

THE  
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

CONDUCTED BY AN ASSOCIATION.

VOLUME IV.



Truth and Progress.



DOVER:  
FREEWILL BAPTIST PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT.  
WM. BARR, PRINTER.  
MDCCCLVI.



INDEX.—PRINCIPAL PAPERS.

Page.

Bishop Hedding, Life and Times of, . . . . .	195
Characteristics of a Good Sermon, . . . . .	296
Christ, Sufferings of, . . . . .	440
Christ as the Divine Incarnation, . . . . .	21
Christianity, Public Conflicts of, . . . . .	1
Christianity, Spirit of, . . . . .	186
Church Membership—Its Conditions, . . . . .	151
Church, Prosperity of the, . . . . .	373
Common Schools in New England, . . . . .	454
Doctrine of the Universal Sleep of the Dead, &c., 36, 121,	321
Denomination, State of, . . . . .	424
Disciplinary State of Success, . . . . .	273
Early General Baptists in the United States, . . . . .	69
Education, . . . . .	408
English Grammar and Grammars, . . . . .	88
Greek Philosophy, . . . . .	175
Hiawatha—Longfellow, . . . . .	108
Holy Spirit, His Manifestation and Functions, . . . . .	361
Human Knowledge, Limitations of, . . . . .	145
Ministry of the Present Age, Fault of, . . . . .	74
Ministry, Studies for the, . . . . .	337
North Carolina Freewill Baptists, . . . . .	221, 328
Pastoral Labor, . . . . .	308
Retribution, Moral, as evinced in the Analogy of Nature,	241
Retribution, Idea or Doctrine of, . . . . .	384
Sea and its Teaching, . . . . .	463
Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation, . . . . .	263

INDEX.—BOOKS NOTICED.

Page.

All Aboard, . . . . .	235
American Bible Society, History of, . . . . .	358
American Atlas—by Colton, . . . . .	357
Amos Lawrence, . . . . .	239

### III

Bible History of Prayer, . . . . .	233
Caste, . . . . .	115
Chapel and Church Architecture, . . . . .	350
Christians Great Interest, . . . . .	240
Critical Commentary on Hebrews, . . . . .	355
Communion Sabbath by Dr. N. Adams, . . . . .	231
Cora and the Doctor, . . . . .	120
Daniel verified in History and Chronology, . . . . .	233
Ecclesiastes explained by James McDonald, . . . . .	354
Edith Hale, . . . . .	233
Elements of Natural Philosophy, by A. W. Sprague, . . . . .	234
English Traits, . . . . .	476
Evenings with the Romanists, . . . . .	118
Forest and Shore, . . . . .	472
Gospel in Ezekiel, . . . . .	355
Heathen Religion, in its Popular and Systematic Develop- ment, . . . . .	231
Humorous Poems of Thomas Hood, . . . . .	234
Illustrations of Scripture, . . . . .	357
Inside View of Slavery, . . . . .	234
Island of Cuba, . . . . .	232
Journey in the Seaboard Slave States, . . . . .	232
Macaulay's History of England, . . . . .	230
Memoir of Heber, . . . . .	470
Memoir of Rev. Sidney Smith, . . . . .	236
Modern Pilgrims, . . . . .	114
North Side View of Slavery, . . . . .	234
Patriarchy, . . . . .	235
Parabolic Teaching of Christ, . . . . .	118
Perversion: or the Causes and Consequences of Infidelity, . . . . .	355
Philip the Second, by Prescott, . . . . .	112
Philosophy of History, by Prof. Shedd, . . . . .	359
Physiology of Marriage, . . . . .	120
Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestic, . . . . .	115
Plymouth Collection of Hymns and Tunes, . . . . .	116
Piazza Tales, . . . . .	472
Pioneers of the West, . . . . .	470
Poems, by R. C. French, . . . . .	470
Poetical Works of Alfred Tennyson, . . . . .	471
Prescott's Histories—Ferdinand and Isabella, Conquest of Mexico, Conquest of Peru, . . . . .	228
Prophets after the Restoration, . . . . .	354
Roman Exile, . . . . .	471

IV

Sabbath Evening Readings on the New Testament, -	231
Sacred Philosophy, -	235
Selection from the British Poets, -	233
Select Remains of Rev. John Mason, -	473
Sermons for the People by F. D. Huntington, D. D., -	347
Sermons for the Sick Room, by Jabez Burns, D. D., -	118
Sinai and Palestine, -	475
Systematic Beneficence, -	233
Theology of Inventions, -	240
The Earnest Man, -	474
The End, -	119
The Time of the End, -	120
The New Ages of Gold, -	472
The Catholic, -	473
The Psalms Chronologically arranged, &c., -	474
The Tongue of Fire, -	358
Vassal Morton, -	472
Village and Farm Cottages, -	119

THE

FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

NO. XIII.---JANUARY, 1856.

---

ART. I.—THE PUBLIC CONFLICTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Christianity has attained its present position in the world by means of many earnest struggles. Her march to empire has not been steady and quiet. Her progress marks the eras of human history, and many a continental convulsion has indicated the strife from which her principles have sprung into the reverent view of men. The conflict awakened by her approach to the individual heart, and which Paul so graphically pictures in his epistle to the Romans, only symbolizes the warfare appointed her by Providence on the stage of public affairs.

And all this was to be expected, both from the announcement of the Master, and the nature of the forces which the gospel brings into contact. "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." So clearly did the Great Teacher reveal the process by means of which his truth was to win its way to supremacy. And as no iniquity, however hoary or venerated—however successfully it had passed the centuries unchallenged, or robed itself in statutory vestments—was to find toleration before the new law at length promulgated from heaven; so there was no reason for supposing that it would meet the cordial welcome of communities whose general life incarnated the views it came to exorcise. It could neither compromise with evil, nor wink it out of sight. It could never be content with a decorous exterior, beneath which demoniacal passions raged, and it had nothing of the cowardice or the worldly wisdom which leaves a Gibraltar of sin unstorm-

ed because of the difficulty of its capture. It did not simply ask a place for its divinity in the world's well-filled Pantheon; it grasped the badge of authority and proceeded to expel every other god from the temple. It did not even admit the service of religious eclecticism; it was only content with royalty. If it wore the robe of a peasant, it spoke with the tone of a king. It claimed the world as its temple, the submissive trust of all hearts as its priesthood, and all human deeds as its sacrifices.

The hostility of which Jesus prophesied appeared while yet the gospel dreamed in its cradle. It was not simply that Herod as a single man stood up to oppose it; the whole civil power which he represented sent the bloody edict to search out the swaddled evangel. The guiding star flashed a terrible brightness on the crimes of that usurping government, and so it rose up to blot out the light by violence. That was the formal opening of the war, whose only truce is capitulation, and which finds cessation only in victory. It illustrates the whole conflict, both in its spirit, and in its issue. Christianity shows human wrongs and demands that they be put away; the guilty parties, eschewing repentance, seek to kill the prophet which rebukes, or abrogate the law which condemns them; the prophet is hidden by the hand of Providence, or his voice, quieted for a day, leaps up at length from the grave with a tone that pierces the avenging skies, and hastens the execution of the statute which can never die.

Sometimes Christian faith enters into and takes possession of a single soul in comparative quietude. No fierce passions seem to stand at the door to dispute the passage. The interior darkness gives way to the celestial light, as mountain mists change slowly to a veil of golden gossamer, and then settle as liquid gems all over the rocks and shrubbery. In the darkened sky of distrust, star after star comes out, followed by the auro-ral light and the triumphant sun. The weary spirit yearns for rest, and welcomes the offer of repose. Perplexed with the jargon of pretenders, it hastens joyfully to sit at the feet of the true Teacher ere he has finished his first beatitude. Gradually comprehending its wants, and beholding the sources of relief, it finds successive elements of satisfaction in partaking of the

living bread. The objects of selfish ambition have gradually become loosened from desire, and the heart's aspirations have climbed higher and higher, until in each ascent they knock at the celestial gates. The new life has displaced the old, as the mineral particles drop one by one into the chasms, left by the decaying vegetable fibre, until the substitution is complete. The work is radically done, but in the midst of outward silence. The divine element has become vigorous, but by a process which makes no more external commotion than marks the development of the mustard seed into the spreading tree. The truth has brought freedom; but the method has been such that no outward ear caught the clank of a fetter as it fell. The heart has changed masters, but no terrible and obvious conflict has taken place on the boundary line which divides the domain of the old from that of the new sovereign. Earnest work has been done, stern self-discipline maintained, a rocky resistance kept up against all soul-foes; but all has proceeded so calmly that a careful outward observer might fail to discern a single indication of conflict.

The same thing is more or less true of communities. Sometimes an old religious faith becomes effete, and perishes like foliage in autumn, while a truer religion is budding on the boughs from which it fell. Or, still better, perhaps, the new faith begins to germinate, and in the process pushes off the old and decaying system, as the needles of an evergreen come forth by disengaging the former growth from their cells, and scattering them into the dust beneath. A mistaught notion seems ready now and then to hear the voice of a true teacher, and the approach of Christianity to the border of a new land calls out a pean of welcome. (Icy barriers sometimes gently melt when the Sun of Righteousness throws his beams upon them, and the eyes of a people having grown weary of gazing upon idols, rest gratefully on the uplifted cross.) Christianity comes in the still small voice, having thrown off the garment of fire, dismissed her tempest herald, and put off her shoes whose pressure stirs the earthquake. Finding a narrow entrance to the public heart, and a small place for rest, it passes within and spreads itself like the leaven—as surely and as silently.

This method, however, both in the private and the public sphere, is the exceptional one. The quiet usually comes only after the storm. The soul is generally a battle ground; and the strife is fearful before a treaty of peace is signed with Immanuel. The subject is sorely rent ere the evil demon quits his citadel. And in communities there is usually a hard contest before the gospel acquires the mastery of general life. Its authority is often disputed, and its rigid requisitions complained of. Open opposition sometimes awakes at its approach, and sometimes it is offered the kiss of hypocritical friendship. Now its doctrines are decried as irrational and disorganizing, and now they are sought to be diluted by mixing them up with the mass of prevalent opinions where coalescence is impossible; just as the same apostles were at one place accused of turning the world upside down, and at another were offered the incense of pagan sacrifices. The cause of this opposition is one and the same, while the forms it assumes are various. One age quarrels with it for possessing a feature which another complains of it for wanting. Now it is charged with contradicting science in its ignorant simplicity; and now condemned for its unfathomable profundities, over which strong natures grow dizzy. One opponent indicts it for its dry didactics; another takes his pen to portray the folly of its fancies. Here it meets the charge of being too presuming and authoritative; and there it is declared to be wanting in comprehensiveness. At one period its morality is affirmed to be practicable only in a world from which all sin is excluded; and then it is charged with a laxity of principle, and with revealing a God whom all good men must hate for his moral deformities. Here it is arraigned for contradicting intuition; and there for falsifying history. Such, and so varied and self-contradictory, are the grounds its opponents have chosen.

It has been left for nearly every age to forge some new weapon of warfare, or exhume and furbish an old one; and so Christianity has been compelled to guard herself against a succession of new foes, or at least old foes with new faces and modes. The infidel spirit has been routed in one quarter, only to hasten to a new point and erect fresh bulwarks. A main



defence has been carried, but at once the enemy has commenced to fortify another position. Some of these conflicts have been conducted on a broad theatre, and kept awake the attention of nations; at other times the strife, though not less severe or important, has had a less conspicuous arena. Moreover, each one has involved a specific principle, and issued in the development of a more comprehensive view of the relations of the gospel. And they have been the wisest and truest friends of Christianity who comprehended the work to be done in their own period, and gave themselves to just that task. There may be little need now of repeating the arguments which eminent Christian apologists have toiled for years in constructing; but it would not be wise, therefore, to depreciate the value of their labors. What men generally accept now as Christian axioms, were once repelled by the whole power of human logic, learning and passion; and the sentiments no intelligent man would think for an hour of avowing, were once the theses of philosophers and the dogmas of brilliant metaphysicians.

It is our present purpose to speak briefly of a few of the public conflicts through which Christianity has passed, and note in outline those into which it now seems about passing. The study of those which are now historical may enable us the better to perceive, and the more wisely to meet, those toward which we are rapidly hastening.

The first open conflict was with Jewish Bigotry and Pharisaic Formalism.

That Jesus ate and drank with publicans and sinners; that he commended, as a religious teacher, much to be found outside of Judaism, and condemned much that passed for eminent sanctity within it; that he asserted the subordination of all outward ceremony to the spiritual life; that he proclaimed the temporary character of their venerated economy; that he made the simplicity of love greater than the splendor of the temple, and the constant smoke of sacrifice; that he made of their rites only symbols of divine thoughts, whose clearer expression was yet to be given by the lips of children; that he foretold the falling of the wall of partition between them and the nations they had despised, and made all souls alike welcome to the

hopes of the gospel, and the sympathy of God on the condition of penitence and trust; that he did all this, was sufficient to provoke a hostility whose fires his blood only could allay. That was the first conflict. Its issue is familiar, and its prophecy a word of hope for the ages. That bigotry blinded multitudes to the real character of Christianity, transformed its author into a criminal, and sent him to the cross. So much its foes accomplished, but in doing it they knew not that they were giving new vitality to his thoughts, and speeding his prophecies onward to the goal of fulfilment. He was crucified; but his death-groan shook the temple to the earth. He was slain as the Lamb of God, and then the national ritual lost its significance and became a dead body of forms. He was lifted up from the earth only to draw all men unto him. The brotherhood of the race was triumphantly preached by men rocked in Jewish cradles. The gospel word was flung across the earth, and became a light to enlighten the Gentiles. The limits of exclusiveness had been burst, and Christianity had gained the world as its theatre.

Then came the conflict with the authority of organized Paganism. This was a struggle in which the question of supremacy was to be decided. Heretofore religion had been a state institution, developed, regulated, and restricted in its expression by statute law. It was an appendage of government—a feature incorporated into organic society. Now came the question, Had it a life of its own? Could it be independent of all statutory enactments, and rightfully refuse conformity to the prescription of the monarch, or the vote of the populace when they came in conflict with the spiritual law? Was religion supreme or subordinate? Was the state above the conscience? or was the duty of the citizen limited by the obligation of the Christian? The whole question was up. The state had power; the disciples had courage. The arm of Cæsar was strong; but the quickened conscience of Paul modestly but unshrinkingly defied it. Persecutions multiplied; so also did the converts. "Burn incense to Jupiter," commanded the magistrate with his hand on the Roman tables. "Christ is my only spiritual master," replied the martyr, pointing to the roll

on which the gospel had been written. "Curse Christ or die," said Pagan sternness, as it led a quiet company to the door of the amphitheatre where the wild beasts waited for their human food. "We can die, but we cannot yield," answered the children of the new kingdom as they caught sight of the upper throne. Blood flowed; but Christian loyalty could not wholly be drawn from the veins of society. Each execution spread the new faith through the testimony which was thus borne to its power. Such soul-triumphs as sung at the stake, perplexed the magistrates, terrified the monarch, and convinced the observers. Such courageous meekness, such might of patience, such modest strength of purpose, such unconquerable love, whence were they? The answer to that question softened the heart and palsied the arm of persecution, while it opened many souls to the entrance of the divine power. Patience was an overmatch for passion, tyranny was conquered by submission, and violence dropped its sword in weakness and despair at the feet of principle. Pagan authority grew less absolute, and its statutes relaxed their savage visage, for at last it had learned to tolerate what it could not conquer. And so Christianity came out from this conflict, having established her rights, defended her supremacy, proved her courage, and gained deference to her power.

The new faith was now a recognized force. It came out from beneath the law, and stood up a strong element of life. Has it another open battle-field? Aye, many of them lie between it and its completed mission. One of these appears just before it. On that field its antagonist comes in a new guise and a subtler form. It is speculative Gnosticism, bent on alliance, and prescribing terms which can be acceded to only by the compromise of vital principles. Preceding foes had come as open enemies breathing hostility; this approached with terms of compliment on its lip, and the promise of distinction in its hand. Of the specific tenets of the Gnostics nothing need be said here in detail. Neander's Church History, and Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels, will yield ample information to the inquirer. Suffice it to say, that an attempt was made to incorporate many of the truths of Christianity into the Gnostic sys-

tem, divest it of its exclusiveness and its more unwelcome demands, and send it abroad in a philosophical dress, which should commend it to men of taste and standing. Not a few, wearied with conflict, and craving human respect, were caught with the prospect, and entered the path to popularity. Men of learning and ingenuity wrote commentaries on the gospels, representing that the stories of miracles were allegorical representations of the interior life, and praised Jesus as the highest symbol of the spiritual principle. His incarnation and resurrection, and ascension, were figurative prophecies of the final triumph of the pure soul over tainted and vicious matter. "There is high truth in this new manifestation of the Good," said these teachers; "but heretofore you have held it in the crude state; now it is time to give it systematic form; it has been in chaos, let us unite to give it the beauty and completeness of philosophical order." The ark of God was in danger of falling into the Philistine hands; for the attack was skilfully planned, and not a few were somewhat weary of such an austere service as that they had given. But there were true souls who took and sounded the alarm. To not a few Christ was yet the power and the wisdom of God, and they would not fritter away the meaning of his words. The simple gospel, though it were a stumbling block to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek, had proved its might, and they would trust it still. Paul had said that the wisdom of this world was foolishness with God. These noble apologists, whose thrilling words are with us to this day, protested, reasoned out of the Scriptures, out of their own hearts, and out of the archives of history, opposing argument to assumption, and authority to ridicule. It was a conflict which was attended with less outward commotion than some others, but it was full of earnestness, determination and importance. Christianity maintained its individuality, and conquered again by the might of the truth and the simple faith of Jesus. She had spurned human philosophy, and in doing so developed one which was higher and divine. Gnosticism died in the struggle, and a large part of the scholarship and prestige it had possessed passed over to the faith which bore off the victory.

Then came the imperial distinction of the Nazarene system, when Constantine represented so wide a sovereignty and professed to have conquered by the cross. From the manger where Herod hunted for its life, Christianity had gone up to the throne of the Cæsars, and become the law-giver of nations. And in that throne it had to endure a conflict with the pride and ambition which so generally accompany distinction, that was full of peril. It had fought with beasts at Ephesus and conquered; but its ease and luxury were the elements that lay like poison in the cup. Its first virtue was meekness; its law, love; its work, self-denying beneficence; its victories, marked by the spread of peace; the object of its ambition, purity; the end of its labor, human redemption. Could it hold the worldly power to its bosom, and keep the viper fangs from its heart? Could it rule in the spirit of Christ's justice, and blend the ministry of the servant with the majesty of the king? Could it frame and enforce statutes for barbarous peoples, yet preserve the Master's spirit, which prompted a cheerful death for an ungrateful and rebellious world? All that is possible; for the Son of Man holds a sceptre over the earth; and the last triumphs of the gospel are to witness its exposition in earthly cabinets, and its proclamation from thrones. But could it bear such a test at that early period? It was a fierce ordeal to which outward prosperity subjected the new faith, and much that seemed fine gold grew dim and changed. It lost the simplicity of its spirit and manners, the beauty of its trust, and the heroism of its early deeds. It was more or less defeated by its victories, and rendered helpless through its power. And it passed rapidly to its next stage and scene of conflict.

This it found in the development of that ambition for pre-eminence which finally culminated in the magnificent pontificate of Leo X. Heretofore its foes had come from without; now they were nursed in the bosom of its own household. That conflict was long and terrible. Spiritual dignitaries rose to power in the church, and then, craving a larger and broader rule, aimed to subdue temporalities to their will. The rights of conscience were practically denied. General culture was discouraged, and the few grew fat on the spoils wrested from the masses.

Divine authority was pleaded for persecution and constraint of will, and men wrote themselves tyrants by the grace of God. Religious orders multiplied; Christian equality was practically annulled. A mountain of rituals had been put between the individual soul and the fulfilment of the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway." Genuine godliness lay prostrate beneath a world of traditions, ceremonies, confessions, penances and superstitions. It was dark around; and when the soul looked up to see, if it might, the radiant cross, pictures of saints, and images of the virgin darkened the whole heaven, and left the gazer in perplexity or despair. Christianity was betrayed by the men whom she had raised to power; and the weapons she had given them to guarantee a victory were turned against her own person. But the réaction came, and the arm of the hierarchy was broken. Priestly tyranny has passed its golden age, and it is never to regain its power. The Pope is now but little more than a figure of speech, or an ancient petrification preserved out of respect to its former importance in the ecclesiastical kingdom. The Bible is open never to be shut; and men are no more to offer their ears that they may be smitten deaf to the voice of God in the soul.

Christianity has met also the host of metaphysical giants who would fain have driven her bewildered into the mist; she has met a flippant, presumptuous, alimentive skepticism, which would have looked her out of countenance, or made her ashamed of her own scruples; and she has been rudely pelted with the phenomena of physical science—but of all these we must say nothing. That race of metaphysicians is mostly extinct, save as a low mutter is now and then heard from a cloister of southern Europe; fashionable licentiousness makes religion a graceful bow; and geologists are intent on showing how the splendors of their science illuminate the first chapter of Genesis.

Of these past conflicts of Christianity this may be said: The first established the comprehensiveness of its design, and the completeness of its adaptations; the second proved its independence of human authority and the power it gives to the soul; the third shows that it is capable *per se* of systematic statement

and philosophical defence; the fourth indicates that the elements of worldly distinction more or less neutralize its forces; the fifth tells us that when Christian equality is denied, life becomes only a game in which despots win the stakes, and that hierarchies are the mausoleums of manly piety; while the remainder which have been alluded to teach patience to Christian hearts, and modesty to irreverent scholarship. For all these conflicts of the past the present ought to be wiser; and men should work for the future with higher hope and care.

It only remains for us to speak of some of those conflicts which are beginning to appear, or toward which we are tending with rapid steps. Of these a few simple words.

1. A vicious independence and an irreverent criticism are to oppose themselves to Christianity in a more decided form than heretofore.

Having passed from beneath the yoke of human authority, and been taught to rely upon itself for a knowledge of truth and duty, the human soul tends, in the reaction, toward the rejection of that authority which is wholesome, and the loss of that deference to concurrent human opinion to which it is always entitled. The wildest and most passionate democracy is apt to succeed a despotism when once the autocrat is unseated. Credulity naturally issues in skepticism. After having worshipped year after year with uncovered head and unsandalled feet and subdued heart before any altar, the discovery that there is no shekinah behind the veil, and nothing but pantomime in the moving scenery of the sanctuary, is apt to stiffen the soul's knees, and give it such a contempt for all-seeming sanctity that the call to worship is apt to provoke a sneer or an oath. A priest-ridden people, once on its feet, is apt to kick at the very smell of sacrifice, and grow passionate over the first line of a liturgy. After having seen the absurdity of dogmas which were forced down the throat without a question, all confessions of faith are in danger of being looked upon as a Homœopathist looks upon the pint dose of Epsom salts. The democratic theory was a great development—significant of much, prophetic of more; but it is almost as certain to be

abused for a time, as the Southern slave is to caricature individual independence amid the excesses of the winter holidays. A higher order than tyranny ever dreamed of will doubtless appear as the fruit of that seed which our fathers dropped in the Declaration of Independence, but it is an order anticipated by a chaos. And the Reformation will yet bring in a truer worship and a steadier faith than the Mediæval time exhibited, though between the gospel dethronement and the spiritual royalty of the individual soul, all forms of doubt and unbelief may intrude themselves.

These fruits are now appearing, and the conflict thus indicated has already begun. Men are impatient of religious authority and restraint, and mock at the sentiments which ages have venerated. The theology of the Bible is often rejected on various pretences, and they who repudiate the Bible itself as a fetter on thought, and a promoter of superstition, demand an endorsement as good Christians. A reputation is often acquired by means of an attack on evangelism—an attack which shows neither vigor nor skill sufficient to provoke notice if they were employed in defence of the prevalent faith. The critical attack has been opened by such men as Strauss and Parker; the irreverent sneering proceeds under the auspices of such as the author of the "Age of Reason," and the zealous correspondent of "The Liberator." Nascent and one-eyed science, too, sets itself to dissolve the theories of theologians into thin air, by bringing forward the sure and simple scheme of law set forth in the "Constitution of Man." But the end is not yet. The creeds of Christendom are yet to undergo a closer analysis by reputed spiritual philosophers, and bodies of divinity will be still more irreverently taken in pieces by metaphysical anatomists. Every confession of faith is to be challenged, put on trial, and perhaps subjected to critical and malignant torture. Each dogma in the creed of the church is to be presumed guilty of falsehood, and called on to prove its veracity. No doctrine is so venerable as to escape being impleaded, nor so sacred as not to be clutched with profane hands, nor so scriptural as to be wholly free from contempt. Men of talent and men of pomposity, men of candor and men of bigotry, men who fear God and



men who reverence only themselves, men who seek for truth and men who go abroad only for the material with which they may fortify their own notions—all these varied characters are to busy themselves with disputing the authority of the gospel. More than now, every man will insist on doing that which is right in his own eyes, demand that he be judged by whatever standard he may choose for himself, and find in the fact that the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount condemn his character, not a ready reason for reforming his character, but a pretence for arraigning the statutes. The time for frank acknowledgments from men of the world that they are sinners seems passing by, for the old definitions of sin are treated as obsolete. Against this vandal spirit Christianity has to contend; and the whole brood of irreverent critics are to be met and sent away ashamed. And it is no merely nominal encounter. The soul that lives must struggle; they who keep the ancient faith, while modern eyes see in it only an animated petrification, and the public is treating it as a city belle might that of a Quaker costume, must be filled with high energy. Blessed and privileged are they who remain quiet amid the tumult, whose feet rest on the firm rock while the loose earth shakes around them, who patiently tread the straight and narrow path, while the world is busy in seeking to throw up a smooth highway to the heavens.

2. Christianity has before her a severe conflict with religious formalism, and a boasting, self-complacent externality.

There is no tendency to reproduce the imposing ceremonial of Mediæval times, for people cannot spare so much time for their religious duties. The forms are fewer, and perhaps less significant. A decorous exterior, a conformity to the religious proprieties, an attention to a few set forms of expressing religious thought and feeling—with how many these already pass for the fulfilment of Christian obligation! And the tendency gathers constant strength and breadth.

And then there are those, not a few, who judge of one's religion by the quickness of his generous sympathies, by the number of loaves of bread he buys for poverty, by the fervor of his harangues for temperance, by the strength of the epithets:

he hurls at slaveholders, by the number of streets he lights with gas, by the zeal with which he espouses the cause of the people. All these things are the natural products of Christian influence—the fruit dropping from her tree; but it is not true, therefore, that every man who has gathered up the fruit has a heart-soil to nourish and perfect it. Strong human sympathy may co-exist with a most stubborn will—they are the endowments of a man, not of necessity the developments of a Christian. They may be what God gave in his providence, not what man has wrought out through the help of grace. And so, of course, Christianity is thus divested of her real life out of professed deference to her appearance; her soul is stolen away by those who come with ointments and sweet spices to anoint her body. It is a subtle enemy which is thus to be met and resisted, and victory will cost effort—large, difficult, and delicate.

3. And then comes another enemy in the guise of “Spiritualism,” protean in forms, in spirit ever the same. It begins by praising every prophet whose parchment was hidden in the ark of the covenant, or whose words yet ring around the earth; but it adds, that the same inspiration they shared was the possession of all lands, and its streams grow deeper as they flow along. More impressive tones than fell on the ear of Moses in Horeb it declares are ever breaking around each one of us;—we may hear them by earnest listening as the sainted ones did. By whispers from within God teaches the highest truths, and the demon of Socrates is turned into a heavenly oracle. And the listening to these interior revelations is religion—the highest phase it ever assumes. According to this new theological nomenclature, sin consists in going out of ourselves for teaching and law; submission means laying the passive soul at the feet of some mesmerizing agency; prayer is a struggle to learn the secrets of the other world; the atonement is a reach down from the seventh circle to pull the spirits of the first up the ladder of progression; faith implies the anathematizing of all settled opinion; and redemption is the proper mating of mismatched souls. Its disciples assume to be self-taught, and so above criticism; as having a complete tribunal in their own intuitions, and so not amenable to the government or the church;

as perpetually inspired, and so forbidden to be self-consistent; as guided by unseen hands, and so bound by no fixed programme of duties. Its expounder believes in miracles, not only in those recorded in the Bible, but in their constancy; holds to Divine manifestation, but to all times alike; asserts the duty of worship, but counts it adequately performed when men pay homage to the divine that is within themselves. The scheme begins with truth; where it ends one could scarcely conjecture. And if Christianity is to come out of this conflict soon and strong, it must be because the laws of the divine manifestation shall have been more clearly defined, and the mass of psychological phenomena more fully surveyed and more accurately classified. In a word, *we must have a truer and fuller philosophy of mind.*

John says, "the earth helped the woman." Our very earthliness—of which more soon—it is said, will probably operate to bury this scheme of spiritualism. Transcendentalism could hardly be expected to thrive very vigorously amid our general competition for gold and political spoils. It would seem that our outward intensity must forbid any general development of a religion of imagination. And yet our intensely practical life may do something to call this spirit into life. When men simply *plod* every where but in the religious sphere, they are liable to *dream* there. Business chains the imagination during six days of the week; if it gets loose at all on the seventh, it is no marvel that it indulges strange freaks in the upper air. Men are not made to look downward constantly, and to those who do so, when at length they look up, the stars seem in chaos, the sun travels the wrong way, the Southern Crown and Ursa Major have changed places, and a comet is mistaken for Mars. And the soul's vision is likely to get equally confused. Christian men may have sneered at these new teachers; or pitied them as spiritual lunatics; but they reveal the gathering of forces for a decided conflict.

4. But the sternest conflict of all into which Christianity is passing, is with the dominant spirit of politics and trade.

Politics and commerce are in some sense necessities. And gradually the whole people are becoming more and more ac-

tively interested in both. Absolutism is fast giving place to democracy, the problems of government grow more complex and difficult, and the interests which claim its attention increase in number and delicacy. As the resources and activities of life increase, the development of the first and the regulation of the second require more governmental wisdom and care. Our politics, therefore, instead of attracting less attention, will be perpetually calling for more. And the bearing of government on the public welfare and on the private virtue, is being more clearly seen and more deeply felt.

And commerce, in its broad sense, regarded as covering the whole scheme of exchanges, is opening new doors to human enterprise, and calling out the highest energy and skill of men in barter and competition. In the one or the other of these spheres a great portion of our men of influence are found. The first minds have aimed at statesmanship, and the publicity of their life puts them in contact with the whole people. They speak to be heard by the nation, and their action becomes the public exponent of duty. And our merchant princes have learned the art of affecting so readily and powerfully the material interests of the country, that their procedure is inspected as closely as a ship-master would watch his barometer between the tropics. Into these active spheres, where life has all the excitement of a game, and competition often all the fierceness of a battle-field, most of the energetic young men seek to find their way. There go our chief practical talent and popular address, and there tarry our prestige and pride. Thence come our educational influences mightier than the discipline of the schools, and there are incarnated the moral principles which find an utterance more impressive than the re-reading of the divine law from the pulpit. It is an important question, What is the moral and religious tone of our political and commercial life?

That there are truly philanthropic and God-fearing statesmen and genuine Christian merchants, is not to be doubted. A belief in the "Higher Law" has been openly avowed at Washington, and a large mercantile house in New York announces that it will sell "silks, but not principles." Heaven be praised for

these timely avowals. But it is too apparent that a scrupulous conscience, and a soul that trembles at the bare thought of moral defilement, are in great danger of being bribed into acquiescence or shamed into complicity with reputable but real vices in both these spheres. A conscientious politician is an anomaly, worth a journey to look at; and when he is found he is likely to be a novice who has not been behind the scenes, or an unsuccessful competitor seeking an opportunity to retire honorably from the field. A scrupulous merchant is pictured to most eyes as a man in a fourth rate establishment, doing a small, snug business, and who has been voted on 'change to be a good honest fellow, but wanting in the tact necessary to large success. The party nominee is expected to possess caucus secrets it were an unpardonable sin for him to divulge; and the broker who writes down fifty thousand dollars of profits for the last year on his balance sheet, it is supposed would feel insulted if he were asked to lay open all his accounts, and exhibit all his confidential correspondence.

Does the question arise, What particular conflict this state of things forces upon Christianity? The reply is ready. It compels her to assert and re-assert, to prove and demonstrate, to announce and repeat, that the rigid morality of the gospel *was meant for practice*; that not one jot or tittle of it can be abated; that its claim on obedience during the six days of trade and electioneering is just as absolute as its demand for endorsement during the time which intervenes between the voluntary and postlude in the sanctuary. And when she has dismissed the assembly from the place of worship, and bidden them go back to the tasks of life, they return to meet the same loose morality, and the same abrogating teachers. "Keep integrity, whatever else may be lost," says Christianity; "Get money," responds mammon from the thousand temples where men are thronging. "Carry the election at whatever hazard," peals out from the caucus, while men canvass the districts to get pledges, and then procure their fulfilment with threats, and money, and gin. Christianity reveals an absolute law; politicians and merchants affix to it a sliding scale, varying with circumstances and necessities. Instead of absolute honesty,

men are bidden be as honest as they can and succeed. And in this way civil constitutions are made commentaries in the decalogue, and the ledger is appealed to to decide whether the Sermon on the Mount is practicable.

And then it is to be remembered that the political and mercantile spheres are largely occupied by professors of Christianity, who go from their study of the gospel to the practice of it in the sight of men. Providence may have clearly pointed these out as the spheres of their effort, and they pass into them. Can they remain unaffected by what is seen, heard and felt there? Their consciences are treated with violence; is it strange that they grow less sensitive? The Christian tenderness, stirred up at the altar of prayer, is frowned on coldly; is it strange that it shrinks from the chilly atmosphere? The nice justice and the soft-tongued charity which looked out so beautiful from the life of Christ, are sacrificed to a shrewder and sterner spirit; and it is too soon counted a weakness to look on the martyrdom with grief and tears. I grant this is not necessary; but in fact it is too common. The ringing cry, "Great is Diana," seems harsh to the heaven-tuned ear; but too soon the cry ceases to offend, or is wholly unnoted amid the profitable trade in silver shrines. And so when her own disciples come back to her from the schools of lax morality, where they sit day after day, Christianity receives them with blunted sensibility, with blurred vision, with a temporizing spirit, and with a war already commenced between the ideal life she gave them to make real, and the actual life they have accepted at the hands of custom. She demands their heroic life, and they insist at last she shall be satisfied with their formal Sunday deference. She was promised an incarnation; she gets a verbal compliment. She asks to be made royal; and is answered by a hosannah of so little significance that the call for crucifixion may blend with its vanishing tone. What is left for Christianity to do but to struggle with the influences that would remove her, with ostentatious care and skilful persistence, beyond the sphere of all real, earnest life?

Nor is that all. If Christianity utters herself clearly and faithfully against these concrete and approved iniquities, she

does it at the peril of her own quiet. The merchant who gambles in stocks on the week day, is uneasy at the portraiture of the scheme on the Sabbath; and the politician who has lied in the caucus and played the hypocrite on the platform, is shocked at hearing chicanery and double dealing put under ban in the pulpit. The sycophant at the feet of power, the human index to the popular feeling, the Janus-faced demagogue who looks black as Erebus towards New Orleans, and white as alabaster toward Syracuse and Worcester—all these have a horror of radical principles, and pronounce the pulpit too ignorant to know, or too reckless to care for its proper work, whenever it paraphrases the rebukes of inspired prophets, or makes a practical application of the sentences which fell like living coals on the hearts of the old Pharisees. Merchant princes express in significant tones their fear that such imprudent zeal in the pulpit will seriously cut down the salary, and silver-haired senators agree that such presumption must be treated to reproof. And churches and reputable societies, not a few, rate it not expedient to hazard so much for the sake of performing a service so peculiarly disagreeable. Alas! that Christianity must fight over, at this late day, the battle for her own freedom; that she must contend for the privilege of her own unbridged life. But so it is; and the heat of the conflict is yet to come. Our material prosperity and our consequent love of earthly gain; our thrilling political experiences, and our consequent interest in government; the gradual narrowing of the obvious chasm between the member of the church and the member of the congregation; the growing power of wealth and office, and the increasing influence they wield in religious affairs—all these things point onward to a coming day—not very far off—when the true friends of Christ and his gospel must combine and struggle to prevent all that is really vital in Christianity from being frittered away. Prudence and courage, and especially a vital sympathy with the Master, and a faith that makes spiritual things real to the heart, can alone fit for the strife, and purchase Heaven's "Well done."

There is no need of faltering, on the one hand, nor of feeling that we are cut off from all high heroic work on the other.

The truth is mighty. God energizes it with his spirit, and the foes that have lain prostrate at its feet, as it has swept on to triumph, rebuke our fear. The heavens may be dark, and the path before us seem leading through the desert and the sea. It matters not much, if so be we tread it with fidelity and trust. The floods shall part before duty, and the fire-pillar point out a highway through the most barren wild. "The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge."

And it is well to remember that the earnest work of Christian men is by no means done. There is no need of sighing over the departure of the church's heroic days. No martyr at the stake was ever privileged to make a nobler confession for the sake of the truth than is possible to every true soul to-day. If our era seems cold and spiritless, it is only because our poor inane souls have no high life to give it; and all eras seem so to eyes that are earthly, and to hearts that are afraid of enthusiasm. It was not the chiselling out a rude epitaph in the catacombs, or the erection of a simple cross where a saint fell on the Alps, that made the doers of the work immortal; it was rather the heroic faith which chose fidelity with exile rather than honor with faithlessness. But for that, the subterranean tombs might have denoted only the ambition to earn a dinner; and the mountain crucifix have only symbolized a superficial sentimentalism. To each of us it is given, if we will, to render a service for which ages shall be grateful. On the church's eyes may God pour the revealing light, and on her heart the grace that makes it leap to the conflict to which her Master and her duty summon her.



## ART. II.—CHRIST AS THE DIVINE INCARNATION.

It is our purpose in the present article to contemplate Christ as the Divine Incarnation. It is, however, far from our purpose to confine ourselves to mere theory. Neither does it form any part of our present purpose to trace in history the longings for the Divine Incarnation, which the human race has in all ages and countries shown itself as experiencing in greater or less degree. It is rather our purpose to bring this sublime doctrine, so far as we may, into contact with experience, and so within the range of the most ordinary powers of thought, as that it may warm the heart of the humblest Christian that may peruse these pages. Though it would be folly to pretend to abjure metaphysics on such a subject, we may have an aim entirely practical.

Spirit-manifestation is, as a general fact, through the medium of body. Do not, kind reader, give it up as a subject too hard for you. We have uttered our most enigmatical sentence, and that we promise to make plain. Do not at once turn your thoughts entirely upon disembodied spirits when you read, "spirit-manifestation is through the medium of body," nor leave your thoughts to dwell upon "spirit-rappings," at the mention of "manifestation" and "medium." But reflect how one man communicates to another man the knowledge of his own thoughts, feelings and purposes. He must make such communication by means of words, motions, and other signs, all of which imply the use of the body as medium in the transmission of thoughts, feelings or purposes, or more accurately the knowledge of them, from one mind to the other. This we state only as the general fact in the experience of this world.

Examine this fact a moment longer. Thoughts, feelings, and purposes are the only phenomena or manifestations of mind with which we are acquainted, or of which we can conceive. Through these, therefore, a spirit, so to express the thought, unfolds itself to another spirit. What we know, for instance, of the mind of any person, we know by means of his thoughts, feelings or purposes, and these, as we have seen, are manifested

in one way or another, through the medium of the body. We trust every one can easily comprehend so much of our statement, "spirit-manifestation is, as a general fact, through the medium of body," as will serve the purpose of an easy transition to the intelligent consideration of one of the sublimest themes unfolded in the sacred Scriptures; indeed, a theme with which they are chiefly concerned.

"God is a spirit," and, as a general fact, he manifests his thoughts, feelings, and will to us, who are dwellers in body, through the medium of body. We mean, in such communication of thought, feeling, and will, he employs, as medium, some physical substance, aside, too, from our own body. This distinction, we trust, may be observed and remembered throughout this article, without further elaboration or emphasis. This brief paragraph contains in germ nearly all we propose to say on this occasion. All the rest is to be but little more than some illustrations of the principle here stated. We add only, before passing, that it does not devolve upon us to show why a medium so unlike spirit should be chosen by him who has arranged the relation of things. This question, were it to be discussed, would resolve itself into simply this:—Why was any medium chosen? since, if any, it must be matter. But it is ours only to stand by the fact and its legitimate sequences.

Taking our stand in the light of this central fact which we have now before us, it is much more than a mere figure of speech, when we speak of the physical creation as a body through which, as medium, God reveals, at least to a limited extent, to other spirits, his own thoughts, feelings, and will; or, more briefly, physical nature as a body through which God unfolds to the perception of other spirits certain of his attributes. Through this, as a medium of manifesting the attributes of his own spirit, he communicates to us a knowledge of his unbounded wisdom and infinite power. This communication is just as complete, in the sense in which we speak of a revelation from God to man, as the words of an accredited messenger from God could make it. So complete is it, as a revelation of God to man, that in morals we may be held to account, so far as its influence on our conduct is neglected, as if we violated any command which

Jesus gave. This is more than implied in that remarkable passage in the first chapter of Romans, wherein the Holy Ghost expressly asserts that the heathen will be held accountable for their ungodliness and unrighteousness on the ground that they have a knowledge of God, "for God hath showed it unto them, 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 without excuse. Because that when they KNEW God they glorified Him not as God."

It may not be superfluous to call attention to the fact that in this remarkable passage it is insisted upon that the heathen turn away from God, after God has taken pains to reveal to them "a clear knowledge" of himself. It is not for turning from an unknown god, but turning from a known to an unknown that he threatens them with punishment. The whole representation here is, and this is the point we wish to emphasize, that this unfolding of God's attributes, this revealing of himself through the medium of physical creation, is not merely incidental. It is with as direct design that this revelation is made as any other, whether by angel, prophet, or Messiah: and the design is stated to be, that of securing the appropriate state of mind on the part of man toward God. From this point of view, what is the difficulty in apprehending the justice of the idolater's doom, as well as we can apprehend the doom of the greatest apostate in Christendom? Both alike have turned away from God's revelation. The difference is only that of degree, which, in the punishment, God plainly says he will observe. If the degree in the amount of the revelation, after "a clear knowledge" has been given, is to serve as a ground for neglecting what has been given, it is manifest that only one out of the human race could be held as being "without excuse;" namely, the individual who knows most of nature and the Bible. The point is, each is bound to observe revelation to the extent he has it, irrespective of the medium through which that revelation has come. When God speaks, whether by nature, angel, prophet or Messiah, we to whom God speaks must obey, or be held as wilful transgressors of God's authority.

Physical creation, however, has its limit as a medium of divine communication to the human family. Though it may be employed to unfold his eternal power and Godhead, it requires other means to reveal to our race God as Jehovah—as the covenant-keeping God. The authors of "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul" render 1 Cor. xiv. 9—11, "If you utter unintelligible words with your tongue, how can your speech be understood? You will but be speaking to the air. It may be that the tongues in which you speak are among the languages spoken in the world, and of these languages none are without meaning. Now, if I know not the meaning of the language, I shall be a foreigner to him that speaks it, and he will be accounted a foreigner by me." So, whatever God may speak, by whatever medium, it is no revelation to us, unless we understand the meaning of the signs employed. Creation has a language for us, for which we will be held responsible, because it speaks "clearly" to us of some of God's attributes. Whatever more it unfolds to higher intelligences of God's eternal power and godhead and other attributes, is their concern, not ours. Thus, it follows, that when one medium was employed to its appropriate extent in this progress of unfolding God's attributes, others were called into requisition to carry on the process. That which was spoken by the new mediums, however, had nothing in it with reference to the old, only to acknowledge and enlarge—the farthest always possible from denials of truth or utility of former revelations. The language of God has always been, "Think not I am come to destroy, but to fulfil," even to the last; and must ever be so. It is one and the same spirit, however great the variety of mediums.

As the mere physical creation has its limit as a medium of God's manifestation, so have angels and prophets the same limitations in the same office. These could reveal God as the covenant-keeping God, these could more fully unfold God as moral governor of the universe than the first; or, rather, they could and did more fully unfold God's law as moral governor, but they could not reveal him as Father. A "Son" was "given" to us from God, before we could speak of God as Father, only in quite too figurative a way. But when

prophet-word was fulfilled, "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given," then could he who is in the bosom of the Father declare him in his character and attributes as a Father. Thus, in progress of centuries, was the summit of revelation reached in Christ, as the Divine Incarnation. "We beheld his glory as the glory of the only begotten of the Father; for "the Word"—the unfolding spirit itself—was "made flesh"—was incarnated, was embodied—"and dwelt among men."

God, in the progress of unfolding himself to our lost race, at first sent forth on this mission, so to express it, the physical worlds, the next angels, then prophets, and last of all he sent his Son. Angels, by means of speech proper, could unfold views of the divine character and law which mere worlds could not; still more completely could angels by the medium of prophets unfold God to human apprehension; but all these may be compared to the act of sending a message by another, while that of Christ, speaking and acting in our midst, may be compared to the act of one who sends not another, but comes and delivers his own message. All other mediums are limited, but this has the spirit without measure. All others are ambassadors, but one has now come who speaks for himself. Physical worlds and other parts of creation first strove to give utterance to the mighty revelation, and well, for they delivered their respective messages, but it was too much for them; the Maker of worlds could alone declare himself. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." This maker of worlds is greater than Moses, the chief of the prophets, and he is also greater "than angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell." "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." So to express the idea, and that with reverence, hitherto God has spoken through foreign mediums, but now through his own proper body. In this he comes near to us, as a friend to a friend, and speaketh face to face.

We have now spoken of prophets employed as a medium of the

Divine communication. We use the term prophet here in this sense simply of the conscious or unconscious medium of Divine communications. If God so impresses a human being that he becomes the medium of Divine communication, and impresses him without the intervention of any medium, but directly, and, if we assume that the prophet in this state is conscious of the communications which he is making, we have one exception to the general law of spirit-manifestation. That is, the communication to the prophet, so far as he himself is thus made a recipient of the Divine communication, is without medium, save only the physical organization of the prophet himself. But of course he becomes medium in these communications with reference to others. In the same sense we may speak of Christ as the medium of divine manifestations, only in this case, the relation between the spirit and the body through which the communication is made, is entirely different from the case of the prophet. In the latter case, we have God unfolding himself through a foreign organism of soul and body, but in Christ he is embodied in his own fulness. The word, the unfolding spirit, in its yearnings for manifestations, has at length exclaimed, as if satisfied, "a body thou hast prepared me."

We have now reached our point of observation, from which we wish to contemplate Christ, as the Divine Incarnation, in some of his adaptations to our nature in its present limitations and necessities. We love to look upon one who can say in truth, "he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." We love to let our thoughts dwell upon one who has come in a body to light up our feeble spirit still in a house of clay, into communion with the Father.

The human race has always striven to obtain revelations from the spirit-world. Through the mediumship of various oracles, have the people of all lands and all times sought to woo voices from beyond the chasm which separates us from disembodied intelligences. In this universal longing, the more suscep-

\* That organization was used by the spirit as the spirit's tool in the incarnation.

tible have become the unconscious mediums for the expression of other men's thoughts and feelings, and as these utterances have been so like the things desired by the seekers, because originating in themselves, men have cried out, "God hath spoken." Besides, if there is in the almost unlimited adaptations of the human organism the susceptibility of becoming the medium for the manifestation of spirits dwelling in other bodies, it is not difficult to conceive that there may reside in it a susceptibility of becoming the medium through which disembodied spirits may manifest themselves. Indeed, the fact that in prophets the Infinite spirit finds and calls into exercise such a faculty, is on the side of that possibility, not against it. So of the case of demoniacal possession. With such a nature, how wretched must be our race, without communications from the fountain of truth; and unless such communication come through some definite body, or at least have their culmination in such, how past cure must be the hesitations and consequent superstitions of man! We need to know certainly God hath spoken, and so spoken that we are in no danger of confounding his utterances with those of others. Christ, as the precious incarnation, in this respect precisely bridges over this dark chasm for us. As a historical character, we can as well know his thoughts, feelings and actions, as we can in the case of Washington or any other. In this view, he presents himself as an accredited messenger from the bosom of the Father. While he demonstrates himself as speaking only the Father's words and doing only the Father's works, he is, nevertheless, so completely identified with our race, that his communications are precisely the same as the communications from one mere human spirit to another. Precisely alike, so far as the medium of manifestation is concerned; and, therefore, as definite and as easily understood.

Christ, the Divine Incarnation, is, like divinity, without limit in his office of revealing the Father. Mere worlds, angels and prophets, are of very limited capacities in unfolding the fulness of Deity. Not so with the Son. He can speak the Father's words; he can do the Father's works. The only point of difficulty is the poverty of the language in which human spirits manifest themselves to each other. Indeed, it was not meet he

should come at all, until that language was enriched by the experience of thousands of years; else in most of his communications to us he had been accounted as "a foreigner" by our race.

It was not enough that our race should have many centuries to prepare a language for the Son to employ in unfolding the attributes of the Father, and their relations to the human soul. That race must have, in addition to ordinary experiences and development, the influence of a divine culture, under patriarchs, prophets, and priests. How poverty-stricken is language, after all, when employed to set forth the attributes of Christ; and, of course, his attributes but indicate his power to reveal the Father and the relations of Deity to the human soul. Christ, we can say after the language has been prepared, is "the seed of the woman" that shall bruise the serpent's head; he is the seed of Abraham in whom all nations are to be blessed; he is the Shiloh to whom shall be the gathering of the people; he is the prophet like unto Moses; he is the priest after the order of Melchisedec; he is the heir of David to reign forever on his throne; he is the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. He is, nevertheless, the man of sorrows, and the one acquainted with grief; he is the withered shrub, without beauty; he is the cleanser of lepers; he is the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world; he is the Light of the world; he is the kind Physician; he is the good Shepherd; he is the true Vine; he is the elder Brother. At the same time, he is the Judge of the race, because he is the Son of Man; he is Jesus, because he shall save his people from their sins; he is Immanuel, God with us; he is victor over death; he is the Just One, who died for his enemies, to constitute them kings and priests unto God. But where shall we end the list in numbering the qualities of the Infinite!

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews contemplates Christ in the light in which he is set forth in the Old Testament, and as he who has fulfilled it. After studying him in that light, he reaches his climax in the expression, "We have such an High Priest."



“ This is one of those expressions, (so often found in Paul’s writings,) which indicate an emotion so intense that the author’s heart seems ready to break. Not break with grief, but with an emotion with so much of God in it, that the vessel of clay can scarcely contain it. Such emotion is like new wine in old bottles.

Paul, through the seven chapters which precede the one where this passage is found, had been unfolding the characteristics of Christ. Christ, the Son of God ; the appointed heir of all things ; the Maker of all worlds ; the brightness of God’s glory, and the express image of his person ; the purger of sins, who had already taken his seat at the right hand of the Majesty on high ; Christ, greater than all angels, the first begotten whom all the angels, by God’s command, must worship ; Christ, the God whose throne is forever and ever ; Monarch in a kingdom whose sceptre is a sceptre of righteousness ; Christ, anointed by God as King of kings, because he loves righteousness and hates iniquity ; Christ, able to reign when the heavens pass away, and sway the sceptre with a potency that shall render every foe a crouching slave ; the Lord witnessed to by the Holy Spirit with signs and wonders, with divers miracles and gifts ; Jesus, though for a season a little lower than angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, and the grand ideal man, to whom the Holy Ghost saith, addressing the Father, ‘ thou hast put all things under his feet ;’ Christ, the heroic Captain, who is not ashamed to call his soldiers brethren, and is glad to die for them not for his own glory, but that he may confer on them the glory of achieving their liberty from death and the devil ; Christ, the merciful and faithful High Priest who makes reconciliation for the sins of the people, and who, being tempted, is able to succor them that are tempted ; Christ, so indulgent and kind to the weak, yet faithful to Him that appointed, faithful as Moses in all his house, though Moses was a servant, and Christ a son ; Christ, the second Joshua, who leads all his followers to an everlasting Sabbath-keeping ; the Son learning obedience, nor thrusting himself into the priesthood, but called of God an High Priest, after the order of Melchisedec, and still so entirely mortal as to offer up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears ; Christ, a priest touched with the feelings of our infirmities, as no other can be, yet many-fold greater than Levi, for he is of the order of Melchisedec, who is greater than Abraham, and Abraham greater than Aaron, and Aaron greater than Levi, so great that as he had no predecessor, so he will never leave his place to another ; a High Priest, becoming us, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, not needing to offer every year for himself like earthly priests, nor offering unsatisfying blood, but offering himself once for all as the oath-consecrated priest for ever-more. WE HAVE SUCH AN HIGH PRIEST, WHO HAS TAKEN HIS SEAT ON THE RIGHT HAND OF THE MAJESTY IN THE HEAVENS. *Such* an High Priest !! Think over this concentration of glories again and again ; think of them as contained in Christ, your most feeling friend ; think of these glories as concentrated in Christ, while you think of yourself as utterly vile and wretched, yet as the pitiable object that brought Christ down from heaven ; ponder on this contrast in characters, and if you do not feel your heart swelling with emotion, and your voice spontaneously dwelling on every word and

emphasizing 'such,'—'WE HAVE SUCH AN HIGH PRIEST,' we envy you not your heart.

