this; yet who doubts that it was the Saviour's intention that the latter should supersede the former?

Secondly: Circumcision was allowed in accommodation to the strong religious prejudices of the Jewish Christians, until they

Digitized by Google

could learn more of the spiritual nature of the Messiah's kingdom. Paul circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews." Acts xvi: 3. But he labored hard to convince those churches which he founded, that circumcision was now at an end. Gal. v: 1–5, and vi: 15; 1 Cor. vii: 19. In proof of this, we find believing Jews, having much of the old leaven, accusing Paul: "thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles .... that they ought not to circumcise their children." Acts xxi: 20, 21. They were all zealous of the law; many of them teaching that, unless they were circumcised, they could not be saved. Besides, the name of Christian was synonymous with death, and the loss of all things. This was another powerful motive influencing them to preserve the forms of their ancient worship. "As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, constrain you to be circumcised: only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ." Gal. vi: 12.

For these reasons the Jewish Christians did not, for a time, allow baptism to displace circumcision; but practiced both rites. But the Gentile believers did so understand and receive baptism, as in the room of circumcision. Paul, when writing to the Colossians (ii: 11,) addressed himself, not to *Jewish* converts: "In Christ ye are circumcised, with the circumcision made *without hands*" — Christian baptism; whereas they (the Jews) had the circumcision made *by hands* — *i. e*, of Moses; but to Gentile converts, to whom Christian baptism was in the room of circumcision.

So Justin, A. D. 140, writes:

"We Gentile Christians, also, have not received that circumcision according to the flesh; but that circumcision which is spiritual..... We have received this circumcision in baptism, and it is enjoined on all to receive it in like manner."

In answering the question, "Why if circumcision be a good thing, do we not use it as well as the Jews did? his answer was: "Because we Gentile Christians are circumcised by baptism, with Christ's circumcision." To support this sentiment the writer refers to Col. ii: 11, 12.

John Chrysostom, Hom. 40, in Gen., says:

Digitized by Google

"There was pain and trouble in the practice of that Jewish circumcision; but *our* circumcision, (I mean the grace of baptism,) gives cure without pain, and this for infants as well as men." *

Evidently the Apostles, and the Fathers who lived nearest to them, understood it that Christian baptism was designed to supersede circumcision; as it has, in fact already done.

But, as far as the Jews were concerned, when the two dispensations met, the one did not suddenly give place to the other. They overlapped each other, and were dove-tailed together. John the Baptist and the disciples of Christ were never baptized. They had been put into the Church in infancy by circumcision, and had never apostatized. Christ, being the connecting link between the two dispensations, received both. The converts on the day of Pentecost were baptized, though they had already been circumcised in infancy. But they had rejected the Messiah, and apostatized from the faith. And for this reason their children were not, in all probability, baptized — because they had received circumcision, and had not renounced their allegiance to the true Messiah.

But the opponents of infant baptism derive their most formidable objection to it from the commission of Christ to his disciples. Baptism, they admit, is the sign and seal of the Gospel Church: but it is, by the words of the commission, to be given to believers only, and not to their children. But we have already seen that the parties to the Christian covenant, from the first, were parents and their children. The covenant with Abraham included "all nations," and so does the great commission — the most comprehensive term possible, including old and young, Jew and Gentile, male and female.

But it is objected that, by the express terms of the commission, the rite of baptism is limited to believers. As children are incapable of faith, so they ought not to receive baptism. But the object of this commission was not to define the subject of baptism, but of salvation. All who are fit subjects for salvation, are also for baptism. But as respects one class contained in the commission — adults — he says they must believe in order to salvation, and be baptized as an expression of their faith; for

* Apostolic Baptism, by C. Taylor, p. 74.

Digitized by Google

the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant descend the line of faith, and not of natural generation. If baptism is a consequent of faith, so is salvation. If you deny infants baptism for their want of faith, so you do also salvation for the same reason. A strict and literal construction of the passage, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," would exclude not only infants, but females, both from baptism and salvation.

All nations are to be proselyted by preaching, teaching, and baptizing. And because faith is required of a part of those included in the commission — *i. e.* adults — in order to baptism, is it fair to deny baptism to another part, included, but not specified — *i. e.* infants — because they are incapable of faith, and do not need to have it in order to be saved! The whole weight of the objection rests upon the false assumption that the Church was founded on the day of Pentecost — of which there is not the faintest intimation in the Scriptures. The converts on that day were added to the hundred and twenty, the Church which already existed at Jerusalem. Christ did not organize a new Church, nor institute a new religion. The commission itself differed but little, if any, from the instructions which he had previously given his disciples. He had "commanded" them before what they must do, in discharging their commission. Mat. xxviii: 20. He only enlarged their commission, removing former restrictions so as to include all nations. They understood what the Saviour meant by proselyting. But hitherto their mission was limited to the Jews. Under the immediate eye of their master, they had made many proselytes. "For Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John," or rather his disciples did it for him. They knew how, and to whom, they were to administer baptism. From long and familiar practice, they understood this perfectly. What they are henceforth required to do, was to apply the same practice to the Gentile converts. As infants had all along been included, it was wholly unnecessary to mention them as still included. Let it be remembered that this commission was given to *Jews;* who, of all people on earth, were the most tenacious of the religious rights of their children. They were so scrupulous in this regard, that they would circumcise a child on the sabbath day; while they found fault with Christ for healing a man on that day.

Digitized by Google

Let us suppose Christ to have given that commission to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; and commanded them to *Presbyterianize* all the nations. Would it have been necessary for him to have said "Be sure to baptize your children! Don't forget to bring your little ones along with you?" In this case, not the shadow of a doubt could have rested on the mind of any one, as to the propriety of infant baptism. But had it been the intention of the Saviour that henceforth these should be left out, would it not have been necessary to have excluded them by a spiritual edict? But no such repealing clause can be found. The very silence of the commission about infants, is proof as strong as proof of Holy Writ that they are expected to retain their place, undisturbed, in the house of God. The whole arrangement, in this regard, remains just as it was in the days of Abraham. He believed in God, and received justification by faith before he was circumcised; and his children were circumcised, and received the seal of the righteousness of faith before they believed.

There are other objections, of minor importance and scarcely worthy of notice; but they seem to have great weight with those who put them forward. One is, infants cannot understand what is done for them, nor confess Christ, &c. Neither could they, under the former dispensation. They do not understand that they are human beings, and members of the commonwealth; but they are both.

Again: "If all were baptized in infancy there would soon be none left to profess Christ publicly." This is a mere begging of the question; taking for granted the point in dispute. Besides, the objection goes upon the supposition that the only thing that constitutes real obedience to Christ, is the external form of baptism. Would not the Saviour greatly prefer that his children should consecrate to him the very dew of their youth, and grow up "*in the* nurture and admonition of the Lord;" than wait until they become hardened into rebellion and stiffened into stone, and then profess him publicly?

Again: "The doctrine of infant baptism leads to the union of church and state:" and in proof of this we are cited to the Churches of Rome and of England. But because two things in

Digitized by Google

some instances coëxist, are we allowed to draw the sweeping conclusion that they sustain toward each other the relation of cause and effect? Coëxistence is not causation. Who can point out the precise connection between "sprinkling a little water on an infant's face," and the union of church and state?

Again: Dr. Howell, in his work on the "Evils of Infant Baptism," says — "It [infant baptism] brings into the Church, not the spiritual and the pure only, but also all classes of men." So does the doctrine taught by anti-pedobaptists. Christ's Church on earth has ever been a mixed church.

Again: He says — "The doctrine taught by pedobaptists would bring every child on earth into the Church." Well, if every child on earth were brought into the Church, and trained up according to the obligations which the rite of infant baptism imposes "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," it would certainly be a very great calamity! "But this," continues Dr. Howell, "would blot out every vestige of the Church itself, by wholly destroying its visibility." That is, if every human being on earth were in the Church, the Church would be no longer visible! Yes — then the kingdom of this world would be all swallowed up, and lost, by becoming the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. What a happy and glorious union of church and state! Then, indeed, there would be "none left to profess the name of Christ." What a pity!

Finally: It is asked, "what good can infant baptism do?" Baptism, abstractly, can do no good to any one. It does not convey, by any mystic or mechanical force, its blessings either to infant or adult. The Holy Spirit employs it as a sign and a seal of spiritual blessings, only when the obligations which the rite imposes are rightly discharged by the parent for the child, and the believer for himself.

By birth as American citizens, children have a right to an education, and to the property of their parents. But the title in itself is of no value — unless actual *conveyance is made to the child.* The child comes into the actual possession of the blessings of an education by patient and laborious instruction on the part of the parent, and diligent application of its own intellectual powers afterwards. So, the consecration of a child on the part of the

Digitized by Google

parent, pledges that parent to a diligent and prayerful use of all the means of grace given for the edification of his child, in the knowledge and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. Ask a Jew, what good does it do for him to devote his child to God, when eight days old, and to teach it to fear God and keep his words — "binding them for a sign upon your hand, that they may be as frontlets between your eyes; teaching them to your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up; writing them upon the door-posts of thy house, and upon thy gates." Deut. xi: 18–20. Ask a heathen parent what good does it do to devote his child to his idol god, and teach it all the principles of false religion.