'We have such an High Priest,' said Paul, after considering in detail all the points we have, besides several others quite as important. O that we could give the emphasis to the word 'such,' requisite to express the full meaning which Paul felt! We could then add with him, 'who is set on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens—a minister of the sanctuary and the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man;' has already taken his seat on the right hand of the Divine Majesty. The ancient High Priest could only approach once a year to the divine manifestation of God in the earthly tabernacle; he must come trembling; but our High Priest has entered the heaven where is no sin to hinder the full displays of the Divine glory; he has entered where angels veil their faces; he has entered not as a poor sinful High Priest of old entered the earthly sanctuary, to offer first of all for his own sins, but as one at home in the heavens. He has entered the Divine presence, not to ask forgiveness, but to share the throne—he is at the right hand of the Divine Majesty; he has entered with blood sprinkling the living way, not for himself, but for us; he has entered, not with the blood of beasts, but with his own. Such a sanctuary, such an offering, such a priest, for such wretches.

'But Christ the heavenly Lamb,  
Takes all our sins away—  
A sacrifice of nobler name,  
And richer blood than they.

My faith would lay her hand  
On that dear head of thine,  
While like a penitent I stand,  
And there confess my sin.'

Here may be a good place to express our views as to one of the leading objects Paul had in view in writing the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Jews whom he was addressing were beginning to desert the Christian assemblies, so free from external show and outward display, as being without temple, priest and sacrifice, indeed they were as their feelings clung to the old ritual on the point of returning to it as sufficient without Christ. Paul now strives to lead them by the way of faith into the midst of the realities, 'the heavenly things' of which the old tabernacle and its offerings and priest were only the dim miniature and shadow. These heavenly things are only to be presented to the eye of faith; they can never be represented to the eye of sense; all attempts at representation of the heavenly things but degrade the beholder; but presentation to the eye of faith does not degrade the heavenly things, nor the beholder, but lifts him into communion with them. Paul was writing against the Puseyites of his times."

Let us now contemplate Christ as the Divine Incarnation, embodying in himself all these diverse traits—in his influence upon a nature like ours, and in his influence as a perfect exam-

ple. Precept without example is a word without action. It is a powerless word. To be rendered potential, precept must be embodied—the word must become flesh in order to dwell among us who are yet in the flesh. Some men are so little aware of the weakness of human nature, as to suppose the world quite saved the moment they announce to it “virtue always tends to happiness and vice to misery.” It is not talk about virtue that the world needs, but the power to possess it. It is virtuous example that it must behold. Virtue incarnated is requisite to living hope to despairing humanity.

Take an illustration. The Duke of Wellington is said to have remarked that the presence of Napoleon on the field of Waterloo was equivalent to forty thousand troops. In the presence of such an incarnation of courage every coward was converted into a hero. Washington as the embodiment of the idea of the American Revolution did more to win success than ten thousand men equally able, who should have been merely expounders of the principles of liberty. Now of Christ, it is said he was tempted like ourselves, and yet was without sin. He stands before us the embodiment of what we need to be. He is a thousand-fold better incarnation of virtue than Washington of liberty, than Napoleon of courage. In his glorious presence, on the Waterloo of life's great campaign, every one may fall only as a hero; and so to fall, under his command, is to put on an immortal life and glory.

Paul, in pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God, under the cheering voice of his dear Friend, who had already attained, forgot “those things which are behind;” and, at length exclaimed, “I have finished my course; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me in that day.” What though he said he had not quite overtaken the perfect image of Christ, yet he felt the old garment with its defects giving place to the heavenly raiment. He was on the point of passing from the mortal with its defects to the immortal with its perfection. Mortality was about to be swallowed up of life. This change he said God had wrought through Christ. It was in Christ Paul experienced old things passing away and all things becom-

ing new; "for God hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." It was the righteousness which God required, as displayed in Christ, that Christ was helping the frail mortal to put on. To Paul Christ was the power of God unto salvation.

We have now alluded to Christ in his offices as the Divine Incarnation, as the revealer of the Father, as the atonement, both sacrifice and priest, and as our example. It does not enter into our purpose to do much more than allude to these various subjects from the stand-point which we have taken; but we hope such allusions may be fruitful in the mind of the reader, suggesting in relation to Christ a thousand things which we have not space to write. One view more will we now attempt to present, and that is Christ in his office as the medium of the manifestations of the Holy Spirit to the minds of believers.

We have already spoken of Christ in his character as a historical personage, that as such we can study his thoughts, feelings and actions as well as those of any other historical character, and that as such he has brought us word from the world of disembodied spirits, even from the Father of spirits himself; and now we propose to speak of him in his relations as the medium of present manifestations of the Holy Spirit to our hearts. It is easy for us to add to our conception of Christ as a historical personage, that he is now alive and feels the same interest in his disciples who are now on earth that he did for those with whom he associated during that life of his which is now historical to us. If he is thus alive, and if he feels this deep interest in us now, no doubt, as the all-capable revealer and unfold of spirit, he has some way of contact with us.

Among the last things that Jesus said to his disciples before his death was that of promising in his absence of still holding communion with them. He told them plainly that he would still manifest himself unto them as he would not unto the world. One of the disciples most naturally inquired how he would thus manifest himself unto them as he would not unto the world. The reply is most remarkable, and full of Divine comfort to those who can claim the blessings which are foreshadowed in it. "If a man love me he will keep my words;

and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." The words of Christ are but a synonyme for the law of God. That law can be kept only through love to Christ as the Divine Incarnation. Him we can love, because we can know him in his character as historical and present, as infinitely lovely. In him are those qualities which challenge the admiration and love of the heart. Christ, in his office as the Incarnation, imparts the power to keep his words. In his presence we are more than ourselves, and rise above ourselves. In his presence our sensibility is so affected that the will bursts away from its bondage to the powers of evil, and becomes truly free. He is free whom the Son makes free. Looking to Christ, we love him; loving him, we keep his words; keeping his words, the Father loves us; and whom the Father loves he will make a temple for the Holy Ghost, and in that temple the Father and the Son will make their abode. It is true, we cannot now see Christ with the fleshy eye; but, as we have observed, he can, as a historical and present character, be presented to the eye of faith. "A body hast thou prepared me." On that body our eye of faith can rest now as well as John could once see it with his bodily eyes. That life was once manifested to the organs of sense, but now only to the eye of faith. When the manifested life was on earth, it was a body which served as the medium of Divine communication to the spirits of those who heard, and saw, and handled it. That life, now presented to the eye of faith, is still the medium of manifestations of the Holy Spirit to the hearts of those that love Christ so as to keep his words. "If ye love me, keep my commandments; and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Alluding to this view by faith, Christ said, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me, and because I live ye shall live also."

Here then, at last, is spirit communication aside from the intervention of body in its presentation to bodily organs.

Here at last is introduced a spiritual dispensation in which the communication is direct, spirit with spirit. Nevertheless, this manifestation of spirit to spirit is upon the condition of having Christ before our eye of faith, which cannot be without a given exercise of the organs to ascertain the grounds of faith. The more we know of the Scriptures, and the more we obey them, the more shall be the manifestations of the Divine Spirit to us; especially the more we study the character of Christ in the Scriptures, and the more we love him, and the more we keep his words, the more shall we "know that he abideth in us by the spirit which he hath given us." Thus has Christ provided for our present spiritual wants, as well as in his historical character to bring us a message from the bosom of the Father. Here at last, too, is discovered the proper function of that part of our nature by which disembodied spirits can find manifestation, and through which God, in former times, speaking in the prophet, gave prophecy that he would draw his children into intimate communion with himself. "I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people, and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me from the least to the greatest."

It should be observed that this spiritualism is so connected with the knowledge of Christ, who is to be known primarily by the Scriptures alone, that it can never run into that form of error into which good men have sometimes fallen, that there is a holy spiritualism above and independent of the Scriptures. Indeed, these present us with a test to try the spirits, whether in the body or out of the body: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God." If the full Bible meaning is preserved to the word "confess," the rule is absolute and universal. No other need be applied in the case of modern spiritual manifestations, if indeed there are any such. The Christian who has taken proper hold on Christ in his fulness as the Divine Incarnation, and as the medium of God's past and present manifestations,

will not be disturbed in his faith, if millions of spirits and angels come preaching another gospel. A greater hath spoken to and for him. "That which we have seen," said John, "declare we unto you, that ye may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."

This precious fellowship is for every child of God. The way to it is through Jesus Christ. It is no dim and shadowy way. Christ presented to the eye of faith is still the medium of manifesting the Father. Through him it is the duty, as well as the privilege, of the Christian, to have the Spirit present to help him to say, Abba, Father. It is both his duty and privilege to have that Spirit present as comforter, as unction, as seal, and as earnest—precious officers which he is ever waiting to fulfil in every Christian heart, and of which we know so little in these days, because we know and love Christ so little. Christ appears no more in this world in the body in which he was crucified, but he seeks as of old an incarnation; he seeks a body in which he can once more manifest himself as when on earth, going about doing good. The body he seeks is a church in which the Spirit has free course in his unfoldings of the Father's love. His Spirit is ever seeking to re-incarnate Christ in every soul that loves Christ. "Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." As the unfolding Spirit of God once found a body, and said in great satisfaction, "A body hast thou prepared me," so Christ shall yet see the travail of his soul and be satisfied.

If anything we have said shall be blessed to the end of presenting Christ in a new light, it is not in vain we have written. If we have presented him as the Incarnation in a light that any one shall feel more deeply that he is the only foundation, so far our object is accomplished. If any one shall, by this humble effort, see more clearly Christ as a dear friend dying for our sins, we will rejoice. If any one shall look more to Christ as the appointed and definite medium for manifestations of the Holy Spirit, to our great Intercessor be praise.

**ART. III.—DOCTRINE OF THE UNIVERSAL SLEEP OF THE DEAD, AND OF THE FINAL DESTRUCTION OF THE WICKED, EXAMINED AND REFUTED.**

The doctrines above named, if we may trust to the statements of their advocates upon the subject—and no reasons appear why we should not—have attained to a degree of influence over the public mind both in this country and in England, of which evangelical Christians are hardly aware. As an illustration of the truth of this statement we adduce the following extract from the introduction of a work upon the subject “by Jacob Blair, Baptist minister of Buffalo, N. Y.,” a work which has already gone through six editions in this country. After stating that “about 100,000 copies” of the “six sermons of Rev. George Storrs” on the subject, entitled: “An Inquiry—Are the wicked immortal?” “have now been spread in this country, and still the demand for it continues”—the author goes on to say:

“This awakened an inquiry, and convinced thousands of the truth of the doctrine. In 1846, Rev. H. H. Dobney, and Rev. E. White, of England, published larger works, the former of which has been extensively spread in both countries. Soon after, Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff, of Scotland, followed with some small works. The churches of these ministers adopted their views. Of late, Rev. J. Panton Ham, of Bristol, England, has written largely, and two periodicals have been started, one by Ham and one by Moncrieff. Three of these ministers I have named in England are Congregational, and one a Baptist; all literary men. More than twenty different writers have published works in the United States and Canada; and several periodicals are published which warmly advocate *Life only through Christ*, and the utter destruction of the wicked. The *Bible Examiner*, by George Storrs, of New York, is nearly exclusively devoted to this one subject.

From fifty to seventy-five ministers in the United States advocate the doctrine, and their numbers are constantly increasing. Most of the Advent Societies hold to it, and I know of three Baptist churches which fellowship it. A large number in the different churches believe the doctrine, who say but little about it, except to its open advocates. In brief, the number who now hold the view are so large, and so decided in spreading light, that all efforts to stop its progress must be vain, and a general investigation must soon take place: at least in the United States and Canada. When that comes, the doctrine of endless woe must soon fall, for it can no more stand before the light of God's word, than Dagon before the ark of God. It shows either



great weakness or ignorance of the theological book-world, to say this doctrine has been investigated. Had it been in the field of controversy as Universalism has, it would have triumphed long since."

The old and stupid maxim, "error will cure itself," we have no faith in. Error is no more self-destructive than sin. Our gardens will no more weed themselves and develop spontaneously the useful plant and vegetable, than will the public mind, under the dominion of sin as it now is, spontaneously eradicate from itself those forms of error which depravity naturally generates, and by which the tendency in depravity to generate error is itself developed, confirmed and perpetuated. The maxim above alluded to, we believe, had its origin with the father of lies, and is now held before the public mind for the exclusive purpose of perpetuating the slumbers of Zion's husbandmen, that the enemy, without disturbance, may spread abroad the seeds of error, and its consequent death, through the length and breadth of Christendom. We shall therefore make no further apology for inviting the special attention of our readers to the following examination and attempted, to say the least, refutation of the doctrines above named. Four general topics of enquiry will occupy the attention of our readers—the fundamental features and elements of these doctrines, as distinguished from those of evangelical faith upon the same subjects—the evidence of the truth of the latter doctrines in opposition to those of the former—the character and tendency of the former in distinction from those of the latter—and an examination of the Scripture arguments adduced by the advocates of these new dogmas to establish their claims to public regard.

*Fundamental features and elements of these doctrines, as distinguished from those of the orthodox faith upon the same subjects.*

The entire system of faith in which the articles under consideration are embraced, has its basis, we believe, in one idea exclusively—the *materiality* of the soul, an idea derived from a literal exposition of such passages of scripture as the following: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the earth;" "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return;" "Because he is dust;" "They die and return to their dust;"

"All go to one place, all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again," &c. Such language, it is affirmed, is positive, and its meaning cannot be misapprehended. Man himself, the whole of him, his mind, of course, not excepted, is "of the dust." Mind, then, must be the exclusive result of physical organization. So we must reason, or reject the positive teachings of inspiration itself.

From this idea of the materiality of mind follows almost of necessity, the conclusion that when the body is dissolved, the self-conscious activity of the soul, to say the least, must cease. That which is the exclusive result of physical organization must disappear with the dissolution of that organization. This sentiment, also, it is affirmed, is confirmed and positively taught by the repeated declarations of Scripture, that at death, man, that is, of course, all of man, and this must include the mind as well as the body, "returns to dust," and consequently "sleeps" there till the resurrection, that "the dead know not anything," and that "there is no knowledge in the grave," &c.

Out of this view of scripture and of facts, naturally arises the last article of this new creed, to wit, the destiny which awaits the righteous and the wicked at the resurrection. The former are then endowed, it is affirmed, with the privileges and immunities of an *immortal existence*, while the latter, in the conflagration of the material universe, will be returned to dust again, and never, to eternity, be restored to conscious existence. The punishment of the wicked is *destruction, dissolution, death*, a total and eternal cessation of conscious being. Such, as we understand the subject, is the new creed which is everywhere being commended to our regard, by the most formidable array of scripture proofs, as far as the number of texts cited is concerned.

To every feature and element of this creed, the system of evangelical faith stands opposed. The soul, according to its teachings, is not matter, but a substance of totally different, opposite and infinitely higher attributes; attributes which do not depend upon material organization for their existence; death is not even the temporary destruction of mind, but its introduction into new relations of conscious activity; the life promised

to the righteous is not *continued existence*, but a certain *state* of being, the punishment threatened to the wicked is not cessation of conscious existence, but positive retributions, to which the souls of such are subjected in a state of conscious activity; and finally "the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust," is the eternal re-union of the soul with a physical organization corresponding to its immortal destiny. Such are these two systems as contrasted with each other.

*Argument for the evangelical view, in opposition to the teachings of this new theory.*

We are now prepared to enter directly upon the enquiry, which of these two views of mind, and of its final destiny, accords with reason, and with the Bible? In arguing this question, we would, first of all, lay down the following proposition:

1. The Scriptures most clearly and decisively distinguish between the *soul* and the *body*, affirming absolutely that one is, and the other is not, constituted of "dust," and thus establishing a fundamental distinction between mind and matter. The first passage which we adduce is Eccl. 12 : 7 :—"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was : and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." A distinct contrast is here drawn between what of us is "dust," matter, and what is not dust, spirit, and the destiny of each at death is affirmed with equal distinctness. The meaning of the passage may be thus expressed : then shall what of man is constituted of dust, or is material, return to the earth as it was, to its former unorganized state ; but that which is not dust, nor of it, that which is not matter, "the spirit," or soul, "shall return to God who gave it." We affirm, without fear of contradiction from any unprejudiced mind, that this passage is without meaning, or presents a meaning that is self-contradictory and absurd, if the above is not the true exposition of it. If mind is nothing but matter in a certain form of physical development, and has and can have no existence separate from the organization which it vitalizes, and of which it is a part, with what propriety could such a distinction be made, as is here made between what of man is material, and at death "returns to the earth as it was," and what of man

is spirit, that is not "dust?" If the soul has no existence separate from the body, but with it is resolved into unorganized matter, what is the meaning of the declaration, "the spirit shall return to God who gave it"?

How perfectly the view of the subject presented in this passage accords with the account of the creation of man given in Gen. 2:7:—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." The Lord God is affirmed to have first organized the human body. All of man that is dust is now taken from the earth, and can return to the earth again, is organized. Subsequently the soul is introduced into it, that is, the spirit, that which is not dust. This is the obvious meaning of the passage, the only intelligent meaning that can be assigned to it. The two passages before us are mutually explanatory of each other, and can, by no possibility, be reconciled with a materialistic idea of the soul.

The same fundamental distinction between the soul and body obtains throughout the Bible, in the scriptures of the New Testament most emphatically. We will present a few passages as examples. The first that we cite is 2 Cor. 5:1—9:—"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now, he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (For we walk by faith, not by sight:) We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." We shall have occasion to recur to this passage in another connection. We now refer to it, for the single purpose of establishing the one proposition before

us, the fundamental distinction between the body and the mind, as a doctrine of the Bible. The reader will notice that the soul is here affirmed to sustain relations to its present and future body, precisely similar and analagous to those which man sustains to the house which he occupies. The body, as now constituted, is compared to a "tabernacle," "a tent," a most frail and temporary place of residence erected for temporary purposes. The future body, to be sure, is indissoluble. Still it is nothing to the mind but a mere habitation from which the mind is just as distinct as the occupant of any house is from the building which he occupies. Suppose, now, that the mind is nothing but "dust," a part of the body, as much so as the hand or any other member, and having no real or no possible existence out of or separate from the body, this whole passage is not only without meaning, but fraught throughout with the grossest error.

Again, the apostle represents the mind as being so distinct from, and in itself independent of the body, that the former, even prior to death, may exist in a state of the highest conscious activity, while for the time being, totally separated from it. In 2 Cor. 12: 1—3, he tells us that when he was caught up to the third heavens, and had there unutterable visions of the Divine glory, he could not tell whether he was "in the body or out of the body." In the judgment of an inspired apostle, then—and that when speaking under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit—the mind even now is so independent of the body and separate from it, that out of the mortal body, the immortal spirit may be in a state of the highest conceivable intellectual and moral activity. How can such a conception be reconciled with the dogma, that mind has and can have no existence at all out of and separate from the body, and with its dissolution must return to a state of total unconsciousness? Either Paul, when under the immediate inspiration of the Spirit of God, wholly misconceived and misrepresented the nature of mind, and its relations to the body, or the dogma under consideration cannot be true. If it is true, we are absolutely certain that neither Paul nor any other sacred writer had any knowledge of it, but held and taught sentiments precisely and in all respects the opposite.

The same distinction runs throughout the writings of Paul. The body he tells us, Rom. 8: 10, 11, is doomed to die, on account of sin, and is therefore called the "mortal body," and that for the express purpose of distinguishing and contrasting its nature and destiny with that of the soul or spirit. This could not be true if the mind is a part of the body, perishable like it, and doomed to dissolution with it. So in all other instances. The mind is ever held up as distinct from and in its nature independent of the body. The former, to be sure, is now an inhabitant of the latter, but only in it as a frail temporary tent, which the occupant is soon to leave. All such representations must be false if the dogma under consideration is true.

In perfect accordance with the same fundamental view, are the teachings of the apostle Peter, as we find in 2 Pet. 1: 13, 14:—"Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me." The same figure of a tent, the most frail and temporary of residences, is here employed to express and reveal the relations of mind to the body. The latter is a tent in which the former is to spend a few short years, and then lay it aside, as an individual does his garments, when he retires to rest at night. How would this be true, we ask again, if mind and body are, in reality, only parts of the same organization, and if the continued activity of the former does and must cease, with the dissolution of the latter? For ourselves, before we could believe that such a dogma is taught in the scriptures, we should be constrained to pronounce the Bible one of the most unmeaning and self-contradictory books that ever was written. What is the meaning of "putting off" the body at death, if the mind, at this period, instead of being separated from it, lies down with it, in a state of total unconsciousness, and above all, if from the nature of mind and its connection with the body, no other result can follow from the dissolution of the latter?

Let us now contemplate the command of our Savior, Matt. 10: 28:—"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not

able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." If the soul has no existence separate from the body, and must die when the latter does, then men have precisely the same power to kill the one that they have to kill the other. Three important truths, perfectly fundamental in their bearings upon our present enquiries, are most distinctly and absolutely affirmed in this passage—

1. That the body and the mind are two totally distinct and separate forms of existence.
2. The dissolution and utter destruction of the former do not imply those of the latter.
3. While man can destroy the body, no being but God himself can destroy the soul.

Neither of these principles could be true, if this new system was, and that of the evangelical faith was not, true. If mind is material, or the result of material organization, if, on the other hand, it is not immaterial, and indestructible from any finite cause, then he that can kill the body can also kill the soul; for as far as the body can be destroyed, man can utterly destroy it. The great truth taught in this passage, then, is this:—Mind, in its own nature, while it may be either temporarily or permanently connected with material organizations, is utterly diverse from and independent of such organizations.

We might cite other passages equally to our purpose. These, however, are abundantly sufficient for our present purpose—the establishment of the immateriality of mind, as distinguished from the body which the former now does, or may hereafter, inhabit. The doctrine under consideration is not only opposed, as we shall hereafter show, to the intuitive convictions of the race in regard to the nature and mutual relations of matter and spirit, but equally, as now appears, to the express teachings of the Bible. "God is a spirit," and has never revealed the monstrous absurdity that mind, (finite spirit,) made in his own image, is constituted of nothing but dust. This "dirt philosophy" has no place in the sacred volume, but is a gross and fatal error.

2. Our second proposition under the general topic of consideration at the present time is this: *At death the soul does not slumber with the body in the earth, and in a state of uncon-*

*sciousness, but is introduced into a state of conscious mental and moral activity.* The truth of this proposition we argue from the following considerations :

(1.) That the opposite doctrine, the unconscious sleep of the dead is, in no form, taught or implied in any of the proof texts adduced by its advocates to sustain it. They are such passages as the following:—"For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in any thing that is done under the sun." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." To us it is a matter of wonder, that such passages could ever be supposed to have any bearing upon the doctrine of the real state of the soul, after it leaves the body. The sacred writer is speaking expressly of the relations of the dead, not to the realities of the invisible world, but exclusively to what men are doing in this. Relatively to this world and to what men are here employed about, the departed spirit has nothing whatever to do. "They have no more a portion forever in any thing that is done under the sun." This is the exclusive theme of the writer, and to this he should be understood as exclusively referring when he says that the dead know not anything. Then in this life he would have us understand probation ends. The work for eternity is completed. Relatively to it, there is "no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither we are hastening." What force is given by this view to the exhortation, "whatsoever thy hands find to do, do with thy might." But what reason is there for such an exhortation, in the fact that from death to the resurrection all activity of the mind ceases? It is the height of absurdity to make such a fact the basis of such an exhortation.

(2.) The dissolution of the physical organization presents not the shadow of evidence that the soul then ceases all forms of activity, and remains in total inaction till the judgment. The return of that which is dust to dust presents not the least pre-



sumptive evidence that that which is not dust, but is endowed with the power of thought, feeling, and voluntary determination ceases wholly to think, feel and act. The change referred to on the other hand is equally consistent with the supposition that the spirit is thereby introduced to the exercise of far higher forms of thinking, feeling, and action, than those which pertained to it in its previous state. The most that can be said for this new theory is, that it has not the shadow of evidence in its favor, from scripture or reason either. Hence we remark—

(3.) That the passages which we have cited to prove the doctrine of the fundamental distinction between the soul and the body, and the consequent immateriality of the former, present also in the form in which this great truth is presented in the same, the highest positive evidence of the truth of the proposition now before us, the moral and intellectual activity, instead of the unconscious sleep of the departed spirit, between the period of death and the judgment. In these passages, we are positively taught that the spirit is not "dust," and with the body does not at death return to the earth, "but to God who gave it." Here, too, we are also taught, by our Savior himself, that "killing the body" does not affect at all the vitality of the soul, a fact which could not be true, if the soul does, and from its nature must, as this new system teaches, dissolve when the body dies, into a state of absolute unconsciousness. Further, we are positively taught, that the highest conceivable visions of heaven itself may be enjoyed by the spirit when "out of the body," a fact which could not be true if the doctrine of the necessary sleep of the dead is true. There also, we are as positively informed that the soul of the believer, when "at home in the body, is absent from the Lord." This implies absolutely that when absent from the body, such spirit is not in the sleep of death, but is present with Christ. The declaration of the apostle is without meaning if this is not the case. Hence the apostle affirms that he desired to be "absent from the body," that he might thereby be "present with Christ." How could this be true, if the soul has and can have no conscious existence out of the body in the present, or future even, and consequently that it can, by no possibility, be present with Christ, only when

it is in the body? Finally, the apostle absolutely affirms that, as the only means of "being with Christ," he desired to "depart" from the body. Suppose that he held the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead from death to the resurrection, or final judgment. We know perfectly, that unless he was beside himself, he would not represent himself as desiring death, and that for this exclusive reason that he might "be with Christ," a state "far better" than a residence in the body. There is no possibility of reconciling these passages with any other supposition than this, that the soul of the believer from the period of death to the resurrection, is "with Christ," in the full fruition of his love and favor, and not with the body in a state of unconsciousness.

(4.) The same truth is *implied* with equal distinctness and positiveness in other passages of Scripture, passages, the meaning of which, nothing but a false theory can prevent our understanding aright. Let us, for example, compare Eccl. 12 : 7 :— "The spirit shall return to God who gave it," and the idea of departing from the body and "being with Christ," expressed in other passages, with the following statement pertaining to the spirits of departed saints, when Christ shall return to the earth at the final judgment :—"For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." The saints, at death, are represented as "departing and being with Christ, and the soul of every man as then "returning to God." At his second coming, Christ is represented as "bringing these same spirits, (those of the saints,) with him." How could this be true, if these souls had not been with Christ at all, but in a state of death and total unconsciousness? The passage can be reconciled with no such dogma. Christ is represented as coming to raise the *bodies* of the saints. The spirits, however, which are to re-animate those bodies he is not to raise up with the latter, but "to bring with him," implying most distinctly and absolutely that they had been, not with their bodies in the earth, but "with Christ" in heaven. The phraseology of the passage, when taken in connection with other representations of the Bible, admits of no other construction.

In further confirmation of the proposition before us, we now invite very special attention to the following passage, which may be found in Acts 23: 6 —9 :—"But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and the resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said there arose a dissention between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and the multitude were divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both. And there arose a great cry: and the Scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God." To understand this passage aright, we must recur to the known sentiments of the two parties of which the council opposed to Paul was constituted. The Pharisees held, as we are informed by Josephus and others, to the existence of two classes of spiritual beings in eternity, to wit, angels and the departed spirits of men. The term spirits was employed to designate the latter class, and to distinguish it from the former. At the final consummation they held also that "spirits," the departed souls of men, would be re-united with re-organized spiritual bodies, the doctrine of the resurrection. All these, as we are informed in the above passage, and as Josephus informs us, the Sadducees denied. They not only denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, but also the other article of the faith of the Pharisees, the existence in eternity of two orders of spiritual beings—angels who had never dwelt in bodies—and of the disembodied spirits of men. Now it was, as the sacred writer expressly informs us, with distinct and exclusive reference to those two articles of faith—the doctrine of the resurrection—and of the actual present existence of two orders of spiritual beings in eternity, to wit, angels and the disembodied spirits of men, that Paul avowed himself "a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee." He then actually held both of these doctrines as the Pharisees held them, or he was a dishonest man; and Luke also, when acting under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit, was equally dishonest; for he

affirms, that it was with express reference to the entire question, as above stated, that Paul did affirm himself a Pharisee. The fact, then, is undeniable, that Paul, at the time referred to, held the doctrine of the self-conscious activity of the soul between the period of death and the resurrection, a state of activity similar to that of angels. We affirm, that Paul, acting and speaking under the inspiration of the spirit of God, could not have been mistaken on such a subject as this. This doctrine, therefore, must be true. There can be no mistake upon the subject.

In the light of the above passage, we have a clear explanation of Luke 24: 36—39:—"And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." It was the common belief, at that time, of all who held to a future state, that the souls of men, after leaving their bodies, might, from time to time, appear in visible form, to men in this world. The disciples supposed that the spirit of Christ had thus appeared to them, on the occasion referred to. Christ corrected their misapprehensions in regard to himself, by reminding them of the fact, that "a spirit hath not flesh and bones," as they saw him to have. From this passage, it is evident, that up to this period, the disciples of our Savior held the common doctrine in regard to the state of the soul after death. If that doctrine is untrue, Christ had said nothing to correct their error in regard to it.

As the visible appearance of the Most High was denominated in the Old Testament the "angel of the Lord," so the Jews were accustomed to denominate the spirit of any person when thus appearing, "the angel" of that individual. Thus the Christians who had assembled at the house of Mary, the mother of Mark, to pray for the deliverance of Peter from prison, affirmed, when they were convinced that Peter himself really stood at the gate, that it was "his angel," that is, not that apostle in the

body, but his spirit, appearing in a visible form. Such, as we suppose, is the true meaning of this passage, a meaning, in the light of which we learn clearly what was the common belief of Christians, at the time, in regard to the state of the soul after death. Not a trace can be found of any such dogma having obtained belief among them, as "the sleep of the dead," that is, the unconscious state of the dead.

If the same great truth is not implied, with the most perfect distinctness, in Rom. 8: 10, 11, we are wholly unable to discern its meaning:—"And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Here, as we have seen, a contrast is drawn between the body, on the one hand, and the spirit of the believer on the other. On account of sin, the former is doomed to death, and consequent dissolution. On account of righteousness, however, the latter is not to die at all, but is destined to exist in a state of bliss. To express the idea that the bodies of men die, and that their spirits are not mortal, the former are denominated "your mortal bodies," and of these it is affirmed that even they shall be finally "quicken." The doctrine that the soul is not of the body, that is, material, of its continued existence and activity after death, and of its not being mortal like the body, is, we might say, more than implied in this passage. It is not only implied, but expressly taught here.

(5.) We now advance to the consideration of a class of passages of the character just alluded to, a class in which the truth of the doctrine which we maintain is not only *implied*, but directly and *positively affirmed*. We will refer, in the first place, to that class of passages which sets before us the consequences of believing in Christ. The term *life*, and terms and phrases of kindred import, are commonly employed to express these consequences. For the sake of the argument, we will grant what we shall hereafter prove not to be the case, that continued existence, and not a state of blessedness, is the fundamental element of the idea represented by this term. One thing the

reader will observe, what we shall also render demonstrately evident in the passages which we shall cite, that this life, whatever it may be in itself, is a state which *commences with the act of believing in Christ, and from that moment onward is never interrupted to all eternity.* On this subject there can be no mistake with any candid reader of the New Testament. We will cite a few of these passages as examples: John 6: 48—51:—"I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." John 6: 58:—"This is that bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever." John 8: 51, 52:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death. Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death." John 11: 25, 26:—"Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die. Believest thou this?" John 4: 13, 14:—"Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again. But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

The reader will notice, that in all these passages alike, the life promised was to commence with the act of believing, and was never after to be interrupted at all by death. The consequences of believing in Christ are contrasted relatively to the mind with those which result relatively to the body, from partaking food. In the latter case a form of life ensues which is only of temporary continuance, and is afterwards suspended by death. In the former case, another form of life ensues which never terminates, and which never is interrupted by death.

Those who have this life never "see," nor "taste," of death. They "never die." The "living water" which they receive ever after remains in them a "well of water springing up into everlasting life." Suppose, now, that the spirit dies with the body, and remains in the arms of death till the judgment. What form of life do they receive from Christ which is never interrupted by death? What form of bread does he give of which a man "may eat and not die," "not taste of death," and "never see death"? On no other supposition than this that the soul of the believer at death enters, not into a state of death and unconsciousness, but into a state of conscious activity and blessedness. On any other supposition, the words of Christ in such passages, can, by no possibility, be true. The life promised, we repeat, is every where presented as a *present* possession of which the believer is never, to eternity, to be deprived. "*Hath* everlasting life," "*is* passed from death to life," &c., is the language everywhere employed to express the relation of the believer to the life which he receives from Christ, and receives the moment he believes in him. Death interrupts the life of the body, but no form of death interrupts that of the soul, that form of life which the believer receives from Christ. This is absolutely affirmed in all the promises of life made to us by our Savior in the New Testament. Such a doctrine, in every one of its fundamental elements, is the total opposite of that which teaches the death of the soul as well as the body till the period of the resurrection.

The next passage to which we would invite attention is found Matt. 22: 31, 32:—"But, as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." The original phrase rendered, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," literally rendered would read thus: "God is not the God of dead beings, but of living ones," and this rendering expresses the precise meaning of our Savior in the phrase. The Sadducees, we should remember, denied not only the resurrection of the dead, but with that denial, also that of the existence of angels or spirits in a future state. To

prove that the souls of the dead are now living in eternity would remove all objections against the doctrine of the resurrection itself. For if spirits now exist in a state of conscious activity with God, no reasons can be urged against their re-union with newly organized bodies. Christ removes these objections by proving the fundamental error of the Sadducees in a particular which undeniably has a fundamental bearing upon the doctrine under consideration. How does he do this? By adducing a passage in which God affirms to Moses, that he was, at that moment, the God of the patriarchs who had been, for a long time, dead. God, he adds, is not the God of dead beings, but of living ones. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, therefore, are at this moment, not dead beings, but living ones; for God is now their God, and your fundamental objection to the doctrine of the resurrection falls to the ground. We have, then, the positive testimony of Christ himself, that these patriarchs are now living beings and not dead ones, as the doctrine under consideration affirms. If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are, as Christ affirms them to be, "living," and not "dead" beings, the same we are bound to suppose to be true of all the saints which have departed this life. It was the express and exclusive object of Christ to teach this grand doctrine in the passage before us, and no other valid construction can, by any possibility, be put upon his words in this passage.

Let us now turn to the declaration of our Savior to the penitent thief, Luke 23: 43:—"And Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." If that individual was, that day, as promised, with Christ in paradise, then the soul does not, at death, sink into a state of unconsciousness. Any other view of the passage but that which makes our Savior assert this great truth, makes the veriest nonsense conceivable of the words which he uses. For example, it is affirmed by the advocates of the "theory of the unconscious sleep of the dead," that the printing of the passage in our version is wrong, and that it ought to read thus: "Verily I say unto thee, to-day," making the phrase "to-day" qualify the words, "I say unto thee," and not the following ones—"thou shalt be." On this very day, I say unto you, that is, I did not



say it yesterday, nor last year, nor a thousand years ago. Nor shall I say it next year, nor a hundred years hence. But I do say it to you this day. Just as if the individual addressed needed any such information as that. The explanation is too absurd to require refutation. Yet this very construction must be put upon the passage, or the doctrine under consideration cannot be true; for if that individual was to be with Christ in paradise that very day; and he was, or Christ used words without meaning, every believer has the absolute assurance that at death he will not sink into a state of unconsciousness, but as the apostle expected to do, will "depart," and be with Christ "in the paradise of God." There is no form conceivable in which Christ could assert that doctrine more absolutely than he has done in this passage. He was himself, and a believer by his side, about to die that very day. To that believer he says, you shall ascend with me, and shall be with me this very day in the paradise of God. The immutable laws of language allow no other construction to be put upon our Savior's words, and the great truth which they there reveal, cannot be misunderstood. It was undoubtedly from these words that the form of expression adopted by Paul, "departing and being with Christ," and the great idea expressed by these words, had their origin.

Let us now consider the case of Dives and Lazarus as presented by our Savior. No one doubts or can doubt the fact, that the whole account is based upon the assumption, that the soul exists in a state of conscious activity after death. It is said, in reply, however, that this is a parable, and that from it, consequently, we are not at liberty to suppose that the events described actually occurred. In a certain sense, this is true, and in another fundamental particular, it is far from being true. A parable differs from a fable in this respect. The latter are mere imaginary occurrences, the like of which never occur, and are presented as illustrations on the principle of analogy exclusively. Parables, on the other hand, those of Christ without exception, are taken from classes of facts of actual occurrence, and are employed as illustrations on the principle of direct resemblance. According to the fundamental characteristics of

parables, therefore, those of our Savior especially, we are to infer, that the vision of eternity presented in this case, is, in all substantial particulars, correct. In the whole account, also, our Savior assumes the truth of the then popular belief, in regard to the state of the soul between the periods of death and the resurrection. If it had been his intention, like those who believe the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead, to correct that belief, he certainly would not have assumed, as he has done, in this parable, the truth of that belief. Any man of even common prudence would have avoided such an error as that.

In further confirmation of the truth of our exposition of this case, let us for a moment consider that presented by the advocates of the doctrine which we are now opposing. We will take, as an example, that given by Rev. Jacob Blain :

“ The ‘ rich man ’ denoted the Jewish nation, or the priesthood, or both combined ; the priests, by the law, having to be clothed ‘ in purple and fine linen : ’ Ex. 33 : 1, 2. His ‘ death ’ symbolized the death (destruction) of their *political* and ecclesiastical state : ‘ torment in flames,’ (the flames meaning God’s judgments) denoted or predicted the misery they would endure, as a nation. it is a fact that they have been in ‘ *torment* ’ by persecutions ever since they *died* as a nation. Their looking to Abraham for relief, may denote their relying on the *law* instead of Christ, or grace through him. They have been ‘ *buried* ’ as to nationality and a priesthood.

The ‘ poor man,’ as the prodigal son, symbolized the Gentiles and publicans, who were looked on as ‘ dogs ’ by the Jews, and lay, or could only come to the ‘ *gate*,’ of the temple, for ‘ crumbs ’ of light. ‘ Abraham’s bosom ’ meant the *gospel church*, and when the Gentiles ‘ *died*,’ or changed their former sickly state, they were not ‘ *buried* ’ as were the Jews, but ‘ carried by angels ’ (messengers) into the gospel church. Peter and Paul were special ‘ angels ’ to thus transport them. ‘ Publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you,’—Matt. 21 : 31. The ‘ branches being broken off,’ &c.—Rom. 11 : 17—21, conveys the same ideas as this parable ; and I apprehend Christ meant the same in Matt. 8 : 11, 12 ; “ Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” denoting the ‘ election,’ Rom. 11 : 7, with whom the Gentiles were to ‘ sit down ’ in gospel privileges.”

The author has told us, as he supposes, who are represented by Dives on the one hand, and by Lazarus on the other, to wit, the Gentiles and Publicans, and the Jewish nation, that is, these two personages represent all mankind without exception. Who, then, we would ask, are the “ five brethren ” of the rich

man? They cannot be any part of the human race, and must, if this exposition is correct, be the inhabitants of some other planet. Thus the fundamental aim of the parable is totally misapprehended in this exposition, the exclusive object of our Savior, as himself affirms, being to set before the world this great truth, that if mankind will not "be persuaded" to turn to God, through the scriptures and the attendant means of grace, they would not be induced to repent, though a spirit from eternity should come to them and disclose to them directly what is passing there. The great truth which it is the object of the parable to elucidate, supposes the soul in eternity is in a state of conscious activity, and is able to reveal what is passing around it. Of what possible use would it be for individuals to rise from a state of total unconsciousness, and speak to men in the flesh? Nothing could be revealed in that case but what was known before. The parable, both in its constituent elements and in its fundamental aim, is without meaning, if the doctrine of the conscious activity of the dead, and that, too, in a state of all impressive retributions, is not true.

The next passage to which we would invite very special attention, may be found in Heb. 12: 22, 23:—"But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." We must bear in mind that this epistle was addressed to Hebrews, a people who were accustomed to attach a fixed meaning, and none others, to two terms found in this passage, when found in such connections as they are here employed in. We refer, of course, to the terms *angels* and *spirits*. The Hebrews held that the present inhabitants of heaven were made up of two classes, "an innumerable company of angels"—and the disembodied spirits of saints "who have died in the Lord," that is, "the spirits of the just made perfect," perfected in glory. Paul well knew, that every one of the individuals to whom the epistle was addressed would put this precise and exclusive construction upon these terms in the passage before us. He employed the terms, there-

fore, in strict accordance with that construction; or, when under the immediate inspiration of the Spirit of God, he was a dishonest man. Every law of interpretation requires us to believe that spirits of believers who have "died in the Lord," are not with their bodies in the earth, dead and unconscious, but with "an innumerable company of angels" in heaven, perfected in glory there. This is the present vision of heaven revealed to our faith in the passage before us. No sophistry can wrest any other meaning from the passage. The doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead is not only not sustained by the word of God, but is directly and openly opposed to its most direct and explicit revelations of eternity. Equally direct and explicit is the bearing of the following passage upon our present enquiries. Rev. 5: 8, 9:—"And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." The scene here presented transpired about 1800 years ago. The actors in it must, at that time, of course, have been in a state of self-conscious activity. And who were these "four and twenty elders" who performed such a leading and conspicuous part in that scene? They were none other than the spirits of redeemed sinners, sinners "redeemed to God" "by the blood of the Lamb," "out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," redeemed spirits, not slumbering in death, as the dogma before us affirms to be true of the souls of all believers from the period of death till the resurrection, but as the evangelical faith affirms, and the Bible expressly reveals, "made perfect" in glory. Now what is true of these individuals we are bound to suppose as true of the spirits of all other believers.

Take another vision of the state of those who "die in the Lord," of their state between the period of death and the resurrection. We refer to Rev. 6: 9—11:—"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for

the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." Here we have a direct vision of the state of "the souls" of believers between the period of death and the judgment. What is that state? Is it an unconscious sleep in death and the grave? It is, on the other hand, a state of the highest activity and glory in heaven. This, we must bear in mind, is not a vision of what is yet to be, but of what actually occurred ages ago, and consequently of what is *now* true of the redeemed soul in eternity. Such visions and revelations can never be made to accord with the doctrine of the unconscious sleep of the dead.

We forbear to make further citations of passages of the same character and bearing of those just adduced from the book of Revelation, passages of which that book is full. Of all the leading scenes opened upon our vision in that book, the departed spirits of ancient saints are represented as present, direct, immediate and intensely interested spectators. Whenever Christ appears, he is affirmed to be accompanied by a glorified retinue of such spirits. All this representation is false in fact, and tends only to deceive, if the doctrine of the universal sleep of the dead is true.

We will refer to but one additional passage in this connection. Rev. 22: 8, 9:—"And I John saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." An angel is present to John to open upon his mind visions of the present and future pertaining to earth and heaven. John is so overawed by the presence of the glorified spirit before him, that "he falls down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed him these things." But who did that angel turn out to be? A "fellow-

servant" of John himself, one of his own "brethren, (countrymen,) the prophets," that is, the soul of one of the ancient saints perfected in glory, a soul not dead and unconscious as this new dogma affirms, but a living glorified being who was himself then "keeping the sayings of this book." Such is a concise view of a portion of the evidence presented in the scriptures of the truth of the evangelical view of the state of the dead between the period of death and the resurrection, in opposition to the doctrine of the universal sleep of the dead in a state of total mental inactivity and unconsciousness. For ourselves, we would much sooner attempt to prove from the Bible, that "there is no resurrection, neither angels nor spirits," than attempt to prove from the same book the doctrine just named. The advocates of this doctrine have been "spoiled through philosophy," the philosophers of gross materialism, "the dirt philosophy," as it has been very appropriately called.

The argument, as we have conducted it, pertains mainly to the souls of believers. Its bearings, however, upon the entire doctrine of the state of the dead is not, for that reason, the less manifest. When we have proved the fact, that the scriptures expressly affirm that a certain portion of disembodied spirits are living and acting in eternity, the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead has been proved to be false. The opposite doctrine may then, as a necessary consequence, be assumed as true. Those who admit of the conscious state of the righteous, after death, will not ask proof of that of the wicked.

3. Our third and last proposition under the present section is this:—The *life* promised to the righteous in the Scriptures is not, as this new doctrine affirms, *immortal existence*, but a certain state of existence, a state of blessedness and glory; nor is the death threatened to the wicked *destruction in the sense of annihilation*, but a *state of endless retributions*. The question now before us divides itself into two parts—the *nature* of the life and death referred to—and their *duration*. Our present discussion has mainly to do with the first issue, the nature of this life on the one hand, and of its opposite, death, on the other.

We shall first meet this one issue, and then make a few remarks upon the second.

When we read in the scriptures, that "the wages of sin is death, but that the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord," the question what is the central element of the idea represented by the term "life" on the one hand, and "death" on the other, is certainly one of infinite moment to us, who are to participate of the life, or suffer the death referred to. We may safely presume, that a revelation which "brings life and immortality to light," has not left us in darkness on such a subject. In regard to one fact pertaining to this subject, we are in no danger of erring, to wit, that the central element of the idea represented by the words "eternal life," is either an eternal *existence*, immortality, or a state of *endless blessedness*, while the term death represents the idea of destruction, annihilation, or eternal unhappiness. The question for us to determine is, which of these classes of ideas are represented by these terms?

In answering this question, let us first consider the primary import of the terms themselves. A moment's reflection will convince any one that these words do not primarily, if at all, signify *existence* on the one hand, and non-existence on the other, but different and opposite *states* of existence. Life, of course, implies existence, but is, in no sense, identical with it. Whatever the form of the life referred to may be, its immutable signification is a certain *state* of being, and not existence itself. The same is true of the opposite term, death. The idea which it represents is not destruction in the sense of the termination of existence, but existence in a state the opposite of that which is represented by the term life. If the latter represents the idea of existence in a state of self-conscious activity, the term death would then represent a state of total unconsciousness. If, on the other hand, the term life in any given connection represents existence in a state of happiness, then the term death would exclusively represent the opposite state, that of unhappiness.

Now any one who has read the scriptures with any degree of care, must be aware, on a moment's reflection, that the term

life, when employed therein, to represent that eternal state consequent on believing in Christ, does not represent the idea of mere existence, or existence in a state of mere physical and mental activity, but primarily, if not exclusively, existence in a state of happiness. It would be an insult to their good sense and knowledge of the word of God to hint the idea that our readers are ignorant of so manifest a truth as this. The death there threatened to the wicked is not non-being, nor a cessation of mental action, but a state the opposite of that represented by the term happiness, or a state of unhappiness. What is the vision of immortality which is opened before us in the sacred writings in regard to the righteous? Is it that of mere existence, or self-conscious existence? Is it not exclusively a vision of perfect and endless blessedness? Every one knows that it is. The death then threatened to the wicked is exclusively the opposite state. It is a violation of all the laws of language to make any other supposition upon the subject. "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is," what? Mere immortal existence? or an immortality in a state of self-conscious activity? Not at all. "The end of that man is PEACE," happiness. This is, we repeat, the exclusive form of the life represented by the term "life" in the words "eternal life," when they are employed in the Bible to represent the reward of believing in Christ. The death threatened to the wicked, every principle of interpretation requires us, therefore, to suppose, is not death in the form of mental unconsciousness, but the termination of happiness, or a state of unhappiness. Every child who has spent a year in our Sabbath schools, will at once recognize the above statements as being undeniably and self-evidently true.

Let us now consider a few particular passages in which this subject is distinctly and specifically set before our minds. In Deut. 30: 15:—"See I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil;" we have a specific definition of the terms life and death where employed to express the consequences of obedience on the one hand, and disobedience on the other. The meaning of the passage may be thus expressed: "See I have set before thee this day life," that is "good," or



happiness, and "death," that is, "evil," or unhappiness, misery. The original word here rendered "and" often has the force of "to wit," and this is its uniform meaning in such connections as these. The terms good and evil are simply explications of those of life and death with which the former are connected by the term "and." The life promised to the righteous is not continued existence, or existence in a state of self-conscious activity, but life in the sense of *good*, or happiness. So the death threatened to the wicked, as God himself has defined the term, is not a termination of existence, or of active existence, but death in the sense of "evil," or unhappiness. God, then, having himself specifically defined these terms, when applied to the one subject before us, we are bound to understand them in the same sense, when applied to the same subject in other parts of the scriptures.

Again, Deut. 11: 26—28:—"Behold, I set before thee this day a blessing and a curse; A blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I set before thee this day: And a curse if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God," &c. The fundamental element of the idea represented by the term "blessing" is, not existence, or self-conscious activity, but *blessedness*, happiness. Precisely the opposite idea is represented by the term "curse." Blessedness, or happiness, then, is the exclusive idea represented by the term "life," when employed to represent the rewards of obedience to the commands of God. For the same reasons, misery, or the loss, not of existence or self-conscious being, but of *happiness*, is the curse represented by the term "death," when this term is employed to represent the consequences of disobedience.

Gen. 12: 2:—"I will bless thee, and thou shalt be a blessing," that is, I will render you happy, and cause you to become a source of happiness to others. The meaning would have been precisely the same, had it been written thus: I will impart "life" to thee, and thou shalt be a means of life to others.

Let us now contemplate two passages, in the first of which the consequences of obedience, and the second, those of disobedience, are set before our minds in the most expressive forms. Isa. 60: 19, 20:—"The sun shall be no more thy light by day:

neither for brightness shall the moon give life unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy sun shall no more go down; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself: for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended." Isa. 57: 20, 21:—"But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." Two distinct and opposite mental states are here described, the one as the consequence of obedience, and the other of disobedience. These states are not continued existence, on the one hand, and the termination of existence, on the other. In opposition to such an idea, the one state is complete and endless blessedness, and the other, unhappiness. When employed to represent the consequences of obedience and disobedience, the term "life" represents the former state, and that of death the latter. Any person that attaches any other ideas to these terms, when thus employed, fundamentally misapprehends the doctrine of retribution, as set forth in the scriptures. "Say ye to the righteous, it shall be well with him," (he shall be happy,) "for they shall eat of the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him," (he shall be miserable;) "for the reward of his hands shall be given him." This is the message which every herald of salvation is commanded to deliver to the righteous, on the one hand, and to the wicked, on the other. The individual who changes this promise of good, or happiness, into that of mere continued existence, and this threatening of evil into that of mere deprivation of existence, has betrayed fundamentally the divine message which he was commissioned to deliver. The life promised to the righteous is good, blessedness, happiness; the death threatened to the wicked is, the deprivation of this good, and the endurance of its opposite misery. On these two representations, "hang all the Law and the Prophets," as far as their teachings relate to these momentous themes, we could multiply our quotations to any extent we please. The above, however, are sufficient as far as the Old Testament is concerned.

Let us now turn to the New Testament, and see whether its

teachings accord with those of the Old upon the same subject. The phrase "eternal life," or "life eternal," is the phrase commonly employed by our Savior to express the consequences which result from believing in him. But what is the nature of this life? Is it a continued existence in a state of mental activity? Or is it life in the sense of perfect and unending blessedness? Our Savior himself has given a specific answer to this question. John 17: 3:—"And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." "Life eternal," "eternal life," &c., is not an immortal active existence, but that state of perfect and endless blessedness, which results from the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ here referred to. This is the life promised to the believer in the New Testament. Every representation of it found in this portion of the word of God perfectly accords with this one idea and with none other. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and ye shall find," what? Existence to eternity? No. "Ye shall find REST to your souls." "There remaineth, therefore," not mere continued existence, "but a REST to the people of God." This is the "life" which "the disobedient and unbelieving" are never to "see," that is, enjoy.

In Rom. 2: 6—9, we have a formal and express revelation of the real meaning of the words "eternal life," and "death," when used to express the state of the righteous and wicked in eternity:—"Who will render to every man according to his deeds: To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality; eternal life: But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness; indignation and wrath. Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile." The original word here rendered immortality sometimes has the meaning of unfolding and un-failing blessedness, and this unquestionably is its meaning in the connection in which it is here found. The corresponding term "peace," which, in verse 9, is substituted for that under consideration, leaves no doubt on this subject. However this may be, no doubt is left in regard to the meaning of the words.

“eternal life,” others being substituted for it in verse 9, words, too, whose meaning cannot be misunderstood. In what, then, does the “eternal life” to be awarded to the righteous consist? Not in mere immortal existence or immortal activity in opposition to annihilation, but in “glory, honor, and peace,” in other words, an immortality of perfect blessedness and glory. Equally manifest is the nature of the death which is then to be inflicted upon the wicked. It is not death in the form of eternal destruction of conscious existence, but in the form of “tribulation and anguish.”

In illustration of the same great truth, we will now cite a few other passages, and that without any passing comments. John 1: 12. Rom. 8: 16—19, 28. Rev. 7: 13—17. Rev. 21: 1—8. 2: 7, 11, 17, 26—29. 3: 5, 12, 21. Jude 11—13. Rev. 10: 11, &c. In all these passages the same idea is ever present, to wit, that *happiness* pure and unending, “glory, honor, and peace,” is the exclusive form of the “*life*” promised to the righteous in eternity, while unhappiness, misery, “tribulation and anguish” is the death which is then to come upon the wicked. No sentiment can, by any possibility, be more contrary to the express and most abundant teachings of the scriptures, than the idea that the terms “life” and “death” when employed to express the different and opposite states of the righteous and wicked in eternity, present not the idea of an immortality of happiness and misery, but of an immortal existence on the one hand, and annihilation on the other. On no subject could inspiration itself be more explicit than it is on this. When it promises “life” to the obedient and threatens death to the disobedient, the two are so carefully and repeatedly defined, that those who mistake their meaning are without excuse.

A very few remarks only are requisite in regard to the end and relative duration of these two states. No one doubts that the “life” promised to the righteous is unending in its duration. Now the same laws of interpretation which require us to suppose the happiness of this class to be without end, require us to suppose the same thing in regard to the duration of the unhappiness of the wicked. Any principles of interpretation which would require us to limit the duration of the latter, would

require us, with equal absoluteness, to limit that of the former. This we affirm from the following considerations :

1. The scriptures no where give any *positive* intimation that either of these states will ever terminate, and they no more intimate that the one state is limited in its duration, than they do that the other is. Suppose that the scriptures should fall into the hands of an individual from some distant planet; an individual who understood the language in which they are written, but knew nothing of the inhabitants of this world. From the writings themselves, he would, at once, derive the most positive evidence, that the life of man on earth is of temporary duration only. He would find no such evidence, however, relative to the duration of the happiness of the righteous on the one hand, or of unhappiness of the wicked on the other. If either is to terminate, no positive evidence of the fact can be found in the scriptures of truth. This is just as true of the one state as of the other.

2. We may rest assured that if the Most High intended to teach the doctrine that either of these states will terminate, he would have expressed the fact in language which could not be misunderstood. No idea conceivable could have been more readily and indubitably expressed. It is just as easy to affirm, in language which cannot be misunderstood, a limit to either of these states, as it would have been to affirm the same thing in regard to human life on earth. The fact that God has made no such revelation, renders it demonstrably evident that he definitely intended not to do it. In entertaining the sentiment then, that there are limits to either of these states, we do it without authority from the scriptures. We do it, also, in manifest opposition to the manifest intention of the Most High himself in giving us the scriptures.

3. The scriptures *directly and positively reveal* the fact, that each of these states alike shall be endless in its duration:—  
“These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.”—Matt. 25 : 46. “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.”—John 3 : 36. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that

heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."—John 5: 24. "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death."—Rev. 2: 11. "I will not blot his name out of the book of life."—Rev. 3: 5. "On such the second death hath no power."—Rev. 20: 6. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of God, and from the glory of his power." Every one is aware that the literal meaning of the original word here rendered "everlasting" and "eternal," (the original of both words being the same,) is *unending*, limitless. When the term is applied to that which is not of eternal duration, it always is used figuratively, to give intensity to the idea, as "the everlasting mountains," or it expresses limitless duration as far as the existence of the thing is concerned, as when anything is affirmed to be everlasting relatively to the duration of life, the meaning being that the thing shall continue as long as life itself continues, and is thus *relatively* limitless. Now if we refer to the literal meaning of the words by which the duration of each of these states is expressed, we must suppose the duration of each alike to be absolutely limitless. Then that duration is affirmed to be "everlasting," "eternal," with reference to that which is absolutely without limits, to wit, the eternal future. That which is "eternal," everlasting relatively to the future, must, like that future, be literally unending in its duration. Such is the eternity of each of these states alike. In addition to this, the duration of the punishment of the wicked is revealed as everlasting as *compared* with that which is known to be literally of an unending duration, to wit, the "life" of the righteous. When two states are each alike affirmed to be everlasting, or eternal, the duration of one being set over against that of the other, and when one state is known to be literally of an unending duration, it is a flagrant violation of all the laws of language to assign or to suppose any limits to the duration of the other state. These remarks apply directly to the duration of the punishment of the wicked. It is affirmed to be everlasting as compared with the duration of the "life" of the righteous, which is known to extend literally to eternity. Then, finally,

each of these states is not only affirmed in all of these forms to be literally unending in its duration, but each is, by a negative, eternally separated from the opposite state, the strongest and most positive form in which the idea of absolute eternity can be expressed. Thus, of the righteous, while it is said that they have "everlasting life," it is added, that they "shall not come into condemnation," "shall not be hurt of the second death," &c. By such forms of expression, eternal duration is not only directly and literally affirmed of the happiness of the righteous, but a literal eternity is placed in the most absolute form conceivable between them and the opposite state. In precisely this form is the eternity of the punishment of the wicked revealed in the scriptures. While it is affirmed of such, that they shall be punished "everlastingly," it is also affirmed, that they "shall not SEE life." A literal eternity is thus placed between them and the life referred to. Hence we remark—

4. That if each of these states is not revealed as literally of unending duration, it absolutely is not in the power of language to express such an idea. What are the facts of the case? They are the following, as shown above:—(1.) Each state alike is directly and repeatedly affirmed to be "everlasting" and eternal in its duration. (2.) Each alike is affirmed to be "everlasting" and "eternal" *relatively* to that which has and can have no limits, to wit, the eternal future. (3.) The punishment of the wicked is affirmed to be everlasting as *compared* with the duration of the happiness of the righteous, a state known to be without end. (4.) Those in each state alike are forever separated from those in the opposite state by an *absolute negative*. While each state is affirmed, in all the forms above indicated, to be of unending duration, it is absolutely affirmed of those in it, that they shall never come into the opposite state. If the scriptures, then, do not reveal each of these states, as absolutely unending in their duration, we may say, without fear of contradiction, that it is not in the power of language to express that idea. Any laws of interpretation which would show that the Bible does not reveal each of these states as of unending duration, would affirm the same in respect to any other forms of expression in which there should be an attempt to express that idea.

5. We have precisely the same evidence that one of these states is to be literally of unending duration that we have that the other is. Any laws of interpretation, for example, (we repeat what was said above,) that would show that the duration of the punishment of the wicked is but temporary, would be equally conclusive against the unending continuance of the blessedness of the righteous. This is undeniable. The continuance of the latter state is literally unending. We must therefore affirm the same of the former.

6. We remark, finally, that if the duration of each of these states is not literally unending, the Lord Jesus Christ stands convicted of absolute falsehood. No sophistry, no valid laws of interpretation can, by any possibility, reconcile his language upon the subject with any other idea than the absolute eternity of each of these states. Those who affirm that either of these states is of limited duration, will not dare to take the ground that Christ was ignorant of the real facts of the case, or could have been mistaken on the subject. They must impute to him the deliberate intention to deceive. Suppose that the righteous, in eternity, should ever "come into condemnation," or be "hurt of the second death," or that the wicked should ever there "see life;" what will become of the absolute affirmation of Christ, that no such event shall ever take place? We leave this thought to the solemn reflection of the reader. Christ's words, we say, "will not pass away." We therefore, as pupils of the Bible, hold the literal eternity of these two states. We must do this, or deny the divine origin of the scriptures, and so must you, reader. Our present argument has to do with those only, who, with us, hold "that all scripture is given by inspiration of God." With the unbeliever, we have other arguments upon this subject. With the Bible student, the absolute testimony of Him that cannot lie must suffice. Around each of these states alike the word of God hangs no other indications, as far as duration is concerned, but the ideas of absolute eternity. The judgment is the "eternal judgment." Nothing is connected with the resurrection of the righteous, but the idea of "life," and nothing with that of the wicked but the idea of "damnation." Let us solemnly ponder these revelations, and hasten



our preparation to meet the infinite realities which they open to our vision.

The two remaining topics are reserved for a future number of the Quarterly.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE EARLY GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCHES IN THE UNITED STATES.

It was shown in the last number of the Quarterly, that several and perhaps a majority of the first churches of the Baptist faith that were organized in the Northern and Middle States, were Arminian in their sentiments; also that writers were agreed that those early Baptist churches pretty generally held to the rite of laying-on-of hands. Though in some of those ancient churches, there seems to have been a unanimity of views in regard to the sentiment and practice just named, in others there was a difference of opinion in relation to them which sometimes disturbed the peace of their members, and led to divisions. These troubles, with others, weakened the strength and reduced the numbers of the General Baptist churches, so that for the last hundred years they have increased but little if any in numbers, while some of the most important organizations have long since ceased to exist. The article in the last Quarterly contains an account of the church in New York city, of that at Chestnut Ridge, and of the second church in Baltimore, two of which, after existing for no long period, came to a sorrowful end, and the third changed its views of the atonement, and united with the Calvinistic denomination to avoid a similar fate.

In passing, it may be noticed that the Cohansey church in New Jersey, the third church of the Baptist order in that State, was constituted in 1690. Its original members were from Ireland. Three years before its organization, Eld. Timothy Brooks, with a few other brethren, moved from Swansea, Mass.,

into the vicinity of this church; but "on account of a difference in opinion relative to predestination, laying-on-of hands, &c.," they did not unite with it till 1710. This union was effected by Elder Valentine Wightman, who assisted in forming the General Baptist church in the city of New York. This union was formed "on the terms of bearance and forbearance," the Arminian minister and members from Swansea consenting to *bear* the predestination of their Cohansey brethren, and these to *endure* the Arminianism and laying-on-of hands of their Swansea associates. It seems that for many years there was a considerable amount of the "Arminian leaven" in large numbers of the other early Baptist churches throughout the country, as well as in the Cohansey church.

In pursuing this historical tour South, and passing into Virginia—

#### THE BURLEY CHURCH

first requires notice. Letters previously received from Virginia, induced the Baptists in London to ordain Robert Nordin and Thomas White in that city, in May, 1774. They soon sailed for Virginia; but Thomas White died on the passage. Robert Nordin arrived in Virginia, and gathered a church in a place called Burley, in the Isle of Wight county. It is supposed that there were Baptists there who wrote to London for ministerial aid, and that these two brethren were consequently ordained, and undertook the distant voyage to become their ministers. Mr. Nordin labored in Burley and other places, till he went down to the grave in a good old age, in 1725. In 1727, two preachers, Casper Mintz and Richard Jones came from England and settled with this church, and Mr. Jones became its pastor. It seems, as will soon be seen below, that both these ministers were alive and members of the church in 1756; but scarcely anything is known of their history. Of this church and its pastor, Eld. Paul Palmer of North Carolina wrote as follows to Eld. John Comer, of Newport, Rhode Island, in 1729:—"There is a comely little church in the Isle of Wight county, of about thirty or forty members, the elder of which is one Richard Jones, a very sensible old gentleman, whom I have great love for. We see

each other at every yearly meeting, and sometimes more often." Benedict says that, according to Morgan Edwards' account, after existing between forty and fifty years, this church was broken up by sickness and the removal of families to North Carolina, where they made many proselytes, and in ten years numbered sixteen churches, all of which were General Baptists. The following extract of a letter to the Philadelphia Calvinistic Baptist Association, contains the last information that can be obtained respecting this church:—

"The church of Jesus Christ, in the Isle of Wight county, holding adult baptism, &c., to the Reverend and General Assembly or Association at Philadelphia, send greeting: We, the above mentioned church, confess ourselves to be under clouds of darkness concerning the faith of Jesus Christ, not knowing whether we are on the right foundation, and the church much unsettled: wherefore we desire alliance with you, and that you will be pleased to send us helps to settle the church, and rectify what may be wrong, and subscribe ourselves your loving brethren in Christ, Caspar Mentz, Richard Jones, Randall Allen, Joseph Mattgum, Christopher Atkinson, Benjamin Atkinson, David Atkinson, Thomas Cafer, Samuel Jones, William Jordan, John Allen, John Powell, Joseph Atkinson, Dec. 27, 1756."

This is the last account that has been found of this church, though it was written ninety-nine years ago; nor can it be ascertained what was done by the Philadelphia Association with their request to send them "helps;" but according to the account of Morgan Edwards referred to above, it seems this church never united with any other denomination.

#### CHURCH IN SURRY COUNTY.

No account has been found of the origin, progress, or end of this church. In the above named letter of Elder Paul Palmer, written in 1729, after referring to the Burley church, he writes: "There is another church in Surry county, where my brother Jones lives, I suppose of about thirty more" [members.]

According to this statement, Elder Richard Jones, though pastor of the Burley church, was living in the limits of this church, but it is not known whether he was the pastor of both, or of only one of them. Perhaps this church was organized by Elders Mintz or Jones, soon after their arrival from England, as was stated in the account of the Burley church. However

this may be, Elder Jones signed the petition of the Burley church to the Philadelphia Association in 1756, and it may be that the church in Surry county had been previously merged in that church; but this is mere conjecture, and probably no one knows even where it worshipped, by whom it was constituted, or when or how it ceased to exist as a church.

#### CHURCH IN OPECKON CREEK.

This church originated as follows: In the year 1743, some of the members of the Chestnut Ridge church in Maryland, settled in this place. Their minister, the impure Henry Loveall, soon followed them, baptized some fifteen persons, and constituted the church on the General Baptist plan. Unfortunately for these brethren, they were compelled to exclude their unworthy minister, and the church was broken up. Alas, when a minister falls, it is as when a standard-bearer faints.

In 1751, the remnants of this unfortunate band petitioned the Philadelphia Association for help, and Messrs. James Miller, David Thomas, and John Gano were sent to aid them. Such laxity had been observed in the reception of members, that out of all who applied to this committee for membership in the new church then about to be organized, only three were received. Some openly said they could relate no religious experience, and on this account did not offer themselves, while others were ready to offer if a new church were formed. Some confessed their deplorable state to Mr. Miller, who, at their request, preached to them in the evening, and the result was, they "professed [conversion, and Calvinism probably] and became zealous members" of the new church. Sometime after its constitution, the church on Opeckon creek was called Millcreek; but probably this change of name did not occur till after the church was re-moulded and adopted Calvinistic principles.

The preceding account contains a history of six churches, commencing with that in the city of New York, and ending with that on Opeckon Creek, and embraces a period of ninety-five years, beginning in 1712, when the New York city church was organized, and closing in 1807, when the church in Baltimore united with the Calvinistic Baptists. These six are

probably all the General Baptist churches that existed in that period between the city of New York and the State of Virginia. The extinction of the New York church near 1732, probably soon broke the chain of communication between the Northern and Southern General Baptists; still the few churches of both these bodies seem to have continued their Yearly Meetings as they had done before they became lost to each other.

The ruin that came upon the church in New York, steadily progressed to the South as far as Virginia, either annihilating these churches or converting them to Calvinistic organizations; and the poor General Baptists continued to retreat to the South before the ruinous causes that destroyed their churches. In a subsequent number of the Quarterly, it is designed to follow them in this account into North Carolina, where, though they yet have an existence, trials and misfortunes have kept them low and feeble, while circumstances seem to indicate that unless something efficient shall occur in their favor, the few of their churches that have not united with the Disciples or Campbellites cannot maintain their existence for any considerable length of time to come. But as the body has sometimes risen for a season above the influences that threatened its almost immediate destruction, a day of joy and prosperity may yet arise upon those forlorn churches. But for the exciting subject of slavery, on which the North and the South are now so sadly divided, Free-will Baptist ministers from the North could do *far* more in the way of reviving existing churches and organizing new ones in the morally waste places in North Carolina, than they can possibly do in any other part of the Union.

## ART. IV.—THE FAULT OF THE MINISTRY OF THE PRESENT AGE.

The human mind delights in the contemplation of the excellent. It is not naturally disposed to be fault-finding. And when it does find faults, as in the present imperfect condition of things it necessarily must, it prefers passing them over lightly. As the ear would turn away from harsh and discordant sounds, and the eye close itself upon unhappy scenes, so the mind, finding no pleasure in the defects of the objects it contemplates, glances slightly over them, to dwell upon their beauties. And especially is this true of the Christian, when contemplating the Christian ministry. He delights to bask in the warm sunshine of its excellencies; and it is only at the stern call of duty that he consents to retire beneath the cold shadows of its defects. Were he left to take counsel of his own preferences in the selection of subjects of observation, and modes of examining them, the beautiful, and the lovely, and the admirable would command his whole thought. But taking counsel of duty, and aiming only at the glory of God, he is often obliged to suffer the self-denial of examining and exposing evil and uncomely things. He roils the fountain for its purification, as Bethesda's pool was troubled by angelic agency, for the communication of healing virtues.

The excellencies of the ministry of the present age are many, and well worthy of note. Upon them we would delight to dwell. But we must not ~~choose~~ the flowery path, when duty calls us to walk among thorns. It were pleasant to the Christian minister to preach with his eye forever fixed upon the "golden streets of the New Jerusalem." But he must, nevertheless, often turn to the awful sights and sounds of the pit that is bottomless. In his sympathy with the minstrelsy of heavenly joy, sounding from the city which "flames with the glory of God," he must not ignore the "smoke of torment, which ascendeth up forever and ever." And so, also, in the discussion of the character of the Christian ministry, its defects must be faithfully, painfully pointed out. To ignore these, were to deal

faithlessly with the ministry itself, and facilitate the descent of vast multitudes to perdition.

Christian ministers are but men. They should be good men, venerable men, men of God, men worthy of all honor. But they are, after all, but men of like passions as others, and therefore may be expected to have faults. To be sure from their profession and position, society has a right to expect that their faults be comparatively few. But it is preposterous to predicate infallibility of them. They are of a corrupt stock, and mingling with a corrupt race; though, if, making full proof of their ministry, and magnifying their office, they are morally and religiously high above it. As rebukers and exhorters, their stand-point should be, morally, an elevated one. But alas, it is feared that not very rarely, they are not only *in* the world, but *of* it; scarcely less faulty than many whom they smite with gospel truth in the name of God. Indeed, it holds true, universally, that the worst men are found in the best professions; Judas is among the body-disciples of Jesus Christ. Satan comes up among the sons of God. But if the *worst* of men may be found in the clerical profession, certainly the *best* of men are found there in great numbers—men of wisdom, dignity, humanity, piety—men of whom the world is not worthy, and who are its truest benefactors—men whom God acknowledges, and who are known in heaven as “the ambassadors of Christ” to this revolted and revolting world—men,

“ Whose hearts are warm,  
Whose hands are pure, whose doctrine and whose life  
Coincident, exhibit lucid proof  
That they are honest in the sacred cause !”

But the clerical profession needs not our praise; and if it did it would not receive it in this paper. Our present work is to point out one of its faults, and that a most serious and comprehensive one. It is this—the *failure to exhibit deep, strong sympathy with the truths of the gospel and with those who are to be affected by them*. That there is such a failure we are thoroughly convinced by a very careful and somewhat extensive observation. Multitudes of sermons are, from Sabbath to Sabbath, listened to by Protestant congregations, which have

derived little warmth or fervor from the deep sympathetic soul-breathings of their authors. They may be full of vital truths—the very truths which the people need hear. These truths, too, may have derived clearness and lucidness from their passage through the preacher's head. But, alas, they have received no vivification from a baptism in his fervid heart. The intellect is often but a freezing conductor, from which the most melting truths issue, congealed, and, therefore, beautiful! All warmth is in the heart, and through it Jesus designed that all the truths of the gospel should pass, ere they "distil as the dew" from the lips of his chosen ambassadors. And when it does not, its effect is in a great measure lost. As the minister preaches the doctrines of Christ, so is he in his own person to represent the person of Christ. He is not only to say, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden," but he is to say this *feelingly* as *Christ* said it! Not simply are his hands to be stretched forth to sinners; but his heart is to yearn for their salvation.

Much is in these days being said about a special call to the gospel ministry. What is involved in the speciality of this call we could never understand. That it is a call of God to a work of the highest and weightiest responsibilities is very plain. That it is a call, the disregard of which brings extreme woe, is equally plain. But why it should be spoken of as a *special* call, unless to confuse the ideas of young men who are seriously querying whether it is not their duty to become ministers of the New Testament, we cannot tell.

But though we cannot perceive why it should be called a *special*, we do perceive that it is a solemn and momentous call, one in comparison with which, calls to all secular professions are but idle things. And every person who properly heeds it and assumes its responsibilities, does so, not only with an eye single to the glory of God, but with an intense sympathy with the truths he proclaims, and a yearning compassion for those who, if saved at all, must be saved through them. And this sympathy and compassion with which the minister of the gospel enters upon his mission, must accompany him and be evinced by him through his entire course. When these fail in his heart, the word fails upon his lip, or becomes like the last javelin of



dying Priam which fell short of the mark. It may, indeed, be still eloquent, but the mailed heart of the sinner cares nothing for it. The word indeed may become the more *admirable* as it becomes the less *powerful*, and the impenitent wish the more to hear it, because less fearful of being disturbed or wounded by it. But he who receives their praises then, is but the Herod who received the acclamations of the people, and then fell from his throne of splendor to be "eaten of worms."

The primary characteristic of the true and successful preacher is, and has ever been, deep earnestness—a yearning compassion—a struggle of soul for the redemption of sinners, sometimes approaching the very agony of Christ when he "prayed more earnestly" in the garden! We do not say that, in all the true ambassadors of Christ, this characteristic will stand out equally bold. But we do say that it will of all true ambassadors be the primary one. We might set this proposition in a stronger and clearer light, by reference to the great champions who have wrought most effectually in the gospel field. How was it with Paul? Did he not preach the gospel "day and night" "with tears?" Was he not ready to wish himself accursed from Christ for his brethren's sake? Was not his "heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel, that they might be saved." And in this "*heart's desire*" do we not perceive the primary soul of the great apostle? Take away his deep unutterable anxiety to "win souls," and you rob him of his chief motive power, and leave little more than a sort of tamed *Saul* remaining.

But it may be said the age and gifts of the apostles were peculiar. They are no example for their successors. As ministers of a later age cannot work miracles as they did, so they are not to be expected to feel as they felt. But this objection is only plausible. Indeed, we would rather attempt to prove that the ministry of the present day ought to evince more tearful earnestness than the apostles did, than that they should evince less. But we are willing to set it down that they should evince only as much. And for this we need make no labored argument. We need only appeal to the example of the greater gospel lights since the apostle's days—the Wesleys, the Whit-

fields, the Baxters. Did not these also go about with weeping? Can any one doubt that of *these* also, deep, yearning earnestness, weeping compassion, were the primary characteristics? Their sympathy with the truths they preached, was equalled only by their trembling concern for those whom, under God, they would save by it.

But we have led our reader far enough in this direction. Deep, manifest, absorbing concern for the salvation of the people is, ever was, and in the nature of the case ever must be, the primary characteristic of an eminently successful ministry.

We say *in the nature of the case*. What, then, is the case? It is this. The hearers of the gospel expect, as they have a right to, to see the soul of the preacher moved in degree as the truths he utters are, in their nature, moving. Not accustomed to very nice discriminations in serious matters, they set down the minister and his word as a sort of unity. And, unused to reason back to the original authority of the scriptures, they look upon the minister's appearance and his preaching as upon a man's word and his actions. And we know that the latter are generally spoken of as the more reliable. When, therefore, the preacher does not act, when he is not himself *moved*, as though he himself believed what he preaches, the hearers are very apt to be as indifferent as he, and not act as though *they* believed it. Nay, they are very likely to conclude that the minister does *not* believe, and therefore that they will not. And all this is not very unreasonable. If a man comes to me with a smile of indifference, to announce the death of all my friends, and the destruction of all my property, that smile of indifference is my apology for doubting his word. So if a messenger comes to me with deep sadness, to announce tidings the most glad, the matter of which is most cheering to him and me both, that deep sadness is my apology for giving him no credit. If the message were true, it would move the messenger. But he is not moved, and therefore it is not true, and shall not move me. Now, just such reasoning as this is going on in millions of souls, from Sabbath to Sabbath, in relation to the ministers of the gospel and their messages to the people. When they talk of heaven without a deep smile, glowing up from the soul, and of hell without a heaving

sigh drawn deep from the breast—when they talk of time as though it were not short, of eternity as though it were not long, and of “the wrath to come,” as though it were not wrath—then the people, predicating falsehood of either the preacher or his word, yield readily to the suggestion of their own dark hearts, and let the latter go. And this is the very rock of death to multitudes of hearers of the word, while, for the wrecking of their hopes, the ministry, unmoved by the truth it preaches, is greatly responsible.

We make this point with sadness. With deep sadness do we here discover where lies the great and alarming fault of the Protestant ministry of the present age. That they should preach God’s everlasting gospel to men—sin and perdition—the cross and the crown—as though it were matter of small, and scarcely more than professional importance, is dreadful; and dreadful are the consequences. The apathy that admits of it demands that an alarm be sounded in the ears of those whose business it is to *give* alarm. The sleeping watchmen must be aroused, ere the slumbers of the people can be broken.

But how is the gospel preached at the present day? We think the man who, with the true standard of preaching in his hand, should make the tour of even New England, both city and country, and carefully observe the Sabbath ministrations to all its numerous congregations, following every minister into the pulpit, through it and out of it, would be likely to give us the result of his observations in words something like the following:—“Notwithstanding I found not a few pulpits, scattered here and there, in which the gospel was preached as ‘with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven,’ yet the pulpits in which it is preached without feeling, unction, trembling concern, are so largely in the majority, that I set down as the great fault of the present New England ministry, *its failure to exhibit deep, strong sympathy with the truths it utters, and with those who are to be affected by them.*”

The British pulpit was scathingly rebuked by Garrick, the celebrated player. It preached truth as though it were fiction. Its services, formal and imposing, were without soul. It turned off sermons as the Romish priests, who outran Luther, turned

off masses. Its incumbents preached with the lips and not with the heart. They blessed the people without a smile, and they damned them without a sigh. They were indeed eloquent, but their eloquence, which, after all, was no eloquence, was but "a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." The people cared not for them, because they, evidently, cared not for the people. They presented not the cross, but the garlands with which they had covered it.

But what Garrick said of the British pulpit in time past, is greatly true of the universal Protestant pulpit in time present. It too often preaches the everlasting gospel as though it were matter of small importance, or even fiction, no gospel at all.

Matters of small importance are generally conversed upon in an easy, common-place manner. The eye of their colloquist is not expected to kindle, his gestures are expected to indicate little emotion. Nothing is expected beyond a gentle ripple upon the surface of his soul. To be sure, the manner of speaking is affected not a little by association with time, place, and other circumstances. The tone will be more subdued in a funeral, more grave in a grave-yard. But if the *manner* of speaker depend upon the *matter*, they will be alike common-place or otherwise.

Now let it be asked whether the awful and the glorious truths of the Bible, scattering light on the vast of eternity, from the loftiest heights where the Divine glory shines, to the deepest pit where Divine indignation burns, are not often proclaimed from the pulpit with an air of very great, and even the most common-place indifference—whether it is not very greatly to be feared that, in numerous instances of frequent Sabbath day recurrence, when you have taken away from the manifest interest of the speaker, what may justly be set down to the credit of circumstances of time, place, education, ambition, desire to meet the expectations of the people, and to conform in *appearance* to the true apostolic standard of zeal, little will be left to indicate that he feels any deep interest in the truths he utters, or in the salvation of the people? God knoweth. He is judge. But we fear it is even so. And it is our solemn conviction—a conviction, too, which is the result of not a little careful obser-

vation—that however Christians, in the largeness of their charity, may view this matter, intelligent men of the world, regard it in a way to reflect little credit upon the preacher, and to secure to themselves little profit from the “word.” For, as we have already intimated, a strong sympathy is supposed to exist between the preacher and his word; so that if one seem dead, the other is very likely to be deemed “dead also.”

While making this sad criticism on not a little of the preaching of the age, we have in mind no particular mode of exhibiting pulpit emotion. All we ask is, that the speaker *have* the emotion. We are not directing nor criticising its method of expression. To us the noisiest and most boisterous preaching is often the most shallow and lifeless. We have known torrents of impetuous zeal poured forth from the lips, timed to a mere impetuous gesticulation, while the eye of the speaker has been perfectly innocent of emotion, or indicated only that superficial agitation which it usually exhibits, when a person is attempting to manifest an emotion, or a depth of emotion which he does not feel. The tones are not subdued by sympathy, the voice does not tremble, there is no “fire shut up in the bones” to glow through the flesh. The *speaker* may indeed *fall*—the *pulpit* may—but no cause is apparent why the *people* should.

For this mere affectation of zeal we should have no sympathy—scarcely *charity!* To be sure, there is a true eloquence, and that eloquence is a high virtue. But it is a very different thing from that we are describing. It may be loud; it may be low. But its primary characteristic is *naturalness*. And the more natural, the more efficient. John Colby preached what he felt. Nor was it necessary for him to open his lips in order sometimes to do this. His deep emotion glowed in his countenance. We were once acquainted with an individual now in paradise, who was first deeply convicted by seeing him arise in the pulpit, without uttering a word. And who has not heard of the woman who wept under Whitfield’s preaching, though she could not hear a word. “An unopened note was found upon the table of McCheyne after his death, from one who heard his last sermon, to this effect: ‘Pardon a stranger for addressing to you a few lines. I heard you preach last Sabbath evening,

and it pleased God to bless that sermon to my soul. It was not so much *what* you said, as the *manner* of speaking it that struck me. I saw in you a beauty of holiness I never saw before.' He who has read the life and writings of this young servant of Christ, and marked his earnest, loving, melting appeals, can readily account for this effect upon the stranger's mind."

In this instance, the beauties of holiness appeared in the preacher, *rather than* in his word. His own person, if so it may be said, radiated a purer and clearer light than was thrown by any words he uttered. And such is often the case. The late Rev. Martin Cheney, while yet wild in sin, was arrested by a conference meeting. He stood in an outer room till late in the evening, and when on the close of the meeting he retired, he remembered hardly anything that had been said, but retained this distinct impression, "*these persons are sincere.*" They had spoken, as McCheyne preached, as though they meant what they said—as though they *felt* it. Their *manner of talking about salvation had given it significance* in the hearer's estimation. But alas, how different it is with very many pulpits—evangelical pulpits of the present day. How do their incumbents fail to express in themselves "the beauty of holiness," and, because they do not possess the elements of deep emotion, how do they fail to exhibit it! We do not ask especially for tears, but for that certain something which evidences to the hearers an awful sense of the truth of the gospel, and a yearning for the salvation of men, and which clothes the word with superadded authority and power. But of this, little appears in no small part of the preaching of the present day. Many a pulpit is from Sabbath to Sabbath giving idle utterance to the gospel, treating solemn subjects lightly, awful subjects indifferently, pathetic subjects coldly, and leaving the people to set them down as deists or stoics—infidels or misanthropes.

These remarks may be regarded by some as severe. But let them be well considered before judged. Let it be well considered what the gospel is, exposing heaven and hell to view—exhibiting infinite mercy and infinite justice—and opening up to all men a vista to the judgment seat of Christ. And

then let the carelessness and absence of deep emotion with which the gospel is thrown off from many pulpits, be also well considered. And when these two things have been done, let it be attempted to make them consistent with each other. Let this be done, and if the views herein presented still seem severe, we have no more to say upon the subject.

We have intimated that the gospel is sometimes preached as though it were fiction. If such intimation is just, the pulpit is greatly in fault, and there is just cause of alarm. What is the fact? Let us see. Fiction is generally written to please, rather than to profit. Its authors ordinarily have no higher aim than the production of books which the reading public will admire and purchase. Consequently, they give great attention to style. As the success they have in view often depends less on the matter of their composition, than on its verbal garniture, it is upon the latter that their labor is most carefully bestowed. And hence the argument for novel-reading, that it improves one's style of speaking and writing. How is it now? Have we, or have we not, a right to infer from the character of many a sermon preached from Sabbath to Sabbath, that the chief interest their authors took in preparing them, was the interest of a romancer, writing books for which the admiration of the people should guarantee a ready market. Have, or have we not, a right to suspect that they were gotten up "more for show than use"—rather to bring praise to their authors than to carry conviction to sinner's hearts?

But let us not be misunderstood. Sermons cannot be too thoroughly studied. Their ideas cannot be too well arranged. Their language cannot be too well chosen. Their illustrations cannot be too happily drawn. If written ten times over, so much the better, provided they do not lose their elasticity and freshness. Indeed, we know not that it is possible to spend too much labor upon them. Certainly no where is the perfection of logic and rhetoric needed as in the Christian pulpit. Paul the apostle needs it more than Saul the lawyer. Men never need to reason so clearly, as when reasoning on "righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come." And they never need eloquence as when "praying men" in Christ's stead, "to be

reconciled to God." Let the preacher, then, study to give the highest true gospel finish to his sermons. The highest "*excellency of speech*" will best serve the purpose of his mission; only let it not be "*of men's wisdom.*"

The fault of the preaching of this age, then, is not that it is too much studied, (that were impossible;) but that it is, in many cases, not studied right. Its true object is not kept distinctly in view. Salvation is lost sight of. Instead of laboring intently to point the truths of the gospel, and aim them carefully at the sinner's heart, and drive them into it with the combined force of his own arm and God's, how often, it is to be feared, the sermonizer, so far loses sight of the true object of his mission and of his own responsibility, as to be chiefly intent on winning to himself laurels, though the points of the truths he preaches be lost in the turn of his periods. Forgetful how sinners crowned his Master with thorns, he is more than willing that they should crown his professed disciple with garlands. How often, it is feared, the gospel blade is polished, at the expense of its keenness, that the people may say, "*What a fine sermon,*" rather than, "*What must we do to be saved?*" And is it not hence, that so many learned, as well as ignorant men, succeed so poorly in the pulpit, in bringing souls face to face with the judgment, and to the cross! Is it not because we have so much cold speculation in the pulpit, or mere labored and highly finished *essayizing*, which goes round the cross, but never comes to it, save to hang a garland upon it—which "plays round the head," coquetting with the intellect and imagination, but never coming to the heart save to soothe it—is not this one prominent reason why the word preached, so frequently profits little, and even becomes a "savor of death unto death?"

Robert Hall was asked his opinion of a sermon which a dispersing audience were admiring. "*Very fine,*" he replied, and added, with a significant shake of the head, "*but a man cannot live on flowers.*" The true preaching of the cross may indeed be flowery. God has made the landscape flowery. Poets sing of flowers in paradise. But though flowers may grow *around* the cross, they must never garland or conceal it. "Christ and him crucified" must be forever the minister's theme. The cross must be always in bold



relief, and nothing, *nothing* must be tolerated in his preaching but what has a tendency to draw men to it—not to draw them to Christ simply, or draw contributions from them to build or support pulpits, but to draw them to the cross—the naked, humiliating cross. Thus it should be—thus God would have it. But, alas, it is far otherwise, as any intelligent person, acquainted with the Sabbath ministrations of the times, cannot fail to perceive. In multitudes of sermons, the cross is the last thing to appear; the eye single to the glory of God is not apparent. All is unsanctified; unction is wanting. If not sense, *soul* is sacrificed to sound. Every thing indicates that the speaker's heart is not sufficiently in his work, or that he deems the gospel important chiefly as affording themes on which he may display his powers. The way in which he dresses up heaven and *englooms* hell, and his manner in reference to both, while they fill his audience with admiration, excite in them strong suspicions whether he regards either as anything more than a splendid fiction. And that they are affected by his preaching only as by a "very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument"—that they hear his word, and "do it not" is scarcely more *their* fault than *his*. They are responsible for not repenting, and he for not feeling and exhibiting a deep strong sympathy with the truth he utters, and with those who are to be affected by it. If their fault is grievous, his is scarcely less so, for because of it much of the good effect of his ministration is unhappily, sadly, awfully lost.

But, furthermore, a very great lack of interest in the truths of revelation, and of concern for the people, as tried by them, is by no means rarely evinced by the minister "on this wise;" namely, by practically repudiating the Bible that lies before him upon the pulpit, and taking for his oracle the people who sit before him in the pews. He preaches the doctrines and precepts of the Bible, subject only to the people's veto! To be sure, it is not presumed that he would exclude the blessed volume from his pulpit, even though the people were bold enough to demand it. But still, he shrinks not at dropping from his best of subjects for discussion, a doctrine here and precept there, just in obedience to the known wish of his auditors; thus

clearly intimating to them that he practically regards divine truths as only secondary to their caprice. And hence, not the Bible, but the people, are his oracle, and, of course, he is affected by *them*, rather than they by *him*. Rebuke has little effect when it is left for the offender to dictate its character and language. The Pharisees would not have suffered very severely at the hands of the great Rebuker, if it had been left to them to dictate how and on what subjects he should address them. And it is in no small degree from this very same cause that so little execution is done by the preaching of the present day, among the enemies of the cross. But for this, how quickly would the monster slavery be stuck full of barbed gospel arrows, and the various systems of popular and rich wickedness in Christendom be made to shake and crumble like the walls of a bombarded city. To be sure, some eloquent pulpits might, for the time being, be silenced. But it would be only the recreant ones. Nothing bearing the semblance of goodness would suffer, save so much of satan's craft as is now sailing under the gospel flag. But the gospel would then become "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." Whereas, as it not unfrequently *is*, the people, seeing the readiness and ease with which the preacher trims, mutilates, and compromises the teachings of the cross, conclude that he holds them in only a sort of accidental esteem, and that, therefore, it is no fault in them that they treat them lightly. Seeing the preacher evidently more concerned to please than he is to save them—to keep his place in the pulpit than to win them to a place in heaven—and less willing to lose his place in their affections, than he is that they should throng down the broad way through the wide gate into destruction, the whole matter seems to them a mystery, which they are very likely to interpret in favor of their own wicked prejudices, and sin on under clerical cover, comparatively free from compunction, fear, or shame. For why should their souls be aroused by a soulless pulpit? The minister has no deep, strong sympathy with the doctrines of the Bible, why should they? He manifests no deep concern for their salvation, why should they not rest easy? He treats some portions of the scriptures as a dead letter, why should they not regard the whole

as an "idle tale, and believe it not"? For well has an old poet said of his minister,

" 'Tis not enough that what you say is true,  
For us to feel it, you must feel it too."

But we must close this brief paper, happy if its suggestions shall avail to diminish the fault of which it treats—happy, if by the reading of it, any man in "holy orders," or any student of theology, shall be stirred up to a higher relative estimate of heart-education, and to the absolute importance of a soul on fire. A wise head is indeed important in the pulpit. It is impossible to deem it too highly so. But more, far more important, is a yearning heart. This latter, in its perfection, was primarily characteristic of Him who said, "*Go teach all nations.*" And it should be prominent in all who go forth clothed with this high commission. Unless it is—unless their hearts are charged with a deep, strong sympathy with "living men to ruin bound," and with unutterable concern for the Divine glory, however perfect may be their qualifications to officiate at the outward altar, they do better not to go forth at all. Though they have spent years in mastering theology—a thing which is often very necessary preparatory to entering the pulpit—they do better to defer entering it till their hearts fill with the melting pity that can "warn every one night and day with tears." There is a head theology, and there is a heart theology. Neither is perfect without the other. But especially can the latter never be dispensed with. And when all the numerous servants of God shall possess it to perfection, the millennial day, springing from on high, will streak the horizon radiantly. When all ministers of the gospel shall breathe the true spirit of their mission, feel that they are successors of the apostles, and that they are, as the representatives of Christ, to evince his spirit, no less than to preach his word, and that, like him, they are to shrink at no forms of self-denial, however appalling, and become, like the great apostle, all things to all men, without regard to their own personal comfort, and when, with souls thus melted into heaven, they shall bend, a universal ministry, tearfully over the people, looking round upon them with love and pity, and eloquent with

the spirit of the cross, *then* shall the church be triumphant! Then shall be such revival and reformation among the masses as has never yet been seen; but as was seen on a small scale on the day of Pentecost. When the ministry shall evince a tenderness and concern worthy of their theme, weeping as Jesus wept, and, ready, if need be, and by Divine grace, to bleed as Jesus bled, then, other things being equal, how quickly will fresh life pour along the "dry bones" of the "valley of vision." Then will the church be clothed with might and majesty, the world be aroused, infidelity hide itself in its own proper night, blasphemy slink away, the tongue of cavil and ridicule be silenced, converts multiply as the drops of the morning, and salvation win the day. AMEN! ALLELUIA!

---

#### ART. VI.—ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND GRAMMARS.

We do not place the name of any particular treatise at the head of this article, since it is obviously impracticable to enumerate the whole of the five hundred works on English grammar which are extant, and to make a selection might seem invidious. We design to express our opinions with very great plainness, and of course we wish to be freed as completely as possible from all constraint while doing it.

It is notorious that English grammar is generally regarded as an extremely dull, uninteresting, and difficult study. The practical results of the time and labor bestowed upon it are very unsatisfactory, both to the teacher and pupil; and in our opinion there are abundant reasons why both teachers and pupils should not be satisfied with these results. In fact, we candidly believe that the study, as usually pursued in the schools, so far from being beneficial, is positively injurious; that it has a tendency to dwarf the intellect, to stultify the reasoning powers, and to induce and confirm the most serious and mischievous faults in the use of language. The reasons for these opinions will appear obvious in the sequel.

Teachers generally are aware that there is something wrong somewhere in relation to this subject, and they are not by any means slow to express their dissatisfaction with "the general method of teaching grammar." They commonly lay the blame upon the text books, and frequently speak of the "absurdities" found in them. We can scarcely recollect a single teacher, and our acquaintance among teachers has been pretty extensive, who would, on questioning, express himself satisfied with any one of the numerous text books before the public. They seem, however, in almost every instance, to suppose that the "absurdities" and short comings of the books relate to the *manner* of presenting the subject, and each one deems that he in his superior wisdom is able to present it in such a manner as to render it eminently attractive, and to secure all the great advantages which a thorough knowledge of grammar is supposed to confer. Hence many of them are accustomed to discard all text books, and teach orally. Hence, too, the multitude of treatises which monthly lay claim to the public favor, and whose claims are pertinaciously urged by publishers and their agents—each authoring and compiler supposing that his peculiarly happy method, (though perchance a hundred others may have adopted substantially the same,) will be sure to meet precisely the wants of the public, and render his name as immortal as the name of that ever-renowned and transcendent genius, Lindley Murray. And, indeed, it must be confessed that a good deal of ingenuity has been displayed by these writers, in so varying the manner of presenting the subject as not to expose themselves to prosecution for infringement of each other's copy rights. Almost every imaginable variety of manner and style has been adopted, and in respect to mere method, many of the current works are certainly models of excellence.

But the real difficulty lies farther back than the method, viz., in the subject matter, or substance of what is taught; and in this respect our five hundred grammars, with very few exceptions, are precisely alike—mere copies of one another. In fact, those few writers, (perhaps a dozen or so,) who have dared to exercise their own powers of original thought, and, consequently, to differ from the commonly received doctrines, have

been regarded as unsound and dangerous men, and treated with just about as much fairness and favor as, so called, heretics are by the *unholy* Catholic church. Such was the case, for example, with the venerable Noah Webster, though he offended in relation to comparatively but few points. Doubtless a grammar of any language *should* be an exposition of the structure and idioms of the language—in other words, of the *science* of the language. But this, we affirm, the grammars of the English language *are not*. And this we shall attempt to prove.

Languages are *artificial* in their structure, and some much more so than others. To illustrate this, let us observe that the same word often appears in several different forms, each form having a particular office or use in the language, *and these forms were CONTRIVED expressly for such uses*. Thus, the Latin word *dominus* appears in more than twenty different forms, as *dominus, domini, dominum, dominorum, dominis, domina, dominæ, dominam, dominarum, dominulus, dominuli, &c., &c.* Now each of these forms was *made* for a certain specific purpose, and in order to use the language properly it is necessary to know what particular purpose each form was made for. This shows that the structure of the Latin language is artificial. We might easily have selected a word which has many more forms than the one above mentioned. There are words in the Latin having at least a hundred and thirty different forms. In some languages, however, words do not have so many forms, and hence they are much less complex or artificial in their structure. This is especially the case with the English, where the words corresponding to those which in Latin have a hundred and thirty forms, can scarcely number twenty—where the Latin word has sixteen forms, the corresponding English one has only eight, and where the Latin has forty different forms, the English word has only three!

Now it is the province of grammar *to explain the different forms and uses of words*. It is evident that this must be a great assistance to any one learning to write or speak a given language, for to use a language correctly is, in general, to use the words, in all their forms, *as they were made to be used*.

It is probable that grammars were originally written to facilitate the acquisition of languages, and, if properly written, they will serve that purpose, and also a much higher one, to which we design to refer in the sequel.

We will now suppose that no grammar of any language had ever been written, and that a person should undertake to explain the forms and uses of the words of some language, we will say the Latin—*i. e.*, to make a grammar of it. It is evident that if he were obliged to give a detailed explanation of the several forms of each individual word of the language, his task would be more Herculean than any that even Hercules himself ever performed. But he would probably discover that those words which serve the same general purpose in the language resemble each other also in the changes of form, or inflections, which they undergo. Thus, he would perceive that those words which are used as names agree, for the most part, in a certain set of changes—the resulting forms being invariably used for the same purposes;—that those words which are used as modifiers of names have a set of transformations peculiar to themselves, &c., &c., and he would not fail to notice the fact that those words which are used as exclamations, connectives, &c., never change their forms, *i. e.*, have no inflections.

In this manner he would be led to the classification of the words of the language, as nouns, adjectives, prepositions, &c., and then the inflections of a few words in each class, being explained, would serve as models for all the rest. Hence his labor would be immensely abbreviated. He would next observe, perhaps, that nouns are inflected for three different purposes—

1. To indicate sex, *e. g.*, the form *servus* indicates the male sex, and to denote the female sex the word is changed to *serva*; and so also with the forms *deus*, and *dea*, *dominus* and *domina*, *Julius* and *Julia*, *actor* and *actrix*, *agitator* and *agitatrix*, *adnepos* and *adnepotis*, *rex* and *regini*. He would notice, however, that only a part of the nouns are subject to this change. He would also find it necessary, or at least very convenient, to have some particular *name* by which to designate this and each of the other changes which words undergo, and also names for the several forms resulting from the changes. The change, or

inflection, just mentioned, has been called gender; the form which indicates the male sex is called the masculine gender, and that which denotes the female sex, the feminine gender of the word.

2. Each of the above mentioned forms, as well as those nouns which have not that inflection, is changed to indicate whether one individual, or more than one is meant. Thus *actor* denotes one individual, and *actores* more than one. So also *actrix* and *actrices*, *sermo* and *sermones*. This inflection is called number, and the two forms are called the singular and plural numbers of the word.

3. Each of these forms is made to undergo other changes to indicate the *relation* which the word sustains to the other words of the sentence in which it is placed. Thus *actor* becomes *actoris*, *actori*, *actorem*, or *actore*, according to the manner in which it is employed in the sentence. So, also, *actores* becomes *actorum*, or *actoribus*, *actrix* becomes *actricis*, *actrici*, *actricem*, or *actrice*. This inflection is called case, and the several forms are called the cases of the word, each one having a particular name, as nominative, genitive, dative, accusative. Each case or form points out some particular relation of the word to some of the other words of the sentence; thus, the nominative implies that the word is used as the subject of the sentence; the genitive form implies that it is used to *limit the meaning* of some other word; the accusative form implies that the word constitutes the *object* of some verb or preposition.

Continuing his investigations, our grammarian would find that adjectives have four different inflections, *ss.* 1st. To express degrees of quality, as *altus*, *altior*, *altissimus*. This is called comparison, and the three forms are termed the positive, comparative, and superlative degrees of the word. 2d. Each of these forms is again changed to show whether it modifies a noun in the masculine form, a noun in the feminine form, or one which has neither of these forms, thus—*altus*, *alta*, *altum*. This is called the gender of the adjective, and the forms are called the masculine, feminine, and neuter genders. 3d. Each of these last forms is again modified to show whether it limits a noun in the singular, or



one in the plural number, as *altus, alti, alta altæ*. This is called the number of the adjective, and the forms are called the singular and plural numbers. 4th. Each of these last forms is again inflected to show the case of the noun it modifies, as, *altus, alti, alto, altum, alte*. This inflection is called case, and the forms are called the cases of the word.

(In respect to adjectives it would also be observed that their masculine and feminine forms, as well as neuter, are often joined to nouns which do not have the inflection called gender, thus making it necessary to arrange such nouns in three classes, called masculine, feminine, and neuter nouns. This classification is extremely arbitrary and whimsical, but as the grammarian finds it actually existing, and recognized by the best writers of the language, he must necessarily adopt it.)

Among the pronouns would also be found four inflections, viz., 1st. To distinguish the speaker, the person or thing addressed, and the person or thing spoken of: as, *ego, tu* and *ille*. This inflection is called person, and the resulting forms are called respectively the first, second and third persons of the pronoun. 2d. The third person of the pronoun (*ille*) has the inflection called gender, corresponding to the gender of adjectives, as *ille, illa, illud*. 3d. These last forms, as well as the first and second persons, have the inflection called number, corresponding to the number of nouns, and, 4th. Both singular and plural forms are still further changed to form the cases, corresponding to the cases of nouns.

Our grammarian would find the verb to have five different species of inflection, viz., 1st. To show whether the subject of the verb represents the actor or the recipient of an action, as *rego* and *regor*. This is called voice, and the two forms are called the active and passive voices of the verb. 2d. To indicate the manner in which the verb is used, *i. e.*, to show whether it is used to express an absolute and positive assertion, or one which is hypothetical or contingent—or to express a command, &c., or to serve as the predicate of an abridged proposition, as *rego, regam, rege, and regere, &c.* This inflection is called mood (or mode) and the resulting forms are called the indicative mood, subjunctive mood, &c., of the verb. 3d. To

express the relative time of an event, as *rego, regebam, regam, rexi, rexeram, rexero, &c.* These forms are called the tenses of the verb. 4th. To show whether the subject of the verb is singular or plural, as *rego, regimus, &c.* These forms are called the singular and plural numbers of the verb. 5th. To show whether the subject is of the first, second, or third person, as *rego, regis, regit, &c.* This inflection is called person, and the three forms, which occur in each number of each tense of each mood of each voice are called the first, second, and third persons of the verb.

Finally, the adverbs have one inflection only, viz., comparison—corresponding to the same inflection of adjectives.

Thus we have given the proper signification and use of most of the technical terms, which it is necessary to employ in the grammar of the Latin language, and it is evident that many of the same technicalities are necessary in the grammar of the English, or any other language formed upon the same general plan. The definitions of these terms which we have given are substantially the same which the best grammarians have adopted in the grammars of all the languages. In reference to the English language we might fortify them, so far as authorities can do it, by appealing to such men as Dr. Webster, Dr. Latham, Abp. Whateley, &c., &c. But this we need not do at present.

Now the charge which we have to prefer against the writers of English grammars is this, viz: That their *definitions* of the technical terms are loose and incorrect; that some of these terms they have not defined at all; that they have lugged in several technicalities which have no application, and do not belong in the grammar of the language; that the uncertainty which hangs about the meaning of terms as they have used them, has a tendency to discourage the pupil, and disgust him with the study—to produce in him a like habit of slovenly looseness and want of precision in the use of language—to prevent him from attaching any definite and precise ideas to words in any connection, and therefore to render it impossible for him to reason closely and correctly upon any subject—hence, necessarily, dwarfing and stultifying his intellect; that,

whereas, the structure and grammar of the English language, when compared with others, is extremely simple, they have made it appear complex and difficult; and finally, that they have wholly mistaken the great object, or principal advantage to be secured by the study of English grammar in our schools. We shall see presently whether this charge can be sustained.