God has set Israel in families. Family religion is the most tremendous agency, either for good or evil, in all the world. That it is liable to abuse, that it has been sadly perverted, we do not deny; so has every truth contained in the gospel. There is not a religion on earth that could long perpetuate itself, that ignored this most powerful instrumentality. Judaism, Paganism, Mohammedism, the Papacy, all look to family religion as the very source of all their vitality. And so must the true Church of Christ. He has not overlooked an instrumentality of such tremendous power. Family religion was the very first organized form of religion on earth. The hope of the Church, and the world, is in the family. All social order, national strength, and religious prosperity spring out of it. Its roots go down deeper into the heart than those of any of the other natural relations. It lies back of, and beneath, all other holy relations. By a mysterious tie of our nature, parents and their children are united in destiny as well as in affection. Adam and his whole family are constructively one; "we sinned in him." Both the law and the providence of God declare that parents and their children are thus identified. Hence, he will "visit the iniquities of the fathers upon their children," &c.

Of all the attempts to overthrow Christianity, none were ever conceived in greater wisdom than that of modern infidelity — the attempt to overthrow the family relation. Socialism, in France or in America, if it could have been carried out, would

Digitized by Google

have obliterated Christianity from the earth. If it be possible, conceive of the horrible picture which society would thus present, were the whole human family resolved into one promiscuous herd!

The most powerful agencies in nature are those that are most silent and imperceptible. That great astronomic force that adjusts the rolling worlds to their spheres is just as powerful as it is silent. The Saviour compares his kingdom to the process of germination. How wonderful the process by which the "least of all seeds becomes a great tree," and the sprouting germ becomes "the full corn in the ear!" In a few days it carpets the earth in its velvet of green, and makes the bramble to bear the blooming rose, and the leafless tree puts forth its foliage and its fruit! Yet this miraculous transformation is all brought about by a process as silent as the fall of the dew-drop.

Analogous to this is the silent, but potent influence of domestic piety. The child — a diffusion of ourselves — is given to us at a time when it is least hardened to evil, and most susceptible of good. The natural instincts of both parent and child unite them by the most tender and indissoluble tie on earth. What sacred emotions thrill the heart of the newly made parent, when he looks upon the features of that helpless yet immortal being —

> "An heir of glory, frail child of dust,
> Helpless immortal — insect infinite —
> A worm, a god!"

Here begins an immortality that henceforth is to run on in parallel lines with the existence of Jehovah himself. That infant being is brought into a wicked world; its nature is corrupt; the very air it breathes is contaminated with sin. It is a creature of imitation; at once it looks to the parent for instruction and example. The influence of the parent is almost omnipotent. The child begins to drink in its very being from every look, and tone, and gesture, and word, and action of the parent. The unconscious influence of the parent upon the child, for the first decade in the history of that child, is a thousand fold greater than all others put together. But the devout parent knows that he can operate upon his child only by the uncertain influences

Digitized by Google

of education and example. But it has a wicked heart, and is in a wicked world. It must be trained for the skies. Now what is to be done? Why, the very instincts of natural affection would prompt the Christian parent to bring it, at once, unto the Lord, and consecrate it to him in an everlasting covenant. "Ah, but I can do all this as well without such a public consecration as with it." But will you do it? Why did you make a public consecration of yourself to God? Could you not lead a religious life as well without it? But if it be right to make such a consecration, there is but one method pointed out in the Scriptures by which it can be effected.

But, to the question: "What good can it do?" Let us suppose that every parent in all the earth, taking an enlightened and scriptural view of his relations toward God and his offspring, would bring his children to Him; feeling that they are immortal beings, in a wicked world, with corrupt natures — feeling, too, his entire dependence upon the grace of God to make his instructions effectual in their salvation; and would enter into a most solemn covenant that he would, by precept and example, bring them up "*in* the nurture of the Lord." In one generation the Millenium would burst upon us in all its glory!

That believers are required and expected to thus bring up their children in the way they *should go*, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, cannot be called in question. And has he made no provision for it? Must they first grow up in sin as a necessary preparation for his mercy? Has God made room for them in the purposes of his grace, in the atonement of his Son, in the nurture of his Spirit — room for them in heaven, and in the first dispensation of his Church on earth — and yet are we told that the lambs of the flock have no place in the fold, under the more enlarged and liberal economy of the Christian Church?

"Now, where every other great and noble blessing, circumscribed and tied up under the first economy, breaks out into boundless development in our day, is it not an outrage upon the broad and liberal genius of the gospel, to suppose that this very year of jubilee — which strikes to the earth all checks and hindrances to God's redeeming mercy — should take from the persons of all the children of the Church

Digitized by Google

that strengthening, comforting sign and seal of God's covenanted adoption, which all the narrowness of the early dispensation could not deny them; and should cast our offspring out of God's family unsealed, to wander among the cursed heathen? The sign and seal of God's covenant, so comfortably pledging God's gracious and necessary help — why should it be granted to the children of our fathers, in the old dispensation, but denied to our children amidst the abounding philanthropies of the gospel? What shadow of a reason for this forbidding conclusion do we find either in the *foundations*, or in the *spirit*, or in the *object*, or in the administration of the covenant? What one thought can reason allege for this chilling limitation?" *

T. H. C.

* Presbyterian Review, p. 554.

ERRATA:

In the note on page 391, *read* Buchlin *for* Reuchlin.
On page 414, last line, *for* 1604 *read* 1574.

END OF VOL. I.

Digitized by Google

THE BIBLE ITS OWN INTERPRETER.

CRUDEN'S COMPLETE CONCORDANCE TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES,

OR, A

DICTIONARY AND ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO THE BIBLE.

BY ALEXANDER CRUDEN, M.A.

By which I. Any verse in the Bible may be easily found by looking for any material word in the verse. To which is added,——II. The significations of the principal words, by which their true meaning in the Scriptures is shown.——III. An account of Jewish Customs and Ceremonies, illustrative of many portions of the Sacred Record.——IV. A Concordance to the proper names of the Bible, and their meaning in the original.——V. A Concordance to the Books called Apocrypha. To which is added AN ORIGINAL LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

ONE VOLUME, ROYAL 8vo., PRICE $3 50.

TESTIMONIALS.

From Rev. M. W. Jacobus, D.D., *Theological Seminary, Pittsburg.*—"No topical arrangement of passages, however complete or useful in its way, can answer the same purpose. It is, indeed, a self-interpreting Bible—the Bible arranged in a way to interpret itself. Such a verbal Concordance as Cruden has produced is more needful to the Bible student than the Dictionary to a common reader."

From Rev. Thomas DeWitt, D.D.—"It is invaluable to the Biblical student, and the abridgements which have been made of it furnish no idea of the thoroughness and fullness of the original and complete work. Other works, such as *Gaston's Collections, Scripture Manual, Analyses of the Bible*, etc., have their special excellence and uses, but can never supply the place of the original Cruden's Concordance."

From Rev. W. B. Sprague, D.D., *Albany.*—"It has been the companion of my whole life, both as a theological student and a minister; and it is the last book, with the exception of the Bible itself, that I would consent to have pass out of my hands."

From Rev. Bishop M'Ilvaine, D.D., (*Episcopal,*) *Ohio.*—"No English Concordance can take its place, or do without it. It is equally precious to the minister of the Word and the earnest reader of the Scriptures, of any sort or condition of men."

WE ALSO PUBLISH

THE WORKS OF THE LATE DR. I. S. SPENCER,

EMBRACING

A PASTOR'S SKETCHES, (1st and 2d Series,) each.....$1 00
SERMONS, WITH A MEMOIR, 2 vols..... 2 50
DISCOURSES ON SACRAMENTAL OCCASIONS, (Just out,)..... 1 25

THE WORKS OF GARDINER SPRING, D.D.,

ELEVEN VOLUMES, EMBRACING

The Attractions of the Cross, 1 vol.; The Mercy Seat, 1 vol.; The Power of the Pulpit, 1 vol.; First Things, 2 vols.; Short Sermons for the People, 1 vol.; The Glory of Christ, 2 vols.; The Obligations of the World to the Bible, 1 vol.; The Contrast between the Good and Bad Men of the Bible, 2 vols.