One of the most mischievous of the blunders of grammarians is the logical absurdity of confounding the copula of a proposition with the predicate. In the sentence, or proposition, "Time is short," as every logician knows, the word "time" is the subject, or that of which something is affirmed; the word "short" is the predicate, or that which is affirmed of the subject; and the word "is" is called the "copula," or that which connects the subject and the predicate. So also in the sentences, "time is passing," and "time is lost," the structure is precisely the same. The only difference is that "passing" in one, and "lost" in the other, constitute the predicate instead of "short." Yet, in the eyes of the grammarian(!), these three sentences, so perfectly similar in all respects, are regarded as totally different. In the first, the word "*is*" they call a verb, and consider it as the predicate, while in the second they represent it as a sort of auxiliary, helping to form a tense of the verb pass, and making a part of the predicate—and in the third they say it helps to form the passive voice of the verb lose, and is also a part of the predicate. Now the fact is that the so called "substantive verb," or the "verb to be" is never used for any other purpose than to serve as the copula in a sentence. The apparent exceptions to this assertion are only apparent and not real. In cases like "He promised to be here," the infinitive form "to be" indicates the abridgement of the second clause of the sentence; the whole being equivalent to, "He promised that he would be here," in which "would be" is evidently the copula as usual. So, also, "I asked him to be present," is equivalent to "I asked that he would be present," &c., &c.

In such cases as "He that cometh to God must believe that he *is*, and that he is the rewarder," &c., the language is elliptical, and the word existing should be supplied, thus, ". . . must

believe that he is existing, and that he," &c. Also the sentence "He is in the house," is equivalent to, "He is situated in the house," &c., &c. We are aware that the assertion that the famous "verb to be" is not a verb at all, may seem surprising to some; but yet it is true, and we are only surprised that grammarians have been so stupid as not to discover that fact long ago. The fact is that "to be" has no resemblance whatever to a verb in any respect except its inflections; and even in that it differs considerably, and it never constitutes a predicate, or even a part of a predicate.\*

It should be observed still farther, that the copula in English is always some form of "to be," to which the word "not" is sometimes added, and that no other word is ever used as a modifier of the copula.

We pass now to consider the definitions of the verb which are found in our grammars.

Murray and numerous others give this for a definition, viz: "A verb is a word which signifies to be, to do, or to suffer." Now, in the first place, this definition is founded upon a wrong principle; that is, upon the signification of the word, rather than upon the use of it. If this principle were carried out in defining, it would give an almost innumerable number of "parts of speech," and at the same time produce inextricable confusion. But it is only adopted in the case of the verb, and this fact is sufficient so make one suspect the soundness of the definition.

But, secondly, to say nothing of the improper use of the words "be" and "suffer," this is not one definition, but three: for "to be," "to do," and "to suffer" are very different things, and it is not meant to assert that any one verb "signifies" all of these, but that some verbs signify "to be," others "to do," and others still "to suffer;" thus making three classes of words, all of which are called verbs, but yet so distinct that they are severally defined over again under the names of active, passive, and neuter verbs. But why should they all be called verbs? What is the distinctive characteristic of the verb as such? The

\* See Dr. Latham's "English Language," page 438 &c.

very fundamental principle of all classification is to bring together those things which are alike in some respects; and in defining a class the proper course is to make that characteristic which is most distinctive of the class the basis of the definition. Now in what respect are all verbs alike? The definition gives us no clue whatever to the answer to this question, and it is obvious that the peculiar and distinguishing characteristic of the verb was wholly unknown to the grammarians who first employed this definition, as well as to those who have used it since.

Some, endeavoring to improve upon the old definition, render it thus—"A verb is a word which signifies to be, to act, or to be acted upon." This avoids the objectionable use of the word *suffer*, but, otherwise, is evidently the same thing as the original. Others, studying brevity, say that "A verb is a word which expresses action or being." This definition is liable to the same objections as the others, and to this additional one, that many nouns, &c., express both action and being, quite as clearly as any verbs do, and hence, according to the definition, must be called verbs; and, again, many verbs do not express either action or being. The words *race* and *battle* express action as much as the words *run* and *fight*; and the verbs *appear*, *seem*, *need*, *suffer*, *want*, *feel*, *lack*, *remain*, *continue*, *lie*, *imply*, *signify*, *refrain*, &c., &c., do not express either action or being. The words *life*, *being*, and *existence* certainly "express being," if any words can, and yet they are not verbs.

Finally, some grammarians, catching a glimpse of the true nature of the verb, say it is "A word which expresses an assertion or affirmation." Unfortunately, however, for this definition, it always requires at least two words, in English, to "express an assertion or affirmation," except in the case of the words *yes*, *aye*, &c., which are not verbs. This definition, however, would include them. Others, seeking to be very exact, give this beautifully brief and luminous definition, viz., "The verb is a primary part of speech, and of the most importance. The uses of the verb are to affirm, assert, or declare, to command, exhort, or invite; to pray, request, entreat; to inquire or question." In these two last definitions it is attempted to

define the verb, in accordance with the true principle of defining, by specifying the use of it. But the attempt is not successful. The last definition is liable to nearly the same objections as the preceding one, and to several others which we will not stop to mention. The true definition is this: "A verb is a word which *may be* used as the predicate of a sentence without the copula."

This brings to view the great and only distinctive characteristic of this class of words, one which belongs to every verb, and which does not belong to any word which has not a verb. Thus it may be seen that the class is unique and entire, and, so far as the definition is concerned, there appears no reason for subdividing it at all. But the class is naturally and necessarily divided into regular, irregular and defective verbs, because they differ in respect to inflection; and this is the only division which is either natural, or necessary, or desirable.

The common division into active, passive, and neuter verbs is absurd, and only serves the purpose of forming a basis for the old, and, as we have seen, equally absurd, three-fold definition. To obviate the manifest absurdity of calling such verbs as need, have, possess, &c., active, while such as walk, run, fly, &c., are called neuter, some make a division of the neuters, calling such as run, fly, &c., active intransitive, and making the classification stand thus—active transitive, active intransitive, neuter, and passive verbs. But still, among others, remains the absurdity of calling such verbs as need, owe, have, &c., both active and transitive; for they do not express any action at all, much more one which "passes over from the subject to the object." Others still drop the terms active and neuter altogether, substituting transitive and intransitive for them; and also drop the term passive verb, calling such a combination as "is found" the passive voice of the verb "find."

With regard to this classification we remark: 1st. It is wholly unnecessary and useless. We would like to have any one, who can, point out a single advantage resulting from it. 2d. It is absurd and perplexing. The object of a verb is only one of its modifiers, *ss.* the one which answers the question, "what?" in reference to the verb. Other modifiers answer the

questions "where?" "how?" "when?" "whence?" "why?" &c. Now it is absurd to single out one of these modifiers, and make its presence or absence the basis of a division of the class in question. If verbs are to be divided on the score of the presence or absence of the modifier which answers the question "what?" then they should be similarly divided in reference to the other questions just mentioned.

Again, grammarians are not agreed about the line of division between transitive and intransitive verbs. Some will have it that all verbs are transitive, and others that all verbs are, at least under some circumstances, intransitive; while the residue occupy all possible intermediate positions between these two extremes. This results from the variation of the definition of a transitive verb. Some say a transitive verb is one which "either has, or may have, an object after it." Then, since all verbs may have objects after them, it follows that all verbs are transitive. Again, others say that a transitive verb is one which "requires the addition of an object to complete the sense," and as there is no verb but that may be used without an object, it follows that all verbs are intransitive. Another view is, that in any given instance where a verb has an object, it shall be called transitive, and where it has not, intransitive. Thus the verb sing in the sentence, "She sings soprano" is called transitive, while in the sentence, "She sings sweetly," it is called intransitive. Surely, the study of language has difficulties enough without such needless perplexities.

We come now to the inflection of the verb.

In one of our most popular school grammars, six pages and a half are devoted to the mere paradigms of the verb love, while all its forms can be much more clearly and truthfully exhibited upon less than half a page! and this is a fair sample of the brevity of the whole work, and of most of the school grammars in use.

One method by which the paradigms of the verb are thus spread out, is by exhibiting what is called the passive voice of the verb. Some few grammarians have had sense enough to discard this, but most retain it. The nature of the inflection called voice has been explained above by reference to the Latin, and it hardly seems necessary to say that the English verb has

no such inflection, and that the term voice does not belong to English grammar. The same may be said of mood. The only inflections of the English verb are tense, number and person, the nature of which has been exhibited above. The combination of the copula with the past participle of a verb in English is not an exact equivalent in sense for the passive voice in Latin, Greek, German, &c.; and if it were, that would not constitute a valid reason for calling such a combination a passive voice.

Those ideas which are expressed in some languages by those forms of the verb which are called moods, are expressed in English by particular forms of the sentence, and their consideration belongs to syntax rather than etymology. But our limits will not permit us to particularize farther on this point.

Besides lugging in the technical terms voice and mood, the grammarians manage to extend their paradigms by mixing up the pronouns with the forms of the verb, or rather to cover up the forms of the verb with a mass of pronouns, and the poor student is made to suppose, while he repeats six pronouns with one form of the verb, that he is conjugating the verb. The manner in which grammarians have treated the verb is a tolerably fair sample of their dealing with the other parts of speech.

It has been seen above that nouns have in Latin three modes of inflection, called gender, number, and case. English nouns have the same, but writers of grammars, instead of exhibiting them as inflections and explaining their true nature, have referred to them as "properties" of nouns, and included with them another "property" called person. This last, we have seen, is an inflection of pronouns, and one of the changes of the verb has the same name, but it is not an inflection of nouns in any language, nor is it included among the "properties" of nouns in any grammars with which we are acquainted, except English grammars. This use of the term person makes it altogether ambiguous and indefinite, and we have never found students of any age, having used our common text books, who had any definite and tangible idea at all of its meaning. Repeatedly, to large classes, even of school teachers, have we proposed the



question, "What is meant by the person of a verb?" and found none able to answer.

Again, as a definition of the word case, several of our most popular grammars say: "Case denotes the relation of a noun or pronoun to other words." Now this is ambiguous; for we may either suppose that the author, without telling us what case is, merely tells us what it does—leaving us to imagine what the thing is which "denotes the relation," &c., or we may suppose him to mean that case is the relation, &c. Probably this last is the meaning intended. At least the language is generally so understood, and some grammarians express themselves unequivocally to the effect that the case of a noun or pronoun is its relation to some other word. Most of them also agree in saying that nouns have three cases, called the nominative, possessive, and objective cases. Some, in addition to these, reckon an independent case, of which they enumerate about half a dozen species! Evidently if nouns have so many cases it must be the relation which constitutes the case; for, in each number, the noun has only two forms. Accordingly they say, that in the sentence, "The man went," the word "man" is in the nominative case because it is used as the subject of the verb "went." Also in the sentence, "John saw the man," "John" is in the nominative case, for the same reason, and the word "man" is in the objective case because it is used as the object of the verb "saw"! for, they say, "the subject of a finite verb must be in the nominative case"!! and "the object of a verb must be in the objective case"!! Surely, if their brains had not been completely addled by the previous use of just as worthless text books as they have made, they would never have dreamed of making such an application of this rule of syntax! These very authors say that the possessive case is formed by adding an apostrophe and the letter s, to the word. Is the relation of the word to the other words formed by adding an apostrophe and a letter to it?

Again, they all teach that the three forms he, his, and him are the three cases, nominative, possessive, and objective of the pronoun. Surely, in reference to the possessive case of nouns, and the three cases of the pronouns, they must consider the

form of the word as constituting its case. So, too, in constructing their rules of syntax they assume that the form of the word constitutes its case! They all agree that the sentence, "Him went to school," is not correct, and to enable the student to correct it, they give this rule, and this only, viz.: "The subject of a finite verb must be in the nominative case." Well, let us apply their own logic to this example, thus: The word "him" is used as the subject of the verb "went," and hence is in the nominative case! Therefore the sentence is correct; or, at least, the rule will not serve to correct it, if we interpret the rule according to their own application of it in the above example, "The man went." Also in the sentence, "I saw he," these sapient authors would agree that the nominative case "he" is incorrectly used where the objective case "him" ought to be, and yet making their own application of a rule of syntax we must conclude that "he" is the objective case, thus: "He" is used as the object of the verb saw, and hence is in the objective case; for "The object of a transitive verb must be in the objective case"!!

When authors of grammars will use logic and language in this way, can it be thought strange that students should "study grammar" for years, as they often do, without discovering that "rules of syntax" are rules, (*i. e.*, directions,) for the guidance of writers and speakers, and intended to enable them to make sentences correctly? We have known many students and even teachers, who really supposed that rules of syntax were nothing more than forms to be repeated in "parsing," making a part of the exercise. And this is not at all strange, for many of the so called rules of syntax are mere definitions, and others are expressed in such language as to be wholly unintelligible to the ordinary student; to say nothing of such absurd and nonsensical applications on the part of authors as those above mentioned.

But to return to the subject of case. The most respectable authorities define case as the form of the noun or pronoun which indicates its relation to the other words of the sentence. We have seen, above, that case, in Latin grammar, is the name of an inflection of nouns, pronouns, and adjectives, and it is the

same in English, except that it is restricted to nouns and pronouns—the other words not having this inflection. The word case, from the Latin verb *cado*, signifies a falling or leaning from the first form or root of the word. (See Dr. Webster's Large Dictionary, and also his English Grammar.) Dr. Latham says that "Where there is no change of form there is no case." Various other authorities, of like respectability, might be quoted to the same effect. But even these men have blundered in relation to the cases of the English noun. Since the noun has two forms, they have hastily concluded that it has two cases, viz., the nominative and possessive. But it should be observed that the first form does not indicate the relation of the word to other words, inasmuch as the same form is used in several different relations, and hence this form is not a case. Nouns, then, have but one case, *ss.*, the possessive; but the pronouns have three cases, *ss.*, nominative, possessive, and objective.

It is commonly supposed that the possessive case always implies possession or property, and in many of the grammars we find the assertion that "A noun or pronoun in the possessive case is governed by the noun it possesses." Now the fact is, that: 1st. One word never possesses another, for words are as incapable of holding property as slaves are. 2d. There is no government about the matter at all; and, 3d. The possessive case indicates several other relations besides that of possession. Like the genitive in Latin, it merely shows that the word is used to limit the meaning of some noun.

But we proceed to notice the definitions of gender. Some authors say that "Gender means sex, and as there are two sexes, and only two, there must necessarily be two genders, and only two." Now we have to suggest that the grammarian has to deal with words, and not the things represented by the words; and that in his classifications he ought to classify words and not things or animals. But words do not have any sex, and if gender means sex, then the term has no application to words, and ought not to be used in grammar.

Others, again, say that "Gender is the distinction of objects with regard to sex;" and as one class of objects may be com-

posed of individuals of the male sex, another of the female sex, another of both sexes, and another still of neither sex, they conclude that there are four genders, *ss.*, masculine, feminine, neuter and common. But here, again, they are classifying things instead of words. If gender is "the distinction of objects with regard to sex," it does not belong to grammar at all, but rather to natural history! The true meaning and use of the term in grammar has been given above, in its application to the Latin, and it has the same signification in English grammar. It should be observed, however, that the adjective in English has no inflection except comparison, and hence there is no necessity for classifying those nouns which have not the inflection called gender, as masculine nouns, &c. Also, that we have no specimen of the neuter gender, except the word "it," which is a very doubtful specimen indeed. The fact just mentioned, *ss.*, that our adjectives have no gender, is one of immense importance. From this circumstance alone, our language is almost infinitely more simple and easy of acquirement than the Latin, or any similar language. The same simplification being applied to the German language would reduce the labor and difficulty of learning it at least one half,

Again, since both adjectives and adverbs are identical in their forms and inflections, it becomes impossible, in most cases, to distinguish them, and altogether useless even if it were possible. These words form one tolerably well defined, (*i. e.* distinct,) class, their distinctive characteristic being that they are used to limit the meaning of other words. Hence they might properly be called modifiers. The only reasonable division of this class is into those which have the inflection called comparison, and those which do not; and even this division is hardly expedient, since it is somewhat difficult and of very little practical utility. The common division into adjectives and adverbs, though necessary, and, generally easy enough, in those languages where the adjective has gender and case, is in English absolutely of no practical utility, and is the source of endless perplexity among students, and of dispute among the writers of grammars. Most of our text books contain this among other similar rules of syntax (!) viz.: "Adverbs qualify verbs, adjectives and other

adverbs." Now if this is a rule for making sentences, it must mean that "adverbs" are properly used to qualify "verbs," &c., and that it would be improper to use them to qualify nouns and pronouns. But it happens that very many words are properly used sometimes to qualify nouns, and sometimes to qualify verbs. Now if adverbs are such modifiers as can limit only "verbs, adjectives, and other adverbs," and adjectives are such as can limit only nouns and pronouns, then the words just mentioned are neither the one nor the other, but constitute a sort of mongrel class by themselves, for which no grammarian has yet assigned a name. Again, if either adjectives or adverbs can properly be used to qualify both nouns and verbs, then the ground of distinction is wholly lost, and, though two names are used, they signify one and the same class of words.

Some writers say that adjectives and adverbs cannot be distinguished until they are placed in a sentence; but when the sentence is formed, a word which modifies a noun or pronoun is to be called an adjective, and one which modifies a verb, adjective, or adverb, is to be called an adverb! But, in the name of common sense, we ask, if they cannot be distinguished before they are placed in the sentence, what is the use of distinguishing them afterwards? This distinction cannot be made the basis of a rule for sentence-making, for the sentence is already made before the distinction appears. It is more generally supposed, however, that these words can be distinguished before they are placed in the sentence, and some pretend to say that adjectives should never be used to modify verbs, &c. But on the other hand, it has been most conclusively shown, by Dr. Webster and others, that the so called adjectives are properly used to limit, not only nouns and pronouns, but also verbs, adjectives and adverbs! We conclude, then, that the terms adjective and adverb do not belong to the grammar of our language, and their use ought not to be retained.

The words "yes," "no," "yea," "nay," &c., are, in all the common grammars, called adverbs; but, as they are never used to limit other words, they are not adverbs, and do not even belong to the class called modifiers. These words, together with some others, constitute a class of exclamations, which, to

distinguish them from what are commonly called interjections, might be termed "didactic exclamations!"

Again, as already intimated, English grammar ought to be considered as the science, or, at least, a part of the science, of the English language. But, instead of this, many of our grammarians, with characteristic stupidity, define English grammar as the "Art of speaking and writing the English language correctly," and then in going through with their works the student is wearied and perplexed with the labor of writing out an endless multitude of puerile, insipid and profitless "exercises."

It is altogether better to attend to the subject of composition separately than in connection with the technicalities of grammar, for, by combining them, neither can be attended to properly. It may be regarded as absolutely certain that the art of composition never was and never can be successfully taught on the plan adopted in these works. In mathematics it is customary to give the abstract principles, the science of algebra, geometry, &c., in separate treatises, and their practical applications to astronomy, navigation, surveying, &c., in others; and there are equally good reasons for teaching the principles of language apart from their practical applications. As in the case of mathematical science, the practical application of it, though an object of some importance, is justly considered as by no means of so great consequence as the mental discipline which it gives; so in regard to grammar, the mental culture which may be acquired in the study of the science, is of vastly more value than the advantage derived from it, as far as writing and speaking are concerned.

We quote the following, which we heartily endorse, from Dr. Latham's great and valuable work on the English Language:

"The point upon which the writer has most urgently insisted is the disciplinary character of grammatical studies in general, combined with the fact that the grammatical study of one's own language is almost exclusively disciplinary. \* \* \* \* Gross vulgarity of language is a fault to be prevented; but the proper prevention is to be got from habit—not rules. The proprieties of the English language, like the proprieties of English manners, are to be learned by conversation and intercourse; and the proper school for both is the best society in which the learner is placed. If this be good, systematic teaching is superfluous; if bad, insufficient. \* \* \* \* Grammar,

as an art, is undoubtedly the art of speaking and writing correctly—but then as an art it is only required for foreign languages. For our own we have the necessary practice and familiarity.”

But what kind of mental discipline must the young student acquire from the use of such text-books as we have been considering? It is certain that nothing can be more injurious to one's reasoning faculties than to acquire the habit of using terms in such a loose, careless, vague, indefinite, and ambiguous manner as the writers of our school grammars have employed; and those who follow these writers as guides are surely in danger of acquiring just such a habit. Prof. Faraday, in reference to the modern table tipping mania, says, “I think the system of education that could leave the mental condition of the public body in the state in which this subject has found it, must have been greatly deficient in some very important principle.” We are exactly of the same opinion; and we think also that the use of such school books as we have been considering is precisely adapted to produce just that “mental condition of the public body” to which the Professor refers.

The technical terms in grammar ought to be defined and used with as much exactness and precision as in geometry. If this were done in English grammar, those only being retained which are necessary, the study, no longer repulsive and pernicious, would become delightful and profitable, and, as the English is more simple in its structure than any other language, instead of being, as now, the most difficult, it would become the most easy of acquisition.

## ART. VII.—LONGFELLOW'S HIAWATHA.\*

It is said that the best fruit of an orchard may be selected by noting the tree at which the greatest number of clubs are hurled. If this rule holds good in the literary world, then, certainly, Prof. Longfellow's new poem of *Hiawatha* is of the first quality; for no other recent work has had so many critical missiles thrown at it, as has this.

The charge of plagiarism is a stereotyped one, revised and re-issued upon the appearance of each of Prof. Longfellow's works. In the present instance, it is based upon an alleged similarity between *Hiawatha* and a Finnish poem, entitled *Kalewala*. The principal point of this allegation is, however, turned by the fact that Longfellow confessedly borrows his legends, in which this similarity is said mainly to exist, from Schoolcraft, who, in turn, distinctly avers that he gathered them directly from the Indians themselves, long before he ever knew that such a poem as *Kalewala* existed. This similarity, therefore, militates not at all to the injury of Prof. Longfellow; but, if significant at all, the poem rather looks to some ancient connection between the Indians and the Finnish subjects of the legends of *Kalewala*.

At this point, it may not be amiss to note also a resemblance between some of these legends of *Hiawatha* and Scripture incidents. Like *Jonah*, *Hiawatha* is swallowed by a great fish and escapes alive, though by a somewhat different process than the prophet. On another occasion, he wrestles with a heavenly messenger, and prevails over him, receiving in consequence a heavenly benediction—reminding us, of course, of *Jacob* and the angel. It is certainly curious to note these, to be sure not very close resemblances—for in other respects the legends materially differ from the scripture narrative—and they, as well as the distant similarity of the Finnish story of *Kalewala*, are

\* THE SONG OF HIAWATHA. By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Boston Ticknor & Fields.



suggestive of questions of ethnographical interest, and perchance may prove keys to important conclusions.

Hiawatha is moreover censured for its monotonous gallopade of trochees, in this respect also resembling Kalewala. But metres, and the trochaic among the rest, are the peculiar property of no age, nation, or man, and consequently no charge of plagiarism can be maintained from the use of any particular one of them. The trochaic is indeed unusual, but still by no means peculiar to Kalewala, being found in the classics and elsewhere; but if it were hitherto peculiar to the Finnish poem, that fact could no more bar or stigmatize its use by any one else, than could the first use of any metre prevent the second use of it from being honorable. As to the appropriateness of the metre to the subject, which has also been questioned, we venture that it has not been questioned by any one familiar with the Indian method of singing and oratory. It smacks truly and richly of wigwam scenes, and we only wondered by what experience, or unwonted good fortune, Prof. Longfellow happily hit upon a metre so admirably like the original processes of the life he portrays.

The repetition of language, and the alleged trivial character of the sentiment, have formed other points of attack. And yet these are both most emphatically and characteristically Indian; and they therefore resolve themselves into an accusation against the topic itself rather than the author's treatment of it. On this head, we suggest that it is American—and the burden of critical outcry against our authors has been for selecting foreign themes. Moreover, during several years' connection with the press, we remember scarcely a more frequent topic than a wail of lament for the obliteration and loss of Indian names and memories. Now when the thing we have so heavily sighed for comes, we most summarily dismiss it with a kick and a sneer. We, however, persist still in thinking that the theme *is* worthy; and are grateful that the author was able to throw himself so far into the range of Indian thought and sympathy as to produce, what he undertook, a book of Indian, not of English conceptions, imagery and method.

A very good taste of the quality of the book is given in the Introduction:

" Ye who love the haunts of Nature,  
 Love the sunshine of the meadow,  
 Love the shadow of the forest,  
 Love the wind among the branches,  
 And the rain-shower and the snow-storm,  
 And the rushing of great rivers  
 Through their palisades of pine-trees,  
 And the thunder in the mountains,  
 Whose innumerable echoes  
 Flap like eagles in their eyries ;—  
 Listen to these wild traditions,  
 To this Song of Hiawatha !

Ye who love a nation's legends,  
 Love the ballads of a people,  
 That like voices from afar off,  
 Call to us to pause and listen,  
 Speak in tones so plain and childlike,  
 Scarcely can the ear distinguish  
 Whether they are sung or spoken ;—  
 Listen to this Indian legend,  
 To this Song of Hiawatha !

Ye whose hearts are fresh and simple,  
 Who have faith in God and nature,  
 Who believe, that in all ages  
 Every human heart is human,  
 That in even savage bosoms  
 There are longings, yearnings, strivings,  
 For the good they comprehend not,  
 That the feeble hands and helpless,  
 Groping blindly in the darkness,  
 Touch God's right hand in that darkness,  
 And are lifted up and strengthened ;—  
 Listen to this simple story,  
 To this Song of Hiawatha !

Ye, who sometimes, in your rambles  
 Through the green lanes of the country,  
 Where the tangled barberry-bushes  
 Hang their tufts of crimson berries  
 Over stone walls gray with mosses,  
 Pause by some neglected grave-yard,  
 For awhile to muse, and ponder  
 On a half-effaced inscription,  
 Written with little skill of song-craft,  
 Homely phrases, but each letter  
 Full of hope and yet of heart-break,  
 Full of all the tender pathos  
 Of the Here and the Hereafter ;—

Stay and read this rude inscription,  
Read the Song of Hiawatha !”

Now we know not how it may be with others, but we frankly confess to being enticed by this pre-proclamation. The subject has attractions enough of its own, and the spirit and genius of the poet prophesied of pleasant company—in which we were not disappointed. But not intending a labored critique upon this “Song of Hiawatha,” we must content ourselves with expressing our conviction that, notwithstanding defects, this is one of the books the world will not so willingly let die. And though it by no manner of means follows, in seriousness, that a critic-belabored book is therefore a good one; yet, as in other cases, it may turn out that the trouble with the critics is largely because, while they judge by the standard of common works, this one is so altogether unique, and superior to them, as to be incapable of a just measurement by such standards—and hence to seem all awry when the attempt is made to estimate it by them.

It will live as an *American* poem—American in theme, in thought, in treatment, in authorship. It will live, too, as a memorial of the Indian spirit and life—a life the Caucasian mind has not yet fully fathomed, and which, for want of a sufficient medium of sympathy, has shrunk from manifesting itself to that mind. Among all our traders, our almost half Indian pioneers, and even our missionaries, very few indeed have so nestled down into the heart of Indian sympathy, as to get an adequate view—scarce a glimpse—of the aims and processes of the Indian life. Of all, Schoolcraft has undoubtedly been the most successful; and now, around Schoolcraft’s prose—often prosy enough—a subtle poet, whose world-wide fame is certainly not altogether a mistake, catching most wondrously the tone, the temper, the wierd spirit of the wigwam, has transferred it to the imperishable pages of classic literature. Will such a thing die or be forgotten? Never!—at least so long as Homer’s not excelling heroes are kept in lively remembrance.

If Longfellow has erred, we apprehend it is in this—he has largely omitted the demon element of the Indian life. The presence and power of wicked spirits, and the exercise of vigilant

resistance against them, as well as in a large degree the incarnating the same spirit in their own lives, are prominent features of Indian conceptions and spirit. Hence, perhaps, their cowardly, but savage ferocity. These, though appearing, are not as prominent in Hiawatha, as in the actual life of the wild Indian. A justification, perchance, may exist in this, that it is a much more worthy service to re-produce the good than the evil of life; and hence the historian, the biographer, and particularly the romancer and the poet, may be justified in dwelling much more fully and minutely upon the bright than the dark phases of human events and life.

---

### VIII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

**HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF PHILIP THE SECOND, KING OF SPAIN.** By Wm. H. Prescott, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, of the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, etc., etc. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855.

The prejudice with which the self-constituted literary tribunals of England were accustomed to look upon the fruits of American authorship, has now very greatly abated; not so much, perhaps, because criticism has grown more just and charitable, as because the literature of the New World has acquired a character and become possessed of an influence which allow no exercise to literary cynicism. There are at least a few names on this side of the ocean which carry no small prestige wherever they are associated with authorship. Their distinction is everywhere allowed. And this, not because they inherited power, but developed it; not because they were born to eminence, but nobly won it. Irving drew attention to our literature, which had been ignored, but other men have held it. He induced candid inquiry; but others more than he have rewarded as well as justified it. His spontaneous brilliance silenced reproach, but the solid merits of other men have drawn out a testifying veneration. Webster among our statesmen, Everett representing our elegant and classical scholarships, Edwards as an American theologian, Silliman as a type of our scientific spirit, Wayland as a revealer of our mental philosophy, Channing and Burritt incarnating our philanthropy, etc., etc.—all these make their mark on the old continent as mental forces already doing much and prophesying of more.

And in the department of History there are—not to speak of others—at least two names which American lips may pronounce with a proper pride. These are **GEORGE BANCROFT** and **WILLIAM H. PRESCOTT**. In all the ele-

ments that go to make up the historian who sets himself to portray the life of his own people, and exhibit the processive development of his own country's power, Bancroft may be risked in a comparison with Hume. And in that delicate and difficult work of making the past of distant peoples live before the mind's eye of the contemporary reader, very few would venture seriously to set Hallam or Gibbon above Prescott. His previous works have settled his reputation; and if he were influenced solely or chiefly by a regard to his standing in the world of letters, he might well be cautious about the multiplication of labors which give so large a promise and invite comparison with so high a standard. New efforts can hardly lift him higher; and each of them in some sense puts his literary reputation in jeopardy. But the reading of his Philip II., two volumes of which are before us, leaves room for no such fears. It would be difficult to specify a single excellence found in any of his previous works which fails to appear in its full proportions here. The same thoroughness of research, the same severe and impartial scrutiny, the same patient weighing of evidence, the same fidelity to facts, whatever be their apparent bearings on pre-formed and popular theories; the same philosophic breadth of view, the same large ability to conceive and unify a character amid all the antagonism of its circumstances and manifestations; the same happy faculty to show us the methods and the law where others are confused and hopeless before the chaos—all these traits which have made his "Ferdinand and Isabella," his "Conquest of Mexico," and of "Peru," to supersede all other attempts to portray the life of those periods, will be found without the smallest abatement in this portion of his Philip II.

His style it is difficult to describe. Its perfection is seen in that it is nearly impossible to think of his style at all while hastening over his pages—hastening, not with the feverish, nervous anxiety with which a romance-reader pants for the *denouement* of the plot, but with the free and joyful step of one who gathers up high knowledge in the progress and is gladdened while he learns. It is exact as logic, and yet elastic as a reverie; as unambitious as Locke's Essay, and still as picturesque as Macaulay's portraiture of the last days of the second Charles; concise at times as Butler, and yet making a scene expand gradually before the mind's eye after the manner of Chalmers; intelligible to a child, and yet making the highest literary taste more delicate and discriminating; wholly unostentatious, and yet replete with proofs of the most varied learning; artless, and free, and genial as the unstudied talk of the domestic circle, and yet dignified as the serious counsels of an eminent patriarch. Whether all this will aid in giving any definite idea of Prescott's style to those who have not read his volumes, we cannot say. We only wish that those tyros in literature who deem it necessary to make every sentence an epigram, an antithesis, a paradox, or a verbal sky-rocket, in order to awaken or keep alive attention, could be kept at work reading these histories till they had learned how a chaste and dignified simplicity transcends the intensity and bombast which aim to take a reader by storm. As aids to the formation of a proper and pure style, we know of few works to be more heartily recommended than Prescott's.

The period of history covered by this work is a most important one. The

Spanish empire had just become consolidated and powerful under the administration of preceding sovereigns. The forces of the reformation were just organized for systematic action. Mary, and then Elizabeth, filled the English throne. Literature had just revived, and the papal authority was beginning to wane. The elements of a new civilization were struggling to combine. Many remarkable characters appeared on the stage, and the rule of Philip put Spain into important relations with most of the varied and important transactions of that period. Mr. Prescott shows us the varied forces, each in its turn, exhibits their relations, and then gives us their synthesis in his history. We are never confused; all is simple, plain, natural, and easily remembered; and the narrative, once commenced, can hardly be put down for interest. We shall await the reception of the remaining volumes before attempting any further analysis of the work.

It may be added that the work is published in the best style, and is issued simultaneously with Mr. Prescott's preceding works. The only fault we have to find is, that the leaves are left uncut—a most unpardonable omission.

**MODERN PILGRIMS:** Showing the improvements in travel, and the newest methods of reaching the Celestial City. By George Wood, Author of "Peter Schlemihl in America." In two vols. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855.

Attempts at copying an unique genius are always rather perilous. The ignoble animal in the lion's skin has always a lesson of warning to give. Imitations are apt to consist chiefly of a combination of the lowest and most superficial qualities, while the genuine substance is wanting. The satellites of Carlyle and Emerson are generally little else than shallow pretenders to profundity or originality, caricaturing their masters, and disgusting everybody else.

Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* is a work of genius which the ages are careful shall not die. It is a remarkable example of the power of the allegory when made to deal with vital religious truth. By means of it many a perplexed soul has been led out into the clear sunshine, and many a spiritual foe, springing from an ambush upon the ascending spirit, has found that the Bedford tinker had foretold his approach, and exposed the malignity of heart which lurked beneath a comely and attractive exterior. It was not the allegory *per se*, that gave such permanent power to this little volume; it was the abundance of vital truth which the story clasped, and then incarnated, which invests it with its high power.

The author of these volumes borrows his method, so far as he shows method, from Bunyan; and there the opportunity for comparison ends. The allegory is felt to be not only unnecessary to the accomplishment of his object, but perpetually in his way. His aim is less comprehensive and his spirit far less religious than Bunyan's. To exhibit the various phases of religion which he deems deceptive, and lash the non-conforming multitudes who depart from the author's standard of sentiment and life, either by invective, exposure, or ridicule, is the evident aim. There is certainly some ability displayed in the work, some captivating characters well portrayed and exposed, some valuable lessons of warning taught, and some clever specimens of

the *reductio ad absurdum* in dealing with the religious systems that obtain currency in the present circles of fashionable society ; still the work will reflect no great credit on the author. The plan was evidently incomplete in his mind when he commenced his task ; there are constant tendencies to extreme in his plotting of circumstances and portraiture of characters ; there are too many personalities—the names both of places and individuals are such slight variations from the real ones, that it will seem to many little else than a series of personal attacks ; and the maintenance of the allegorical form is often accomplished only by the sacrifice of naturalness and force. The author has evidently mistaken his sphere, and misapprehended not a few of the conditions of success in the department of writing he has here chosen. We cannot predict for these volumes any long or wide popularity, as we cannot accord to them any very substantial merits. If Dr. Wayland feels himself particularly honored in having the work dedicated to himself, we think it must be on account of the author's friendship and good intentions, rather than from any gratification in having his name associated with this rather miserable imitation of the simple sublimity of the dreamer of Bedford jail. We wish Mr. Wood better success in his next attempt at authorship, for we have no doubt his merits deserve it.

CASTE: A Story of Republican Equality. By Sydney A. Story, Jr. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. New York: J. C. Derby. 1856.

This title holds a sarcasm of the keenest character, and heralds a story of unusual skill in its plan, and of rare magnetic power in its development. It details the fortunes of a brother and sister, who live till they have reached early manhood and womanhood, are surrounded by the dearest friends, become highly cultivated, form connections with eminent and wealthy families, acquire large esteem, and then discover that their mother was a beautiful quadroon, and their father—her master. Then the vision breaks, their friends only pity them, they are spewed out of reputable society, and only gain equality by finding a home under a foreign monarchy. The features of Southern life are sketched with remarkable clearness, and the incidental pictures of slavery exhibited are likely to excite quite as strong an aversion as though the book were written with a purely anti-slavery aim. It is a book to enchain a reader's attention, and the impression it leaves is eminently a healthy one. It has less intensity than *Ida May*, but we think more genius ; it shows fewer spasms, but more strength ; and the convictions it creates against slavery will have less of passion, but more of permanent power. It is a chaste and yet brilliant production ; healthy in its tone, and yet powerful in its grasp upon the feelings ; calm in its spirit, while almost irresistible in the impulse it communicates. The unknown author need not fear to stand out and be seen.

PLAIN TALK AND FRIENDLY ADVICE TO DOMESTICS ; With counsel on Home Matters. Boston : Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855.

This is a very good treatise for its purpose, if it can only be made to serve it well. It is made up of directions to that somewhat important and increasing class of persons employed as domestics. It develops and enforces the principles by which they should be governed, points out the dangers which are to be avoided, shows the evil consequences of duplicity and unfaithfulness, and

gives minute directions to be observed in order that the proper politeness and gentility may be maintained. It sets forth what are the most approved and fashionable modes of domestic management in the higher circles, and so will indirectly help the mistress to order her household fashionably, as well as teach the servant propriety and duty. As to its etiquette we are no judge; but its moral principles are sound, its spirit frank and kind, and its advice wholesome. It would probably be a good investment for each mistress to put a copy into the hands of her servants—that is, if the reading of it were possible and probable.

PLYMOUTH COLLECTION OF HYMNS AND TUNES; for the use of congregations. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1855.

This is a work upon which the Rev. H. W. Beecher has been expending no inconsiderable labor and time for some years. The poetry was collected, revised, and arranged mostly by himself; the musical department was superintended by his brother, the Rev. Charles Beecher, and Mr. Zundel, organist at the Plymouth church, Brooklyn. There are, including doxologies, about 1400 hymns, and 367 tunes. Its primary object, or perhaps it were better to say the controlling motive to the completion, was to contribute to the development of congregational singing, and thus to induce the performance of that part of the public worship by the congregation directly, instead of passing it over by a proxy arrangement, to be done by a small select choir.

As to the object aimed at, we give it our warmest sympathy. The general tendency of choir singing is manifestly to a vicious extreme in the shape of mere artistic display in the orchestra, which hinders rather than helps devotional feeling. The singing hence becomes an exhibition of talent on the part of the performers, and calls out a finical criticism, or an irreverent, undevotional admiration from the listeners. The solemn and devout praise of God is no ambition of the performers, and no experience of the audience. We do not say that this state of things is absolutely inseparable from choir singing, either in theory or in fact; but both reason and experience prove that this is its tendency and largely its operation. Besides, by this means, choirs often become powerful and exacting—making conditions perilous to the best interests of the church, but which it is difficult to reject. And then again, the competition grows fierce, and professional opera singers are alone capable of satisfying the demand, and so they are hired to perform in the orchestra what they have rehearsed on the stage; for they bring a large part of their music with them, only modified sufficiently to enable the stanzas in the hymn book to be sung to its strains. But we cannot now discuss the question. We only say that, after no little thought and observation, we are decidedly in favor of the congregational mode of singing in public worship; and that we believe it is practicable; though its really efficient operation will require time and effort. We come to speak in a few words of this book.

As a collection of hymns, take it all in all, we think it decidedly the best we have seen. It shows great research, the most careful discrimination in making selections from any author, proofs of great labor in getting back to the fountains of song, a proper jealousy of attempted improvements by modern versifiers, strong evangelical sympathies, and yet a noble catholic spirit,



a comprehensive view of the religious life and experience, and a true poetic taste. For the most part, each hymn has evidently been tested by its own merits as a clear and graceful expression of a genuine religious experience, and, in the case of the older hymns, by their historical and associative influence over the heart of the church. Notwithstanding what the *New York Evangelist* has said about its radicalism, we should be more inclined to say it has sometimes paid too much deference to this last test. But the object of a hymn is always remembered here. Didactic rhymes, technical statements of dry doctrine in metre, versified confessions of faith, are mostly left undisturbed where they were. New fields have been explored, and authors of every shade of belief, from the Catholic to the Neologist, have been allowed to sing here of the soul's victories, or portray its pleading unrest. If the hymns are freighted with Christian thought and feeling, Mr. B. deems it little matter who launched them on the sea of affection. And the fugitive pieces of the day have now and then offered a genuine lyric which he has not failed to take. There is scarcely any religious doggerel in the book. Nearly every hymn can be read without torture, and sung without choking. There are more metres than is usual; though most of the hymns are in the usual metres. As said before, we deem it superior as a collection of hymns to anything yet issued.

We are not quite as well satisfied with the music in this collection. It may be that we have been mistaken in the ideal in our own mind, deeming that practicable which, after all, is only possible now as a conception. The difficulty which Mr. Beecher mentions, viz., the impossibility of obtaining quite a number of the old standard tunes, as the holders of the copyrights will not allow them to be used in compiling such a work, we did not anticipate. How many of the tunes that are absent from this collection which we expected to find, are thus put beyond the reach of the compiler, we know not. But they are not here, and their places are filled by others we love much less. Of course a large number of the old standard tunes are here; but there are quite a number of new compositions by Messrs. Beecher and Zundel; some of them evidently composed through the necessity of having tunes adapted to certain peculiar metres, and the inability to find them ready for use; and others composed, we conclude, because those gentlemen believed they could fashion a better tune than they could select. Some of these are good—Mr. Beecher's compositions being especially marked by great delicacy of taste, and requiring great care and nicety to their proper execution. And then there is quite a large share of the music which a large congregation can hardly execute well without the most careful training—we doubt if they can with it. And, of course, the singing of a tune on a remote page, while the hymns are being read from the page where they are printed, is quite perplexing, if the music must be read by the singer. And the difficulty of restricting the singing of certain tunes to a choir when congregational singing is the rule, is likely to be severely felt. The minister might not be able to tell when the congregation should be silent; the congregation might be quite as ignorant, and to allow the choir to dictate would hardly be wise. The type, too, with which the hymns are printed, is quite too small for the use of all ages, and yet the

book would be unwieldy were it larger. Still, on the whole, this is a valuable collection, having high and substantial merits of its own; and nobly leading the way, as we trust, to a nobler and truer expression of public praise.

**THE PARABOLIC TEACHING OF CHRIST;** or, Engravings of the New Testament. By the Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, B. A. Oxon., incumbent of St. Thomas' English Episcopal Chapel, Edinburgh. Robert Carter and Brothers. 1855. New York.

This is an elaborate work on the parables of the Savior. Trench, we presume, stood highest previous to this, but as we have just compared the two, we have grounds to express the deliberate conviction that Drummond will henceforth stand before Trench on this subject. They are both able, but if one must be selected, the choice will be without hesitation as we have said. It is decidedly one of the best books that ever fell under our notice on Biblical subjects. To the lover of the Bible it is a feast of fat things. It is not only able in its expositions in the letter, but it manifests a most remarkable spiritual insight on the part of the author.

**EVENINGS WITH THE ROMANISTS:** With an Introductory Chapter on the Moral Results of the Romish System. By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M. A. Robert Carter & Brothers. New York. 1856.

This work is one which has sprung from the recent discussion of the papal question in England, and presents in striking light the Bible arguments against the man of sin. The chapter entitled, "The Moral results of the Romish System," states many stubborn facts. In Sicily, the papal States, and Naples, the murders, per million of inhabitants, range from 90 to 74, while in Belgium there are only 18, and in England far less, 4, a contrast that can but have its influence on reflecting minds.

We desire to call attention again to the faithfulness of this house in its republications. We all know how the Tract Society sins in the opposite direction, and, with this very book, the vicious example has been followed by a house from which we had a right to expect better things. We hope the press with united voice may come to condemn this species of injustice to authors and their readers.

**SERMONS DESIGNED FOR THE SICK ROOM, FAMILY READING AND VILLAGE WORSHIP.** By Jabez Burns, D. D., Minister of the New Church Street Chapel, Edgeware Road, London. 1854. Houlston & Stoneman.

We are indebted to a kind friend for a copy of the above work. It consists of fifty sermons. It is known to our readers that the author of this work has had before the public for some years "The Pulpit Cyclopaedia," "Sketches and Skeletons of Sermons," and several other works which have been well received. Though for ourselves we never had any peculiar partiality for this kind of works, we mean "Sketches" and "Skeletons" of sermons, we have no doubt those put forth by this author have been extensively useful. They all breathe the right spirit, and are eminently Biblical. The present, we judge from the few hours we have been able to give to it, is decidedly in advance of the previous works of the same kind by this author. The sermons, though brief, have been skilfully condensed, and the topics well chosen,

**VILLAGE AND FARM COTTAGES.** The requirements of American Village Houses considered and suggested. With Designs for such Houses at moderate cost. Illustrated with one hundred engravings. By Henry W. Cleaveland, William Backus, and Samuel D. Backus. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

This is a volume of great practical utility, because—1. The authors combine practical knowledge of details of construction and finish with architectural knowledge and taste; 2. It concerns the class of houses for which such designs and suggestions are most needed. Most similar works require a considerable sum to build after their designs—thus making of no use to the common classes, while the rich in building would each employ an architect for himself, and build from an original design. This book, on the other hand, applies architectural taste and skill to buildings such as the farmer, the mechanic, and the day laborer need, as well as those of somewhat more ample means, but who would not employ a professional architect; and teaches them how they may build tasteful and even elegant homes, at a cost scarcely if at all exceeding that usually expended upon the more common and ordinary class of houses; 3. The suggestions and directions are eminently clear, practical and common sense, and comprise in a very small compass all that concerns the construction and adornment of both the house and its surroundings. We commend it as one of the very best books for common and popular use that has for a long time come from the press—the best of its class, and a class calculated to make the dear spot of *Home* prettier, better, and more attractive.

**THE END:** or the proximate signs of the close of this dispensation. By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D. F. R. S. E., &c. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., &c. 1856.

This title is significant in another sense than was intended by the author. His books have followed each other from the press with what would ordinarily be a perilous haste for most book-makers. The public have doubtless often inquired, with various feelings, when *the end* of this long series was to come. It is here in the title of this volume; though we find no assurance that the Crown Court pastor is now to cease repeating and extending his sermons by means of the types.

It is the design of this volume to present the consecutive argument in support of the position that the end of the present dispensation is at our doors, and unfold what the author deems the prominent circumstantial features of that event. The matter appears in Dr. C.'s prevailing style—that of the sermon or religious lecture. There is in the book the same spiritual fervor, the same catholic charity, and the same marks of haste in the composition, and the same weak places in the logic, that characterize its predecessors. There is not much that is new in the discussion, or that is unusual in the impressiveness with which he enforces it. Like most advocates of a long controverted point, he finds evidence where others would look for it in vain; though he is quite free from the dogmatism and the intolerance that disfigure the pages of so many religious controversialists. On the whole, we know of no one volume where a reader would find the ground of this view of "the end" stated with more clearness and force, and charity, and at the same time gather up so much of really valuable practical instruction.

"THE TIME OF THE END:" A prophetic period, developing, as predicted, an increase of knowledge respecting the prophecies and periods that foretell the end: Illustrated by the history of prophetic interpretation, the expectation of the church, and the various computations of the times of Daniel and John, by commentators, who generally terminate them between A. D. 1830 and 1880. Also, "Our present position in the prophetic calendar," with his "Apocalyptic seven-sealed seroll." By the Rev. E. B. Elliott, A. M. Lectures on the nature and nearness of the advent. By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D. Lectures on the new heavens and new earth. By Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Hitchcock and John Wesley. And the testimony of more than one hundred witnesses against the modern Whittyan theory of a millennium before the advent. By a Congregationalist. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., &c. 1855.

There! what will our readers think of that? And all put, too, within the compass of a single 12 mo vol. of about 400 pages! Having copied that title page, we think we can be honorably excused from writing anything more. It is, however, quite a thesaurus of reasonings and opinions, gleaned from a large circle, and very well arranged. Its theory is, that "the time of the end" antedates by something of a period the end itself; that the general interest on the subject, and the prevalent expectation of the end indicate that we are living in the *time*. To those interested in such studies, the book will have its attractions.

CORA AND THE DOCTOR: or Revelations of a Physician's Wife. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., &c. 1855.

This is, on the whole, quite a charming picture of domestic and neighborhood-life, full of spirit, freshness, and *naïveté*. The fair author remains incognito. How much of what it reveals is actual experience, we find it difficult to decide; but it is plain enough that more or less of the experiences detailed here sprung from the heart more than from the imagination. It purports to be a journal, commenced with the opening of married life, and transmitted by piece-meal to the young wife's distant mother. It is really a story; in which the characters are sufficiently numerous and diversified to afford the elements of a fine plot, to allow of frequent episodes, and furnish opportunity for skill in portraiture. The book is full of absorbing interest, and its tone appears quite unexceptionable. It is doubtless destined to a respectable "*run*."

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF MARRIAGE. A book for both sexes. By an old physician. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. 1855.

This book is full of most valuable facts and hints on subjects of the highest importance. The author is always plain, but never indelicate; and the information given is so practical that it stimulates no sensual desires, while it faithfully lifts up its voice of warning against vices and perils into which many fall for want of knowledge. The aim is evidently high, and the influence of the volume must be salutary.

THE  
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

NO. XIV.----APRIL, 1856.

---

ART. I.—DOCTRINE OF THE UNIVERSAL SLEEP OF  
THE DEAD, AND OF THE FINAL DESTRUCTION OF  
THE WICKED. ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE  
DOCTRINE ANSWERED.

In the preceding article, we have attempted to elucidate and establish the scripture doctrine of the nature of the soul—of its state from the period of death till the judgment, and of eternal retribution. Before proceeding to a consideration of the remaining topics, we will notice the explanation given by the advocates of the doctrine we are opposing, of one important proof text, which we have made use of. We refer to Matt. 10: 28: “And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.”

The following is the explanation given by “H. H. Dobney, Baptist minister, Maidstone, England.” We give the explanation in full, that no injustice may even apparently be done to our opponents:

“We need not explain what it is for the body to be killed—to be deprived of life—of all conscious existence. Our Lord well knew the only idea his phrase about destroying the body could possibly convey. But he uses the word ‘destroy,’ as equivalent to the word ‘kill,’ which he had used in the preceding clause, and uses it in reference to *both body and soul*. Evidently teaching the disciples, what indeed none ought ever to have doubted, that it

is at all events in the power of God to kill the soul, to destroy it, as the body is destructible. And he teaches them to fear *on this very account*; and to let this greater fear of God, who could destroy *both* body and soul, overpower and expel the lesser fear of persecutors, who were 'not able to kill the soul,' but could only destroy the body. In other words, our Lord certainly did ~~set~~ before his hearers, as a fearful warning, the idea of an entire destruction of their whole conscious being. This, I think, was unquestionably the only idea of which his words were fairly representative, and which they must unavoidably suggest. And if the thing itself be deemed impossible, or if it shall be affirmed that God never will destroy both body and soul in hell, then did the 'Faithful and true Witness' do what some of his followers (with reverence be it spoken) would scruple to do, and ought to scruple,—namely, employ as a motive an argument, the perfect inaccuracy of which was at the time known to him. For, since the soul is not indestructible, the use of the word 'destroy,' in reference to both it and the body, could, it is submitted, fairly convey but one idea. The sense of the word as used in reference to the body, which could be understood, would fix the meaning of it as applied to the soul."

This explanation, it will at once be perceived, overlooks wholly the important statement here made, to wit, that while man can "kill the body," he cannot "kill the soul." It also overlooks the necessary relations of this statement to a fundamental article of the faith of our opponents—*the necessary unconscious state of the dead resulting from the death of the body*. If the body and the soul die together, if the destruction of the former does imply, as they maintain, that of the latter, then he that can kill the body can kill the soul, and he that does kill the body does, in the same sense, kill the soul. This declaration of our Savior, then, cannot be true, if the doctrine of the necessary sleep of the dead, which is a fundamental article of the faith of our opponents, is true. Mr. D., then, utterly evades, instead of meeting the real bearing of this passage upon the question at issue, and for this reason, all that he has said has no bearing whatever upon that question. Two fundamental truths, we affirm, are undeniably taught in this passage, to wit: the fundamental difference between the soul and the body—and the great fact, that the dissolution of the latter does not affect at all the life, and consequently the activity of the former. Neither of these truths can be made to co-exist at all with the fundamental doctrines of our opponents.

We will now advance to a direct consideration of the scripture proof professedly adduced by the advocates of the final destruction (annihilation) of the wicked to establish that doc-

trine. We would remind our readers that the question now at issue is purely a biblical one. As we desire also to meet the argument in its full strength, we have concluded to present it entire, as given by those who have put it forward. The following very lengthy extract from Mr. Blain, comprises in the most concise and impressive form that we have been able to find, the entire mass of proof texts under consideration. We trust that our readers will give them an attentive examination, and then, with the same attention and care, consider what we have to say in reply. We give, in the first place, those texts which are cited under the title, "Direct proof of Destruction."

"To see the force or positiveness of proof in the passages I quote to sustain my views, which I will give first, and then present the opposing texts, let the rule of Bible critics be well considered. Andrew Fuller gives it thus: 'Every term is to be taken in its *proper or primary sense*, except there be something in the subject or connection which requires it to be taken otherwise.'

When this rule is applied to *terms* for destruction, we are met with the assertion—'man is immortal, and therefore these terms must not be taken in their primary sense.' I only answer at present, that this is purely an assumption; for not a text in the Bible says man is immortal, or has an *immortal soul*, or *deathless spirit*. These, and many like expressions, are men's *additions* to the Bible; and their very frequent use by teachers, should arouse hearers to *suspect* they are not being taught from the Bible, but by men's inventions. 'Mortal man,'—'God *only* hath immortality,' is the language of the Bible. Of course the wicked are not *immortal*, if the Bible declares they are to be *literally* destroyed as the beasts, and finally burned up. Most of the texts I proceed to quote, or refer to, may be seen to be in plain language; and are selected and judged to refer to the final doom of the wicked. A few of them *may* be construed to mean only earthly judgments, but as they have been used as proof of the common doctrine, it is necessary to examine them.

I will give first, direct, and then a few strong inferential proofs of my views.

The limits I propose, will permit me to draw off only a part of the passages, and give a concordance of the rest.

I.—DIE. Gen. 2: 17; 'Thou shalt surely die.'

J. Lock, Esq., the great mental philosopher and Christian, says: 'It seems a strange way of understanding a law which requires the plainest and directest words, that by "*death*" should be meant eternal life in misery.' If this was meant, then no redemption has been made; for Christ did not thus die. The Bible is plain, 'that he died for our sins.' 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a *curse* for us.' Gal. 3: 13. His death then tells what the threatening was, and that *eternal woe* could not be included. The plea that the greatness of his character made up for this endless misery, is adding to the Bible, or arguing from its silence, just as do the Catholics. These two thoughts alone are enough to overturn all our systems of divinity on this point.

How can we know brutes die, if 'to die' is not the extinction of conscious existence? Ecc. 3: 19, 20, tells us they die alike. Again, an endless life

in misery is *more* and *worse* than *death*; therefore God, and all the Bible writers used deception if that was meant, for they nowhere explain death to mean it. Prov. 15 : 10 ; 19 : 16 ; Jer. 31 : 30 ; 2 Chron. 25 : 4 ; Ez. 3 : 18, 19, 20 ; 18 : 4 ; 17 : 21 ; 21 : 26 ; 31 : 32 ; 33 : 8, 11, 13, 18.

'The soul that sinneth it shall *die*.' If death means separation of soul and body as men (not the Bible) say, I ask, what is the death of a soul! Has that got two parts so as to be separated?

John 11 : 26 ; 6 : 50 ; 'Bread (Christ) may eat thereof and *not die*.' Rom. 8 : 13 ; 'If ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*.' Did not Paul know how to say 'be tormented forever' as well as we? Of course *final* death is meant, as those who 'walk after the spirit' die a temporal death.—(*Twenty Texts*.)

II.—DEATH. Deut. 30 : 15, 19 ; 'I set before you *life* and *death*.' Of course Moses did not mean that the obedient would not die a temporal death ; hence final death was intended. Ps. 7 : 11, 12 ; 'If he turn not, he hath prepared for him the instruments of *death*.' Prov. 2 : 18 ; 5 : 5 ; 7 : 27 ; 8 : 36 ; 14 : 12 ; Jer. 21 : 8 ; 'I set before you the way of *life*, and the way of *death*.' It is serious business to say all the prophets were combined to keep the people blind as to what is meant by DEATH ; as no intimation is found that it was eternal misery in the Old Testament.

Matt. 4 : 16 ; John 5 : 24 ; 8 : 51 ; 'If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.' Temporal death, of course, is not here meant ; and does he mean *misery*, or the 'second' and final *death*?

Rom. 5 : 21 ; 6 : 16, 21 ; 'For the end of these things is death.' 6 : 23 ; 'For the *wages* of sin is *death* ; but the gift of God is eternal *life*.' Note the contrast. Rom. 7 : 5, 10, 13 ; 8 : 6 ; 1 : 32 ; 2 Cor. 2 : 16 ; 7 : 10 ; Heb. 2 : 15 ; James 1 : 15 ; 'Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth *death*.' 5 : 20.

The *second death*: Rev. 2 : 11 ; 20 : 6, 14 ; 21 : 8 ; 'Unbelievers, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone ; which is the *second death*.'—(*Thirty-three texts*.)

McKnight and Whitby, noted commentators, say, 'in the second death, the body will *die* again, and the soul live on in misery.' If such assumptions do not deserve ridicule instead of an answer, I know of nothing in catholic expositions that do. But they were the *great* and *good*, whom ministers *never* take as their guides.

III.—DESTROY. Ps. 5 : 6 ; 52 : 5 ; 'God shall also *destroy* thee *forever* and root thee out of the land of the *living*.'

Ps. 145 : 20 ; 'The Lord preserveth all them that love him ; but all the wicked will he *destroy*.'

Ps. 9 : 5 ; 37 : 38 ; 'The transgressors shall be *destroyed* together.' 92 : 7 ; 'When the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be *destroyed forever*.'

Prov. 1 : 32 ; 11 : 3 ; 7 : 16 ; 13 : 13, 10 ; 29 : 1 ; 'He that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be *destroyed*, and that *without remedy*.' Matt. 10 : 28 ; 1 Cor. 3 : 17 ; James 4 : 12 ; 'Who is able to save and to *destroy*.'

Acts 3 : 23 ; 'And it shall come to pass, that every *soul* which will not hear the prophet, (Christ,) shall be *destroyed* from among the people.' This threat has not yet been fulfilled ; and of course the finishing of Christ's work, as king, is referred to. Notice, the soul (psuche) is to be destroyed. The

\* Our title, '*Death not Life*,' may need an explanation to some. The popular theology makes the *final death*, threatened in the Bible, mean *life* in misery, or a *miserable life* ; and the caption is intended to deny this meaning.



proper rendering of the Greek is, 'shall be *utterly exterminated*.' How would it sound to say, 'be tormented from among the people?'

Luke 6 : 49; 'The house fell, and became a great heap of *ruins*.'—*Geo. Campbell*. When a brick house falls, it is no more a *house*; and though the materials of which it was built are not annihilated, *the house* is. Thus we see men are guilty of quibbling, when they say 'nothing can be annihilated.'

2 Peter 2 : 12; 'But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and *destroyed*.' 1 John 3 : 8; 'For this purpose the son of God was manifested, that he might *destroy* the works of the devil.' Not so, say our creeds; they must be preserved forever, and be greater after 'the Son of God' has finished his work than ever before!—more misery and more hatred and cursing!

Rev. 11 : 18; 'That thou shouldst *destroy* them that *destroy* the earth'—of course the devil is included. Why not say, 'Shut them up in *hell*,' as divines now do?

*Destruction*.—Job 31 : 3, 23; 'Is not destruction to the wicked?' 21 : 30; 'The wicked is reserved to the day of *destruction*.' Ps. 73 : 18; 103 : 4; Prov. 10 : 29; 21 : 15; Isa. 1 : 28; 'The *destruction* of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together; and they that forsake the Lord shall be *consumed*.' The time has not yet come, so it predicts the judgment. Matt. 7 : 13; 'Broad is the way that leadeth to *destruction*.' Rom. 9 : 22; 'Vessels of wrath fitted for *destruction*.' 1 Thess. 5 : 3; 2 Thess. 1 : 9; 'Be punished with everlasting *destruction*.' Why not say *torment*, Paul! See Acts 3 : 19; 'from the presence,' &c. 1 Tim. 6 : 9; 2 Peter 2 : 1; 'Bring upon themselves swift *destruction*.' 3 : 16; 'Wrest the scriptures to their own *destruction*.'—(Forty-two texts.)

These terms are used five hundred times, and to learn their meaning we must go to the *Bible facts* where they are used, and not to theologians. When applied to men and beasts, they are synonymous with death, except in a few cases where the context shows they are, like all words, used figuratively. For *facts* see Jude.—God destroyed in the wilderness all who 'came out of Egypt over twenty,' &c. What became of them? Was their *happiness* only destroyed, as we are told this term means? No, it was their lives. What became of Sodom, Pharaoh's army, &c.?

IV.—*PERISH*. Ps. 2 : 12; 'Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye *perish* from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little.' Ps. 49 : 12; 'Man being in honor, abideth not: he is like the beasts that *perish*.' V. 20; 'And understandeth not, is like the beasts that *perish*.' V. 19; 'He shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall never see light.' V. 14, 15; 'Like sheep they are laid in the grave...death shall feed on them...but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for he shall receive me.' These verses in their connection show that a final doom is intended, and to '*perish* like the beasts,' is to cease to be, as they do—to remain under 'the power of the grave, or of death'—'the second death.' Job 20 : 5—7; 'The triumphing of the wicked is short...he shall *perish* forever like his own dung.' V. 9; 'The eye also which saw him shall see him no more.' Ps. 10 : 16; 92 : 9; 37 : 20; see v. 18; 'The Lord knoweth the days of the upright: and their *inheritance* shall be forever. But the wicked shall *perish*, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall *consume*, into smoke shall they *consume* away.' Ps. 87 : 22; 'For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be *cut off*.' We see a *final* doom is told in these texts; as the wicked are no more 'cut off' nor 'perish' than the saints, as yet, but are to be 'the many who go in the broad way to (final) destruction,' till Christ comes.

Ps. 68 : 2; 'As wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked *perish* at the presence of God.' Remember the Psalms are predictions, and often the

prayers of Christ. They are inspired prayers too. It is absurd to say the prophets for four thousand years did not know what future punishment would be.

Ps. 73 : 27 ; 112 : 10 ; Prov. 10 : 28 ; 11 : 7 ; 19 : 9 ; 21 : 28 ; Isa. 41 : 11 ; 'They that strive with thee shall *perish*...be as nothing, and as a thing of nought.' Surely if they groan and curse forever, they will not be 'as nothing,' and they are *something* while on earth. Job 6 : 18 ; 'They go to *nothing and perish*.'

Matt. 18 : 14 ; Luke 13 : 3—5 ; John 3 : 15, 16 ; 11 : 50 ; 'It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation *perish* not.' The 'whole nation perished' (died) on the earth, but 'the election' will not 'perish' eternally.

John 10 : 28 ; Rom. 2 : 12 ; 'For as many as have sinned without law, shall also *perish* without law.' Acts 13 : 41 ; 1 Cor. 1 : 18 ; 2 Cor. 2 : 15 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 10 ; 2 Peter 3 : 9 ; 2 : 12 ; 'Shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption.'

If perish and destroy mean *loss of life* in this world, it is folly to *guess* they do not mean the same in the world to come. A specimen of blindness or perversion is heard in quoting Isa. 57 : 1 ; 'The righteous perisheth,' to prove perish cannot mean death. If men read the Bible with any care, they would see by the whole verse that temporal *death* is meant.—(*Thirty-one texts.*)

V.—PERDITION. John 17 : 12 ; 'Lost none but the son of *perdition*,' (Judas.) Phil. 1 : 28 ; 2 Thes. 2 : 23 ; 'Man of sin, the son of perdition.' It is admitted that the 'man of sin,' (popery,) is to be ended, and this proves the wicked must be ; for 2 Peter 3 : 7, says ; 'The present world is reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and *perdition* of ungodly men.' 1 Tim. 6 : 9 ; Heb. 10 : 39 ; 'We are not of them who draw back unto *perdition*.' Rev. 17 : 8—11.—(*Eight texts.*)

VI.—CONSUME. Ps. 37 : 19, 20 ; 'The wicked \* \* \* into smoke shall they *consume* away.' 49 : 14 ; Isa. 1 : 28 ; 'They that forsake the Lord shall be *consumed*.' Ps. 104 : 35 ; 'Let the sinners be *consumed*, and let the wicked be no more.' Good critics tell us that many of David's prayers are predictions, and are the words of Christ ; but why did the Spirit inspire David to pray, if this be only a prayer, for what he did not mean to grant ? Ps. 59 : 13 ; 'Consume them in wrath ; *consume* them, that they may *not be*.' Certainly if they are only *shut up* somewhere they '*will be*.'—(*Six texts.*)

VII.—DEVOUR. Ps. 21 : 9 ; 'The Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall *devour* them. This Psalm is evidently Christ's words, and tells a final doom.

Heb. 10 : 27 ; 'There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of *judgment* and fiery indignation, which shall *devour* the adversaries.' Here and in 2 Pet. 3 : 7, we learn *where* Gehenna (hell) is to be, and *what* it is, as Lev. 10 : 2 ; and Num. 26 : 10, tell us what *devour* means.—(*Two texts.*)

VIII.—SLAY, SLAIN, KILL. Ps. 34 : 21 ; 62 : 3 ; 139 : 19 ; 'Surely thou wilt *slay* the wicked, O God ; ye shall be *slain*, all of you.' When ? They have not been slain yet ; but Luke 19 : 27, tells when they will be. 'But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and *slay* them before me.' V. 15, tells the time—the judgment. Prov. 1 : 32 ; Isa. 11 : 4 ; 'With the breath of his lips shall he (Christ) *slay* the wicked.' Matt. 10 : 28, and Luke 12 : 4, tells us it is to be done in *Gehenna*, denoting a place of slaughter at the judgment. Amos 8 : 14 ; 'They that swear, &c., even they shall *fall*, and never *rise up* again.' When is this fall to be ? If only temporal death be meant, they will 'rise up again' in the resurrection.—(*Eight texts.*)

IX.—**BLOT OUT.** Ps. 69 : 28 ; ' Let them be *blotted out* of the book of the *living*, and not be written with the righteous.' V. 11 and 26 show these are Christ's words, and so says Dr. Lord, of Buffalo. ' This text harmonizes with Rev. 3 : 5 , ' I will not *blot out* his name out of the *book of life*.' Again we say the final doom of the wicked was revealed to the prophets of the O. T. It is impious to say these expressions only mean '*blotting out*' *happiness*. But perhaps I should forbear such remarks till I show there is not a text demanding such a change. Ps. 9 : 5 ; ' Thou hast *destroyed* the wicked, thou hast *put out* their name forever and ever.' Predictions are often put in the past tense. Prov. 10 : 25 ; ' As the whirlwind passeth, so are the wicked *no more*, but the righteous are an everlasting foundation.'—( *Four texts*.)

X.—**HEWN DOWN.** Matt. 3 : 10 ; 7 : 19 ; ' Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.' Do we cast trees into the fire to preserve them? Did Christ aim to deceive?—( *Two texts*.)

XI.—**LOSE LIFE.** Matt. 10 : 39 ; 16 : 25, 26 ; Mark 8 : 35—37 ; John 12 : 25 : The import of these seven texts is alike and seen in the last, ' He that loveth his *life* shall *lose it*, and he that hateth his *life* in this world, shall keep it unto *eternal life*.'

No doctrine of the Bible is made more plain than the loss of existence to the sinner is here. The repetitions and the comparison show that Christ meant to be emphatic, and put it beyond the possibility of being misunderstood. The original word *psuche* (life) is used thirteen times in these texts, but the translators have put it *soul* four times in Matt. 16 : 26 ; and Mark 8 : 36, 37. Perhaps they translated it *soul* to prevent repetition, and it is only our *expounders* who dissemble by pretending that *life* and *soul* in these texts mean two things. Let those who dare, say losing *life* for Christ's sake, in this world, means literal *death*, but losing *life* in ' the world to come ' means only the loss of *happiness*. I pity those who do so, whether their motives be pure or not.

John 3 : 36 ; ' He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting *life* ; and he that believeth not the Son *shall not see life*.' 1 John 5 : 12 ; ' He that hath the Son hath *life* ; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not *life*.' Creeds say they have *life* ! Saints have ' the Spirit which is the earnest and seal of their inheritance ; ' and in this sense they have *life* now. Eph. 1 : 13, 14 ; 2 Cor. 1 : 22. How would this text sound to say, ' he that hath not the Son, hath not happiness ? ' They (the wicked) have more than heart could wish. Ps. 73 : 7.—( *Eight texts*.)

XII.—**END.** Ps. 7 : 9 ; ' O, let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end.' Will wickedness be ended, if the wicked *live* to hate God ?

Heb. 6 : 8 ; ' Whose *end* is to be burned.'

Ps. 37 : 38 ; ' The end of the wicked shall be *cut off*.'

Phil. 3 : 19 ; ' Whose *end* is *destruction*.' Neh. 1 : 9.

If the wicked are immortal, then they have *no end*, and this language is absurd. If we had not become accustomed to absurdities, just as the Catholics have, we should see that the common theory makes the Bible the most contradictory book ever written.—( *Five texts*.)

XIII.—**NOT BE.** Ps. 37 : 16 ; ' For yet a little while and the wicked shall *not be* ; yea thou shall diligently consider his *place*, and it shall *not be*.' Where is hell then? Prov. 12 : 7 ; Obad. 16, ' They (the heathen,) shall be as though they had not been.' 1 Sam. 2 : 9 ; ' He shall keep the feet of his saints, and the wicked shall be *silent* in darkness.' Job 8 : 22 ; ' The *dwelling-place* of the wicked shall come to nought.' *Marginal*, ' not be.' ( *Five texts*.)

XIV.—**CUT OFF.** Ps. 37 : 9, ' For evil doers shall be *cut off* ; but those that wait upon the Lord shall inherit the earth.' When? ' The new heaven and earth.' V. 22 : 28, ' His saints are *preserved* forever ; but the seed o the

wicked shall be *cut off*;' v. 38. Ps. 34 : 16, 'The face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to *cut off* the remembrance of them from the earth'—Cut *them off*, not their *happiness*.—(Five texts.)

XV.—CORRUPTION. Gal. 6 : 8 ; 'For he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap *corruption* ; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap *life everlasting*.' Note the contrast.—(One text.)

XVI.—GROUND TO POWDER. Matt. 21 : 44 ; Luke 20 : 18, 'On whosoever it, (the stone, Christ,) shall fall, it will *grind* him to *powder*.' 'Crush him to *pieces*.'—Geo. Campbell. Crush *him*, not his peace.

XVII.—TEAR IN PIECES. Ps. 50 : 22, 'Now consider this ye that forget God, lest I tear you in *pieces*, and there be none to deliver.' 1 Sam. 2 : 10, 'The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces.'—(Two texts.)

XVIII.—PUT AWAY AS DROSS. Ps. 119 : 119, 'Thou puttest away all the wicked of the earth like *dross*.' This is not yet done, so it must refer to the judgment.—(One text.)

XIX.—NOTHING AND NOUGHT. Isa. 41 : 11, 12, 'They that war against thee shall be as *nothing*, and as a thing of *nought* ; and they that strive with thee shall *perish*.' Jer. 10 : 2, 'Correct me, but not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to *nothing*.'—(Three texts.)

XX.—BURN AND BURN UP. Mal. 4 : 1, 'For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven : and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be as stubble ; and the day that cometh shall *burn them up*, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither *root* nor *branch*.' V. 3, 'The wicked shall be *ashes* under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this.' Thus the O. T. begins with the threatening of *death*, and ends with the doom of being '*burned up root and branch*;' and this tells what '*to die*' means.

By the above *map* of the O. T. we find eighty-five threatenings for utter destruction ; and, as I shall show, not *one* for *endless suffering*.

In the same *map* we have seventy-seven promises of '*life*' to the righteous. Surely God did not leave his people 4,000 years without the *motives of fear and hope* as to the *endless future*. In contrasting the fate of saints and sinners, many other terms are applied to saints, such as, 'be preserved forever,'—'inherit the earth'—'redeem me from the power of the grave,' &c., and these terms show that the promise of *life* means *existence*, and not mere *happiness*, as we are vainly taught. Such promises fully taught the Jew a resurrection.

But how does the N. T. begin, as to the penalty ? Matt. 3 : 12, 'Whose fan is in his hand, and he shall thoroughly *purge* his floor, and gather the *wheat* into his garner ; but he will *burn up the chaff* with unquenchable fire'—wrath, vengeance, which never will be quenched. 'Our God is a *consuming fire*.' If single texts could confirm a doctrine, ours is confirmed here ; for a stronger comparison cannot be made. Chaff put into fire to be preserved ! So say our creeds. Matt. 13 : 30, 38, 42, 48, 50, 'As therefore, the *tares* are gathered and *burned* in the *fire* ; so shall it be in the end of this world,' &c."

The entire argument above presented, rests upon one assumption, to wit, that the "proper and primary sense" of the terms "die," "death," "destroy," "perish," &c., is destruction, or annihilation, or the cessation of conscious existence, and that when applied to the wicked, in the scriptures, they are employed in this one sense exclusively. Not a solitary passage adduced, nor any argument based upon it, has any force or

pertinency whatever, on any other supposition. In reply, we affirm, 1. That this is, in fact, not the proper and primary sense of most of these terms; and 2. That when applied to the wicked, they are invariably used in a strictly and exclusively metaphorical sense. In verification of these statements, let us consider, in the first place, the terms "die," and "death," as employed in the passages above cited, and in others of kindred import in the scriptures. On this topic we remark:

1. That the "proper and primary sense" of these terms is not destruction in the sense of annihilation, or the cessation of conscious existence. As defined, and correctly so, by Worcester, death is "the extinction of life." As defined by Webster, its "proper and primary sense" is "that state of a being, animal, or vegetable, but never particularly of the animal, in which there is a total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions," &c. Death, according to its "proper and primary sense" is a *change of state*, and not the cessation of existence, much less of self-conscious existence. To affirm of a being, simply that he is dead, or shall die, determines nothing whatever in regard to the fact whether he has, or has not, a soul, or whether, if he has one, his soul is, or will, after death, be in a state of self-conscious activity or not.

2. The term death is a RELATIVE term, and stands related to the term life by way of opposition. Its meaning, in any given case, can be determined but by a reference to the kind of life to which it stands opposed. When opposed to the idea of animal or vegetable life, it supposes, not a cessation of existence, but of the "total and permanent cessation of the vital functions." Nothing, we repeat, is implied in this idea of death, pertaining to the state of the soul. When the term life represents the idea of existence in a state of happiness, death would imply existence and self-conscious existence, but existence in the opposite state, a state of unhappiness. When the term life, as it often does, represents the idea of existence in a state of moral purity, then that of death represents existence in the opposite state, a state of sin, and *vice versa*. When the term life represents the idea of existence, or of self-conscious existence, then, and only then, would the term death as repre-

senting the opposite state, represent the idea of non-existence, or of the cessation of self-conscious being.

3. In all of the above senses are each of these terms frequently employed in the Bible. We will adduce a few passages in which they are employed in one or the other of the three senses last named. In the specific sense, last named, we find these terms employed in Matt. 22:32, a passage commented on in our first article on this subject: "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," that is, God is not the God of non-existing, or unconscious beings, (the Sadducean idea of the state of the dead,) but of living, that is, existing, self-conscious beings, (the evangelical idea of the state of the dead.) The meaning of the terms in this passage cannot be misapprehended by any unprejudiced mind, and that meaning, as we have already seen, is perfectly fatal to the entire system of the destructionists. Though physically dead, yet in the Sadducean or destructionist sense the patriarchs, and consequently, as the Savior directly affirms, all who have died physically are not now dead beings, but living ones. In other cases the term death is employed to represent the idea of total sinfulness, as opposed to the term life, when employed to represent a state of moral purity. In accordance with these distinct and opposite meanings, though more is also implied, the terms life and death are employed in such passages as Eph. 2: 1—5. "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved.\*)" In this and kindred passages, the term death, instead of implying the cessation of self-consciousness, implies existence in a state of self-conscious mental activity. As opposed to the idea of spiritual life, those who are living in sin are dead. As

changed from this to a state of moral purity, they are affirmed to have been raised from the dead. Death, then, does not, of itself, imply a cessation of conscious existence, and it is contrary to all the laws of correct interpretation to infer from the fact that death is threatened to the wicked, that they shall be annihilated, or shall cease to exist in a state of self-consciousness. In other passages Christians, as separated by their union with Christ from a life of sin, are affirmed to be dead. "For ye are dead," Col. 3: 3. "Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ," and Col. 2: 20. "I am crucified (dead) with Christ." Gal. 2: 20. By the same arguments by which the doctrine of "destruction" is attempted to be proved from the scriptures, we can prove first, that all sinners are now in a state of total unconsciousness, and in the next place that all true Christians are also in the same state; for both classes alike are affirmed absolutely and unqualifiedly to be now dead.

4. Before the least shadow of evidence can be adduced in favor of the doctrine of destruction, from the fact that the terms "die," and "death," are employed to express the future state of the wicked, it must be shown, that the life promised to the righteous is exclusively a state of self-conscious activity. This they have never done, and it is sure they never can do. Their whole argument is based upon a total misunderstanding of the fundamental meaning of the term death, to wit, that it always represents a state, in all respects, the opposite of an other specific state represented by the term life, and that to determine its meaning, in any given case, we must determine the nature of the specific form of the life to which, in such specific case, it stands opposed. Suppose that the destructionists, instead of adducing fifty-three passages in which the terms "die" and "death" are employed to express the future state of the wicked, could adduce five thousand similar passages. All this would have no bearing whatever in favor of that doctrine, until they have shown that the life promised to the righteous, is not, as the scriptures affirm it to be, "glory, honor, and peace," "a crown of glory," "a rest," &c., that is, a state of endless blessedness, but simply and primarily, a state of immortal self-consciousness. Any careful reader of the Bible knows perfectly,

that the life promised to the righteous is not continued existence, but a certain state of existence, to wit, eternal blessedness. The term death, as representing the opposite state, therefore, represents, not a state of non-being, or unconsciousness, but a state of unhappiness. The immutable laws of language prohibit any other conclusion.

The whole argument upon this subject may be thus stated: The terms "die," "death," &c., always represent a certain state the opposite of some specific state represented by the term life. The form of life to which these terms always stand opposed, when employed to represent the future state of the wicked, is not continued existence, or existence in a state of self-consciousness, but primarily and exclusively a state of mental blessedness. These terms, then, when employed as above stated, represent, not a state of non-being, or unconsciousness, but a state of unhappiness. This argument must be valid, or these terms are employed in the scriptures in violation of all the laws of language. The entire argument of the destructionists is based upon a fundamental misapprehension of the "proper and primary sense" of the terms under consideration, and in a corresponding misapplication of them, in reference to the subject before us. Death, according to its "proper and primary sense," is "the cessation of life," and implies the cessation of existence when and only when it stands opposed to the term life, as representing mere continued existence, which is not its "proper and primary sense." When employed in the scriptures to represent the future state of the wicked, the term death always stands opposed to a totally different idea, to wit, that of eternal happiness. Every one of our author's proof texts, therefore, are totally misapplied.

In reply to the statement of "J. Locke, Esq.," we would simply remark, that no one infers from the simple fact that the term "death" is employed to represent the future state of the wicked; that "eternal life in misery" is meant. This inference, on the other hand, is drawn exclusively from the fact that this term, in all such cases, stands opposed to the term life as representing the idea of eternal happiness, and consequently



must, according to the immutable laws of language, mean "eternal life in misery."

Our author's zéal led him, we remark further, into a very singular mistake, when he affirmed that the death of Christ "tells what the threatening was." The dissolution of soul and body in the case of Christ did not surely render his soul non-extinct, or unconscious. We may infer, then, from our author's reasoning, that the death of the wicked will not render them non-extinct, or unconscious.

We now advance to a consideration of two other terms upon which our author dwells at great length, and lays the greatest stress. We refer to the term "destroy," or destruction, and to the term "perish." In forty-two passages of scripture the former term, and in thirty-one the latter, is employed, to express the future state of the wicked. Here, also, it is assumed, that the "proper and primary sense" of these terms is annihilation, or the permanent cessation of existence, and that in all these passages they are employed in this one sense exclusively. On no other supposition do any, or all of these passages together, present the least shadow of evidence in favor of the doctrine of "destruction."

Now we affirm, that both the terms destroy and perish are, in the scriptures, applied to individuals while existing, in the first case, and when cessation of existence is, in no form, implied in the next. Hosea 13:9. "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help." Here persons who are yet alive and in the body are affirmed to have been destroyed. Destruction, then, in the Bible sense of the term, does not always imply the cessation of existence, or even the temporary suspension of self-consciousness. Isa. 57:1. "The righteous perisheth," &c. Natural death, we admit, in accordance with the explanation of Mr. Blain, is here intended. We cite the passage for this one purpose, to show that the term "perish," as used in the scriptures, does not, of itself, imply annihilation; for the righteous do perish, and even destructionists affirm that they are not annihilated, but will exist to eternity. So, for aught that is implied in the terms under consideration, the wicked may be destroyed and perish, and yet exist in a state of self-consciousness to eternity.

Let us contemplate other and similar passages. Acts 9: 21. "But all that heard him were amazed, and said; Is not this he that destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent, that he might bring them bound unto the chief priests?" Paul *destroyed* many of the saints, but he did not annihilate one of them. They were destroyed, and yet will exist to eternity. Ex. 8: 24. "The land (of Egypt) was corrupted (destroyed, the literal rendering of the original,) by reason of the swarms of flies." Here was destruction, but no annihilation. Ex. 10: 7. "Knowest thou not yet, that Egypt is destroyed?" Egypt was *destroyed*, but not annihilated. We cite the above passages, and we might multiply our citations to any extent desired, to prove that, in the Bible, as well as in common language, the terms "destroy," "destruction," and "perish" are not synonymous at all with annihilation. If these terms were applied in the Bible ten thousand, instead of seventy-three times to the wicked, no argument whatever could be legitimately drawn from thence in favor of the doctrine of "destruction," as now advocated, and that for the undeniable reason that these terms, as used in that book, are not synonymous in their meaning with destruction in the sense of annihilation, or reduction to a state of non-being.

According to the "proper and primary sense" of these terms, on the other hand, any object is destroyed, or has perished, when rendered incapable of answering the end for which it was made, and that whether it still continues to *exist* or not. Mind was made for a state of moral purity and happiness. When permanently separated from that state, it may as properly be said to have been destroyed, or to have perished, as if it had been annihilated. There is nothing in the original, the Bible, or the common meaning of these terms, which does not render them as applicable to one of these states as to the other. If the evangelical idea, instead of that of the destructionists were, as we affirm it to be, the real doctrine of the Bible, in regard to the future state of the wicked, no change whatever would be demanded in the language of a single passage under consideration. They could, we repeat, as properly be said to be destroyed and to perish, in the one case, as in the other. If

annihilated, they might properly be said to have been destroyed, or to have perished, of course. If permanently separated from a state of moral purity and happiness, the same language, as before would be just as applicable to express their state. They are as really destroyed, according to the fundamental meaning of the term, in one case as in the other. The proof texts of the destructionists fail totally to sustain their dogma, for the obvious reason that every passage which they cite equally, according to the immutable laws of language, consists with the doctrine which they deny. All their arguments involve a fundamental violation of the universal principle of interpretation, that no text can properly be adduced to prove any one doctrine, when said text equally consists with the opposite doctrine.

That the wicked are to be destroyed and to perish, is absolutely affirmed in the scriptures. As there are different forms of destruction, however, the words destroy and perish determine nothing whatever in regard to the particular and specific form referred to, in any given case or cases. This we are to learn from other passages exclusively. If they affirm, that the punishment to be inflicted upon sinners is, not annihilation, but "tribulation and anguish," which are never to terminate, this determines the meaning of the terms "destroy," "destruction," "perish," &c., when employed to represent that punishment. We might with as much conclusiveness adduce the declaration of the Bible, that "man is born of woman," or, that Eve is "the mother of all the living," to prove the doctrine of "destruction," as to cite the passages under consideration to prove the same doctrine.

The remarks made above are so directly applicable to all the other passages cited by our author, that little in addition need be said in regard to them. Let us suppose, that in eternity, the wicked are to exist in a state of unending separation from all good, and to be thereby the subjects of all evil, that is, of "tribulation and anguish," and that the object of the scriptures is to set this idea before us in the most impressive forms. There is not a solitary text or scripture expression adduced by the destructionists, which is not as well adapted to express

that idea, as that of annihilation. On the other hand, while all of these terms are perfectly adapted to represent metaphorically the former idea, many of them, to say the least, are wholly unadapted to represent the latter. We see no occasion whatever for all this array of metaphor to express so simple an idea as that of cessation of existence.

Let us look, however, for a few moments at some of these classes of passages. The original word rendered "perdition," means simply destruction without any reference whatever to its form. In Acts 25: 16, it is employed to represent natural death, "to deliver any man to die," (to perdition.) In Matt. 14: 4, it is translated "waste." "Why was this waste (perdition) of the ointment?" Five times in the New Testament it is rendered destruction, eight times perdition, twice waste, once damnation and damnable, once perish, "thy money perish with thee," once die, and once pernicious. In one instance only, 2 Thess. 2: 3, is it employed in a connection which indicates with any distinctness at all, that the destruction referred to is annihilation. In other instances, it is employed in connections which preclude the idea that this form of destruction is at all intended. Nothing, then, can be more illogical than the inference, that because this term is used to represent the future state of the wicked, that destruction in this one form exclusively is intended. The term, according to original derivation, and most common usage, is just as well adapted to represent the evangelical idea of destruction, as to express the one under consideration. So much for the eight texts cited under the head, "perdition."

Six texts are then cited in which the word "consume," and two in which its synonyme "devour" is applied to the wicked. By the same arguments by which the doctrine of "destruction" is proved from such texts, we can prove that our Savior himself was actually annihilated by his zeal for the honor of God, the land of Egypt by famine, the eyes of David by weeping, and David himself by the rod of God, on the one hand, and by his own zeal, on the other, &c., &c. "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up," (devoured me.) John 2: 17. "The famine shall consume the land;" Gen. 41: 30. "Mine eye is consumed because

of grief." Ps. 6: 8. Were David's eyes annihilated by his grief? "I am consumed by the blow of thine hand." Ps. 39: 10. "My zeal hath consumed me." Ps. 119: 139. According to the arguments of the destructionists, David was twice actually annihilated, once, as we have said, "by the stroke of God," once by his own zeal, and then almost annihilated by his enemies. See Ps. 119: 87. At the same time we are, according to the same construction, told, 2 Sam. 13: 39, that the soul of David was annihilated by his desire to go after Absalom. "The soul of David longed (literally, was consumed,) to go forth unto Absalom." Yet neither Christ, nor the land of Egypt, nor David's eyes, nor David himself, nor his soul, was ever annihilated at all. The reason is obvious. To consume, and to devour, neither of them, nor both together, imply annihilation. There is nothing in the original, or derived meaning of these words from which the remotest evidence can be adduced in favor of the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked. So of the words, "slay, slain, kill," found in eight other texts cited by our author. We might with as much propriety cite the phrase, "the man Christ Jesus" to prove or disprove the divinity of our Savior as to cite the above passages to prove the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked. In no language on earth are these terms at all synonymous with annihilation, and in none do they represent any ideas which imply it.

Our author tells us that "it is impious to say," that the phrase "blotting out," means only "blotting out happiness." In reply, we affirm, that it is equally impious to say, that this phrase means "blotting out" existence. When God has separated the wicked from the society of the holy, and from all that is blessed, in the universe, and when the term life is used, as it is, to represent the state of the righteous, and death to represent that of the wicked, no language conceivable is better adapted to express the state of the latter class, than such a phrase as "blotting out," &c. Besides, this same phrase is often applied to objects which never will and never can be annihilated. An act once performed, an act of sin, for example, can never be annihilated. It must stand as a fact of actual occurrence forever. Yet this very act may be, and is often, in

scripture, affirmed to be "blotted out," that is, forgiven. If the act of forgiving is "blotting out" sin, so the eternal separation of the wicked from the society and blessedness of the righteous, while the former as well as the latter may exist to eternity, may, with the most perfect propriety, be denominated "blotting them (their names) out from the book of the living," and "out of the book of life," &c.

We feel quite safe in leaving Matt. 3: 10; 7: 9, "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire," to the good sense of our readers. The simple truth presented in these passages is this, that as those trees which do not bear good fruit, are reserved as fuel for the fire, so the wicked are reserved for the impending judgments of God. The individual who finds the doctrine of annihilation in such passages, ought to return to the Sabbath school, and there learn what are "the first principles of the oracles of God." He is certainly one who "has need of milk, and not of strong meat."

Similar remarks are equally applicable to our author's argument drawn from the "seven texts" in which the phrase "lose life" is found. The idea never danced in our brain before, that loving existence is a crime to which the penalty of annihilation is annexed. Such, however, is the real teaching of the destructionists, as set forth by themselves. Let us read some of the passages cited under this head, "lose life," in accordance with the meaning which they expressly attach to this phrase, and to the term life. "He that loveth his life, (existence,) shall lose it, (his existence,) and he that hateth his life, (existence,) in this world, shall keep it, (his existence in this world,) unto eternal life," (existence,) that is, shall never die even a natural death. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, (existence,) and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life," (existence.) "He that hath the Son hath life, (existence,) and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life, (existence.) The wicked, then, are already annihilated. Surely, the advocates of the doctrine of destruction must be hard pressed for proof texts, or they would never force into their catalogue of texts such passages as these.

"Accustomed to absurdities," as our author thinks we have become, we can yet see the infinite absurdity of arguing from five texts, in one of which a prayer is presented, that the "wickedness of the wicked may come to an end," and in the others, the affirmation is met with, that "the end of the wicked shall be cut off," and that "their end is destruction," and "to be burned," that the wicked will be annihilated. We have often prayed that "the wickedness of the wicked might come to an end," that is, might terminate, while the thought never entered our mind, that we were praying that the wicked themselves might be annihilated. We should regard it as impious in us to put up such a prayer. We pray for the conversion, and not for the annihilation, of the wicked. Two meanings are, among others, represented by the noun "end," to wit, *destiny*, and the *plan* of life, or the *object* aimed at in life. In the first sense the term is employed in Heb. 6:8: "Whose end is to be burned," and Phil. 3:9, "Whose end is destruction." In the second sense, it is employed in Ps. 37:38, "The end (plans) of the wicked shall be cut off," (defeated.) What bearing have such texts upon the doctrine of destruction? We might as properly argue from these passages, that all men will be saved, as that the wicked will be annihilated. In none of these passages has the term "end" any reference to the *existence* of the wicked. There is nothing in it contradicting, in any form, the idea that they may or may not exist to eternity.

The only passage cited by our author which has even an apparent bearing in favor of his doctrine is Ps. 37:10, and one or two others of a kindred phraseology: "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." Here, according to our translation, it is affirmed, that, in a short period, the wicked will cease to be. The reader will perceive, from the fact that the terms "shall" and "be" are in italics, that they are not in the original. Our translators put them there to express their idea of the meaning of the original, and they put them there with no thought whatever that any one would understand the passage to mean that the wicked will ere long cease to exist. They knew very well, that the passage, as it stands in the

original, means no such thing. The wicked, in this Psalm, are presented to our contemplation, as they now appear, as contrasted with their state hereafter. In a little while, we are told all this prosperity will vanish, even their dwelling places of wealth and luxury, while the righteous shall "delight themselves in abundance of peace." To set before us this approaching change in the condition of the wicked, it is affirmed that his prosperity is but momentary. In a short period he will not (appear,) that is, in his prosperity, and triumph over the righteous. Even his habitation will be a desolation. While the blessedness of the righteous shall be eternal, that of the wicked shall disappear, as the fat of lambs is consumed upon the altar, and in smoke passes away. It is perfectly common, in the Bible, and in all languages of earth, to express the utter destruction of prosperity by affirming that the possessor himself has perished, has been destroyed, ruined, or consumed. Thus when merely the ordinary productions of a country have been destroyed, the country itself is, in Bible language, affirmed to have been destroyed, consumed, &c. So the utter destruction of the prosperity of the wicked is expressed in precisely similar language, when their annihilation is no more referred to, than is the annihilation of a country, in such expressions as, "Egypt is destroyed," "Egypt is consumed," &c.

What strange theological logic is that which adduces, in proof of the annihilation of the wicked, such declarations as these, "The wicked shall be *silent* in darkness," and "The *dwelling-place* of the wicked, (his present abode of prosperity,) shall come to nought." Silence in darkness, and the destruction of a dwelling-place synonymous with the annihilation of the individuals referred to!

We turn to our Bible and find that God "will *cut off* the righteous and the wicked," Ez. 21 : 3, that "the Messiah shall be *cut off*," Dan. 9 : 26, &c. Here, surely, individuals are "cut off," but not annihilated. We then turn to the productions of the destructionists, and find five texts in which it is simply affirmed that "evil doers," "the end," and "the remembrance" of "the wicked shall be cut off," adduced as absolute proof, that all the wicked will be forever annihilated. In what dictionary



do they learn that "cut off" implies annihilation? Whoever thought, till he met with the strange fact in these writings, that such terms and phrases as "corruption," "ground to powder," "tear in pieces," "put away as dross," "shall be as nothing and as a thing of nought," (treated as worthless objects,) and "burn and burn up," mean to annihilate? Some divinity students are making very strange progress in Biblical learning. In the Bible, and in all languages, such terms and phrases are in common use, where no approach whatever is made to the idea of annihilation. Yet, for the simple reason that such language is employed to represent the future state of the wicked, their eternal annihilation is inferred. Our God, to be sure, is, in a metaphorical sense, "a consuming fire." How can we infer, from hence, that he will ever annihilate any being or object? He will "make all things new," (re-organize the entire universe.) This he may do without annihilating any being or object. The fact that he will thus create all things, therefore, gives no ground whatever for the inference, that the wicked, or any being or object will, or will not, be annihilated.

We will draw the present article to a close, by noticing briefly the following proof texts of our author, cited with remarks, under the title, "Another class of texts proving destruction." As in the former case, we let our opponents speak for themselves:

"As I am arguing with the orthodox and not Universalists and Restorationists, I bring another class of texts as positive proof of *destruction*, viz., those which tell of the cleanings of the universe from 'the last enemy,' or all evil. If governments have the *power*, they put an end to rebellion, by killing off some of the rebels, and then it is properly said, *peace* and '*reconciliation*' are restored. I kindly ask Universalists to keep in mind this idea while I take from them these strong texts on which they rely, and apply them to prove my views.

Acts 3 : 21, 'Whom the heavens must receive until the times of *restitution of all things*.'

It will be a strange '*restitution*' if more misery and sin are produced when Christ comes than ever existed before! This must be, if the popular theory be correct; for *all* sinners are not now miserable nor *very* bad—in their *hell* they would *all* be so.

1 Cor. 15 : 25, 26, 'For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be *destroyed* is death.' Are sinners and sin enemies to Christ! If so, they will be 'destroyed.' Christ is said to 'put enemies under his feet.' To have eternal groaning and cursing in a 'footstool' would not *seem* to be pleasant. This is a Bible expression for utter destruction of enemies; see Mal. 4 : 3; Rom. 16 : 20, and when men say it means only to '*shut them up*' they add to God's word.

Heb. 2 : 8 ; 1 : 13, are similar. Eph. 1 : 10, 'That in 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.'

Phil. 2 : 10, 11, 'That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.'

Col. 1 : 19, 20, 'For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fullness (power) dwell ; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile all things* unto himself by him, I say, whether they be *things in earth, or things in heaven.*'

Rev. 5 : 13, 'And every *creature* which is in *heaven*, and on the *earth*, and *under the earth* \* \* all that are in them, heard I, saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.'

Rev. 21 : 4, 'And there shall be *no more death*, neither *sorrow*, nor *crying* \* \* nor any more pain, for the former things are passed away.' V. 5, 'And he that sat upon the throne, said, *Behold I make all things new.*'

Ps. 2 : 9, 'Thou (Christ) shalt break them with a rod of iron ; (all the wicked of the earth) thou shalt dash them in *pieces* like a potter's vessel.'

1 John 3 : 8, puts in the keystone of this class of texts. 'For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might *destroy the works of the devil—he that committeth sin is of the devil.*' See also Rom. 14 : 11, and 2 Cor. 5 : 19.—(Ten texts.)

These ten texts, and others quoted by Universalists, would fully confirm their doctrine, were they not *overwhelmed* by the previous 200 for destruction. The fact is, and Universalists see it—if the wicked are *immortal*, their doctrine is true.

I can only notice briefly some of the expressions in these ten texts. 'Heaven and earth,' Prof. Stuart says, 'was a Hebrew phrase for the universe,' and it is seen to be so from their views of *astronomy*, and the fact that Bible language is accommodated to their views.

I ask (1.) where the wicked and devils will be when '*all things* (in the universe) are reconciled to God?' Col. 1 : 20. Where when 'every creature (in the universe) gives *glory* and *honor*,' &c., Rev. 5 : 13 ? (2.) When God 'makes *all things new*,' what will *hell* be? Rev. 21 : 5. (3.) Divines tell us 'death' and 'second death,' mean '*to be tormented*,' and Rev. 21 : 4, says, 'There shall be no more *death*,'—how then can there be *torment*, if death and torment be synonymous? O, consistency, thou art a jewel."

The time of the "restitution," we would remark, is the period, as we are informed, of which "God hath spoken by the mouth of all his prophets, since the world began." Before we can infer, from such predicted restitution, the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, it must be shown, that such destruction constitutes a part of the restitution as thus foretold. We have already seen, that no restitution including the annihilation of any beings is foretold by all or any of the prophets. No such destruction, therefore, is, in any sense, implied in this passage. Putting enemies under one's feet, let us remark, implies neither their conversion, nor their annihilation, but their subjection to

appropriate retribution. The enemies of Christ are now at large, and in open rebellion. When they are all brought to judgment, and receive their rewards, then, according to the proper meaning of the words before us, will "his enemies be put under his feet." To put under foot is one thing. To annihilate is quite another, and is not putting under foot at all. Death, the last enemy to be destroyed, (subdued,) now reigns through the earth. At the final resurrection, "all will be raised incorruptible," and death will not be annihilated, but will be destroyed, in this sense, that creatures will never "die" any more. This is the idea, and the only idea, expressed by the phrase under consideration.

The phrase "gather together in one *all things* in Christ," refers of course (so we are specifically told in the passage before us,) to the inhabitants which will be "in heaven, and on earth," *at the time* when this consummation "foretold by all the prophets" is to take place. Whether the wicked, who are previously to be separated from heaven and earth both, are or are not to be annihilated, we are not here informed. Nor can any legitimate conclusion having the remotest bearing upon this question be deduced from it. The same remarks are equally applicable to Rev. 5 : 13, with this difference, that what is here referred to occurred eighteen centuries ago, when the seals were opened. *All*, in the sense of absolute universality, is not here intended.

The meaning of Phil. 2 : 10, 11, is fully explained Rom. 14 : 10—12 : "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." As also 2 Cor. 5 : 10 : "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." When all the righteous and the wicked together "stand before the judgment seat of Christ," and bow there, whether willingly or unwillingly, to receive their final doom, then will all that is affirmed in Phil. 2 : 10, 11, be

fulfilled, and that without any being annihilated. In bowing to Christ, as Judge, all do "confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

Col. 1: 19, 20, simply reveals the *end* for which Christ was appointed as the Savior of the world, to wit, the reconciling of all alike to God. Whether all will avail themselves of his mediation and become reconciled, and what will become of those who do not, of these things nothing whatever is here affirmed, denied, or implied. The passage has neither a near nor a remote bearing upon the doctrine of destruction.

Rev. 21: 4, refers specially and directly to the inhabitants of heaven, to God's people, among whom he is to dwell, and whose God he is to be. See the whole chapter. Christ did indeed "come to destroy the works of the devil," and "he that committeth sin is of the devil," as to his *works*, but not as to his *existence*. If Christ, then, shall annihilate the wicked, he will destroy something which is not the work of the devil, and which, consequently, he was not commissioned to destroy, and did not come to destroy. The sense in which he is to destroy the works of the devil (sin) we know, to wit, atoning for sin, forgiving it when repented of, counteracting its final effects, and punishing it, when not repented of.

We here close the present article, reserving our general remarks upon the doctrine before us for another occasion. What we have written thus far we commend to the candid and prayerful consideration of our readers.

## ART. II.—LIMITATIONS OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE.

There are many things we would like to know, concerning which we know little or nothing. What we may know of them, often only the more keenly tantalizes us with the perplexing and ungratified desire to know more. Just where our desire to know has reached its highest intensity, there we often find absolutely no answer to our inquiries. To all questionings, all wrestlings of thought, or intensity of desire, there is only the same provoking dumbness. And frequently, as if in punishment for our eagerness, the more earnest our questioning, the more inexpressive the silence that alone seems to listen to it. It is as some ghost which no incantations can lay, tangible to no human touch, and audible to no mortal ears, but which, with steady and unearthly stare, glares ever in your face. You cannot turn from it; or, if you do, the feeling that the same ghostly eyes are still fixed upon you, is not less unendurable.

Nor is the case different with Revelation. It might be supposed that in making mankind a revelation, God would have made all things plain. The knowledge is with him. He could have communicated it to us. His infinitely merciful and benevolent character might seem to guarantee that he would do so. But evidently he has not. The mind is still left to grasp in vain with some of the mightiest problems, of which it has any conception. The Bible, for instance, gives no answer why sin and misery were permitted in the world; why they have been allowed to load humanity everywhere with a burden of woes almost unendurable—blasting the fairest prospects, crushing the fondest hopes, turning human love into the fiercest hate, smothering the best impulses, and inspiring the worst passions, and engendering the foulest vices to maggot in the rottenness of human depravity; and why depravity and woe are never to come to an end? Concerning these and many other questions, which like these sometimes almost stagger our faith in God and goodness, no satisfactory answers are revealed. We may wonder, we may complain and fret that it is so; but so it is.

Here, then, is the fact that there are many mighty problems that man cannot solve, even with Revelation in his hand. Why is it so? Why has God thus left us in such perplexity and doubt? Why has he withheld what he might easily have communicated, and which would have explained these torturing queries?—especially since it apparently might have been revealed in less space than is occupied in the Bible with what appears to be the comparatively unimportant narrations of genealogies and ceremonies? But this question must itself measurably be catalogued with those concerning which it inquires. We cannot answer even this with entire satisfaction. We may not be able to gainsay an answer that may be given; but yet the question will come up again and again, and compel the half instinctive confession that it is not really answered after all—it remains a question still. There are, however, some considerations, bearing upon the subject, worthy of attention.

1. Inasmuch as man is not omniscient—and is never to be—it is evident that there must somewhere be a limit to his knowledge; a point within which he does or may know, and beyond which he cannot.

2. Practically this point is not the same in different ages, or men, nor even in the same men at different times. The highest attainments of one age often fall far behind those of another—and especially of a successive one; and what may be a problem quite too hard for one man to solve, may prove to be altogether easy to be understood by another. And what a man may not comprehend to-day, he may find himself able to grasp to-morrow. This limit, therefore, is not a fixed one, being, perhaps, in no two cases precisely alike, and moreover the area of knowledge it encloses is capable of almost indefinite extension. Hence it cannot legitimately operate to stifle inquiry. Though a problem has hitherto defied solution, it may still find one. Though we may not have been able to find answers to our perplexing inquiries, it is altogether possible, if not probable, that we may gain answers at last. Certainly, it does not follow that because up to this time no answer has been found, that therefore none can be found.

3. But no extension could relieve us of this perplexity of un-

solved problems. So long as our knowledge is not infinite, so long there will be just beyond what we do know, something that we do not know, and which will therefore perplex and tantalize us because we do not understand it, just precisely as we are perplexed and tantalized by what are now our unanswered questionings. Indeed, the extension of the limit of human knowledge rather increases than diminishes this difficulty. The more we learn, the more we discover beyond to be learned—just as the larger our horizon, the greater the number of indistinct objects that skirt it. Moreover our progress in knowledge is from the more simple to the more abstruse—from elementary to more advanced truths; so that the questions lying without the limit of our knowledge are higher and intrinsically more important than those within that limit—just as, to the boy familiar only with Arithmetic, the mathematical problems beyond him, in Algebra and the higher mathematics, and which are to him unanswered questions, are higher and intrinsically more important than the arithmetical principles he has already mastered. Hence as the limit of our knowledge is extended, both the number and the magnitude of these unanswered questions are increased.

It follows, therefore, that the ability to grasp and comprehend the questions that now so tantalize us, while it would of course remove our present perplexities, would inevitably open up to our perception other perplexities, even more numerous, of greater magnitude, and still more perplexing. And if these in turn were to find a solution, they would reveal other and greater, still unsolved, in the greater distance beyond—and so on perpetually. Newton, at the height of his surpassing attainments in knowledge, saw vastly more numerous and important questions unsolved beyond, than a school boy, having mastered addition, sees in the to him unsolved problems of subtraction. The cultivated Saxon mind finds a much greater number of more perplexing queries, just outside of the limits of its knowledge, than does the Patagonian outside of his very much more restricted range of knowledge. And if those now the highest shall one day be solved, others higher yet will of necessity appear. Heaven itself, for aught we can see, is subject to this

same necessity. From our different circumstances there, it may affect us differently; but the thing itself must remain substantially the same. The Bible, indeed, intimates as much—that angel and archangel likewise “desire to look into” \* questions beyond the reach of their present knowledge, and in all probability such will be the case forever.