In Setts, $12, *or separately*, $1 25 *per vol.*

HISTORY AND REPOSITORY OF PULPIT ELOQUENCE,

(DECEASED DIVINES,)

Containing the masterpieces of the marked men of all countries and times, from the Fathers to the Present Age; with Historical Sketches of Preaching, and Biographical and Critical Notices. By Henry C. Fish, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo.....$5 00

PULPIT ELOQUENCE OF THE 19th CENTURY,

Containing Discourses from eminent LIVING Divines of six different countries, accompanied with Portraits, and Biographical and Critical Notices. By Henry C. Fish, D.D. 1 vol. 8vo.....$3 50

With many other valuable works, as per our Catalogue, which we are happy to forward, post-paid, on application.

M. W. DODD, Publisher and Bookseller,

506 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Digitized by Google

PERIODICALS PUBLISHED BY

The American Sunday School Union,

PHILADELPHIA.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL WORLD

Is published by the American Sunday School Union on the FIRST WEDNESDAY of every month, and embraces the interests of Sunday Schools, and their improvement and extension at HOME and ABROAD.

It contains a general survey of the Missionary field occupied by the AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, and kindred institutions in the United States and other parts of Christendom.

It presents a summary of Sunday School intelligence from all sources within reach, and a view of the progress and prospects of religious education generally.

TERMS.

Single copies, - - - - - - - - - - - -	$0 50 a year.	Ten copies, - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	$4 50 a year.
Five copies, to one address, - - - -	2 40 "	Twenty copies, - - - - - - - - - - - -	8 00 "

THE CHILD'S WORLD,

A NEW CHEAP ILLUSTRATED PAPER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH,

WILL BE PUBLISHED BY

THE AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION,

JANUARY 1, 1862.

"THE CHILD'S WORLD," a paper intended to furnish the children and youth of the United States with reading matter for the improvement of mind and heart, carefully prepared and illustrated with engravings. It will be conducted in accordance with the principles and objects of the Society, inculcating virtuous habits, and instilling the truths of our divine religion. Each number will contain one page devoted specially in type and contents to the YOUNGEST READERS.

"THE CHILD'S WORLD" will be issued semi-monthly, and will take the place of the *Sunday School Banner*, heretofore published by the Society, which will be discontinued after the current year. The first number of "THE CHILD'S WORLD" in each month will be printed independently as a MONTHLY, for those who do not wish to take the paper twice a month. The terms of "THE CHILD'S WORLD" will be as follows:

To Subscribers in Clubs.			*Sent by mail, postage pre-paid.*		
	Monthly.	Semi-Monthly.		Monthly.	Semi-Monthly.
10 copies, per year,	$0 90	$1 80	10 copies, per year,	$1 15	$2 30
15 " "	1 20	2 40	15 " "	1 57	3 15
25 " "	1 88	3 75	25 " "	2 50	5 00
50 " "	3 50	7 00	50 " "	4 75	9 50
75 " "	4 88	9 75	75 " "	6 75	13 50
100 " "	6 00	12 00	100 " "	8 50	17 00

An edition of the Monthly will also be printed on superior paper at the following rates:

To Club Subscribers.		*By mail, postage pre-paid.*	
10 copies, per year,	$1 00	15 copies, per year,	$2 00
50 " "	4 50	50 " "	6 00
100 " "	8 00	100 " "	11 00

No club subscription to either edition will be received for a less number than 10. For any number more than 10 and less than 15, the 10 rate is charged; for more than 15 and less than 25, the 15 rate is charged, and so on.

For any number less than 10 the single rate is charged, 12 cents for the Monthly, and 25 cents for the Semi-Monthly. Subscriptions for a less period than one year are received at proportionate rates. When furnished at the club rate they must all be sent to one address.

☞ PAYMENT INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

Specimen copies furnished gratuitously on (post-paid) applications to any of the Depositories.

Philadelphia, No. 1122 Chestnut Street,

New York, 599 Broadway, Boston, 141 Washington Street.

Sample copies furnished and subscriptions received also by George Crosby, 41 West Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio; Tomlinson Brothers, 153 and 155 Lake Street, Chicago, Illinois; J. W. McIntyre, 9 South Fifth Street, St. Louis, Mo.; and by Wm. H. Bulkley, 313 Fourth Street, Louisville, Ky.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS

PUBLISHED BY

SWAN, BREWER & TILESTON,

NO. 131 Washington St. Boston.

A liberal discount to the Trade, to Teachers, and to Schools.

A Hand-Book of Classical Geography, Chronology,

MYTHOLOGY AND ANTIQUITIES.

Prepared for the use of Schools by T. P. ALLEN and W. F. ALLEN, 12mo. 131 pp. Price, 50 cents.