4. For the most part, however, lack of ability, rather than of opportunity, determines the limit of our knowledge. There probably are some things in themselves altogether within the grasp of our powers, concerning which God has withheld from us the data necessary to understand them. But in the large majority of instances, this does not appear to be the case. The law of gravitation will serve as an illustration. Ever since man inhabited the earth, the evidences of the existence and operation of gravitation were as plain and decisive as they are now. But until Newton’s time no human mind proved itself capable of understanding them. The opportunity of this knowledge was never wanting—the ability to use the opportunity hitherto constituted the lack. So with the art of printing; so, too, with the telegraph; so, indeed, with all the arts. God at the creation made them just as accessible and as easily to be learned as at the present time; they were not earlier understood because the human mind had not before become strong and cultivated enough to lay hold upon them.

The same is undoubtedly true of very many of the questions, over which we are still pondering. In the air, the water, the fire—in, perchance, some of the things most familiar to us, there may be the most decisive data for the clearest solution of these problems. But our mental ears are not yet keen enough to catch the sound of their voice—our intellectual eyes not discerning enough to read the hand writing in which the solution is given. As with printing, with the telegraph, with gravitation, and the like, some of them may yet be solved, here on the earth. But the fact remains that they are not, only because our capacities are not yet able to grasp them. Hence, it follows that God has given us the opportunity of knowing, not

\* 1 Peter 1 : 12.



only as much as we are able to know, but undoubtedly far more than we have yet proved ourselves competent to master.

5. Human knowledge, past and present, has been very nearly in the ratio of human want. When mankind were in a barbarous or semi-barbarous state, their wants were few and simple. They did not need the printing press and the telegraph. Railroads and machinery supply wants that then had never been conceived of—much less felt. If such things had been in existence, they would neither have been prized nor used. All together, they would not have been deemed so valuable as the product of one day of Esau's hunting, or of Jacob's rustic agriculture. What would old Nimrod have cared for a newspaper? If you have any doubts, ask a perfectly wild Indian now what he cares for one. In like manner, and in a degree almost exactly corresponding, knowledge was also limited. It covered the area of present want, and but little if any more.

But as mankind increased, and as their relations individually, and as communities and nations, became more intricate and exacting, thus multiplying human wants, the limits of human knowledge were correspondingly enlarged. As one nation became plethoric of numbers or skill, some new land opened itself in the progress of discovery, inviting them to the development of its newly discovered resources. When the necessity for better clothing and a higher grade of dwellings arose, in close connection with the necessity came also the sufficiently increased knowledge of the materials, of which they might be made, and of the way to fabricate them. When mankind had become so numerous, so widely extended, and their relations so elevated, as to create a necessity for something more than an oral method of communication, printing was invented, and to supply a new and higher want in the same direction, we have the telegraph. Thus supply has kept pace with the demand, so that the one might at any time be taken as the index of the other.

6. Having thus employment for our entire energies in meeting the practical necessities of life, it follows that if, by any means, we were to find solutions for and be occupied with these now unanswered questions, it could only be to the neglect of

our other immediate and pressing interests, and would therefore result to our decided disadvantage. These unsolved problems, as we have seen, lie without the range of our present wants; and since we have to do all we are capable of doing, to meet those present wants, the knowledge that lies beyond would be, not only useless, but to our great injury would divert our powers from the practical supply of pressing necessities.

It is not necessary that we should know where sin came from, in order successfully to resist it. To know why God saw fit to permit sin and woe in the world, would not in the least assist us to meet the consequent responsibilities of life. Why sin and misery are never to come to an end, is a question, the answer to which, we can hardly conceive to be of any use in enabling us to rid ourselves of their power. On the other hand, he whose mind is occupied with trying to solve these problems—since the mind as well as the body cannot be intensely occupied with two different things at the same time—is thereby necessarily prevented from using his powers as intensely as he should in efforts to free himself and others from the power of sin. When the time shall come that this necessity shall be obviated—when men shall be so freed from sin, as to release our energies from the now terrible necessity of escaping from it, and when a new and higher necessity shall be developed, to the practical meeting of which a knowledge of the reason why sin is permitted, is necessary, then, no doubt, such knowledge will be found accessible. Until that time, it is not necessary, nor would it be a blessing, but the rather a curse—and so of all the other perplexing queries we cannot solve.

7. The whole matter, therefore, is resolved into this, why God has made us as he has—with just such capacities, and no more, in precisely these, and not other circumstances; in fact, it is only another form of the question Paul disavows, Rom. 9: 20—“Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, ‘Why hast thou made me thus?’” One asks, “Why this terrible danger of sinning and perdition?” It is, in fact, “Why was I made a man, a sensitive, thinking and willing being, and not a rock, or a tree, subject to fate, and therefore not capable of sinning?” Even then, as a rock, the complaint

might be uttered: "Why the liability to be upheaved from my position, to be sent tumbling in fragments to the plain?" So we ask: "Why can we not answer these questions? Why has God withheld their solutions from us?" It is: "Why has God seen fit to make us as he has?—to place us at the point in the scale of knowledge, where we find ourselves to be, and not somewhere else? Why are we not otherwise, or more than men?"

---

#### ART. III.—CHURCH MEMBERSHIP—ITS CONDITIONS.\*

No one who believes in a self-existent God, the datum upon which must be founded all correct reasoning, and who receives the doctrines of his Son, Jesus Christ, as the oracles of this Divinity, can deny that he has an invisible church here on earth, composed of persons of both sexes, of all ages, of all colors, of all degrees of intelligence, and of all shades of religious faith. The real members of this church, the *Ἐκκλησία* of Christ, are such, and such only, as are actuated by the *spirit* of the Divine Teacher of Nazareth. It matters not what may be one's professions of piety, what particular branch of the visible church he may be connected with, what his outward course may be, or what his standing before the world, he has no right to claim that his name is written in the Lamb's book of Life, and that he is a member of the true church of Christ, unless the same *spirit* which Jesus possessed governs all his motives of action.

And when he thus has the spirit of Christ, it matters not by what name as a Christian he is designated, it matters not whether he have been sprinkled, poured or immersed, or neither, whether hands of confirmation descended in a regular line from the apostles have been laid on him; it matters not whether he be an outcast from the synagogues of men, whether the sentence

\* We insert this article, though its ultimate conclusion of the propriety of different church organizations is less distinct and confident than our own.—ED.

of ecclesiastical excommunication be fulminated over his head from the tiara of Rome, or whether his name has ever been registered on the record book of any visible church; he is nevertheless a member of the Ἐκκλησία of Christ. For by the spirit of Christ he has been *called* most truly from the spirit of the world. And, moreover, he will recognize to a greater or less degree, just according to his spiritual light, the mission of the church to enlighten, elevate, purify, and save the world from wrong doing. At any new form of evil his sword will leap from its scabbard, and where the contest waxes warmest, thither will you find him pressing, fighting his way along most valiantly for the truth. And as long as there is an inebriate in the land, he will preach temperance, and seek signatures to pledges of total abstinence. As long as there is human slavery, just so long, like the knights of old, will he go forth to combat the hydra-headed monster. As long as sensuality wallows in the sty of vice, or drags along its slimy form, polluting all the fairest flowers of life, so long will he not cease to bruise its head with the heel of truth. As long as bigotry rears its intolerant form, so long will he hold up before it the mirror of charity, that it may behold its own horrid features, and abashed shrink away with its brazen countenance into nonentity. As long as there is ignorance and superstition, so long will he continue to pluck ripe clusters of fruit from the tree of knowledge and present them to the famishing minds around him. In short, as long as there is anything contrary to the *spirit* of Christ, the spirit by which he is actuated, just so long will he not cease his efforts as a missionary of the invisible church to a sin-depraved world.

Now undeniably such a one is a member of the true, spiritual church of Christ. And the question I propose to consider in the present article is this: *Shall a visible church make its platform so wide, its creed so liberal, its discipline so lax, that all persons who are undoubtedly members of the invisible church, may be received in full communion into the one great, universal, visible church, whatever their views upon abstract dogmas and the outward ceremonies of religion?* I propose to consider the question in the affirmative and negative, and then draw an impartial conclusion.

## I. AFFIRMATIVELY.

1. I remark, firstly, that all religious creeds other than the Bible, are formed, often under prejudice, by erring man. The fingers of our Savior never held the pen that traced a sentence of a single creed that is made requisite to membership in most of the Christian churches. His lips never uttered one, save his words in the New Testament. His apostles had no confession of faith to which the heathen convert was compelled to assent, other than that Jesus is the Son of God. Why, then, have we become wiser than our divine teachers, narrowing the platform which they erected, restricting the liberal creed of the New Testament as they left it, and thus hedging up God's own highway to heaven? Now no ecclesiastical historian pretends that a single creed of the numerous ones of the different churches—the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, or any other, can be traced back nearer than two or three hundred years from the apostles.

Why not, then, open freely the church doors to every one who sincerely professes to believe in the Son of God, and who believes he is worshiping the Father, even though it be after the manner that some of his brethren of different circumstances, of different powers of mind, and different heart-culture and spiritual light, call heresy? What *authority* have we for shutting the church door in the face of any one who professes to take the New Testament as the rule of his faith and practice? Is not the creed traced, by the finger of the living God, sufficiently exact and specific to bring men to heaven? Are we more wise than Omniscience? Shall we attempt to daub our untempered mortar upon God's own work? When one particle of evidence can be adduced to prove that a single one of the many church creeds now held as the key which unlocks the door to Christian fellowship was framed by Christ, or his apostles, then may it lawfully claim every Christian assent. But this can never be done—they are all the work of men of like passions with ourselves.

It is true that all these creeds profess to be drawn from the New Testament. But might it not just as consistently be required, because that God made man in his own image in the

beginning, to believe that the female who promenades Broadway on a pleasant afternoon in late autumn, white-washed, and painted, and padded, with dyed eyebrows and hair, all bedecked with thousands of dollars worth of silks and velvets, furs and feathers, and diamonds, was the true primitive work of God, as to believe that all the different religious creeds overloaded with article upon article of abstract dogmas upon which no two agree, are the true inferences from the New Testament?

2. Again. These narrow creeds are the cause of denominational prejudice and persecution, and thus they prevent growth in grace and a knowledge of the truth. The most intense and deadly hatred in our world burns in the breasts of religious bigots. No wars have been so bloody as religious wars. Nothing has caused the sacrifice of so many human lives as intolerance in religion. This is amply proved by the wars of the Crusaders, or the wars of the Roman Catholics against Protestants. St. Bartholomew's Day, in France, is but a fair sample of the spirit of these wars. Intolerance in religion has been a great curse to the world's advancement. It has turned the heart of the husband against his wife, and the wife against her husband; it has broken up the household, so that literally a man's foes were those of his own house. It has impelled the father to accuse his own daughters, in whose veins his own blood was circulating, to the inquisition, to furnish the only evidence against them<sup>s</sup> of so-called heresy, and then in his own arms, from his own trees, to supply the fuel that was to consume them on the inquisitor's *auto da fe*. It has depopulated the fairest portions of the earth, where were farm-houses with happy occupants, broad fields of grain and orchards laden with fruit. And it has done even worse than this: it has turned the pulpit into a citadel, from which preachers have shot forth at each other arrows of spite, barbed with venom and hatred, until ministers and people have forgotten the practical duties of religion, forgotten that the spirit of the Christian religion is love, so intense has been their anxiety to prove each other heretics, and on the road to perdition. If they assembled together on the Lord's day, it was not to worship him in spirit and in truth, but to hear another church traduced. If they prayed, it was

that God would curse their religious opponents. If they read the Bible, it was to twist some of its sentences into a fulmination against another church.

But even this is not the worst evil that arises from these narrow creeds. They endeavor to crystallize the truth into certain forms of expression. They must force these stereotyped sentences to be received by every mind as the exact decrees of Jehovah. Ossified conservatism, petrified at heart, sits with chilly iciness, brooding over these creeds, as the very eggs of truth, which were addled long ago by the heated prejudices of the councils which produced them, and from which it would be as impossible to awake living forms of piety, as it would to make bread of paving stones. There was once, it is said, a bachelor who was an atheist, and who said that matter was just as likely at any time to assume a human form as any other; and so he filled a box formed somewhat like a churn with earth, and every day he would turn the crank so as to stir the earth well up that it might change to a woman; fully resolved never to marry till his wife should be thus produced. Now when that man finds that the clay which he thus boxed up assumes the form of a beautiful, blooming maiden for his wife, then may we look for breathing, warm, living forms of piety to arise from the preaching up constantly these old, obsolete creeds, the fossil remains of former ages. They are dead; they were still-born, and they are past all hope of resurrection. Gabriel's trump that, when it reverberates from mountain to mountain on continent and island, shall awake the slumbering dead in the bosom of the earth, and in the depths of the sea, shall never awake them. No soul will ever rise with their spirit. They will form no part of the song of the redeemed in heaven.

But this is not all the evil resulting from substituting these man-made creeds for the Bible. The spirit of investigation is checked. There stands the creed, like an old statue in bronze, with the stiff folds of its antiquated garments ever the same. There is no life, no motion, not even the beating of a warm heart beneath to move the old fashioned robe. The dull, grey light falls upon it in the gloomy niche where it stands and is ever reflected precisely the same. The warm days of summer,

that disrobe man and even the animal of winter garments, never change these. The breeze that gently waves the tree-branch, never ruffles a single fold of its unmovable attire. It is like the heathen's idol, which his own hands have fashioned, but which, nevertheless, his superstition has transmuted to a God, whose divinity it would be blasphemy to question.

Now this being so, the spirit of free inquiry is entirely rebuked in religion. The investigator in the field of scientific truth may throw off old theories, forget their very existence, when he turns his telescope to the starry heavens, and feel that whether he arrive at the conclusion that the earth journeys round the sun, or the sun round the earth, it will not make him an outcast and an alien. He may also with perfect impunity reject all the opinions of his predecessors as he descends stratum below stratum into the bowels of the earth, to read the history of the periods of its creation in its petrified plants and bones, and the tracks of animals and the marks of rain-drops engraved on beds of rock. But in his investigations in the religious field, let him but cast aside, even whilst making his inquiries, what is termed the orthodox creed in his particular locality, and woe is him! He is a heretic; in league with the arch-fiend; wherever he goes, eyes of suspicion are cast upon him, whose withering glances are not unfelt even in his sternest moments; for

“ There is a basilisk power in human eyes,  
 When they would look a fellow creature down,  
 'Neath which the faint soul fascinated lies,  
 Struck by the cold sneer, or the with'ring frown.”

He is shunned, his good is evil spoken of; and forthwith he is cast out of the synagogue of conservative respectability. Now such a pressure as this chills, freezes at once, the spirit of inquiry in religion. The man must wear the same religious coat he wore when a boy; and however it pinches, he must declare its style is just to his taste, and that it is perfectly easy. The consequence is, that while there has been advancement in everything else, there is a great lack in our religious philosophy of adaptation to the spirit of the times. We are men with the



coats of ~~boy~~hood on, but so accustomed to their scanty proportions that we have no more realizing sense of the sorry figure we make in them, than the Chinese lady of the symmetry of person which is destroyed by her unnaturally small foot. And no wonder; for all religious investigations have been undertaken for the one sole purpose of bolstering up the creed. The inquiry of the religious investigator has not been as it always should be, What is truth? But what does my church say, and *what can be found* to sustain the council's creed or the assembly's confession? Take away, then, this restraint, and let men have the same privilege of thinking upon religion which they have upon all other subjects, and it would not require centuries to measure the progress of religious light, the world would soon be converted to Christ—intelligently converted.

3. Once more. Any man-made creed tends to exclude from the visible church, from the laborers in the moral vineyard of the Lord, many of the best, the most efficient men in the world. It is undoubtedly true that, owing to the narrow creeds of the different religious bodies, there are as good men, men as near heaven, out of the church as in it. Where is there a single church where it is not true that, so far as man can see, there are many such who meet Sabbath after Sabbath in the congregation of the Lord, who are as unexceptional in all the practical duties of religion, as the very best of those whose names are enrolled on the church records, and who have been baptized and subscribed to the confession of faith? Never was there a time when there was relatively such a vast number of good, moral men outside of the nominal church. And what but the narrow creeds of the churches has caused this state of things? Their influence also operates most disastrously on the cause of religion.

On the one hand it nourishes bigotry and that pharisaical self-righteousness which is most destructive to heart-piety; while, on the other, it causes many to be lost, lost to the world, to moral purity, and to God. Many a young person, when the mind is called to the subject of religion, refers forthwith to these generally acknowledged good men outside of the churches, and resolves to live in the same manner. Thus conscience

is quieted. But he may not have the same strength of character with the other; or different circumstances may arise, and, without the restraints which the church always throws around its members, he yields to temptation, and is morally ruined. Now what wrought his ruin? What person or what power, besides himself, is responsible for his evil course? Why, it is answered, the churches are responsible, whose narrow creeds kept that moral man, to whom he referred, and whose course he resolved to imitate, beyond the pale of the church. He undertook to follow in the steps of a giant, but, his moral stature being small, he went "*non passibus æquis*," and was finally bewildered in a labyrinth of unforeseen temptations.

But this is not all. It is generally admitted by the different sects that the members of each are good Christians, and that when they die they will be received as faithful servants into the joys of heaven. *Now, is it not a strange inconsistency to grant that a soul may be prepared for the immaculate church above which is not sufficiently orthodox to be received into the church on earth?* Shall we say that the church militant is *purser* than the church triumphant? Shall the door to the church on earth be more narrow than the door to the church in heaven? Is not he who is prepared for the pure society of angels and the spirits of the just made perfect, and to be a brother to Jesus Christ, and a joint heir with him, to the glories of heaven, prepared to be an associate and co-laborer with Christians on earth? Can a church on earth dare refuse to receive to its *communion table*, when application is made, a man whom it believes to be a *good Christian*, simply because he cannot conscientiously conform to their particular mode of baptism, or subscribe to all the technicalities of their abstract dogmas? Purity of heart and a faithful life, the Savior's spirit of love to God and the world; this is all that is required to enter the blissful abodes of the saved in heaven. Let this be the only passport to the churches on earth, and there would soon be such a multiplication of their numbers and moral efficiency as would perfectly astonish superannuated conservatism, and cause the powers of darkness to tremble.

4. But, finally: These sectarian creeds cause a great tax of

time, and money, and energy upon the world. Each sect must have its full number of officers, its houses of worship, its printing presses, its schools, and its benevolent societies. It not unfrequently happens that in one small village, with just about resources enough to support well one good, faithful, talented and educated minister of the gospel, who could easily attend to all the duties which his office would impose upon him for the whole village, that there will be as many as four or five different sects with, perhaps, another in prospect of formation. The consequence is, that four or five ministers of the gospel, with very indifferent talents and moderate education, are just kept from the severest necessity, supported just so as to keep, with the most rigid economy, soul and body together. There are four or five houses of worship, erected by the greatest exertion and self-sacrifice; either one of which is amply capacious to accommodate every person in the village. One thousand dollars a year would be a fair salary for the man who should take the whole pastoral charge; and could be easily raised without taxing any one beyond his means. Instead of this, more than two thousand must be raised by subscriptions, or questionable fairs, to defray the expenses of the different churches. This, of course, is such a drain upon them that they are able to contribute but very little for educational purposes or missionary enterprises.

Nor is this all. One man could not only preach to them all, and attend to the other religious duties, but they would be able to have such a man as would be profitable to them as a religious instructor, one who could edify them, and be a safe guide for them to follow. But with the exceedingly small salary they are able to give their four or five, they are obliged generally to be content with men of very inferior abilities, who can be worth but very little to them, because their talents and attainments are slender, because their congregations are so small that they feel but little incentive to pulpit exertion, and because their salaries being incompetent to their actual wants, they are obliged to expend a part of their energies in some secular employment to support their families.

Then, again, there are four or five small Sabbath school li-

braries of cheap books, each containing the same volumes as the others. The rising generation are thus robbed of a good and extensive library, which might be obtained at no additional expense if all were united. The parents moreover are so taxed that they must deny themselves of books and lectures and needed recreation, and economize every penny and every moment of time that the four or five pastors may not suffer for the necessities of life.

But the evil is not confined to one locality. Young men of talent and piety, while educating themselves, have great desires to enter the gospel ministry, but looking to the families of the poor, overworked ministers, the sacrifice appears too great, and so with a heart-sick sigh they turn away to the less congenial avocations of life. So by means of these man-made creeds, the pulpit loses its brightest ornaments and the church its most efficient laborers. The evils also resulting from the establishment of sectarian schools are full as deleterious in their effects upon the world. Three or four schools must be founded by as many different sects in a section of country where one is amply sufficient. They must be endowed to some extent, at least, by the greatest effort and sacrifice. And even then they are often obliged to employ second and third rate teachers, for want of funds to command men of the first abilities. And thus the schools for years drag along between life and death, all of them together not beginning to be as valuable to the country as a single one might be made. And then, again, their printing presses are sustained at immense disadvantage. If they could unite and publish one newspaper, it would be far more valuable, because conducted by the best ability and the people could receive it at less than one-half what they pay now. And so of religious books. Their sectarian limitation makes them come high, and circumscribes their usefulness.

These evils, and others that might be mentioned, all arise from a little lack of Christian charity, from an unwillingness to believe and let believe in the non-essentials of religion. From these, and other considerations that might be urged, it is contended that it would be better for the world, if every sect would throw away its man-made creed, take the Bible without

note or comment as the only rule of faith and practice, and only require as a passport to the universal, visible church, evidence of a pure heart and life, and Christ's spirit of love to God and man. Or simply what all admit are evidences of membership in the invisible church of Christ.

## II.—NEGATIVELY.

1. The different sects of Christians which are the result of the various creeds drawn from the Bible, promote activity and a healthful emulation in the religious world. Almost anything is less to be dreaded than entire stagnation. Now, in every country where there is but one religious sect, the members of that church seem spiritually dead—nay, past being galvanized into a spasm resembling life. The ministers are often ignorant, indolent, dronish men, with apparently no interest in their parochial duties, save to get through with them and receive their salary. And generally this is not all. They are often immoral—avaricious, intemperate, and licentious. And the people, in respect to these things, follow but too faithfully their spiritual guides. An old worn out liturgy is repeated again and again without a single thought about its sentiment. Their priests are generally settled for life, or during their own pleasure, and so they have no anxiety about success. Their homilies are dull common-places, which they have copied from some old book, and in which no one takes interest enough to listen to their soporiferous delivery. They have no interest in education, in literature or the arts. They contribute nothing for benevolent purposes. And intellectually, physically, civilly and religiously they are every way far below what they are capable of being.

Now this is almost universally the state of the inhabitants of Roman Catholic countries; and of some Protestant ones also, where there is but one church; or rather, one long established church. Now, place a good faithful minister of another sect in such a village, and he will soon wake up a healthy emulation. If the former priest, and any of the members of his church are intemperate or licentious, the other society will soon publish it abroad and raise such a tempest that the offending members

will be driven to reform, and their priest will think it the better part of valor to retire; and his successor will be warned by his fate. Or if he is ignorant and unfitted for his place, the other society will not be slow to make the discovery, and to take advantage of it, to increase their own strength. If his sermons are prosy and uninteresting, he will soon discover the fact written upon his own empty pews, and the overflowing house of the other society. In short, there will be no time for indolence or immoralities. They will watch each other, and a healthy activity will be maintained in both.

This emulation also will write books, publish papers, and read both; establish schools and patronize them, and send the gospel by liberal contributions to the destitute. And if it cost the people more to sustain both, emulation so quickens the mind that their business affairs are improved, and they are thus now better able to support both than one formerly. And the spiritual garden which was of late all overgrown with weeds and noxious plants, through which slimy reptiles were crawling, and noisome insects held riot, whilst the gardener reposed in quiet slumber all the day, in the grateful shade of some wide-branching tree, is now blooming with the beautiful and fragrant flowers of paradise, and not a reptile or poisonous insect can be found within its borders, and birds of heavenly note are trilling their sweet songs of praise, whilst both gardeners are striving to excel each other. Revivals follow; souls are born into the kingdom of God; all begin to labor; they are going here and there; praying in private and in public; exhorting each other to faithfulness, and, like a swarm of bees in summer, each is laboring for its own hive. And all are becoming more and more intelligent, and more and more consecrated to the cause of God. Thus does a worthy emulation energize the soul and promote the welfare of the world.

2. Again: The division of the church into different sects promotes harmony of religious feeling. Now nothing is more evident to an intelligent mind than that men do not all see truth from the same point of observation. As in a field one man may have a beautiful view of scenery which a little knoll may entirely hide from the other in his position; so in the religious

world, two men may not be able to see the same truth in the same light, owing to the difference in the construction of their minds or the different circumstances under which they were educated.

The jutting top of one of the mountains in New Hampshire forms in one place of observation the distinct features of a human countenance, which is called the Old Man of the Mountains; but as you pass along, the features become more and more indistinct, and gradually fade away, and are lost. Now let one stand in the former place of observation, and another at the latter, and one would see what certainly resembles the profile of Benjamin Franklin, chiselled by the hand of nature herself, on whose massive brow the lightnings play and the thunders utter their voice: while the other would see nothing but the craggy side of a shapeless mountain. The one says to the other: How plainly that represents a human countenance, the countenance of the great American philosopher! But the other replies, there is no resemblance at all. And both are honest. Now what would be the use for them to stand and wrangle a week when both are right and both are wrong, and neither can see his error from his stand-point of observation? Thus it is often in religious disputes. Both sides are honest and neither can see its error.

A tall man has a greater horizon than a short one. Now it would not be becoming in the short man to accuse the other of falsehood for speaking of a prospect beyond his field of vision. And yet, as he can see nothing of it, he cannot help thinking that the other has mistaken, is deceived, or deceiving. Thus it is with Christians. One of great powers of mind, well cultivated, and of a large growth in grace, sees many truths which one of small mind and few attainments has no conception of. Now shall the wiser man denounce his weaker brother for what he cannot see? or the weaker accuse his wiser brother of heresy because he cannot understand all his doctrines? And yet if you confine them together, will not each keep insisting that he is right and the other wrong, till the happiness and growth in grace of both are destroyed by the union?

Again, some minds are mathematical in their construction;

others poetic. One looks up to the stars and thinks of nothing but how to measure their distances, or how he may calculate the amount of light they afford the earth; the other with his fervid imagination peoples them with angels, watching over human destinies; the one stands beside a river flowing through a beautiful grove all bathed, as it were, by the moonlight, and he thinks of nothing but the worth of the wood and what kind of a mill privilege the river would make; the other hears music vibrating from every leaf, while the river plays the deep bass, and heavenly visitants seem to join in the refrain; the one will be all for the useful; the other for the ornamental; the one will reason; the other will tearfully relate his own happy experience as a Christian; the one will love the writings of Paul; the other will delight to sit on the mount at Jesus' feet, and listen to the beatitudes; the one subjects everything to a severe analysis; the other receives all by faith; the one thinks for himself on every subject; the other receives all his opinions second hand. In short, the one knows what he believes, and why he believes it, and the other knows only that he believes. Now let these two extremes be brought together, and all the various shades of mind between them, and attempt to form a church universal, and if the elements did not completely neutralize each other, and so entirely destroy each other's influence and growth in grace, one thing is certain, there would be endless wranglings and recriminations till the confusion of Babel would seem renewed. A large, unwieldy church formed of such opposite elements would be, in the words of the Latin poet,

———" rudis indigestaque moles,  
Nec quidquam, nisi pondus iners, congestaque eodem  
Non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum."

Now the only harmony of feeling that can be obtained under such circumstances is by separation. And this, too, is the only way to obtain efficiency of action. Let those of the same order of mind unite together and form churches by themselves. Those of different mental organizations will not then be brought into and kept in contact with each other's peculiarities. Each one



may then worship God in peace and quietness under his own vine and fig tree, without having his worst feelings irritatingly stirred constantly by allusion to those points of doctrine which are so obnoxious to him.

A few years ago a class of social reformers arose, having more sympathy than understanding, who were to teach mankind how they could subsist with less than half their accustomed labor. Their theory seemed very fine at first. They proposed to unite a certain number of families into a community, where they should possess almost everything in common. A large block of tenements was to be erected for the accommodation of the whole association, with one kitchen, capacious enough for the culinary purposes of all, and for dining, a hall where all could sit down to a common table. And here they were to work together, eat together, and live together at a great saving of house rent, fire-wood and labor. Well, it all looked very fine on paper, and sounded most heavenly from the lips of an eloquent advocate; but when it was reduced to practice, its machinery would not work at all. There was too much selfishness and depravity in the human heart for such proximity; so the idea was abandoned, and each family returned to the old way of living; which, though it appeared hard when contemplated in the future, it nevertheless had one virtue—it was practicable. So would it be if all the sects should give up their creeds and form one church universal. It would soon be found in a union which could be only merely nominal, that the different orders of mind were just as far apart as ever. And they would soon find it for their spiritual interests to return to the old method of separate church organizations. This is evident from the internal discords of the Roman Catholic church. If ever a universal church could succeed, that, surely, had every advantage. But every one knows it is divided into different orders of monks, who hate each other almost as bad as they do Protestants. Now there is no better way to extinguish a fire than to separate the brands; they will then cease to burn without further effort. But if you keep them together, they will help consume each other. Thus it is with Christians with different orders of mind. Keep them together,

and they will be engaged constantly in controversy with each other. Separate them, and the fire of wrangling will die out itself, and they will grow in grace and a knowledge of the truth, edify those of like minds, and do good in their day and generations. If all the world were of one order of mind, then there could be but one church; but God has not so arranged it; hence it is apparently his design that there should be different denominations of Christians.

3. The different denominational church organizations operate upon each other as checks upon erroneous doctrines and the usurpation of too great civil power. The effects of error, whether of belief or action, are always evil. There never was a greater mistake than to suppose that it makes no difference what a man believes, provided only that he is sincere. It makes all difference. The Irishman, and Italian, and Spaniard believe in the infallibility of the Pope, and the divine authority of their priests, and see the results of that belief in their degradation. The greatest poets and orators in the English language tell us what the Irish mind is when it has freedom of development. The history of Italy centuries ago reveals to us what the Italians were before poisoned by the errors of Catholicism. And the discovery of our own country is a glorious monument of Spanish enterprise in former times, before the results of the Roman hierarchy were as fully manifested as now. A man cannot help acting out his religion. If the faith of a nation is wrong, that faith will show itself by evil works.

Now a man who is always praised and never criticised, will almost of necessity become opinionated, careless, and fall into errors. It is so of a church. If there were but one church, there would be none to criticise any doctrine it might promulgate; and the consequence would be that it would be very sure to become heretical. And as heresy of belief must result in heresy of action, as has already been shown, it is of the utmost importance that the church should be kept free from all errors of doctrine. But this would not be were there but one church. The history of the Roman Catholic church sustains just this position. Ages past it had all the power, and the full confidence of the Christianized world; and when it uttered its voice there was a

ready obedience and none to demur. And the consequence was, that it baptized errors, and canonized heresies, till the book of God was exchanged for the book of superstition, and thus it sapped its own foundation. Had there been several other rival churches, it would have been more cautious, more thorough in its examinations before committing itself to a measure—having in view all the time the fiery ordeal of criticism it must pass through. Now if it is undisputedly true that while the Protestant sects, through the criticism which their creeds receive at the hands of each other, have been becoming more and more orthodox, leaving behind them the errors which they formerly embraced, and dropping one after another of the absurdities and superstitions of the darker ages, the Roman Catholic church has been all the time growing more and more heterodox, getting farther and farther removed from the simplicity of the religion of Christ, and deeper and deeper into folly and superstition.

What has effected this difference? Why, in the one case Protestants have so watched and criticised each other that doctrines which could not be maintained by the light of reason, they have been obliged to forsake; and every advance position taken has been carefully guarded against the assaults of opponents, till it has become exceedingly difficult for a false doctrine, wherever originating, or however defended, to maintain its ground any length of time and gain proselytes. Hence the Protestant churches have been growing stronger and stronger from their commencement; while, on the other hand, the voice of the Vatican is final. It speaks, and the Roman Catholic world is silent. It commands obedience, and on pain of eternal damnation forbids doubt and criticism, and it is obeyed. Here, then, is a real advantage to the world resulting from a plurality of religious sects. This division develops thought, critical power, gives an opportunity to raise up more really great men, and keeps error from creeping into men's religious belief. For any one can see that the Protestant churches are fast progressing in a knowledge of the truth, and fast purging themselves from the errors of the superstitious ages of the past. And

what greater cause has operated to bring this about than their separate organizations?

There are also political dangers to be apprehended from the exclusive predominance of any one religious sect. If the vote of the churches in our own country was a unit, we might soon despair of civil liberty. Because human nature is not pure and strong enough to be entrusted with absolute power here or anywhere else. And as there must always be a head to every organization, and as the religious sentiment is the strongest sentiment in the human breast, it must follow that those who should be at the head of a universal church would be possessed of just about absolute power. The government of our country would then in reality be a theocracy. Now Christians in the highest religious stations are but men with like passions of others, and very apt to become dizzy headed at lofty elevations. The division of the church, then, into different sects, is the safeguard of our liberty.

This is well illustrated by the late American movement. It was found that the vote of one denomination of Christians was a unit; and that that vote could be purchased of the highest church functionary in our land of that sect, by the highest political bidder; the one who would pay the largest sum of money and promise the most offices. The other religious denominations took the alarm, and by their timely efforts saved the liberty of the country. But if there had been only this one church, it is evident enough that the requiem of our civil liberty might have been chanted before this; for designing politicians would have made any bargain for power and plunder. Is it not evident, then, that there is a deeper philosophy in the division of the church into sects than appears on the surface? Is not the providential hand of God in it?

4. The different church creeds which have been drawn from the Bible are only the systematized doctrines which men well qualified to judge have believed to be revealed in God's word. Books are the store-houses of thought. And a church creed is only a store-house of what its members believe in religion. The tide leaves the mark of its advancement on the sand, but its next return may wash it out. Now a creed cannot be con-

sidered as enchaining the human mind unless it be the creed of truth. The history of the past proves this. The time was when the Roman Catholic church had the only creed that was allowed to be evangelical; but the human mind was not fettered by it. When its advancement was sufficient, it burst through all restraint. Now in England the Episcopalian has the only creed recognized by law as evangelical; but just as soon as the great body of the people are advanced enough in a knowledge of the truth—which, from present indications, is fast approaching—to take a step beyond so much of that creed as is error, it will no more hold them than the seven new withes did Samson. There was a time in New England when the Independents had the only creed recognized as evangelical by law; and Baptists and Quakers were heretics. But that time is past. New England Christianity has outgrown such ideas. Any religious sect has power to alter its creed at any time, and will do so when a majority of its members are convinced that it contains error.

The shepherd remembers that he has lambs in his flock, and he arranges his speed according to their strength and not according to that of the dams. So in the religious fold there are lambs in spiritual strength and knowledge, and they form, perhaps, a majority of the flock. Now the creed was arranged with reference to them, and expressed in such terms as they could best comprehend; and not for the few alone of great powers of mind and religious growth. A few minds may see some phraseology in any creed which, on account of its liability to be misunderstood, they would prefer to change, if all were prepared to receive the change. But as they feel they are not, with their own explanation of it they are satisfied to subscribe to it as truth, and let it remain. Now what harm can there be, taking this view of a church creed, in requiring all who unite with the church to subscribe to it? If it does not meet the approbation of any one, he is at perfect liberty to join that church with which he can sympathize. Why, even political parties erect their platforms. It is thought to be hardly specific enough for them to say that they are patriots and in favor of the form of government bequeathed us by our immortal fore-

fathers. Extend the same charity to the churches that is extended to the political parties, and there would be found no practical difficulty in the adoption of a confession of faith.

Other arguments might be adduced in support of the negative of the question under discussion; but these, perhaps, are sufficient fully to show the reasons generally urged, why it would not be well for the church to adopt a creed so liberal, with a discipline so lax that all the Christian family, with their differently constituted minds, could subscribe to it, and submit to its authority.

### III—CONCLUSION.

It was our intention to sum up the preceding arguments advanced on both sides, and render a decision from the preponderance of the one over the other; but the length of this article precludes that course, and we can only briefly give the conclusions to which we have arrived in our own mind after a careful examination of the subject.

1. And we remark in the first place: That it should never be forgotten, that it is very much easier to criticise the faults of the church, than it is to substitute something better. To show the evil in an institution itself, or that results from its unwise management is one thing; but to found another without evil, or that, human nature being what it is, shall be better managed, is quite another. The most unskilful woodman can quickly cut down a worthless tree, however large; but to cause a valuable oak to grow in its place is not so soon accomplished. The former may be done in an hour; the latter requires ages. Now, there are those who are very ready to denounce the divided condition of the Christian church, and its corruption, who have never asked themselves whether it is not as united and as pure as the world is prepared to receive; and when taken away what they would substitute for it.

We have surface philosophers enough, who can most flippantly declaim against the bigotry of the churches, and who, elevated into a morbid atmosphere, in a balloon of their own gas, are entirely ignorant of the condition and wants of the people toiling amidst the stern realities of every-day life, and earnestly

desiring the conversion of the world to Christ. They live sumptuously upon the hard earnings of others, because people who are living in sin are willing to support them, that they may gain from them a little quiet to an accusing conscience, by hearing the church denounced as a brotherhood of hypocrites. It affords the guilty sinner a little immediate relief to hear it demonstrated, even when he knows it is done by sophistry, that he is as good a saint as anybody in or out of the church. If the arguments do not convince him, he thinks, perhaps, they will convince his neighbors, and so he is willing to pay for them, and hardens his heart and does worse than ever. Such church denouncers as these do great evil, and no good. They discourage the good and confirm the bad in their iniquity. For there are many who cannot perceive the difference between sound argument and ridicule and sarcasm. But just ask these declaimers what they would have instead of the church they so much abuse—abuse when forbidden to speak in its houses of worship, and abuse just as severely when courteously permitted to do so, and it will soon be seen how shallow is their philosophy. The answer will generally be, an anti-slavery society, or a free-love community, or a vague unintelligent theory about inaugurating the kingdom of God on earth. Now the objections to the church of such scheming, visionary enthusiasts, should have but little weight. They know not their own wants. They are a kind of religious lunatics. Heed them not, and no others, in their bitter denunciations of church organizations, till something better than the church is proposed for the world. A poor dwelling is better than none.

2. The division of the church into different sects is at present a necessity. In forming our judgment upon this subject, we must take society as it manifests itself, as it actually is, and not as some poetic imagination might picture it. We must be decidedly utilitarian. Now it is a matter of fact that men have differently constructed minds; that our circumstances, education, and manner of thinking are different; and these things being so, we shall and must have somewhat different religious creeds, whether written or unwritten. The secession of some of its members has been more than once the salvation of the

church. And as long as the best of men are as uncharitable and selfish as they now sometimes manifest themselves, just so long must there be secessions and separate organizations. A few think alike, sympathize together upon some subject which they regard as of the highest importance to the welfare of the world; and they ask more of the church than simply to be tolerated in their views by their brethren; they demand that all the others shall see and think as they do, or they will secede. The others cannot conscientiously assent. Now how are they to be kept together? And if a nominal union should remain, it would be destructive to the prosperity of the church; for everything else would be forgotten in their endless wranglings; and the worst passions of the heart would be constantly irritated. This being so, we can see that a man who is believed to be sincere, and a Christian may be separated from a church organization on earth, not with the pretension that the visible church here is more pure and holy than the church above; but, on account of the imperfections of the best of human beings at present, it may be done because the growth in grace and a knowledge of the truth, and the religious advancement of both parties require it. This, again, is evident from the fact that men who denounce the lack of charity to continue together, are the very first to show their want of it.

There are no more bigoted denouncers in the world than the members of a certain society in Boston who are always dwelling upon the bigotry and denunciatory spirit of the church. They denounce everybody and everything not agreeing with them as worse than the devil himself. And their inconsistency is sometimes somewhat amusing. A few years since, they were everywhere entering the houses of worship, and disturbing the exercises; and not hardly more than a year ago they were as ready as the readiest to call upon the police to carry out from their assembly Father Lampson and Abby Folsom for doing what some of their number had done and taught to be right, time and time again. And the police, too, was sustained by that law and government, backed up by the sword, which they had berated till the dictionary could afford no new terms of abuse! Now these things teach us that as



long as human nature remains as it is, separate religious denominations are inevitable. These things, however, we hope are not always to last. The time is promised when they shall end. God speed on the millenium.

3. In forming articles of faith, or in the organization of a religious sect, it should never be forgotten that a church is not a common business association. Men may form co-partnerships honorably to buy, and sell, and get gain, and exclude everybody else; or they may propose just such terms of admission as they please; and nobody has reason to complain. But it is not so with a church. That was instituted by Christ himself for the purpose of evangelizing the world. It is not of man. And when men get together to organize a church, they profess to be acting for Christ—according to his instructions, his spirit—for the general good, and not for private, selfish purposes. They have, then, obviously no right to make the church any more exclusive than they honestly and prayerfully before God believe Christ has done.

Now it is evident that the spirit of love to God and man which the Savior possessed, purity of heart, and a conscientious discharge of duty as believed to be revealed in the Bible, constitute all the necessary qualifications to membership in the invisible church of Christ. And still, through the weak consciences of very many, the world may not yet be prepared for a creed so liberal, and therefore it may be right for a church generally to make the observance of certain outward ceremonies spoken of in the scriptures an indispensable condition of membership. But there are exceptions to all rules. If a man in the church lives a correct life, and evinces the spirit of Christ, who has conscientiously come to the conclusion that he ought not to perform any of the outward church rites; and still desires to retain his connection, have the church Bible ground to exclude him? Now, there are two other questions that ought to be considered before this question is answered. Does he by his obnoxiously intruding his peculiar sentiments upon the brethren at every possible opportunity destroy or seriously injure the peace and prosperity of the church? And is his course wounding the consciences of very many of his brethren;

and also injuring the influence of the church upon the community? If these questions can be answered in the negative, we know of no authority in the church to exclude the brother against his will. But if they must be answered in the affirmative, then it seems to us that it is the duty of the church to cause a separation, that its discipline should not be so lax as to retain him. Precisely the same also may be said of any one who may wish to join a church, and yet who cannot go through with the preliminary ceremonies established by that church for the initiation of its members. Sometimes such a one could be received and sometimes he could not. Circumstances must determine. There ought to be no Mede and Persian law in these non-essential matters. But everything connected should be taken into account, and then we should act just as we believe Christ would act were he present, for it is his church, and not ours.

4. No article should be admitted into any church creed which is manifestly contrary to our principles of reasoning, however great may be the antiquity of its origin. There are, it is true, revealed truths which the reason never could discover, and which it can never fathom in its present state, that we must believe upon the authority of revelation alone; but so far as can be known, they violate not the reason. Revelation and reason have the same Author, and they must harmonize. God gave us our reason that we might rightly interpret his Word, and better understand our duty. Revelation is worth nothing without reason; and reason is insufficient without revelation. Now whilst we fully grant the necessity of the existence of separate religious sects, we are just as free to assert that many of the church creeds need revision. Their phraseology is antiquated; it does not mean to those who subscribe to it, what it seems to express; and if it ever did, its spirit has long since departed, leaving but the petrified shell. If something is not done soon, it will require a Clarke's knowledge of ancient languages and ancient habits and manner of thought to write extensive explanatory commentaries upon many of the creeds so that they may be intelligible to common minds. This ancient phraseology, which often may be interpreted by cavillers as sanctioning the most unreasonable doctrines, is working most

disastrously for the church. It is the fulcrum for infidelity. A very large part of the objections urged against religion are simply against the phraseology of some antiquated church creed. This makes the point of many a sneering jest against the truth. It befogs needlessly many inquiring minds; and it is no more solemn, or impressive, or acceptable to God, on account of its antiquity.

The conclusion, then, of the whole matter is simply this:—The different religious sects are a present necessity; church creeds should be just as liberal as circumstances will permit, and be scriptural; and they should always be expressed in simple, modern terms. No particular rule can be given for admittance into the church which will apply to all places and all persons. But the fewer requirements it is found necessary to add to what is acknowledged only to be essential to membership in the invisible church of Christ, the better. But on account of the hardness of men's hearts, and their spiritual blindness, it is evident that something more may be required by the church visible. Yet it should never be forgotten that the creed is made for the church, and not the church for the creed.

---

#### ART. IV.—GREEK PHILOSOPHY.

The term philosopher, or lover of wisdom, is an appellation which was first applied by Pythagoras of Samos. He was the originator of the Italic, as Thales, his predecessor, one of the sophoi or wise men, was of the Ionic school, about 640 years B. C. Philosophy means a search after wisdom. When this is looked for amongst the things that are seen and handled, weighed and measured, it is physical philosophy. But he who seeks for an object which is not of this material kind, is called a metaphysical philosopher.

All philosophical elements are in the east, but enveloped in one another, needing a distinct and natural growth. As the

roots of the modern world are in classic antiquity, so those of classic antiquity are on the coasts of Egypt, in the vales of Persia, and on the heights of Asia. The oriental world preceded Greece, but has left no legible record of her past. In the progressive west alone does authentic history begin, and this is embodied in history, as in every other branch of human improvement. The world of humanity was seen to take a step forward, when civilization descended through Asia Minor, and traversed the Mediterranean to rest on the coasts of Attica. There all the elements of human nature came under a new condition, and soon adopted the permanent order of an independent march.

The earliest philosophy of Greece had an Asiatic origin, and was received through Ionia. Many fragments from that source were incorporated in the works of Homer and Hesiod, and others are quoted by the primitive annalists from the still more ancient oracular poetry. Sir William Jones was of the opinion that the six leading schools whose principles are explained in the Dersana Sastra, comprise all the metaphysics of the old Academy, the Stoa, and the Lyceum. "Nor," continues he, "is it possible to read the Vedasta, or the many compositions in illustration of it, without believing that Pythagoras and Plato derived their sublime theories from the same fountain with the sages of India." In the mathematical sciences, the Hindoos were acquainted with the decimal notation by nine digits and zero. In algebra, Mr. Colebrooke found reason to conclude that the Greeks were far behind the Hindoos, but it is possible that the latter was obtained from the Morea at a later period, through the Arabs. But on the question of philosophy there can be no doubt that incipient notions existed in Hindoostan, compared with which the antiquity of Pythagoras is but of yesterday, and in point of daring, the boldest flights of Plato were tame and common place.

Grecian art, which rose to absolute perfection, ended also with itself, and presents a striking exemplification of the perishable nature of merely instinctive greatness. But the philosophy of that wonderful people was more immutably founded, and has never ceased to show that the human race, unlike

an unbroken circle, constantly revolving upon itself, progressively advances into the infinite, and strives unremittingly with inborn ardor to attain the highest and noblest ends. Humanity, that is, thought, art, science, philosophy and religion, the powers which are represented in history, embraces all, profits by all, advances continually through all, and never retrogrades. A given system may perish, and this may be a misfortune to itself, but not to the general weal. If it possessed real life, that life is still realized in some higher manifestation, but perhaps so modified by co-operative elements as to appear lost. It may indeed be obscured, but can never be obliterated. Vicissitudes and revolutions may rapidly succeed, and in great confusion; but human destiny is higher and better than these, it accepts all, assimilates all, and subordinates all to its own supreme behests. Every epoch, in retiring from the stage of the world, leaves after it a long heritage of contrary interests; but these only wait for a sufficient accumulation of other like elements, that with them a homogeneous amalgam may be formed as the basis of yet worthier superadditions.

The Hellenic mind invented the art of deducing truth from principles, by the dialectical process; and this divinest of Japhetic discoveries has exerted the most auspicious influence on subsequent philosophy and religion. The world had already learned much, when the Greek first demonstrated that reasoning might often err, but reason never. That is the only medium through which truth is conveyed, and Greek philosophy was truly precious, when it became to mankind the translation of the instinctive consciousness of God into reasoning. This was first applied to fathom the depths of physical speculation, and then in the consecrated soul of Socrates, it labored to possess the bosom of universal humanity, that thereby it might unfold to all, the highest science. Shem transformed figurative signs into simple letters, and invented the alphabet; but that greater prophet of the human race, Japhet, did vastly more, by translating the hieroglyphics of thought into simple elements, thereby inventing dialectical philosophy. This changed myths, legends, and visions, as well as more authentic annals into the heirloom of mankind by reason, and became at once and for all time the great

organon for dealing with both conception and existence of all kinds everywhere.

There was military activity enough amongst the Greeks to preserve them from intellectual and moral torpor, but fortunately it did not exist in sufficient force to engross the faculties of superior minds. Therefore energies of the highest order were thrown back upon intellectual pursuits; and the masses, so led, were also inclined to like culture, especially in the direction of æsthetics and philosophy. The bold writers of the Republic shrunk not from propounding all those problems in science and morals most interesting to man; and whatever may have been their skill in solving them, they certainly were the first to point the way to true greatness. But for the restless spirit of inquiry which was awakened by Greek philosophy, the western nations might still have been slumbering in barbarian ignorance. Ancient dialectics prepared the way for modern progress by teaching intellect to discipline and comprehend itself, in order that it may accurately scan nature, and bind her forces to the car of human welfare. Such was the idea expressed by Aristotle when he said: "The order of the universe is like that of a family, of which each member has its part not arbitrarily or capriciously enforced, but prefixed and appointed, all in their diversified functions conspiring to the harmony of the whole."

Philosophy, like the literature, art, and science of the ancients, had its origin amongst the Asiatic Greeks. The same region that gave existence and character to Homer and Herodotus, produced also Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes and Heraclitus, founders of the Ionic school. They belonged to the same region, studied under like auspices, and formed continuous links in the great chain of perpetual progress. To the same source is to be accredited those who extend the Ionic doctrines to Magna Grecia and southern Italy, such was the poet Zenophanes, and that mighty founder of the most erudite confederacy, Pythagoras.

Anaxagoras, successor of Anaximenes, was born 500 years B. C. After giving great distinction to the Ionic school, he came to reside at Athens, where he taught Pericles and Euripi-

des, at the same time he was opening the source from which Socrates derived his knowledge of natural philosophy.

Parmenides, Zecus, and Leucippus, natives of Elsa, enhanced the reputation of the Eleatic school, founded by Zeno-phanes about 500 years B. C. Democritus, a disciple of Leucippus, increased its fame still more, but modified its doctrines extensively.

Socrates, according to Cicero, "brought down philosophy from heaven to dwell upon earth, who made her even an inmate of our habitations." His discomfiture of the Sophists, whose futile logic inflicted such injury on the Athenian mind, was a great blessing to his country, but one which cost the benefactor his life. His doctrines were never committed to writing by himself, but have been preserved in substance by his distinguished pupils, Plato and Zenophon.

The Cyrenaic sect was founded by Aristippus, a disciple of Socrates. It degenerated through the varied succession of Theodorus, Hegerias, and Anniceris, to merge finally in the kindred doctrines on happiness inculcated by Epicurus.

Antisthenes was the first of the Cynics, and was succeeded by the more notorious Diogenes. This school was composed of disciplinarians, rather than doctrinists, whose whole business was to endeavor so to arrange the circumstances of life, that they may produce the maximum of pleasure, and the minimum of pain. The caustic wit of Diogenes was directed against more refined teachers, especially his great contemporary Plato. The latter, in terms which implied respect for the evident talents of a rival whom he had so much reason to despise, called him "a Socrates run mad."

Archelaus succeeded Diogenes, and was called, by way of eminence, "the natural philosopher." Before him Anaxagoras had taught occasional disciples in Athens; but it is probable that Archelaus was the first to open a regular school there. He transferred the chair of philosophy from Ionic to the metropolis of Minerva 450 years B. C.

The Megaric sect of sophists was the last and worst. It was founded by Euclides, and produced Eubulides, Alexinus, Eleensis, Diodorus, and Stilpo. Contemporary criticism applied

to some of these such epithets as the Wrangler, or the Driveller, which doubtless were well deserved. Stilpo was the last gleam of philosophic worth in Greece.

Of the religious views of Socrates we shall treat in another article. Under the present head, it is sufficient to say, that his moral worth illustrated the age in which he lived; and his admiring disciples branched into so many distinguished families or schools, that he is justly called the great patriarch of philosophy. Socrates was the first philosophic thinker who demanded of himself and of all others a reason for their thoughts. He roused the spirit, and rendered it fruitful by rugged husbandry. He insisted that men should understand themselves, and so express their reason as to be understood by him. Thus he produced all he desired, movement, advancement, in reflection; and leaving successors to arrange systems, it was enough for him to supervise the birth and growth of living thoughts. As the Pythagoreans were the authors of mathematics and cosmology, Socrates consummated the scientific endeavor, and added psychology. Thus the dignity and importance of human personality stood revealed, the crowning light most needed, to complete the age of Pericles. Around this fundamental idea, created by psychology, was gathered the idea of personal grandeur in heaven as upon earth in literature, art, science, philosophy, and religion. As soon as philosophic genius proclaimed the supreme importance of the study of human personality, the higher divinities became personal, and the representations of art no longer fell into exaggerated forms, but were definite, expressive, and refined. Moreover, as this principle prevailed and was acutely felt, legislation became liberal, and the social polity was necessarily democratic.