This work is the most complete and useful Hand-Book, in this department of learning, extant. It contains: Ancient Geography, Ancient Chronology, Grecian Mythology, Roman Mythology, Egyptian Mythology, Grecian Antiquities, Roman Antiquities, Miscellaneous Tables, Genealogies, &c., &c. Sent by mail, on receipt of price.

Manual of Agriculture.

An Elementary Treatise, comprising the Principles and Practice of Agriculture, including the composition of Soils, the Atmosphere, Water, Manures, etc., the Preparation of Lands, the Culture of Special Crops, the Principles of Rotation, the Diseases and Enemies of Growing Plants, the Choice and Management of Farm Stock, and the General Economy of the Farm and the Household. For the use of Schools, Families and Farmers, by GEORGE B. EMERSON and CHARLES L. FLINT. Illustrated by many Engravings. Price, 75 cents. Sent by mail on receipt of price.

The Board of Agriculture of Massachusetts, have given the following hearty endorsement:

Resolved, That this Board approve of the Manual of Agriculture, submitted by the authors, George B. Emerson and Charles L. Flint, and recommend its publication by these gentlemen, as a work well adapted for use in the schools of Massachusetts.

Outlines of Universal History.

From the Creation of the World to the Present time. By Dr. GEORGE WEBER, Professor and Director of the High School, Heidelberg. 8vo. 575 pages, price $1 67. Sent by mail on receipt of price.

This work has met with unprecedented favor, and become the Standard Text-Book in many of the Colleges, Academies and High Schools in the United States. It is the best compend of Universal History ever published.

Worcester's Series of Dictionaries.

A National Standard both in England and America. Consisting of Worcester's School Dictionary, 38 cents; Worcester's Elementary Dictionary, 75 cents; Worcester's Comprehensive Dictionary, $1.12; Worcester's Academic Dictionary, $1.75; Worcester's Universal and Critical Dictionary, $3.50; Worcester's Quarto Dictionary, $7.50.

These Dictionaries have received the approval of the most eminent literary men, both in England and America. The Royal Quarto Dictionary, although first published in January, 1860, has already become the standard work in most of the literary institutions in the country; while the smaller works, especially the Comprehensive and the Primary School Dictionaries, have been extensively introduced into the best academies and Common Schools in the United States.

Digitized by Google

A New Hebrew Grammar.

JOHN WILEY,

56 Walker Street, New York,

HAS JUST PUBLISHED

A GRAMMAR OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

By Prof. Wm. Henry Green,

Of the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

Complete in one 8vo. volume. Cloth - - - $2 50.

This work has received high commendation from those who have examined it, and has already been introduced into a number of the leading Theological Seminaries.

The following are a portion of the favorable notices it has received;

From Rev. Prof. Jacobus, D. D.—We have introduced it here, and weregard it as fitted to supply the want of our Theological Seminaries in the Grammar of the Old Testament."

From Dr. Lyman Colman.—"It is but simple justice to say that it is refreshing to have at least an intelligible Grammar of the Hebrew language."

From the Presbyterian Quarterly Review.—"That there is room for a better Hebrew Grammar all will admit; that Prof. Green has made it, we are much inclined to believe." . . . "We are pleased to see that our general idea of the excellence of this Grammar is confirmed by our contemporaries."

From the Christian Herald and Presbyterian Recorder.—"On the whole we are clearly of opinion that this Hebrew Grammar is an advance upon those which have preceded it, and must be regarded as occupying the front place among the accessible Hebrew Grammars in the English language," &c.

From the Boston Recorder.—"We have bestowed sufficient attention upon this Grammar to be satisfied that it is an advance upon any and all works of the kind in the English language," &c.

From the Presbyterian.—"Thus his Grammar is likely to supersede those in common use."

*** Copies will be mailed and postpaid on the receipt of the price. Professors in Seminaries can have a copy by mail for examination for $1.50.

IMPORTATION OF BOOKS, &c.

☞ Books and Periodicals for the Trade, Public and School Libraries, and Private Persons, imported by the single copy, or in quantity, from England and France. School Libraries and Public Institutions receive their Books free of duty.

Orders Forwarded weekly by the Steamers.

Catalogues and Cheap lists furnished promptly to order on receipt of Postage Stamps.

American Books, in every department, furnished promptly to order, and on the most favorable terms, *and single copies mailed to any part of the United States on receipt of their value.*

JOHN WILEY, 56 Walker St.

Digitized by Google

"GET THE BEST."

WEBSTER'S UNABRIDGED DICTIONARY.

NEW PICTORIAL EDITION.

PICTORIAL ILLUSTRATIONS OF MILITARY TERMS.