Plato, the great glory of Athenian philosophy, was born in Ægina, about 430 years B. C. Descending from Codrus and Solon, his lineage was most distinguished; but his genius was much more illustrious than any ancestral fame. He learned dialectics from Euclides the Megaric; studied the Pythagorean system under Philolaus and Archytas; and travelled into Egypt to accomplish himself in all that which the geometry and other learning of that country could impart. Returning to Greece he



became the most characteristic and renowned teacher of philosophy in the Periclean age. Demosthenes, Socrates, and Aristotle were among his disciples, and continuators of his immense mental and moral worth. Plato also visited Italy, where he gathered the noble germs which he grafted on the doctrines of Socrates, and which are not accounted for in Zenophon. On his final return to Athens, he took possession of a modest apartment adjacent to the groves and grounds which had been bequeathed by Academus to the public, wherein he lectured to the public on sublime themes. He divided philosophy into three parts, Morals, Physics, and Dialectics. The first division included Politics; and under the second that science which afterwards came to be distinguished by the name of Metaphysics. In his Commonwealth, the object of Plato was to project a perfect model to which human institutions might, in some remote degree, approximate. He seems even at that early day, to have had a presentiment of the ennobling republicanism which human progress would necessitate and attain. His writings form a mass of literary and moral wisdom, inculcated with the highest charm of thought and manner, which had ever appeared to exalt the imagination and affect the heart. He was doubtless the best prose writer of antiquity; in the form and force of his composition he stands at the highest point of refinement Attic genius ever attained. He died at Athens, eighty-one years of age, and was honored with a monument in the Academy, upon which his famous pupil, Aristotle inscribed an epitaph in terms of reverence and gratitude.

The philosophy to which Plato gave his name, recalls at once all that is most profound in thought and pleasing in imagination. But no isolated genius can be correctly appreciated. His predecessors, Socrates and Anaxagoras, as well as his successors, the Neoplatonists must be taken into joint consideration, or the great master, in whom philosophic grandeur culminated, will not himself be properly understood. Neither is the skeptic school of Pyrrho, nor the Stoic school of Zeno, Democritus of Abdera, radiant with smiles, or Heraclitus of Ephesus, bathed in tears, to be discarded from the view, when we would sum up the aggregated worth of that philosophic age. But the hour

has come when the god of philosophy, a son of Metis or Wisdom, realized the menace put into the mouth of Prometheus by Æschylus, and Zeus with his compeers, is driven into the caverns of the west to share the exile of Cronus. Who was the predestined instrument of all this?

Stagirus, the birth-place of Aristotle, was situated on the eastern side of the Shymonic gulf, a region which in soil and appearance resembles much the southern part of the bay of Naples. When seventeen years old he came to Athens, the centre of all civilization, and the focus of every thing that was then brilliant in action or thought. Plato fired his mind and fortified that wonderful industry in his hardy pupil which enabled him, first among men to acquire almost encyclopædic knowledge in collecting, criticizing, and digesting the most comprehensive mass of materials. So extraordinary was the application of Aristotle, that Plato called his residence "the house of the reader."

How wonderful is Providence! While Aristotle was exiled in Mytilene, and when the auspices of human progress were most foreboding, he was invited to undertake the training of one who, in the world of action, was destined to achieve an empire which only that of his master in the world of thought could ever surpass. In the conjunction of two such spirits, according to the predetermined mode and moment, the invaluable accumulation of Periclean wealth was to be distributed westward without the slightest loss. The great transition here needed to be trained in a way befitting his mission, and this required that he should be infused with something better than the austerity of Leonidas, or the flattery of Lysimachus, so that his character might command respect, and his judgment preserve it. Through the influence of Aristotle on Alexander, this conservative result was attained. The rude and intemperate barbarian became ameliorated, and soon manifested that love for philosophy and elegant letters which were the fairest traits of his life. So strong did this elevating passion become, even amidst the ignoble pursuits of war, that being at the extremity of Asia, in a letter to Harpalus, he desired the works of Philetris the historian, the tragedies of Æschylus, Sophocles, and

Euripides, and the dithyrambs of Telestis and Philoxemus to be sent to him. Homer was his constant travelling companion, a copy of whom was in his hands, and deposited by the side of his dagger under his nightly pillow. Thus did the beautiful age of Pericles blend with martial force about to succeed.

When Aristotle returned to Athens to close the great era of philosophic vigor, being near the temple of Apollo Lyceus, his school was known as the Lyceum, and here, every morning and evening, he addressed a numerous body of scholars. Among the acute and impressible Greeks nearly all objects, however ideal in their original treatment, subsequently received a practical form. As the imaginative sublimities of their poets became embodied in glorious sculptures, so the theories of their early philosophy were wrought out politically, or gave way to emulative mathematical demonstration. Plato, in dialogues and dissertations, philosophied with all the fervor of an artist; while the method of Aristotle was strictly scientific in the minute as well as enlarged sense of the word. To the first, philosophy was a speciality which engrossed a practical life, but the latter treated not only of natural science, and natural history as well, but he also wrote on politics, general history, and criticism, so that it may be said truly, that he epitomised the entire knowledge of the Greeks. The age of Plato was an age of ideals; but with Aristotle the realistic age had dawned. Pericles had begun to take part in public affairs one year before the birth of Socrates. Olynthus was taken by Philip of Macedon the very year in which Plato died. This intermediate period of one hundred and twenty years was all occupied with some ideal of beauty, wisdom, or freedom, in the persons of poets, architects, sculptors, painters, statesmen, who were striving to realize it, dreaming of it, or sporting with it to amuse and bewilder their fellow men. But the name of Aristotle, as that of Philip, is a signal that concentrated, organizing power has appeared in the realms of thought and action, and that the coming age requires a philosophical expounder who shall in his own career garner the old and represent the new. It was at Athens that Aristotle collected all the treasures of

scientific facts the conquered nations could contribute, and wrote there the great works which were still young in their influence when the Macedonian madman had long since mouldered into dust.

To the followers of Plato in the Academy of Aristotle in the Lyceum, the Cynics of the Cynosurgus, and Stoics of the Portico, Epicurus came in the decrepid effeminacy of the age at the moment of its lowest degradation, and amid the pastures of prettiness which, with the pittance of eighty minæ, he purchased for the purpose, established the so-called philosophy of the Garden. Such was the last expression of that Ionian school which shared somewhat of the Hindus national character, wherein it originated, and so far resembled a hot-house seed. Opening with gorgeous colors and rich perfume, it grew rapidly and produced precocious and abundant fruit. But the more western growth was like the oak, hardened by wind and weather, striking its roots into solid earth, and stretching its branches in free air towards both sun and stars. In the Ionic school, the human soul performed but a feeble part. The Italic school, on the contrary, was mathematic, and astronomic, and at the same time idealistic; it was at once the brain and heart of Grecian progress and power. The former regarded the relations of phenomena as simple modifications of the same, and founded the abstract upon the concrete; whereas the latter neglected the phenomena themselves for their relations, founding thus the concrete upon the abstract. To the Ionic school, the centre of the world's system, is the earth; but the centre of the universal system, according to conscious reason in the Italic school, is the sun. Ten fundamental numbers therein formed the decadal astronomy, the harmonious *trosmos*, whose laws of movement around the great central luminary produced the sweet music of the spheres.

Empedocles of Agrigentum, 455 B. C., presents the most western phase of Greek character, and the one which, in the clearest manner, anticipated the age to come. He noted the great changes which transpired in society, and believed he saw their counterpart in the convulsions going on within and upon the earth. The war of disorganized humanity, passions against

nature, and the conflict of enraged elements amongst themselves, were closely considered, but doubtless with a confusion of physics and ethics in his mind. Love, hatred, friendship, treason, were all recognized, mixed up in the fearful warfare of earth, air, fire and water. Great nature was no imaginary battle-field to the mind of Empedocles; the hosts which Homer had portrayed fighting for Greeks and Trojans were still in deadly struggle, and his vivid speculations soon after became actual history. Cotemporaries called him the enchanter; because, as a zealous student of the outer world he could not disengage himself from the perplexities which he found within his own constitution, but followed out with fervor the greatest questions of our being. He not only won at the chariot race, as his father did before him, and fought for the liberties of his native Agrigentum, that last hold of freedom in the west, but as poet, as well as philosopher, he forms a curious link between Homer, Pindar, and his Roman admirer, Lucretius.

As often as the historian and philosopher speak of heroic virtues, they will mention Lycurgus, and the influence of his legislation. But when they glance at the higher objects man was made to attain, the harmonious development and adornment of all the powers in his possession, they must look to the laws of a nobler culture in Atticlemes. It was there only that all ennobling influences were blended and subordinated to the highest use by the best minds. Plato frequented the studios of artists, to acquire correct ideas of beauty; and Aristotle, in his Politics, says that "all were taught literature, gymnastics, and music; and many also the art of design, as being useful, and abundantly available for the purposes of life." But not one beautiful flower of intellect or art sprang in Laconian soil, to acquire thereon either healthful vigor or attractive growth. No gladdening voice of the poet has thence descended, nor were the obscurities of nature, and the depths of immortal consciousness either investigated or enlightened by any of her sons.

Thus, from the sublime terrace of the Acropolis, have we cast another glance over that glorious land where Homer breathed forth those songs for six and twenty centuries unexcelled;

where Phidias, like his own Jupiter, sat serene on the loftiest throne of art; where Pericles ruled with sovereign grandeur in the first of cities, not by mercenary arms, but by the magic influence of mind; where Socrates first scanned the human heart, and learned to analyze its deep and mighty workings; and where the royal pupil of Aristotle, the last and greatest of universal victors went forth on the mission of conquest, not designedly to plunder and destroy, but to spread the literature, arts, science, philosophy, and religion of immortal Greece throughout the civilized world.

---

#### ART. V.—SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY.

“Not for ourselves, but for others we live,” said the noble hearted Payson. “None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself,” said the inspired Paul. “The natural state of man, therefore, must necessarily be a state of warfare, in which all are struggling to advance their own selfish interests,” says the infidel Hobbs. Selfishness is natural, says the infidel. It is against nature, replies the Christian. That the actions of men are generally selfish no one can deny, but there is the most unmistakable evidence that the primary laws, and real wants of nature are violated and sacrificed by such a course. Christianity condemns it as unnatural, sinful, injurious, as the result of a depraved state, and wrong use of the powers of the soul; and demands reform, and offers the means of restoring man’s nature to its true position, to a healthy action. Man is only natural when he acts in harmony with the laws and wants of his being. Hence Christianity may be said to restore him to his natural state, as it inspires him with love, and makes him most happy, when he does good to others. By this we discern between the righteous and the wicked, between those who serve God, and those who serve him not. Sin is selfish, Christianity benevolent; sin is unnatural, Christianity natural;

sin is injurious to subject and object; Christianity adds to the happiness of all; sin is so absorbed in self-seeking that it results in a curse; Christianity is so anxious to do others good that richest blessings fill the heart of its devotee.

Not a few deny the benevolence of the Christian system. In the days of the Savior, and the apostles, and all the way down to the present time, Christians have been accused of hypocrisy, bigotry, misanthropy, phariseism. Persons of this character have called themselves Christians, but the very system they profess to follow condemns them to perdition. In all ages there have been many weak Christians, whose natures were not fully controlled by the spirit of the gospel; but they are no more worldly, selfish, imperfect, because they are Christians. Had they more religion, they would be more holy. The selfishness of the world, which constantly presses upon the church the habits of sin which were formed before conversion to Christ, the passions which have grown strong by gratification, the temptations of the enemy of truth, are responsible for the imperfections of Christians, while the credit for any improvement in their morals is due to the gospel.

Christianity makes no man worse, but many better and happier.

The benevolence and magnanimity of the Christian system is conclusive evidence of its divinity. Depravity and selfishness, characterize the works of man. A system that rests upon this profound principle, that genuine happiness can only result from genuine benevolence, that the more ardently a man seeks his own, the less good he enjoys, and the more he is devoted to works of benevolence, and lives for others' good, the richer are his personal blessings, is an impossible product of depraved man. It is an unreasonable stretch of credulity, to believe that he could by any means develop such a system, so perfect and clear in conception, so complete in all its parts, so dissimilar to the creations of human genius, so adapted to correct all the ills of life, and so opposed to the ordinary current of human thought and action. Let us review some of these peculiar properties of Christianity.

1. The real Christian lives to do good. If he succeeds in this, he is satisfied, if not, his life is regarded a failure. The severest possible rebuke is, "Ye have done no good;" the highest commendation, "Ye have abounded in works of love." This is not the fruit of sympathy, passion, emotion, that is changeable, but a principle confirmed by conscience, and enforced by reason. Hence it strives to remedy the sufferings of the race, by removing the cause—sin. It aims at permanent results, and embraces eternal interests in the list. Hence, just as soon as the soul is renewed by the spirit of Christ, it cries in the ears of the wicked and miserable, "cease to do evil, learn to do well." "Break off your sins by righteousness." "Love God with all the heart, and your neighbor as yourself." "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." So did Christ and his apostles; and every follower of Christ embarks in the same mission work. Love is the law, and "Love is the fulfilling of the law." "Do good unto all men" is the rule of the believer's life. He is not to ask, Will it bring me honor or disgrace? riches or poverty? friends or enemies? But is it right, and will it result in the greatest good? Inspired by such a purpose, the church have faced persecution, peril, poverty, performed an incredible amount of labor, incurred immense expense, with no other motive than to do good to others, even to enemies, and persecutors. And yet they have seldom attained to the full measure of Christian benevolence. The system is yet superior to the practice of believers; but the practice is greatly superior to any other religious or infidel life. It must be Divine!

2. He loves his enemies.

The motto of unbelievers is, "An eye for an eye," but Christ commands, "Love your enemies, do good to them who persecute you." He that will not forgive, cannot be forgiven. Witness the spirit of our Master. He is nailed to the cross, a victim of malice. Yet he prays, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." Hear Stephen, too. "Lay not this sin to their charge."

No persons hate sin like Christians, and none like them have such compassion for the sinner.



“ If they who hate the trespass most,  
Yet when all others' love is lost,  
Love the poor sinner, marvel not,  
Christ's mark outwears the foulest blot.”

Some skeptics in Christian lands endorse this law of Christ, but the whole current of worldly life is against it. All the affairs of governments, and social life, where the gospel has not shed its light, are conducted on the principle of retaliation. Men are slow to receive this higher wisdom, and conquer by love.

The gospel achieves its victories by doing no violence, returning good for evil, love for hatred. It forbids resentment, and retaliation, and demands compassion, mercy. Some may pronounce this feature of Christianity weak and cowardly; but self-control is the highest feat of moral power, and to rise above personal considerations in devotion to others' welfare is certainly the climax of chivalry. That is a miserable, though a popular philosophy, which leaves man the victim of passion, and blinds his eyes to those eternal interests that depend upon a careful culture of kindness to all men. “When thine enemy hungers, feed him,” suggests a world of thought, a knowledge of human nature, and the true remedy for the ills that curse the race, which savors strongly of heaven. Christians have so long been familiar with it, that they almost forget its moral sublimity; but when we contrast it with the ideas of the heathen, even the wisest of them, its grandeur is apparent.

3. A peculiar feature of Christianity is solicitude for the welfare of children. The master said, “Of such is the kingdom of heaven.” The Christian esteems an infant with peculiar interest. He sees in the little child an immortal being, an heir of glory; a subject of angelic solicitude; the purchase of the Savior's love; a candidate for everlasting glory; breathing in a world of peril, where ten thousand forces tend to destroy, and send the dear one down to woe. No language can express the anxiety that fills Christian hearts for the welfare of children. Not their own merely, but all children, they yearn to redeem from all that can harm.

Nothing takes such a deep hold upon their sympathies, noth-

ing prompts to such self-denial, labor, sacrifice, as the fact that millions of children are exposed to corruption and ruin. While the mass of men are either indifferent to the virtues of the young, or actually corrupt them, the Christian is engaged in active efforts to save them. The Sabbath school is one fruit of this interest. What is the reward which patrons of this institution seek and desire! No more nor less than the present and eternal good of the children. Political or sectarian ends are trifles in their estimation. The personal welfare of the child is the animating motive. Does Paganism, Mohammedanism, or infidelity, present any such spirit as this? Do they possess a love so disinterested, so practical, useful, modest, sincere? No where is it found except where Christ has true disciples.

4. The estimate which Christians place upon their own virtues evinces the sincerity of this love. Though they rejoice in redemption from sin, and consider virtue, honesty, piety, love a greater treasure than the world affords, a greater honor than can come from man, yet they have no heart to boast, are not self-complacent, nor lifted up with pride. The progress which they have made in goodness, they credit to the grace and truth of God; and as they advance, their ideal of a perfect life becomes higher and higher, and their defects appear more glaring. As the artist becomes a keener critic, just so fast as he improves in skill, so the Christian realizes his imperfections and dependence more and more as his virtues increase, so that the more marked his holiness, the greater his humility. As he grows up into Christ, and his love of virtue, love of souls, largeness of heart, nobleness of purpose increase, he cries out with increased earnestness, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name we give glory, for thy mercy and thy truth." From the bottom of his heart he sings—

" 'T was grace that taught my heart to fear,  
And grace those fears removed."

" Grace all the work shall crown,  
Through everlasting days;  
It lays in heaven the topmost stone,  
And well deserves the praise."

Christianity promotes the very highest type of virtue, and in the same ratio promotes humility. The best Christian is the most humble man. Here is benevolence without ostentation; virtue without self-righteousness, justice without severity, faith without vain confidence, boldness without impertinence, aggressiveness without dogmatism; every virtue which is necessary to ennoble, bless, and sanctify the man, while, at the same time, the whole heart ascribes the honor and praise to Christ and his gospel for effecting this marvellous work, planting in the soul these clusters of gracious thoughts, affections and purposes. We admire that system which has power thus to exalt and abase, honor and humble, make man so meritorious and yet so meek. Enemies of God, and fools only will believe such a system to be earth-born. God alone could have conceived it. He only could have developed it, and maintained its vitality so as to produce, in these two thousand years, such wonderful results. We bless God for this unspeakable gift.

“ O for such love let rocks and hills  
Their lasting silence break,  
And all harmonious human tongues  
The Savior's praises speak.”

5. The basis of fellowship is evidence of the same benevolence.

The church of Christ holds out no selfish motives to gain proselytes, and imposes no physical restraint, no temporal terrors to deter from apostacy. Disciples are won by love, are pledged to the works of love, are held in fellowship by the bond of love. The church is a product of the conviction that more good can be done and greater progress in holiness attained by association. The usual motives of gain, honor, pleasure, are positively forbidden here; and whenever they have been indulged, they have proved that an alien spirit had crept in, the spirit of the world, that the disciples had departed from Christ. Princes have often courted the favor of the church, and infused into her the ambition of political hierarchs, but a revival of vital piety always drives out this worldly spirit, and returns to the democratic basis of brotherly love.

Christian benevolence is a powerful bond of union. It overcomes national antipathies, breaks down partition walls, sweeps away caste, pride of birth or station, and embraces in one brotherhood, men of every degree. When we contrast there-lation of Christians with the habits, exclusiveness, and antipathies of worldly men, we are filled with admiration. The law of the church is "love one another," "receive the weak," "call no man master," "all ye are brethren," "if any man will be great among you, let him be servant of all," "have not faith with respect to persons." The church has often been sorely pressed by the pride and aristocracy of the world, but the whole force of the Christian spirit protests against all partial, unequal, unbrotherly treatment of fellow-disciples. Diversity of opinions, plans, mode of operation is not allowed to break the bond of union, or prevent brotherly love. Paul and Barnabas differed in policy, and parted in labors, but always cherished the deepest interest in each other's welfare and prosperity. Midst the various sects of living Christians, there is a bond of love, which is able to withstand the surgings of the wildest excitement. Brotherly love is not difficult when there is unity of plan and purpose; but when love endures the test of opposing policy, its sincerity, strength and disinterestedness cannot be doubted. Paul spoke as a Christian, when he rejoiced in the success of brethren who were even willing to add affliction to his bonds. So Christians now rejoice in the triumphs of the truth, in the hands of whatever agency. Mere sectarians are lightly esteemed; even in their own party, their memory rots in forgetfulness; while the man who is more a Christian than a sectarian, who may love his sect much, but Christianity more, is held in sweet remembrance by all the saints of God.

How stand Luther, Calvin, Knox, in the esteem of the church? Luther taught transubstantiation, Calvin fatalism, Knox presbyterianism; but these peculiarities are forgotten in our admiration for their glorious labors for Christianity. If, like Moses and Elias, they should now re-visit the church, every sect of true disciples would welcome them with enthusiasm. Who glories in the lives and labors of Bunyan, Foster,

Hall, Carey, Pike, Judson? Baptists alone? No, verily. They are the inheritance of the whole church, and none would consent to relinquish their interest in them. Are Congregationalists only grateful to God that Elliott, Payson, and Edwards lived and labored for sinners? Do Presbyterians glory alone in the works of love, of Wardlaw, Chalmers, Mason, Thompson? Do Episcopalians love the names of Heber, Arnold, Doddridge, more than other Christians? Who does not bless God for the gift of Roger Williams, that champion of religious and political freedom, John Wesley, the apostle of spiritual life; Whitefield, the prince of preachers? To whom belong the labors of the pious, noble Baxter? Who reads his Call to the Unconverted, and his Dying Thoughts? But the host of these noble men we are unable in this article even to mention. Their memory, their works of love are graven upon the hearts of all the redeemed.

Which among all the sects, would consent to part with the labors and Christian life of any of these champions of the gospel! Was it proposed to sweep the memory of Calvin, with all his works, from the record of life, a simultaneous No! no! would come up from the entire Arminian host. Would Calvinists vote to expunge the impress of Wesley's labors from the memory of men? Never! no, never! The immortality of these heroes of the church does not rest upon their sectarian tenets, but upon their devotion to, their service in, the cause of Christ. There is a soul, a vital life, in Christianity, which is common to all regenerated men; and all Christians delight to do him honor who does good service to this inner life, whatever may be the peculiar cut of the dress in which he appears. There have been many heroes of sects, but they were never greatly loved, and were soon forgotten. But when men have done good service in the cause of Christ, turned many from sin to holiness, carried light in dark places, and peace to the weary and heavy laden, their personal eccentricities, doctrines, plans, sectarian attachments are forgotten, and the warmest affections of the Christian's heart are awarded them for their faith and labors of love.

Thus we see how strong is the bond of union, how ardent

the brotherly love which subsists among Christians. It survives these antagonistic forces, honors true merit, bids every true heart "God speed thee," in his efforts. Such love is not of the world.

The church, among men actuated by the common spirit of self-interest, is an impossibility, without a radical change in its policy and objects. Worldly men must have honor, money, pleasure, fame, to incite them on, or they will not toil. But in the church there is nothing of this kind. Love to God and love to man, is its soul, life, and force. There is no other basis like this. None but those who have been to the cross, who have experienced the power of the Redeemer's spirit renewing their hearts, filling them with a new spirit of benevolence, and an earnest desire for the good of the race, can appreciate, or feel deeply interested in this basis. Yet to the regenerated there is a luxury in this life, this union of hearts in the work of benevolence which is unspeakable, which is Divine.

Now let skeptics bring forward their theories, let the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing, the kings of the earth take counsel together, and see if they can produce anything which will compare with the Christian system, in the beauty, sublimity of doctrine, and practical power over the hearts and lives of men. It is an easy thing to find fault with God and man, but more difficult to equal the gospel in its plan, spirit, purpose and power. And until man can equal the Christian system, until he can produce some plan, that results in equal good, we have a right to claim, and all men are bound to believe, that Christianity is not earth-born, but from heaven. Indeed, from what we know of man, we are justified in concluding that there is no wisdom to conceive, nor power to execute such a system in the universe, except in God. Then we will accept it as Divine, and to God give all the glory.

## ART. VI.—LIFE AND TIMES OF BISHOP HEDDING.\*

Elijah Hedding, late Senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal church, was one of the few men into whose hands great judicial and executive authority could be safely committed. He was a man eminently qualified to execute the plans and combinations of others. It was only necessary to show him what was his duty, or, in other words, to tell him what had been prescribed by the legitimate authority; and without deviating a hair's-breadth from the appointed line, he would move forward with as little compunction or symptom of flinching as a machine. Yet he was not a cold nor an unscrupulous man. He only possessed, in a large degree, that quality of conscientious regard—reverence almost—for law and the enactments of the legally constituted majority, or in other words, the rightful supreme power, which makes a man faithful, trustworthy, and incorruptible. He wanted to be told what the power above him had a right to enjoin, and how much and what it had appointed for his share of duty, and he felt at once the "woe is me if I do it not;" and walked forward, or ran, or remained to suffer, as the command was, with a most heroic and unquestioning obedience. And genuine modesty and true Christian lowly-mindedness, rather than want of character, energy, or even ambition, led him into this honorable and very useful pathway.

He was not original, not profound, not far-seeing, nor brilliant. But he was conscientious, honest, firm almost to stubbornness, active, diligent, persevering, and, above most others, prudent and self-sacrificing. And these latter qualities are the most useful of virtues; while the former rise only to the rank of agencies—profitable indeed, and admirable, though never so highly rewardable.

It was a characteristic of Bishop Hedding, while he had comparatively little confidence in himself or his own abilities,

\* LIFE AND TIMES OF REV. ELIJAH HEDDING, D. D., late senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal church. By Rev. D. W. Clark, D. D. With an Introduction by Rev. Bishop E. S. Janes. New York: Carleton & Phillips.

to place the most implicit reliance and trust in the general system, whatever it might be, to which he attached himself. When he had carefully and prayerfully settled in his own mind that any particular mode or plan of business, or line of duty was right and according to the wisdom and determination of God, he seemed never afterward to have a hesitation, or a doubt, about the successful termination of the course or enterprise; and in the discharge of what was clearly marked out by a divine Providence as his share of work to be done, he no more delayed to enter upon it, than the cannon-ball or bomb-shell waits for instructions or explanations, when gunpowder bids it speed on its destroying mission. And yet he was one of the most tender-hearted of men, especially when others were concerned, and the system which he was chosen to execute was not in danger of compromise.

Our Methodist brethren were, therefore, singularly fortunate when, in 1824, they elected Elijah Hedding to be one of their executive officers, or superintending bishops. A bishop in that church is of all men in a situation least favorable for original action. He is an executive officer merely, having no vote—not even a casting one in cases of a tie—in any of the councils of the church. It is hardly considered proper for him to make recommendations, and such recommendations are only tolerated from courtesy. He can speak in an Annual Conference, or in the General Conference, only by permission of the body; and hard would it be for the popularity of that bishop who should often avail himself of such courtesies and attempt the lecturer. The truth is, in the words of their Book of Discipline, it is emphatically made his duty to “keep our rules, not to mend them.” And these are rules which, perhaps, more than the regulations of almost any other church, are the growth and work of circumstances. The wishes and desires—not unfrequently the whims and singularities—of the membership, expressed in private conversation to the preachers, or discussed and recommended by class-leaders, stewards, exhorters, and local preachers in the quarterly conferences; but more especially the usages grown up in the several circuits and stations under the daily and yearly administrations of preachers and



official members, have extended and consolidated themselves into established customs, and thus have found their way up through the Annual Conferences to the General Conference, where they become enacted into rules and authoritative law. The acts and decisions, the experiences and experiments of the preachers from year to year have thus been admired or condemned by the people, and adopted or rejected as generalities, fit some of them to be made universal rules to bind in all cases. Methodism is an iron system, we admit, much more capable of adding new restrictions than of rejecting what is old, but nevertheless it is a very useful system of agencies, almost, if not quite, indispensable among the means of evangelizing and Christianizing the world.

We imagine that *outsiders* commonly look upon the Methodist bishops as having great powers and authority. But, in strict reality such is not the literal truth. These men do indeed have great labors and duties, and consequently great responsibilities devolving upon them; but great power and authority, in the sense of great powers to make rules, or to enforce obedience to their own commands or wishes, they possess in a less degree than most other men in official stations. They must be men of strictest rule and method; but the rules are not made by themselves; and in their methods they must never deviate from the course marked out and prescribed by custom and common long established usage. It will not even answer for the Methodist bishops to interpret rules and construe general practice and usages in a manner different from their predecessors, whose acts and interpretations have been approved by the consent of the General and Annual Conferences, and by the universal acquiescence of the membership. A Methodist bishop, therefore, becomes greatly influential among the men of his denomination by doing exactly what he is told to do; and it is understood that it is none of his business to hesitate or to ask questions at all about it. The decree of the church, in her legitimately recognized councils, is his guide; and his greatness and his goodness as an officer, consist in the promptness and the pertinacity with which he follows out and enforces those decrees.

We called the Methodist system an iron system, but not in a

reproachful sense. We called it so simply in view of the almost utter disregard for the tender ties that bind pastor and people together, and for the constant demand which it makes on the powers of endurance, and self-sacrifice of its entire church membership. It seems to demand—more than any other system of church organization—an entire singleness of purpose, and a complete renunciation of all ease or desire except the one and sole good of the system, which its controversialists sometimes seem to us to imagine is quite as extensive, if not a little more so, than Christianity herself. And yet we have often been compelled to admire the sublimity of its practical operations. To see a million of people—for the two branches of the Methodist church number more than that—many of whom are not remarkable for philosophical accumen, nor in any way distinguished above their fellow Christians for far-seeing, and self-sacrificing benevolence, voluntarily agreeing to be separated, almost annually, from the pastors, whose spiritual power has been the instrument, in God's hand, of converting them to Christ—cheerfully submitting to the breaking up of the most endearing ties of Christian friendship—patiently enduring the increased taxation, which these continual migrations of their ministers must impose upon them, to supply the wear and tear of goods, and loss of health, and sometimes of courage, caused by their nomadic rules—yea, absolutely and imperatively demanding all this sacrifice of money, time, goods, affection, interest, and not unfrequently of life itself, simply because they, on the whole, reckon it necessary in order to give the gospel its widest and most rapid spread—awakens a sense of the moral sublime, higher, we confess, than the contemplation of any other church organization or system of operations can awake.

And with all this comes to our minds another thought—that although our sister church has a system of operations, that breaks down and uses up more men and women, as ministers and their wives, than is possible in any other organization—the average length of their ministers' lives being said to be less than ten years—some even putting it at eight, while others say it is twelve—and although this church loses annually by

secessions, and withdrawals, more, probably, than all the other churches of our country put together—and although there is at all times a severe discussion of all these hardships, these losses, and these disadvantages—yet we shall find the membership of the Methodist church, least of all churches, disposed to destroy or to radically change their sublimely useful, but heroically self-sacrificing, expensive, and life-wearing itineracy. It seems almost an instinct with them to cling to it, and to guard and strengthen, rather than experiment to alter or to amend it.

Indeed, in all ages and in all circumstances the people themselves are most intensely conservative. They want quiet; and the continuance of the present order of things always promises to secure quiet, sooner and more satisfactorily to our idle nature than any change or revolution can. The people, therefore, are not disposed to move any radical convulsion of the existing order of things—found comfortable at their birth and known by experience to have been tolerable during their whole lives. They move not to revolutions of their own motion. They are excited to this by some bold and radical thinker, and reckless, though often sincere, and independent actor. He may indeed be a demagogue who stimulates them: or he may be a philanthropist. But the desire and the impulse to change, to destroy, or to renew, commonly comes from a solitary individual, and from him spreading to others, at length involves them, as flames take hold on dry stubble, and kindle it into a sweeping conflagration, which consumes a land.

We consider the Methodist church, therefore, of all others, least liable to such radical changes in its doctrines or in its policy and administration of government and discipline. The frequent and distant removals of its ministers—especially its more eloquent and influential men—its enormous braggadocios about its “admirable book of discipline,” and “its wonderful, its almost miraculous growth and progress”—numerous specimens of which occur in Dr. Clark’s book—the firm persuasion of its almost entire membership, that their peculiar system has been divinely raised up by God, for “the spread of scripture holiness over all lands”—each in its due measure, and all com-

bined will tend to keep that church together, and to maintain its organization without radical change for years, more probably for centuries to come.

We are not sure, however, that the Methodist church is, after all, so much less disposed to change than are others. History shows that a particular church organization is most likely to be permanent, and to outlive all institutions—the family only excepted. And when it becomes corrupted, it is the most difficult of all to be reformed. Abuses in state can be corrected. In everything else that is human, lynx-eyed men will mark faults, and ready and skilful hands will be employed to remove evils, and to ingraft improvements. But in regard to a church which, in no unimportant sense, is a human institution, it is hard to point out, so that men shall see it, any imperfection, and much harder is it to inaugurate a reform. Church reform hence commonly proceeds by secession, rather than by healing. And our Methodist friends, while they, as we before hinted, have done a great amount of discussion about radical changes in their economy, have, nevertheless, always contrived to end these discussions by a secession of the disputers—generally the smaller body, and the weaker party goes off. But once, in the “division of the church,” as it is called, in 1844, on the slavery question, it was in real truth the larger and more powerful body that went off.

Let us not be understood, however, as wishing to interfere with the affairs of our neighbors. In fact, we are not at all ambitious to see changes in their economy. They are not very likely, as it seems to our apprehension, to swallow up our younger and smaller organization, and we certainly are not yet prepared even to wish to swallow them. We agree with them in too many points, and admire them too heartily to wish to gain by their damage. Their machinery admirably accomplishes its glorious work—a much needed work, which all other churches could not exactly perform without it—with a good deal of friction, to be sure, but with as little—perhaps less—than would be found in any other church, that should undertake the work of converting men with the same vigor as that with which the Methodists pursue it. It probably needs no

important modification. Let it keep its place and perform its work in its own way, and with its own instrumentalities, and we will thank God for it and its heroes, and its lessons of self-denying devotion to hard and unrequited labor in behalf of fallen humanity. And yet, while we thus admire it as a church, and look upon it as one of the best agencies for preaching the truth, we are frank to say that if it were to become universal, it would be one of the worst, or least suitable that could be contrived.

We must be allowed to say a few more words upon the Methodist system, and its peculiar ability and adaptedness to draw out and to increase every talent found by it, and then we will proceed to discuss Dr. Clark's book, and to speak of the bishop as a man and as an officer of the church. The Methodist church has most commonly been regarded by those without it, and not unfrequently by those within it, as a collection of men and women called, organized, and governed by the ministry. Such, however, is not the essential truth in the case. Their church is but a growth of the membership into an organization. It resembles, more than almost any other body, the formation of a coral reef. The little, soft-fleshed insects join together and form each for himself a tiny shell, which they unite and join to others, till very soon they find themselves formed into a miniature wall. As these insects grow and die, others attach their shell-covered bodies above them, and the wall grows apace; and centuries after bears a continent of beauty and fertility on its insect-formed bosom. So the Methodist church grew from a few *members*, not from *preachers*. It was a *class* of a dozen with a *leader*, and he, because they had no *pastor*—only a *preacher*, in Mr. Wesley—was designated to visit and converse with the members and others who might be seriously inclined. At the weekly meetings of this *class*, the *leader* was their spiritual adviser. At other times when they met, another helper, called a *prayer-leader*, grew up among them to conduct their devotions by reading the Scriptures and supplication. Then as the unconverted came in often when no preacher was present, the little class found out their need, and appointed one or several of their own number

to be *exhorters* for their public meetings. Then, to defray the few expenses which would necessarily occur, they found it convenient to employ others whom they called *stewards*, to collect funds, and to transact the temporal affairs of the class. Some of these *exhorters* would improve rapidly, and display an uncommon ability for public address and for persuasive eloquence; hence they would be "THRUST OUT," in their own Methodistic phrase, into the work of the ministry, either as *local* or as *itinerant* preachers. Though at first, and until it grew into a "*general rule*," this was done by the consent, advice, or appointment of Mr. Wesley, yet even under him, and especially since his death, all this is done, or all these functionaries are really appointed by the members of the church; and these are all the real and distinct officers of their church. It is true the *preacher in charge* of a circuit or station has the right to nominate all these, but the membership, by advice, and by common consultation, direct his choice to persons agreeable to them. In order to keep up a constant itineracy, or change among the preachers, they now need Presiding Elders and Bishops. The Bishops are appointed directly by the preachers, voting by delegates in the General Conference, and the Presiding Elders are appointed by the Bishops at the Annual Conferences, generally after more or less advice and consultation with the preachers.

Their whole system of officers and labors has thus grown up from the people; indeed, it is the people growing up and taking the affairs of governing a church into their own hands. To make a Methodist minister, no more education is needed at the outset than is possessed by any young man of ordinary advantages and abilities. He must feel that he is called of God to preach; and the people must have that general confidence in his piety, in his good sense, and in his natural and acquired abilities, which shall afford to them good ground to believe that he is not deceived as to this call. They then vote him an *exhorter's* license, and he makes trial of his gifts. If God, by his Spirit, seems to own his labors, and souls are converted by his instrumentality, the church, by their "board of stewards and leaders," give him a *local* preacher's license, or a recom-

mendation to the Annual Conference, and in either case he becomes one of the *preachers*.

This is a brief outline of the system to which Bishop Hedding was attached, and which his influence contributed to make respectable and powerful. And it seemed to us necessary to say so much respecting it in order to a full understanding of the circumstances in which he was placed, which gave to him the field and the opportunity for his remarkable life-work of duty, and which served to develop and perfect his naturally solid and unostentatious, yet noble and grand character. We do not mean to be understood as saying that Bishop Hedding owed all his greatness to the accident of his having belonged to the Methodist church, but only that his connection with that church, and the circumstances thus made to surround and to mould him did modify him, and afforded to him very peculiar and very favorable circumstances for influencing the world, and for accomplishing the destiny and duty of an honest, a conscientious and a hearty-working Christian man.

Elijah Hedding was born June 7th, 1780, in Dutchess County, New York. His parents were neither of them professors of religion, though the religious element appears to have been more than commonly strong in the character of his mother. From her he undoubtedly inherited the strong tendency of his nature—a disposition to believe and confide in the supernatural. But this in him was early shown to be connected with one other element and tendency—to take nothing for granted till thoroughly convinced of its truth. The first made him, when converted, a humble, teachable Christian—the second made him an independent, strong-minded thinker—characteristics not at all inconsistent with each other, though by no means necessarily conjoined. We must notice these traits in him, as they will aid us in our estimate of his work—partly wrought upon himself, and partly wrought upon his fellow men.

When he was eight years of age, the Methodist preachers first travelled into the neighborhood where his parents lived. His mother became a regular attendant both on their meetings for preaching, and on their class meetings, and young Elijah was so impressed with their exhortations, and a sense of

his own lost condition, that it was long before he was at ease.

In 1791, when he was eleven, his parents removed to Starksborough, Vt., where they fixed for themselves a permanent home in a new country. This town lies not far from twenty miles east of Lake Champlain, on the ridge of land dividing the waters of the Onion river from those of Otter Creek. Here he was subjected to all the privations and labors of a wild country, and was made to feel the necessity for resolute and energetic labor, the importance of prompt decision and self-reliance, and the superiority of a hardy, industrious, self-willed man over all the inconveniences of place, and the austerities of circumstances. Here, too; he acquired, in the fresh air of the mountains, that vigorous constitution which enabled him in after years to endure so much hardship, and to perform so much labor even when borne down by pain and weariness of body.

The time from his settlement in Starksborough, in 1791, to his conversion in Dec. 1798, may be regarded in a very important sense, the period of the man's formation. It was during this period that he grew to be a man in stature—being a trifle more than six feet in height, and well-developed, muscular, broad-shouldered, broad-chested, and majestic in mein and countenance. During all this period of seven years, he was pondering in his mind those all-absorbing questions which must awaken the interest of all thinkers; "Whence this discontent within me, with my own motives, and this awful assurance that I am not good?" "Why, since I am certain I am not good, is this insatiable longing for goodness—a quality so really foreign to myself?" and, "Why this full persuasion that if I attain not, in some way, to that goodness which I long for, I shall be guilty?" These questions had been started in the inquiring lad of seven, when he dwelt among the scenes of his infancy, and first heard the preaching of the servants of God; and they continued to occupy his thoughts when he had removed to the wilderness, and dwelt far away from the privileges of worship.

In his own thoughts he pondered all the various modes suggested of solving these queries. He tried to deny the necessi-



ty for goodness. But his own judgment would not allow that conclusion. He attempted to persuade himself that he already possessed goodness. But this his own consciousness denied. He then undertook to believe that there is no moral guilt, and no tribunal to which men are accountable. But here again his conscience and his reason convinced him of his error. This brought him to the one conclusion that he was a sinner, accountable to God, and needing a renewing application of the blood of Christ to fit him for either life or death.

The mystery of conversion, as it may properly be called, can never be explained in philosophical terms, so as to be understood by the uninitiated. It is not always, but frequently, and when it produces its legitimate results, accompanied with almost overwhelming mental anguish. A man, in order to be prepared for its transforming power, must, in a greater or in a less degree, feel the force of two truths, his own radical tendency toward evil rather than toward good, and the utter helplessness of his own unaided strength to resist that evil tendency, and to change it into an impulse toward the good and the holy. This persuasion will—constituted as man is, and especially in an independent man, such as Hedding was—be preceded by a long and fierce struggle, first to conquer his own heart, and, second, to persuade himself that there is no necessity for any cleansing whatever. The fierceness of this contest will be measured in part by the clearness of the person's previous knowledge of the truth of God's word, and in part by his disposition to submit to the dictation of a power without himself. And it will be likely to go on, and increase in bitterness till the point of complete self-abnegation is reached. He feels, and is not ashamed to own his utter nothingness; and more than this, he must feel his complete accountability for every word, act, and thought, to God who rules above him.

Thus far it is not so hard to explain. But the next step after this self-renunciation is totally inexplicable by words. It is the act of faith or trust in Christ, and is, of course, immediately accompanied by the new birth. The man now finds all his sense of guilt, and, in one sense, his helplessness, removed. Instead of being a lonely wanderer, who is to find his unaided

way through a world of difficulties, he is led by a Divine conductor. He becomes a child of God, and feels at once a mysterious union with him. This great change wrought in the man's nature is the conversion of the soul, and it produces a complete alteration of his relations to his fellow-men, to God, and to all duty. Self has been renounced. Ease has been forgotten. God has been seen and acknowledged. Duty has been embraced as the highest good. The soul loves and longs for, or hates and loathes, according to other affinities and repulsions than those with which it was born.

Before this hour of conversion, the young Hedding had been an energetic worker as a young man. At eighteen, he had become a leader of the farm work, in clearing land, in putting in crops, and in all that hard and exhausting, yet exciting and health-giving labor usual upon an improving farm. He now manifests the same general characteristics of energy and modest boldness, as had marked him before his conversion. And at this point we see the adaptedness of the system of Methodism to which he attached himself. It insisted upon two things. The first, that he or any other convert should not rest till something more than tolerably satisfied of his acceptance with God: The second, that whoever professed conversion should by all means begin at once to speak of his individual experiences. For this end the class-meetings are admirably adapted. And the early usages of this and other denominations, was well calculated to develop whatever talent might be hidden in the bosoms of the young converts. Immediately, therefore, and in accordance with this usage of the people among whom he was converted, young Hedding now began both to pray and to exhort publicly, and from house to house. He was eighteen, and went to the village to study arithmetic with a man noted for his skill in mathematical subjects. His mind and heart had, however, been too much absorbed in the beauties and intricacies of God's word, and his soul was so thoroughly imbued with the interest of the sweet hymns of Wesley, to allow him to give much attention to arithmetic, or in fact, to anything except the Bible and the hymn-book. These he read, and sung, and prayed over, till he had, in a comparatively short time, obtained

a more thorough and practical knowledge of their contents, in a single winter, than many a theological student gains in a three years' course. Love for the Redeemer of men and the way of salvation, supplied to his mind an ardor in his study, and imparted a retentiveness to his memory, which a philosopher in the pursuit of knowledge might covet.

The next we find him called to commence the work of his ministry. The circumstances seem well to accord with the idea of a divine call to preach the gospel of reconciliation. The strange Lorenzo Dow had been appointed to what was called the Essex Circuit, extending from the Onion river, over the whole country between Lake Champlain and the Green Mountains, some thirty miles beyond the Canada frontier. He left his work and made a voyage to Ireland, and the boy of nineteen, after some urging by his brethren, began his life-work of preaching Christ crucified. It was November when he set out, and he was compelled to travel three hundred miles every four weeks, often preaching—or, as he modestly insisted on naming it, *exhorting*—ten times a week, besides meeting as many classes, and holding four and six prayer meetings besides. And these meetings, according to the Methodist usage, were, each of them, a severe tax on the capabilities of lungs as well as mind. Many of them were interrupted by disorderly persons; and often he was, with his worshippers, in great danger both of life and limbs.

After the labors of this circuit were over, just before spring, he returned to farm work, and although now fully decided to preach, yet it was not till the 16th of June, 1801, a few days after he had reached his twenty-first birth-day, that he was received on trial into the New York Annual Conference. Now he began in earnest that self-sacrificing and laborious career, which has made his life almost an epic, and which resulted in so much good to the Methodist church and to the world.

For the next two and a half years, he travelled as a Circuit preacher, over the whole region lying around Plattsburg, and fifty miles west down to the south end of Lake Champlain; and all over the north-west of Vermont to the Green Mountains, and fifty or seventy-five miles into Canada, thence into New

Hampshire. It would be interesting to follow him more into detail in these journeyings than Dr. Clarke has done. We remember having heard Bishop Hedding in his old age, recall the history of those days, when he rode, sometimes along mere Indian trails, through the forest, holding a Bible in hand to read as he rode, or an English grammar, or some tract, or the hymn book, or a dictionary, or Stackhouse's History of the Bible, watching the unevenness of the way or the branches of the trees; now catching a whole sentence, and now only a part, and turning it over in his mind till he fully comprehended its meaning; often learning whole pages, or chapters, or hymns, so as to make it impossible ever to forget them; rising and preaching at five in the morning, and then riding fifteen miles to preach again and *lead class* at two in the afternoon, and hurrying on six miles or so further to preach again at "early candle-light," and hold a prayer meeting afterwards till the "*mourners*" were comforted—which often meant till late at night; and then laying himself down in a log cabin for a few hours' sleep, where in summer he might be thoroughly drenched with rain, and in winter was often buried with snow. He could tell of fording rivers, where his horse must swim, and sometimes where the ice made it dangerous. In short, he was compelled to endure privations such as only soldiers in a winter campaign, or ill-provided settlers in a new and inclement country were ever called to suffer; and all with no prospect of glory or gain. To spare meals and insufficient raiment, to long and weary journeys, and laborious days and nights, to absence of friends, and the daily presence of danger, there were added misapprehension of motives, coldness, neglect, and base and bitterly cruel slander and opposition to his self-denying work and labor of love.

We cannot avoid the conclusion that it was the exposure and hardships, combined with the accumulated labors of the first two years of Hedding's itineracy, forced upon him partly by circumstances, but more by the enthusiasm of his early zeal, that laid the foundation of that tormenting disease from which he suffered so acutely for almost fifty years, and which finally removed him from earth, at an age when his originally ro-

bust constitution ought to have had a full decade of vigor in reserve.

For Hedding had hardly entered upon his third year of itinerating labor—on the Bridgewater circuit in New Hampshire—and had begun with almost apostolic success the work of his ministry there, when he was prostrated with disease. He could not wait fully to recover, and undertook to travel and preach quite too soon. He was again prostrated, this time with a disease—the rheumatism—that never left him, but always hung about his system, sometimes in ambush, to be sure, yet always ready to spring forth and bind him, on any occasion when he grew incautious. For eight months he suffered, and so eager was he to discharge his duty, that he was often compelled to be lifted on and off his horse, and to hold the bridle in his teeth, as he rode from appointment to appointment, where he would preach with much power, sitting in his chair.

The next year he had so far recovered that he was appointed to the Hanover Circuit, in the north-west of New Hampshire. Here it was that he entered systematically upon the formation of that graceful, terse, and sententious style, for which, in after years, his extemporaneous sermons were so noted. His writings were by no means so correct as his spoken compositions. We account for this partly by the fact that his whole attention when young, and during his formation period, was given to public speaking, and partly because he never criticized his writings as he did his spoken sermons. He used to tell his friends that he bought a grammar, and carried it in his *saddle-bags*, reading a portion of it, and learning it every morning, looking into it while riding, while resting, or at night, after retiring; and comparing every sentence he had occasion to say with its rules. Then he would parse and analyze whatever he had heard, and especially whatever he had said, watching himself, and correcting in private all the blunders he made in preaching or in conversation. And at last he had changed himself from the ungrammatical and uncouth extemporizer, to a correct, and even a polished and elegant master of the English idioms.

To learn the proper meaning and use of the words of the

language, he then took with him a dictionary and read and studied every word of it by course till he knew every shade of meaning in each word, and till all were conquered and made a ready servant. A young man of twenty-four, with a burning zeal for doing good, and an ambition to return as large a number of converts as possible, who can thus restrain his ardor, and resolutely harness himself down to these minute points, and pursue what was so dry, so uninteresting, and so little promising for the moment, in order that he may gain power for the future, is no common man, and will most certainly far outstrip in influence all his compeers. Let others note the example.

For three years more, young Hedding continued to travel in the northern parts of Vermont and New Hampshire, doing the work of an evangelist among the scattered settlements, and making full proof of his ministry, amidst hardships, sickness, and toils, such as not often fall to the lot of the itinerant preachers of the church to which he had attached himself. The next year—1807—he was the Presiding Elder of the New Hampshire district, and was compelled to make the tour of nearly the whole State on horseback once in three months. So inadequate was the provision for his support that, above his travelling expenses, he received for the year only four dollars and twenty-five cents. He continued on this district only two years, and was then removed to what was called the New London district, which occupied the half of Connecticut, all of Rhode Island, much of Massachusetts, and, in fact, a part of New Hampshire. Here he also continued two years.

These four years of his Presiding Eldership are among the most interesting to us of all the Bishop's life. At their beginning he had just come through that severe course of self-discipline in the meaning and correct use of the English language. But it was during these years that he first developed that peculiarly sound and judicious conservatism which made him so influential among his denomination, and which, in fact, fitted him so eminently for the office and work of a general Superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal church. The occasion which called forth this exhibition of conservative character, and

his part in it are soon told. The Methodists till 1808, held Annual Conferences—as now—at which both their Elders—or men who have been for four years preachers—and the Deacons—or men of two years' preaching—attended and had a right to vote in all the business; and once in four years they held a General Conference, at which only the Elders had a right to attend. It was found that if this General Conference met in New York, all the Elders in the vicinity would attend, and but few of those from the extremities of the work; and this would give the control of all affairs to the central Conference, whichever it might be for a particular session. The distant Conferences, therefore, asked, in 1808, for a representative General Conference, at which each Annual Conference should have a specified number of votes, and no more. This was refused at first; and the Elders from New England were so much dissatisfied, that they—all but Hedding, then a man of twenty-nine—determined to return home without participating further in the deliberations of the Conference. They were older men than himself, but he concluded to remain; he even persuaded them to defer their departure; and finally, by his influence, obtained a reconsideration of the vote, and secured the adoption of the measure by which delegates have ever since been elected, and has added to the efficiency of a large and well-combined organization, to the very practical system of Methodism.

It was during these four years of his Presiding Eldership that he married Miss Lucy Blish, of Cheshire Co., N. H., who was to him in after labors and trials a helpmate indeed. At the close of these four years which completed his first decade in the itineracy, he thus writes:—

“ I have averaged over three thousand miles' travel a year, and preached, on an average, a sermon a day since I commenced the itinerant life. During that period, I have travelled circuits and districts that joined each other, through a tract of country beginning near Troy, N. Y., and going north into Canada, thence east through Vermont and New Hampshire: and thence southerly, through Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, to Long Island Sound. I have never in this time owned a travelling vehicle, but have ridden on horseback, except occasionally in winter, when I borrowed a sleigh, and also a few instances in which I have travelled by public conveyance, or a borrowed carriage. I have both labored hard and fared hard. Until

recently, I have had no dwelling-place or home ; but as a wayfaring man, lodged from night to night where hospitality and friendship opened the way. In most of these regions, the Methodists were comparatively poor. I was often obliged to depend on poor people for food, and lodging, and horse-keeping ; and though, in general, they provided for me cheerfully and willingly, yet I often felt that I was taking what they needed for their children, and that my horse was eating what they needed for their own beasts. I often suffered great trials of mind on this account ; and have travelled many a day in summer and winter without dinner, because I had not a quarter of a dollar that I could spare to buy one. All the pay I received for these ten years was four hundred and fifty dollars, or an average of forty-five dollars a year. One year I received on my circuit, exclusive of travelling expenses, three dollars and twenty-five cents ; this was made up at Conference to twenty-one dollars."