Webster's Dictionary excels in these, and has, among others, pictorial representations of the following:

Barbacan, Bastion, Battlement, Bar-shot, Block-house, Bombs, Cannon, Carronade, Chain-shot, Chevaux-de-frise, Caltrop, Limbers, Madrier, Martello Tower, Mortar, Portcullis, Ravelin, Redan, Star Forts, &c.

No other English Dictionary published in this country has a fourth part of these.

—SO ALSO ITS—

DEFINITIONS OF MILITARY TERMS.

As, the foregoing, and Abatis, Ambulance, Ambuscade, Armistice, Banquette, Bivouac, Brevet, Caisson, Caliber, Canister-shot, Cantonment, Caponiere, Casemate, Cartel, Chain-shot, Chamade, Commissary, Commissariat, Counterscarp, Chef de battaillon, Cul de sac, Dahlgren gun, &c., &c.

Sold by all Booksellers.

REBELLION RECORD,

A DIARY OF AMERICAN EVENTS,

With Illustrative Documents and Narratives, Rumors, Incidents, Poetry, Anecdotes, &c., &c. In separate Divisions.

Edited by FRANK MOORE,

AUTHOR OF "DIARY OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION,"

With an Introductory View of the Great Issues before the Country, and the causes of the Rebellion,

BY EDWARD EVERETT,

Prepared (with additions) for this work. With a Copious INDEX, etc., etc. A Colored MAP OF THE UNITED STATES, and PORTRAITS ON STEEL of Gen. SCOTT, Gen. McCLELLAN, Gen. FREMONT, Gen. BUTLER, Gen. ANDERSON, Gen. DIX, Gen. CAMERON, Gen. LYON, Gov. SPRAGUE, President LINCOLN, and JEFFERSON DAVIS.

VOLUME I., now ready, is COMPLETE IN ITSELF, containing about 800 closely-printed pages. Royal octavo. Price in cloth, $3 75; sheep extra, $4 00; half calf, antique, $5 00. It contains the ONLY FULL, IMPARTIAL and RELIABLE HISTORY OF THE

GREAT STRUGGLE FOR FREE GOVERNMENT.

This work will continue to be published weekly and monthly. Weekly Nos. at 10 cents; Monthly Parts, Illustrated, 50 cents. The Illustrations for the Weekly Nos. will be published in two Nos. at 30 cents each, making the price for weekly and monthly editions the same—viz., $3 00 for each vol. each six months. Covers for binding vol. I., in cloth, 25 cents.

G. P. PUTNAM, Publisher, 532 Broadway, N. Y.

C. T. EVANS, Gen. Agent.

Digitized by Google

THE
NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPÆDIA:

A DICTIONARY OF GENERAL KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

GEORGE RIPLEY AND CHARLES A. DANA.

To be completed in 16 *volumes, royal octavo, large size, double columns. Volumes* 1 *to* 13 *are ready, and a successive volume will be issued every three to four months.*

Price in Cloth, $3; Sheep, Library Style, $3 50; Half Morocco, $4; Half Russia, $4 50, each.

PLAN OF THE CYCLOPÆDIA.

The New American Cyclopædia presents a panoramic view of all human knowledge, as it exists at the present moment. It embraces and popularizes every subject that can be thought of. In its successive volumes is contained an inexhaustible fund of accurate and practical information on Art and Science, in all their branches, including Mechanics, Mathematics, Astronomy, Philosophy, Chemistry, and Physiology; on Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufactures; on Law, Medicine, and Theology; on Biography and History, Geography and Ethnology; on Political Economy, the Trades, Inventions, Politics, the Things of Common Life, and General Literature.

OUR SUBSCRIPTION LIST

already numbers TWELVE THOUSAND names, from every section of the country, which evidences the universal popularity of this NATIONAL WORK.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPÆDIA

is sold exclusively by subscription, and Agents have been appointed for almost all sections of the Union. In case, however, Agents are not to be found, we will receive subscriptions, and forward copies of the work, free of expense, on the receipt of the price. Persons at a distance may send money for one or more volumes at a time, it not being necessary to take the whole ten volumes at once, unless they feel inclined to do so.

D. APPLETON & CO., *Publishers*,
443 & 445 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Digitized by Google

JUST PUBLISHED,

—BY—

SMITH, ENGLISH & CO.,

Publishers, Booksellers, and Stationers,

NO. 23 NORTH SIXTH STREET,

PHILADELPHIA.

1. THOLUCK ON THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. By Dr. A. THOLUCK. Translated from the Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition, by the Rev. R. Lundin Brown, M. A., translator of "Ullmann on the Sinlessness of Jesus." 8vo. Cloth, $2 25.

2. LYONS' CHRISTIAN SONGS.

Christian Songs, Translations, and other Poems. By the Rev. J. G. LYONS, LL. D. 12mo. Cloth, 80 cents.

The present volume contains all the Christian Songs hitherto published, together with eight sacred, and fifteen other poems not included in the last edition.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Hengstenberg on Ecclesiastes, and other Treatises. 8vo	$2 00
Fleming's Vocabulary of Philosophy. Second Edition. 12mo. Cloth	1 75
Pulpit Themes and Preachers' Assistant. 12mo	1 25
Kurtz's Church History. 12mo	1 50
Farrar's Science in Theology. 12mo	85
Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Diction. Second Edition. 8vo	3 00
Stier's Words of Jesus. 5 vols., 8vo	14 00
Tholuck on John's Gospel. 8vo	2 25
Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Diction. 8vo	3 00
Fairbairn's Hermeneutical Manual. 12mo	1 50
Religious Cases of Conscience. 12mo	1 00
Helps for the Pulpit. 12mo	1 25
Gerlach on the Pentateuch. 8vo	2 50
Coles on God's Sovereignty. 12mo	63
Schmucker's Popular Theology. 12mo	1 00
Luther on Galatians. Small 8vo	1 25
Bengel's Gnomon of the New Testament. 5 vols., 8vo	*Net*, 5 00
M'Ilvaine's Evidence of Christianity. 12mo	63
Litton on the Church of Christ. 8vo	1 25

The above can be had of booksellers in all parts of the country, or will be sent by mail, prepaid, by the publishers, upon receipt of the prices advertised—Bengel's Gnomon alone excepted, which will be sent, free of expense, for $6 50.

LATELY IMPORTED.

Vaughan's Hours with the Mystics. Second Edition. Revised and Augmented by the Author. 2 vols	*Net*, $3 50
Maclaurin's Works. Edited by Rev. W. H. Goold. 2 vols., 12mo	4 00
Dictionary of Scripture Parallels. 8vo	3 00
Aikman's Cyclopedia of Missions. 12mo	1 25

Digitized by Google

THE

Danville Quarterly Review.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION BY WHICH THIS PERIODICAL IS CONDUCTED:

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,
EDWARD P. HUMPHREY,
STEPHEN YERKES,
JOSEPH T. SMITH,
} Professors in Danville Theological Seminary.

JAMES MATTHEWS,
JACOB COOPER,
} Professors in Center College, Danville, Ky.

ROBERT W. LANDIS, Pastor, Somerset, Kentucky.
JOHN M. WORRALL, " Covington, Kentucky.
ROBERT L. BRECK, " Maysville, Kentucky.

☞ Original articles or letters in reference to matter for publication in the Review, should be addressed to DANVILLE REVIEW, Danville, Kentucky, or to some member of the Association.

The DANVILLE QUARTERLY REVIEW will be issued regularly in the first week of the months of March, June, September, and December, and contain 176 pages a number.

TERMS:

For one copy, one year, payable in advance	$3 00
For one copy, two years, if paid strictly in advance	5 00
For four copies, one year, if paid strictly in advance	10 00
For five copies, one year, payable in advance, (the sender to receive the fifth copy for his trouble,)	12 00
For one copy of any single number, by mail, prepaid	80
For ten copies of any single number, by mail, prepaid	6 60
To Missionaries, if paid in advance, one copy per year	2 00

Remittances for the work, by mail, will be at the Publisher's risk, if in registered letters. Subscribers are requested to remit by mail, as it gives them the least trouble, and the money is received more promptly. Large amounts should be sent by check or draft.

This being a Quarterly Periodical, the postage, when paid by subscribers quarterly in advance, is THREE AND A HALF CENTS on each number, or FOURTEEN CENTS for the year, to all parts of the United States.

Remittances, and other letters on business, should be addressed to

RICHARD H. COLLINS,
Publisher Danville Review,
25 WEST FOURTH ST., CINCINNATI.

STATE OF THE COUNTRY.—The Article by Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, "*Our Country*," in the March No., and his two Articles in the June No., the "*State of the Country*," and "*Fast Day Discourse*," and his Article in the December No., "*The Civil War*." are *all* re-printed in *one* pamphlet. Price 35 cents, or 3 for $1; *either* Article singly for 12 cents; sent postpaid. Address as above.

Digitized by Google