Not a word of complaining, or whimpering, does this man of true metal drop before man or God, but rather accounts it joy that he too is called to suffer for the spread of Christ's cause in the earth. He thinks, as he travels on his lonely circuit, of the inconveniences he is causing to others ; but hardly a thought—certainly not a word—of his own sicknesses and spare diet, and exhausting labors. Such is a hero.

The next thirteen years he spent in a way very similar to the ten already passed. He was now, however, stationed in the cities and large places—particularly in Lynn, Mass., where the Methodists have larger societies in proportion to the population than in any other place in New England. We find Hedding stationed in Lynn four years out of seven during this period, and however much we are disposed to grant to the success of the plan of the itineracy among our Methodist brethren, yet we cannot help attributing something of their success in Lynn, to the fact that they sent Elijah Hedding there so often, and in that instance came so near establishing a settled ministry. We do not wish to advise them, but we really think that they could find facts in their own history, which might teach them that a frequent return of the same men to places where their labors have been specially blest would add greatly to the efficiency of the system. Hedding was also stationed in Boston, Nantucket, New London, Portland, and, as Presiding Elder, on Boston district. In all these various appointments he showed that capability of ready adaptation to persons and to



circumstances, without any of the cringing of a sycophant or indecision of the time-server; that skill to plan and power to influence others; that sound common sense, and cool, discriminating judgment for which he was characterized from the time of his conversion to his death.

During this period of thirteen years, a very exciting and somewhat annoying discussion arose in relation to the mode of appointing the Presiding Elders. Hedding's opinion was well known, and though he was one of the last men to advance any new views he might entertain, and never brought disputed questions of the day before his people or the Conference, yet the fact that he held an opinion gave great weight to it even without his arguing upon it.

It was a question of much practical importance both to the Bishops or Superintendents, with whom rested the responsibility of fixing the appointments of the preachers, or of assigning to them their several fields of labor, and to the preachers themselves, whose spheres of work were to be allotted to them, how the Presiding Elders, who form the advisory council of the Bishops in this work of stationing preachers, should be chosen—whether by the Bishops alone, or by the preachers alone in their Annual Conferences, or by a nomination from one party made to the other, and confirmed by that other. The discussion on this subject raged from 1808 to 1820, when it was resolved by the General Conference to give to the Annual Conferences the privilege of electing each Presiding Elder from three candidates nominated by the Bishop. Hedding had advocated this measure, and had been quite earnest in pressing it to a successful issue. But when one of the Bishops—the most venerated—entered his protest against it, and one of the men elected Bishop refused to act in consequence of it, the General Conference concluded to postpone the time of its going into effect.

Bishop Hedding was among the first to hesitate, and finally to insist on its repeal. For this he has been often and severely censured. We think he only acted in this case exactly in accordance with his usual character. He was not an original thinker, nor a bold experimenter. He wanted a beaten path to travel in, and in that path he would be a leader. But he

hardly dared to explore the region round about for the situation through which to lay a shorter, a safer, or an easier path. Hence while he was among his equals, most of whom thought as he did, he reflected their opinions. When he came in contact with the authorities of the church, or rather with those who had large experience, and who were acquainted with old usages, he hesitated, and, fearing the results of change, while he knew the good tendencies of the then existing state of things, he at length resolved to risk no change whatever. In this he was consistent not only with himself, but he merely showed that he only followed the general course of energetic and prudent young men.

When men are young and imaginative, bold and ardent, they love freedom, and hate every semblance of wrong; and not seeing how intimately connected are a hundred excellent things with a single seeming wrong, they demand that an attempt to demolish the wrong, or at least to cure or to correct it shall be instituted at once. As they grow older and enjoy comparative comfort, and even make improvement under what they had denounced as a huge wrong, and, furthermore, survey the difficulties of reformation, and the consequent disturbance of that which all men love, they are apt to be the most stern and resolute of conservatives. This was Hedding's character, and at the time of which we write—1820—it first developed itself. We do not blame him. We cannot commend him. Scarcely can we excuse him. But we can to ourselves at least fully explain the cause of his course.

Up to 1820 he had been nineteen years exposed to hardships and sufferings far beyond the ordinary lot of public and self-sacrificing men. Solitary he began his wanderings, and toiled among the cabins of backwoodsmen, eating his bread from house to house. Tormented by almost unendurable pains of sickness, he had been a receiver of care and nursing from the hand of charity. He had labored and watched to rid himself of faults produced by early negligence; and at last had emerged into a far better position, as to comfort, influence, usefulness, popularity. Is it to be wondered that he—claiming for himself, as he did, nothing more than a very ordinary

amount of genius or even energy—should begin now to reckon that system by which he had risen, and in the administration of which he had met with so much success in the conversion of men, to be not only the best system, but to be so perfect that it needed no changes, and, in fact, admitted no improvement? And the effect of early toils and subsequent comfort on the minds and hearts of enthusiastic young men, is by no means rare among our Methodist friends. They seem to us to be especially blest—or encumbered—we know not which word is more complimentary—with such ardent, energetic young men who become inveterate conservatives in middle and old age. They afford to their ardent young aspirants for the glory of reformers work enough to tire them thoroughly, and provide a sufficient number of sufficiently long removals to counteract much of the dreaded harm that discussion is thought to produce; and at last they give them in age—if they have not died with extra labors—just enough of honor and consideration to make them desire the continuance of the present order of things quite as ardently as they formerly desired its change. This keeps up a continual discussion in their church—an angry one often—but one never resulting in any change—unless to strengthen what has before been established.

In 1824 Elijah Hedding was elected Bishop. He had been in the itineracy twenty-three years, and was in the prime of manhood. Beloved and confided in by his brethren, respected and honored by his opponents, he was well fitted for the office, and entered upon his duties with that peculiar modesty and unpretending energy for which he was always distinguished. Now began those long and exhausting journeys from Maine to Louisiana, from New York to Missouri, in which he strove to perform the expressed will of the church. Bishop Hedding was especially fitted for this great office in good part, because he had now no will of his own. He asked what was prescribed by the authority above him, not so much what was right according to his notions. We cannot trace him in his travels among the snows of Canada to visit the converted Indians, nor among the primitive forests of the West, to preach to the destitute settlers, nor among the heats of the South, to meet An-

nual Conferences, and sustain the institutions of the gospel. At one time he pauses among the woods of Ohio to look up the grave of a brother hero in the ministry, with whom he had ridden circuit in his youth; and having found the spot he kneels upon it, and makes the forests vocal with the voice of prayer, such as he and his friend in youthful days had poured out among the snows and woods of Canada.

For almost thirty years he followed this way of life—traveling from three to ten thousand miles a year—presiding over from two to ten Annual Conferences of one or two weeks each, making the appointments and arranging fields of labor for from three to twenty-five hundred preachers—and preaching from one to four hundred sermons. Such was his prescribed work. But much more came upon him. Care, anxiety, correspondence, superintendence of missions, and the general promotion of peace and harmony among the various and discordant interests of a widely separated connexion. But with his duties came sickness—fever—rheumatism—ague—nervous prostration. And yet such a herculean power of endurance had he, and such a will within him to propel and overrule, that he hardly ever lost an appointment, and rarely asked the aid of a colleague to perform what devolved on him.

These last years of his life were made still more abundant in pain and suffering to his heart, in consequence of a bitter controversy on the subject of slavery. We think that Bishop Hedding did not display the full amount of his natural shrewdness, when he allowed himself to be drawn into this controversy. And in strict justice to him, it ought to be said that he could not really be said to be a controversialist. Yet he did for a time seem to be such. He was drawn into odium in this way. One or two Presiding Elders in New England had been active lecturers and disseminators of anti-slavery opinions. The General Conference of 1836 had advised all the preachers to abstain from such doings. And Bishop Hedding felt obliged to remove them from their offices. In doing so, he allowed himself to be drawn into a personal controversy with one of these men. This, we think, was unnecessary and unwise. But further than this, he undertook to defend the course of the General

Conference, which was, in our opinion, entirely indefensible except on the ground of demanding fidelity in a minister to his ordination vows. The General Conference advised its ministers to refrain from discussing the general and particular bearings of slavery, because such a discussion was harmful to the peace of the church; while it might have asked and insisted that its ministers should devote themselves to the particular work of the ministry in preaching and pastoral labor. And so Bishop Hedding would have been justified in changing a preacher's field of labor, or in appointing him—as in case of the Presiding Elders referred to—to a less responsible post because he was not giving himself wholly to the ministry; but was, in fact, neglecting to devote his talents, as he had pledged to do when he joined his Annual Conference, to the special work of converting souls.

But when it was alleged that discussions of slavery threatened the peace and unity of the church, and must therefore be stopped, many men at once cried out against the injunction. There can scarcely be a doubt but that Bishop Hedding, in theory, and in the reflections which preceded his decisive action, took the view of his duty which we have named above. Yet in the angry disputes which arose concerning this point, he allowed himself to be committed against the discussion of the great iniquity of slavery, equally as decidedly as against a minister neglecting the work assigned to him under his solemn promise to devote himself wholly to the work of preaching. To demand that a man shall perform his promise is one thing; and to demand that in the performance of that promise he shall refrain from touching a topic, necessarily involved in the full discharge of the duty undertaken by that promise, is quite another thing. That the Bishop was honest in what he did and said, we do not doubt. And that he was considerably in the wrong, so far as his sentiments of abhorrence of slavery were concerned, we have as little doubt.

He had, through almost forty years, been in the constant habit of looking upon the Methodist Episcopal church as the great agency of converting the world. He had reckoned her usages to be correct, and he had—as we noticed above—be-

come eminently conservative. While, therefore, he feared any changes, he could see nothing wrong or imperfect in her usages of admitting slaveholders to her communion, and, in remaining completely silent as to their conduct. But above all, he was an executive officer of the church, and as such he deemed it his duty to have no will of his own, and to execute implicitly whatever he was commanded to perform. When, therefore, the General Conference said, "Stop the agitation of this exciting subject," what could he do but resign his office, or undertake to stop it? At the General Conference in 1832—the one previous to that which attempted to stop agitation—he had proposed to resign, on account of the anxieties and cares connected with his work, but his brethren would not allow it. So he had but a single course open, and in that he walked fearlessly, with a little too much of whining and complaining about misconstruction of motive, and estrangement of affection, but still boldly and resolutely, turning neither to the right nor to the left till his work was done. We really admire his courage, although we are confident he was wrong, and accord to him a hearty acknowledgment of the honesty of his opinions, the unselfishness of his motives, and the straight-forwardness of his actions.

A few years later he took the view of his duty we have intimated above, and carefully avoided confounding the discussion of the subject of slavery, with neglecting the work of an evangelist; and the result was, that the hearts of those brethren of whom he had complained on account of their estrangement, returned to him, and he and they had great satisfaction once more in mutual esteem and confidence.

The last years of Bishop Hedding's life were singularly peaceful and honored. Indeed, he suffered from great bodily pain, but the force of this was broken by the promise of God. He had an amount of honor and affection from all who knew him that few men can have. His colleagues had, through a special vote of the General Conference, excused him from much of the labor of travelling. They now looked to him as the wisest and safest expounder of the Constitution and law of the church, but from other toils they strove to release him

almost completely. . With a competence to support him and his amiable wife, and something for charities in which he delighted, and, surrounded by friends who vied with each other in doing him all needed acts of friendship, he dwelt at last beyond the reach of slander, malice, or even disquiet. And at last, after many labors, sufferings, and duties, well endured and performed, he went to his everlasting home on the 9th of April, 1852, aged 71 years, 10 months, and 2 days, more than 50 of which had been spent as a travelling minister, in the legitimate work of an evangelist.

He was humble, modest, firm, conscientious, energetic and diligent, loving, childlike, unaffected, sincere, generous and heavenly-minded. Many mourn his loss, and admire his virtues. May there be multitudes to imitate his zeal, his self-sacrifice, and his sweet and noble piety! Such a man, so eloquent in the true art of persuasion, with only his own solitary cultivation; so wise by self-application and unaided reflection; so learned in all practical knowledge without assistance from the schools; so skilled in all duties, without ever having given a moment to study simply as such; so dignified and gentlemanly without having been trained in circles of refinement; and so noble without affectation or haughtiness, is a credit to the race, and should make us feel how easy it is in any circumstances to make a man, whenever the human will can submit to the law of Christ.

It is now time to attend to Dr. Clark. His book is entitled, "The Life and Times of Bishop Hedding," and is certainly very readable. To a Methodist it ought to be a very popular household book, as indeed it is to every lover of hearty piety, and practical labor. It is a good specimen of Methodist biographical literature, full of brag and boasting, and disfigured by many an ungenerous fling of scorn and ill-will towards the ministers who have withdrawn from their communion, or who have felt compelled to locate from the itinerancy. In reference to these classes of men—some of whom are certainly as honest and sometimes make far greater sacrifices to withdraw from the church of their early choice than they would have made to remain, the Dr. is particularly severe. He sets up monuments

all along the road, to warn every reader of their errors, and to admonish us to beware how we—or rather Methodist preachers—allow the suspicion to creep into the mind, that Methodism is not entirely perfect, or that a man's duty may lie in a direction different from what he thought when he may have entered the ministry. "Remember Lot's wife," must have been a favorite topic of reflection to the good author when he was composing his book.

Aside from these two faults, braggadocio and censoriousness, twin errors, surely, the book is quite admirable. It was evidently undertaken more from sincere love and admiration of the aged Bishop and the church, than from the command of the "Book Concern." And we may as well confess at once as not, that we really like the book, braggadocio, censoriousness, and all. It is so thoroughly Methodistic and hearty, so full of real life and progress, it so completely lets us into the Methodist family, and unfolds their secrets and their weaknesses as well as their strong points; and although we can conceive a modest Methodist—the epithet is not an impossible one—as being compelled to blush a trifle if he were requested to read it aloud to a promiscuous company of all denominations, yet he might, after all, be very justly proud of the book, its subject, and the church for which it is principally written.

We therefore take our leave of it, feeling that we are better from having read it, and knowing that the world is better for having such a church in it. We introduce a quotation to show the progress made in the growth of our sister church during the life of Bishop Hedding:—

"The life and labors of Bishop Hedding extended through an important epoch in the history of Methodism in this country. When he first entered the ministry, the work, then extending over the whole United States and Canada, comprised but eight annual conferences, three hundred and seven preachers, and 72,874 members. Now we have on the same territory 54 conferences, 6,266 travelling preachers, 9,853 local preachers, and 1,255,418 members. A man who had participated in labors and witnessed results like these, might well feel that he had not lived in vain."



## ART. VII.—NORTH CAROLINA FREEWILL BAPTISTS.

The churches in the State of North Carolina, which had previously been called Anabaptists, Baptists, and General Baptists, adopted the name of Freewill Baptists in 1828. As the denomination there still retains this name, it will often be used instead of that of General Baptist in this and future articles respecting these churches.

In the last number of the Quarterly, it was stated that some of the families of the Burley church removed from Virginia to North Carolina, where, in ten years, they increased to sixteen churches, all of which were of General Baptist sentiments. This statement rests on the authority of Morgan Edwards, as given by Rev. Mr. Benedict. Eld. Knight concurs with it in one place, while in another he says the number of churches was eighteen, which is no doubt an error. It may be remarked here, that Elder Knight dates the settlement of the Burley church in 1715, and that of the church in Surry county in 1725. These facts were overlooked in what was said respecting those churches in the last number of the Quarterly. It was also stated in that article that Robert Nordin and Thomas White were ordained in 1774, whereas their ordination occurred in 1714.

In following this small body of Baptists in their retreat from the North, whence misfortune and ruin drove them, most of the little that can be learned of their early history must be gleaned from the writings of those who regarded them much as the Jews did the Samaritans. Such is the weakness of human nature and the strength of sectarian feeling, that, in speaking of those whose religious views they regard as erroneous, the prejudice of writers may easily induce them to magnify the defects and depreciate the good qualities of those who honestly differ from them. And this seems to have been the case with those who have given some account of the early state of the Freewill Baptist churches in North Carolina. These churches were very prosperous for a while after their organization, and gave indications of becoming a strong and permanent

denomination. But their joy was soon darkened, and their prosperity was of short duration, for in some less than thirty years after the first of their number was constituted, most of them became divided, and the more active and energetic of their members had gone over to Calvinism!

Some of them united with the Kehukee Baptist Association, and the history of that body contains most of the information that can be obtained respecting this little company of churches. No church record extending beyond 1793 can be found among the early General Baptist churches in North Carolina; and the records of only two of them, viz.: Luzen Swamp and Grimsley, reach back to that date. It is much to be regretted that but very little can be learned of this body from its commencement in North Carolina down to the beginning of the present century, which embraces a period of not less than sixty or seventy years. During this almost obliterated period, as far as the history of these Baptists is concerned, they enjoyed for a time a great degree of prosperity, of which but very little can now be known. They also passed through the most trying and adverse scenes that have ever befallen the connexion. Considerable more is known of their adversity than of their prosperity, and some account of the former will be given in a future article, while what little is known of the latter will be embraced in the history of the following churches:

#### PERQUIMANS CHURCH.

Though there were some individual Baptists in North Carolina as early as 1695, it is said that the first church organized in the State was gathered by Eld. Paul Palmer, about the year 1727. It was located towards the north-east part of the State, on the Chowan river, at a place called Perquimans, from which, no doubt, its name was derived.

The above is Mr. Edwards' account of the location of this church; but in 1845, Dr. Wheeler of Murfreesboro' wrote Mr. Benedict that he thought the account is incorrect, as the seat of the church at that date was on the Pasquotank river, in Camden county. This is at a considerable distance from Perquimans, on Chowan river. The early Baptist ministers in

this region occupied a large extent of territory, and established branches of their growing communities in different places. Sometimes one and then another of these branches gave name to all the rest, which is the way Mr. Benedict accounts for the apparent discrepancy in relation to the location of this church, and several others.

It is recorded that Eld. Palmer was born in Maryland, and was baptized in Delaware at Welch Tract, by Eld. Owen Thomas, pastor of the church in that place, and that he was ordained in Connecticut. He spent considerable time in New Jersey, then in Maryland, and finally moved into North Carolina, and gathered the Perquimans church as has been stated. Though some difficulties occurred which are not specified, he remained with this church until his death, the date of which is not given. Benedict says he appears to have done some good, but unhappily did not leave a good character behind him. Rev. John Comer, of Newport, R. I., corresponded with him several years, and spoke of him in his manuscript journal in respectful terms.

Soon after Eld. Palmer moved into North Carolina, Joseph Parker, who, it is supposed, was one of his disciples, began to preach in the same region. The former died before the defection of the churches; but the latter retained his original principles after that event, and never changed his religious views.

In 1848, this church bore the name of Shiloh, which is a name given to many Southern churches. It also then belonged to the Chowan Association; but no means are at hand by which it can be stated when this connexion was formed, nor is it known when the church changed its Arminian doctrines for Calvinism.

#### KEHUKKE CHURCH.

Benedict says that about the year 1742, one William Sojourner, who had the reputation of being a most excellent man, and very useful minister, immigrated, with many of his brethren, from Berkley, in Virginia, and settled on Kehukkee creek, in Halifax county, about one hundred and twenty miles north-west of Newbern. The same year he organized a church in that

place, and Burkitt and Read say that it was constituted out of persons who had previously "been received and baptized on the Free-will plan." Nothing more is known of this church till the year 1755, when it changed its sentiments and united with the Calvinistic Baptists. The church became large and prosperous. Several other churches grew out of it, and its name was given to the Kehukee Association.

### 3 TOSNIOT CHURCH.

This church is situated in Egecombe county. Benedict says it is one of the oldest Baptist churches in the country, and was gathered by the General Baptists in the early part of their settlement in North Carolina. The time of its organization is not known; but in 1758 it adopted the Calvinistic creed, and united with the regular Baptist denomination. At the time of its defection, it contained three excellent preachers, viz.: John Thomas, and his sons Jonathan and John. Jonathan was a man of considerable eminence. The church now belongs to the Neuse Association.

### 4 CHURCH IN CAMBEN COUNTY.

According to Asplund's Register, this ancient and respectable church was constituted in 1757. Burkitt and Read think it was organized on "the Free-will plan," and there seems to be no reason to doubt the correctness of this opinion. Though it early went over to Calvinism, it is not known when it changed its doctrinal views and denominational relation.

### 5 MEHERRIN CHURCH.

This church was organized in Hertford county, and was at its constitution of General Baptist sentiments; but no account of the time of its organization can be found. Elders Joseph Parker, Wm. Parker, and Eld. Winfield, who were strongly opposed to Calvinism, often preached to this church as did other ministers of Arminian views. Eld. Wm. Parker resided in the neighborhood of this church with which he united on his baptism, and soon commenced preaching. In 1773, he was its pastor. It is not known when this relation commenced, nor

how long he continued in that office. He baptized many persons, but it is stated by Calvinistic writers that this was owing, to a considerable extent, to his baptizing all who wished him to administer the ordinance to them, without requiring the relation of a Christian experience. The erection of a Calvinistic Baptist meeting house in its vicinity, and the organization there of a church of that faith, soon much reduced the numbers of the Meherrin church. After Eld. Parker's death, the remaining members applied to Eld. Burkitt to supply them. Through his influence the declining church came "under re-examination," and the result was the formation of a small Calvinistic church, which joined the Kehukee Association in 1794.

#### 6 REEDY CREEK CHURCH.

This organization is situated in Warren county. Dr. Josiah Hart is said to have been the first Baptist minister who preached in that place. He commenced his ministerial labors there, "about the year 1750." His efforts resulted in the conversion of sinners, who received the ordinance of baptism at his hands. It is not stated where he was from. Wm. Washington, James Smart, Samuel Davis, Wm. Walker, and others, all of them of the Arminian faith, soon joined in the work of preaching, and large numbers came and were baptized. Burkitt and Read say that those thus baptized had no church constitution. It is probable, however, that they regarded themselves as a church, for they selected Wm. Walker as their pastor.

In the fall of 1755, a committee from the Philadelphia Association visited the Freewill Baptist churches in North Carolina, and succeeded in converting most of them to Calvinism. That committee visited this church, but found "only about ten" of its members who were regarded as sound in the faith and true Christians. These were organized into a Calvinistic church, which united with the Kehukee Association. At that period, what Benedict calls the strong views of hyper-Calvinism, were regarded by the members of the Philadelphia Association, and by the North Carolina Freewill Baptists who adopted their

sentiments, as "the doctrines of Free Grace"—*the faith once delivered to the saints*. Of course none but those holding these views could be admitted into fellowship in their churches. This, no doubt, was one important reason why such numbers of the members of the Free-will churches were not allowed a place in the Calvinistic fold, for it is uncharitable and unreasonable to suppose that none who could not adopt the strong views of hyper-Calvinism, were either deceived or hypocrites. And it is equally absurd to suppose that all who were converted to such views were true followers of Christ. It may well be believed that some of the many members of the Reedy Creek church, who were not allowed a place in the new church on the alleged ground of false doctrine and non-conversion would have been admitted with their ten brethren, had they been regarded as equally sound as these were in the important doctrines of personal and unconditional election and reprobation, limited atonement, &c.

No account can be found of what became of the large number of the members of the church at Reedy Creek and other churches who were regarded by their Calvinistic examiners as not born again; but probably they lingered a season in a suffering and scattered state, and then became extinct.

The account of the six churches described above contains most that is known of the sixteen churches in North Carolina that were organized there on Arminian principles. These six churches, as has been shown, became highly Calvinistic, or rather portions of their members did so, while, it seems, considerable majorities of their communicants were refused admission to the new sect, and no doubt many of them were so strongly opposed to its doctrines and measures, that they had no wish to join it. The work of division and secession went on among these churches, till all except two or three of them had embraced the principles of the innovation. It seems strange that the history of only six of them has been written. In consequence of this omission, nothing is now known of the remaining ten. Even their origin, names, and locations are unknown, nor can it be ascertained whether they joined the Calvinistic Baptists, and became extinct afterwards, or are still in existence. It is said that after

their defection, some of the churches united with the Charleston, S. C. Association; but the history of that body as given by Benedict does not name any of its members as being churches of this class. His history states distinctly that the Kehukee N. C. Association arose out of what he calls reformed Freewill Baptist churches. Considerable prominence is given to them in his account of the North Carolina Baptists, while he states only incidentally that some of those reformed churches united with the Charleston Association after their renovation. This statement occurs in his history of the Kehukee Association. In his history of the Charleston Association, he says that the few churches from North Carolina withdrew from that body previous to 1773. This is definite enough respecting their leaving the Charleston Association, but it leaves their origin, names, and subsequent history enveloped in total darkness. Did those "few churches" unite with some other Association, either in South Carolina or North Carolina? If so, where are they, and what are their names? Did they, on withdrawing, unite with some other denomination? Did they stand apart from all denominations? Are they still in existence? It is a matter of regret that no answer can be given to these questions; also that the origin and subsequent history of more than half of the sixteen original Freewill Baptist churches in North Carolina must remain almost a blank, scarcely any historical account now remaining of them besides their conversion to Calvinism, and their union with Baptists of that faith. Perhaps some of them united with the Calvinistic or New Light Baptists as they were then called, but the history of their renovation has not been preserved. A religious interest commenced, by whom or what means it is not said, in the valley of Flat Swamp and the Connetoe settlements, in Pitt county, "about the year 1766," and some ten years afterwards, a New Light church, called Flat Swamp, was organized there. Sometime subsequently, say the New Light historians, the love of some of the members waxed cold, and the seeds of discord were sown in the church, "which caused the *Arminians* and *Universalists* to look out of their dens, where they had been driven by the refulgent beams of gospel truths." It is added

that Arminianism prevailed but little among them, as it was an old doctrine they were well acquainted with before their conversion. From this statement it is manifest that there were Freewillers in the place, who, according to the figurative language of their enemies were driven into seclusion by the glorious light of Calvinistic decrees, election, reprobation, &c. But it is not intimated whether or not there had previously been a Freewill church there, and the fugitives from the New Light effulgence named above, were members of that church who could not be admitted into the new organization, or else utterly refused to join it. Such may have been the case. So also it may be that they were only individuals belonging to a Freewill church in some other place, or were members of no church.

---

#### ART. VIII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

**HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF FERDINAND AND ISABELLA, the Catholic.** By Wm. H. Prescott. In three volumes, 8vo. Eleventh edition. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856.

**HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF MEXICO; With a preliminary view of the Ancient Mexican Civilization, and the Life of the Conqueror, Hernando Cortez.** By Wm. H. Prescott. In three volumes, 8 vo. Twenty-third edition. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855.

**HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF PERU; With a preliminary view of the Civilization of the Incas.** By Wm. H. Prescott. In two vols, 8 vo. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855.

The issue of these new and magnificent editions of Prescott's Histories affords a favorable opportunity for saying a word respecting them through the medium of the Quarterly. The seal of public approbation was put on them at once on their appearance in the world of letters, and they can hardly fail to be regarded as standard works for a long time to come. It seems now as though no judicious author would think of venturing into these fields of research after learning the extent of Mr. Prescott's efforts, and becoming familiar with their results. No one would fail to perceive the thoroughness and impartialities, and skill with which the work has been prosecuted by the historian; and when we are modestly told of the obstacles which were necessary to be overcome, the volumes stand before us as most impressive monuments of labor and perseverance.

Ferdinand and Isabella opens with a rapid and vivid sketch of Spanish



history, from its barbaric period up to the point where an effort was made to unite the separate and independent sovereignties, which had a feeble life on contiguous territory, into one great empire. This was effected in the marriage of Ferdinand with Isabella, by which means the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon yielded up their separate life and became a powerful unity. Such a result was not effected without conflict and difficulty. As was usual on the accession of new sovereigns, disputes and wars arose respecting the validity of the succession. There were hostile elements which would not readily coalesce. The Catholic rule, now inaugurated, was stern and bigoted, and the large numbers of Mohammedans and Jews dwelling in the country, sternly resisted the Romish edicts of the government. The inquisition was introduced, and the famous Torquenoda, who had become confessor to the Queen, used it with its full rigor. The civil wars were long and bloody, but the government triumphed, while the Moorish dominion became extinct, and the Jews marched sadly abroad before the edict of expulsion. Meantime navigation was becoming more and more a science, and Spain was not wanting in efforts at discovery. Columbus had arisen, and was walking from court to court evolving his great conception of a new continent lying far away to the West, and Isabella was sagacious and generous enough to make the first offer of patronage to the bold adventurer. The successive development of these features in Mr. Prescott's masterly manner, constitutes the first part of his history.

The second part exhibits the subsequent period of their reign, which illustrates more particularly the foreign policy of the now consolidated and vigorous empire. Wars arose with Italy, and the relations with France were often anything but harmonious and pleasant. The ecclesiastical policy adopted in Grenada had been somewhat lenient, but Cardinal Ximenes arose, waxed influential, and became the master-spirit in the sphere of religion, carrying the spirit and often the forms of the Inquisition abroad into the colonies of the empire, furnishing not a little material for the history of papal persecution. New expeditions for discovery and conquest were fitted out under Columbus, as well as under other navigators, some of which were successful, while others brought back little save disaster. Then follows the death of Isabella, of Ferdinand, of Ximenes, with portraiture of the character of each, and the whole work closes with a general survey of the reign of the sovereigns, and of the state of the empire. Few periods of history present a more varied series of pictures, or require a greater skill on the part of the historian in order to their clear and systematic development. Mr. P. finds a field worthy of his high and peculiar powers, and it is difficult to imagine how his work could have been more admirably done.

The Conquest of Mexico was undertaken by the Spaniards a few years subsequent to the death of these distinguished sovereigns: and therefore serves to exhibit both the spirit and policy of the new empire. As to the story of the conquest itself, it has all the charm of the most splendid of Scott's romances. The view given of the country is most vivid and striking, the portraits of distinguished actors are eminently life-like, and the gradual tending of the plot on toward its *denouement*, until the city falls before the fury and skill of the invaders, forbids the reader's interest to flag even for an hour.

The Conquest of Peru was undertaken at nearly the same time—only a very few years afterward, and becomes, therefore, another episode in Spanish history; not less instructive, however, than a continuous account of the home life of the empire. There is less unity in this story than in the last, simply because the action is less regular and simple; but the same high qualities are in constant exercise, and the valuable information communicated is scarcely less. After the Incas are subdued, the quarrels of the conquerors among themselves are traced out step by step, until the imperial sceptre of Spain subdues the whole land to quietness, and the people to colonial vassalage.

The History of Philip II., noticed in our last issue, is a resumption of the thread of Spanish history nearly where these volumes leave it, and will serve to show us the steps by which the Spanish empire went down from its height of glory to its station of political inferiority. Two vols. only of this last work are as yet issued.

These histories are a triumph of American genius, learning, and labor, at which we may point with an honest pride. Their intrinsic worth is not at all to be estimated by the value or interest attaching to the naked facts thus brought to light. They teach great lessons of social and political philosophy; they illustrate and enforce the great principles which enter every where into life, and bind one's sympathies more strongly to the welfare of his race. They dignify the whole subject of history, and will give an impulse to our literary spirit as needful as it is strong. Whoever it be that is making a collection of books, may most appropriately put these ten volumes of Prescott into a prominent position on the central shelf. The volumes present a beautiful picture to the eye; and illustrate the high degree of perfection which has been attained in the art of book-making. The author has found in Messrs. Phillips & Sampson some most enterprising, appreciative and generous publishers. These new editions are far superior to any which have been heretofore issued.

**THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James II.** By Thomas Babington Macaulay. Vols. III. and IV. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856.

Two more of Macaulay's volumes are here before us, numbering some 600 pp. each, and sold at the astonishingly low price of 40 cts. per vol.

Of the work there is little to be said. History, in Macaulay's hands, becomes like an eastern palace, called into magnificence by the magic flash of Aladdin's lamp. These chapters are a series of essays, whose erudition and brilliance nothing in the pages of the *Edinburg Review* ever surpassed. He moves among the events of the past a literary monarch, whose coronet and sceptre are significant of the native might of the possessor. His march is almost terrible in its stateliness; and every man, and institution, and dynasty may well tremble when he rises from the seat of literary judgment to pronounce the verdict. Independent, fearless, penetrating, a hater of all pretence, paying no deference to merely great names and venerated titles, catholic in his sympathies, and yet having no reverence for the amiable weaknesses of character, he cuts and slashes on either side without regard to the lenity

with which his predecessors have passed by sinners of distinction. He will find readers in every circle ; and they who complain of him most bitterly, will be held captive by his magic skill, and be awed into silence by the array of his learning and his proofs. As a reliable historian, no one, perhaps, would like always to confide in Macaulay. He shows us almost every object in an attitude similar to what would be occupied by a statue standing among the cross-lights from the stained windows of a Cathedral. He intensifies almost every character, and sets us to look at events through a kaleidoscope. And yet every one will refer to him in the settlement of any historical question of which he has treated. These volumes are just as necessary to every library as Uncle Tom's Cabin. He who does not read them will lose a most rare literary luxury, which the publishers have made accessible to all classes of readers. Only eight or ten years of English history are crowded into these 1200 pages. At this rate of progress, Macaulay will need the antediluvian longevity to carry out his expressed purpose of bringing English history down to the present time. It will not materially effect the estimate to be put upon him or his work, whether he completes his proposed task or not.

**THE HEATHEN RELIGION, in its Popular and Symbolic Development.** By Rev. Joseph B. Grass. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., &c. 1856.

This treatise indicates considerable study of the ancient mythology, and exhibits the philosophical tendencies and catholic spirit of the author. It is ingenious in many of its theories and expositions, and will invest the systems of religion of which it treats with new meaning to many minds. To all who have a fondness for the study of the religious sentiment in its progressive development without the aid of special revelation, we commend this volume, as offering them many valuable suggestions. Its style seems to us somewhat faulty. It is too scholastic, and considerably wanting in flexibility and vigor.

**SABBATH EVENING READINGS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.** St. John. By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D. F. R. S. E., &c. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., etc. 1856.

Of the general characteristics of Dr. C.'s style we have heretofore spoken freely. It is re-produced here, as in all his productions. We are better pleased with this than with any previous volume of his "Readings." He catches the peculiar spirit of this evangelist with great readiness, and puts his reader in contact with it in a high degree. He is happy in seizing upon the salient points of the text, and in bringing out the significance of the various incidents given by the writer. It is well adapted to its purpose, and will be likely to invest the reading of the gospel with more interest. The religious tone is admirable—full of fervor, and free from cant.

**THE COMMUNION SABBATH.** By Nehemiah Adams, D. D. Same Publishers.

We wish Dr. A. would confine himself to the writing of such works as this, where evidently his head and heart are at home. It is a series of brief discourses that is here presented to us, taking up, one after another, the inci-

dents connected with the death of Christ in significance and time. There is a most appropriate simplicity in the manner of treating these subduing themes, and the influence received by the heart is a most grateful one. Few Christians could read it without profit.

THE ISLAND OF CUBA. By Alexander Humboldt. Translated from the Spanish, with Notes and a Preliminary Essay. By J. S. Thrasher. New York: Derby & Jackson. 1856.

Who is J. S. Thrasher? He would seem by the dedication of his volume to be a "member of the American press;" but the name is a new one to us. The translator's essay covers nearly a hundred pages, and is rather a peculiar production. While professing to accept the accounts of Humboldt as reliable, and his work on Cuba as far better than any other extant, he still seems to us to be seeking by an adroit method to prejudice his reader against many of the legitimate inferences of the volume, and to tell him beforehand how to interpret the statistics which are yet to appear. It is a covert plea in defence of the fillibustering for the conquest and annexation of Cuba to the United States, which has turned out so sadly, and a miserable attempt to show that the abolition of slavery in Cuba would doom the whole West Indies to destruction, and provoke the virtuous American spirit of the Southern States to an uncontrollable and fearful activity. He adds, "The result would be the utter annihilation of the black race in Cuba, which might lead to a war against them in all the larger Antilles. Who can contemplate such a result without shuddering? What philanthropy can advocate a policy which must attain such terrible results!" It needs no words of ours to exhibit the standpoint of the author, and it is not necessary to quote his repeated sneers at what he calls "the baseless social theories of Europe"—meaning thereby, the theory that freedom is the right and the interest of the whole human race. His statistics often show in their arrangement the point they are meant to sustain, and his logic is the index to the warp of his sympathies. The treatise of Humboldt is very valuable; and one cannot see any grounds for the opinion that he would feel particularly honored by having Mr. Thrasher introduce him to the American public as he has done.

A JOURNEY IN THE SEABOARD SLAVE STATES, with remarks on their economy. By Frederic Law Olmstead, Author of "Walks and Talks of an American Farmer in England." New York: Dix & Edwards, etc. 1856.

Against the statistics and reasonings of the essay mentioned above, we would be satisfied to put this thick 12mo of 723 pages, without a word of comment—as an antidote to the bone. The author made two tours at the South at different periods, taking in his course Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana. He is obviously no fanatic, no mere theorizer, but a solid man of large common sense, who looks at every thing in a very practical way. He has no case to make out, no pre-formed theory to illustrate and defend. He goes to see and learn facts for his own profit chiefly, and communicates them with scarcely a comment to his readers. He sees slavery in almost every phase, and Southern life in all its degrees of grandeur and degradation. But these facts tell most powerfully against the

slave system. No one can read it without feeling sad over the wasted energies which are seen every where as an attendant on the system. Looked at from the simple point of economy, the slavery of the South appears an unpardonable blunder. The book is valuable as a Thesaurus for frequent reference.

**EDITH HALE: A Village Story.** By Horace Tolman. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856.

**WOLFSDEN:** An authentic account of things there and thereunto pertaining, as they are and have been. By J. B. Same Publishers.

The first of these is a charming story; chaste, fresh, sparkling and healthy—a model in its plot, its portraits and its *dénouement*, as well as in its episodes and its moral tone.

Wolfsden is of a peculiar character, and the different portions of very unequal merit. It shows ability of a high order; but its style is sometimes artificial, sometimes heavy, sometimes transcendental, and sometimes pedantic. The plan lacks unity, and the impression it leaves is indistinct. The author may hope for improvement.

**THE BIBLE HISTORY OF PRAYER,** with Practical Reflections. By Charles A. Goodrich. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1856.

The title suggests the character of this volume. The work is skilfully and happily executed; and the reflections fitting, suggestive, and practical. It is a good companion for the closet.

**SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE.** Three Prize Essays. The Great Reform. By Abel Stevens. The Great Question. By Lorenzo White. Property Consecrated. By Benjamin St. James Frye. New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1856.

This volume is the result of a prize offered for the best essay or essays on the subject here discussed. Thirty-three essays were presented; from them these were selected. They possess individuality and merit. The first is a plain, direct, and effective presentation of the facts, the law, and the duty. The second is a mere philosophical discussion, able, but somewhat weakened by its verbiage, and the rhetorical ambition evinced by its style. The third is mostly a scriptural discussion, where the divine example and authority and love are made to furnish nearly all the terms in the argument. It is a valuable treatise.

**DANIEL, VERIFIED IN HISTORY AND CHRONOLOGY.** Showing the complete fulfilment of all his prophecies relating to civil affairs, before the close of the fifth century. By A. M. Osborn, D. D., etc. Same Publishers.\*

Among the many attempts to expound this much belabored book of prophecy, this little volume richly merits attention. Its views are clearly stated, and defended with fairness, learning and ability. Even where his readers differ from him, they must accord him the merit of courtesy and consistency.

**SELECTION FROM THE BRITISH POETS.** By Eliza Woodworth. With twelve Illustrations. Same publishers as above.

This is as well, perhaps, as any one could do in an attempt to tell us some-

thing of fifty poetical authors, (beginning with Chaucer and ending with E. B. Browning,) and give us an idea of their poetry by means of selections. It would be impossible to give very full satisfaction in such a work; as each person will have his favorite authors, and his favorite passages; and the diversities of taste would produce a difference of opinion as to the skill exhibited in the selections. It is a good introduction to English poetry; and perhaps adequate to give a tolerable idea of the leading qualities of the various poetic authors, to those who lack the time and means to go up to the fountains of song, and follow the stream onward in all its flowings.

**HUMOROUS POEMS OF THOMAS HOOD**, including Love and Lunacy, Ballads, Tales and Legends, Odes and Addresses to great people, and Miscellaneous Poems, now first collected. Edited by Epes Sargent. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856.

To those who are familiar with the poetic humor of Hood, this title will tell them sufficient to prompt them to get the volume forthwith; if any of our readers have not the pleasure of an acquaintance, we commend this and the volume issued a year since to their attention; and shall be sure of getting the thanks of every one who is hence induced to purchase.

**THE ELEMENTS OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY**; Copiously illustrated with familiar experiments, and containing descriptions of instruments, with directions for using. Designed for the use of Schools and Academies. By A. W. Sprague, A. M. With two hundred and eighty engravings. Same Publishers. 1856.

The *specific* aim of this book is to teach the student how to illustrate and verify by experiment the principles evolved in the treatise; and the attempt promises a rich success.

**INSIDE VIEW OF SLAVERY: Or a Tour among the Planters.** By C. G. Parsons, M. D., &c. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., &c. 1855.

**A NORTH SIDE VIEW OF SLAVERY, THE REFUGEE: or the Narratives of Fugitive Slaves in Canada.** Related by themselves, with an account of the history and condition of the colored population of Upper Canada. By Benjamin Drew. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1856.

Dr. Adams' "South Side View" suggests both these titles doubtless. They are very well chosen, both for their appropriateness and significance.

The work of Dr. Parsons is mostly a record of what he saw and heard during a tour of two years in the South—principally in the State of Georgia, where he supposes the system of slavery is to be found in its medium phases—being severer than in the States bordering on the line of Mason & Dixon, and milder than in the States lying to the South-west. There is much valuable and evidently reliable information found here. The volume will easily enable the reader to understand how different observers obtain such different views of the system, and will aid in reconciling not a few apparent contradictions in the reports of honest and credible witnesses. We would especially commend it to the attention of the author of the "South Side View," and to all who are inclined to make a quotation from his pages the end of an argument.

The work of Mr. Drew is of surpassing interest, as might be easily inferred from its title. The fugitives here become autobiographers. More than one

hundred persons who were actually slaves here give an outline of their experience, and a statement of their view of the system. Surely they have a right to be heard, and they will be. There are startling things revealed here. There are tales of hardship, stories of patient endurance, deeds of the highest daring, exhibitions of tragic passion, and developments of demoniac wickedness presented in these simple narratives, which thrill, and subdue, and chasten, and horrify, as one or the other element predominates. The experience of the refugees as given here is greatly diversified—the best and the worst phases of our Southern life are pictured. The language was evidently corrected and purified by the reporter. The volume will attract attention, and carry authority with it.

**ALL ABOARD; Or Life on the Lake. A Sequel to "The Boat Club."** By Oliver Optic. Boston: Brown, Bazin & Co. 1856.

This is a charming story for boys, teaching noble lessons of manliness and integrity, and setting forth the perils of false principles and selfish indulgence. It may be said that the boys fare a little better than is usual, and exhibit a degree of intelligence and sagacity, and dignity, not common to their years. But the ideal of character here set up is a fine one, and it is so presented that it must act strongly as an attraction to the miniature men who study it. May the author multiply his labors.

**SACRED PHILOSOPHY. God Revealed in the process of Creation, and by the manifestation of Jesus Christ; including an examination of the development theory contained in the "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation."** By James B. Walker, author of the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation." Boston: Gould & Lincoln, &c. 1855. Also,

**PATRIARCHY; Or the Family: Its Constitution and Probation.** By John Harris, D. D., &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, &c. 1855.

We have had no time as yet to give these volumes that degree of attention requisite to enable us to speak of them critically. But to those who are familiar with the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation," the new volume will give assurance of ability and deep interest. It is evidently a more profound work than the other, and marked with high originality.

Dr. Harris's name is everywhere a commendation of whatever bears his name as author. Since beginning authorship, there has been a steady and healthy growth of what we may call author-power, such as we remember to have noted in no other man in the same degree. This is the third of his theological series, of which "The Pre-Adamite Earth" and "Man Primeval" were the first and second contributions. Those works were widely read, and produced a deep impression. We judge there is no falling off of interest in the present volume. A few rapid glances over the pages, suffice to exhibit the same eminent characteristics which have set the author on so enviable a height. We may have occasion to refer to these volumes again.

It has long been in our hearts to say a word respecting the "NATIONAL MAGAZINE," edited by Rev. A. Stevens, and published monthly by Messrs. Carlton & Phillips, New York, at \$2.00 per year. It is printed in Royal Octavo form, on the best of paper, each number containing ninety-six pages,

I had no idea Mrs. Partington would make such a fortune; I sent my speech to nobody, but it was copied into the "Times." I am told it is up at the caricature shops, but I did not see it.

Your faithful and affectionate friend,

SIDNEY SMITH."

We append a few of his brief witticisms, which sparkle all over the pages of the memoir:

"An argument arose, in which my father observed how many of the most eminent men of the world had been diminutive in person, and after naming several among the ancients, he added, 'Why, look there, at Jeffrey; and there is my little friend —, who has not body enough to cover his mind decently with; his intellect is improperly exposed.'"

"Fox wrote drop by drop."

"There is a New Zealand attorney arrived in London, with 6s 8d tattooed all over his face."

"How is —?" "He is not very well." "Why, what is the matter?" "Oh, don't you know he has produced a couplet? When our friend is delivered of a couplet, with infinite labor and pain, he takes to his bed, has straw laid down, the knocker tied up, expects his friends to call and make inquiries, and the answer at the door invariably is, 'Mr. — and his little couplet are as well as could be expected.' When he produces an Alexandrine, he keeps his bed a day longer."

"Yes! you find people ready enough to do the Samaritan, without the oil and twopence."

"My living in Yorkshire was so far out of the way that it was actually twelve miles from a lemon."

"Don't talk to me of not being able to cough a speaker down; try the hooping-cough."

"Daniel Webster struck me like a steam-engine in trowsers."

"When I began to thump the cushion of my pulpit, on first coming to Foston, as is my wont when I preach, the accumulated dust of a hundred and fifty years made such a cloud, that for some minutes I lost sight of my congregation."

"To take Macanlay out of literature and society, and put him in the House of Commons, is like taking the chief physician out of London during a pestilence."

"At Mr. Romilly's there arose a discussion on the Inferno of Dante, and the tortures he had invented. 'He may be a great poet,' said my father, 'but as to invention, I consider him a mere bungler—no imagination, no knowledge of the human heart. If I had taken it in hand, I would show you what torture really was; for instance, (turning merrily to his old friend, Mrs. Marcet,) you should be doomed to listen, for a thousand years, to conversations between Caroline and Emily, where Caroline should always give wrong explanations in chemistry, and Emily in the end be unable to distinguish an acid from an alkali. You, Macaulay, let me consider—oh! you should be dumb. False dates and facts of the reign of Queen Ann, should forever be shouted in your ears; all liberal and honest opinions should be ridiculed in your presence; and you should not be able to say a single word during that period in your defence.' 'And what would you condemn me to, Mr. Sidney?' said a young mother. 'Why, you should forever see those three sweet little girls of yours on the point of falling down stairs, and never be able to save them. There, what tortures are there in Dante equal to these?'"

"Never was known such a summer as this; water is selling at three-pence a pint. My cows drink beer, my horses ale."

"Ah, you always detect a little of the Irish fossil, the potato, peeping out in an Irishman."

But there is hardly any place to stop when one begins to quote Sidney Smith's keen witticisms. The volumes will afford rare entertainment for a



leisure hour, and prove a good medicine for melancholy or mental lassitude. At the same time, one can hardly fail to be profited by the vigorous good sense, and the concentrated wisdom which appear in these flashes of the amiable and witty divine. It is a good service which his friends have here done.

EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY AND CORRESPONDENCE OF THE LATE AMOS LAWRENCE; with a brief account of some incidents in his life. Edited by his son, Wm. R. Lawrence, M. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1856.

It is refreshing in these times of mercantile gambling, and sinking of mercantile credit, to meet with such a man as the subject of this memoir. They offer stimulus to one's faith in the favorable issue of the present conflict of gain with principle, and hold up before young men a clear and steady light, which they may follow to a true distinction. It is a glorious transfiguration of integrity, or rather it is a presentation of integrity before the eyes of men in its own proper character, freed from the dust of the world, and commanding reverence by its mein of majesty. We may point to that life with an honest pride, as one of the products of the new world we need have no fear of exhibiting.

"Messrs. A. & A. Lawrence & Co." is the name of a business firm long familiar to New England, and making itself felt and respected in the Stock boards of other countries. The elder brother is here portrayed in this memoir. His experience in trade began early. The principles he took with him to Boston were definite, sound, and well considered. They were the fruit of a high moral training at home, and they were never departed from under the force of the severest temptations. He would never run great risks, in the hope that some good fortune would befriend him. He had faith in his principles, and he never failed to confide in them even when speculation suddenly enriched his neighbors. He meant his business should be honest and prudent. He could wait for the coming of success after he had nobly earned it. And it came to him; came only to confirm him in the high integrity he had so long venerated. Wealth flowed in upon him; but he grew neither avaricious, aristocratic nor proud. His gifts kept pace with his gains. He systematized his beneficence as he had done his business. He regulated his bestowments by his gatherings.

Misfortune came to him; year after year he was shut away from his business, and he became a benefactor known over many States. His religious spirit grew more controlling and beautiful. The simplicity of his heart equalled the sagacity of his understanding; and his deeds became the embodiment of both.

Nearly seven hundred thousand dollars are supposed to have been given for charitable purposes—and he was largely his own patient, unwearied, and modest almoner. Of few men is the description of patriarchal beneficence found in the book of Job more fully descriptive than of Mr. Lawrence. "When I went out to the gate through the city, when I prepared my seat in the street; the young men saw me and hid themselves; and the aged arose and stood up. The princes refrained from talking and laid their hand on

their mouth. When the ear heard me then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me it gave witness to me; because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me, and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I put on righteousness and it clothed me, my judgment was as a robe and a diadem. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the poor; and the cause which I knew not I searched out."

The work of the biographer is most gracefully done. There is a chastened reverence apparent in almost every paragraph which he has penned, such as is becoming the filial relation to such a father. The letters of Mr. L., however, do most in the way of furnishing the biography. They are simple and chaste, showing the transparent and artless spirit of a good man. It is a volume we would gladly see in the hands of every young man, ere he meets the strife, and bustle, and competition, of this outward age. It could hardly fail to confirm a faith in righteousness which is beginning to waver, and save many a life from the wretched experience and the disastrous influence it sends abroad. Parents could hardly do better than to lay it in every son's trunk beside the Bible, as they send him out to perform his part on the theatre of life. The mechanical features of the work are of the highest order.

**THE CHRISTIAN'S GREAT INTEREST.** In two parts. By the Rev. William Guthrie. With an Introductory Essay by Thomas Chalmers, D. D. Seventh edition. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1856.

The theme of this book may appropriately enough be called self-examination. It is written with a view in the first part to aid one in that duty. The second part has a special regard to the duty of one who weighs himself in the balances, and writes against himself wanting. Besides these two parts, there is a sketch of the author's life. It was deemed a work of importance enough by Chalmers for him to commend to special attention by an introductory essay. The old proverb says no man is wise at all times. We have read it in a mood not favorable to a clear perception of its worthiness, at least, the high degree we expected to find. It is nevertheless a good book.

**THE THEOLOGY OF INVENTIONS; Or, the Manifestations of Deity in the Works of Art.** By Rev. John Blakely, Kilkinillock, Scotland. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1856.

The author of this book was looking over the works of art in the Crystal Palace, London, and every object seemed to re-echo the announcement of the ancient prophet—"This also cometh from the Lord of hosts, which is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working." There had been books enough to show God in nature, but now the author has a new thought, to show God in art. The theme is a rich one, and every hour devoted to reflection upon it makes it seem more suggestive. The material is abundant and interesting. The author has done well by the theme, and no one can read his book without having his thoughts enriched and the feeling of devotion to God quickened.

THE  
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

NO. XV.----JULY, 1856.

---

ART. I.—MORAL RETRIBUTION: AS EVINCED IN THE  
ANALOGY OF NATURE.

In the discussion of this subject, it may not be improper at the outset to inquire concerning the character of the argument to be employed in its elucidation. Upon this, very obviously, depends the nature and significance of the evidence to be expected as the result of the investigation. Moreover, some writers upon this subject, whose abilities justly entitle them to the highest respect, appear to have confounded terms belonging exclusively to one department of reasoning with an argument of an entirely different character. Though this may not have arisen from confused or indistinct perceptions of the subject in their own minds, it has at least tended to prevent a distinct and definite understanding of the matter in the minds of their readers.

When it is geometrically proved that the square of the hypotenuse of a right angled triangle is equal to the square of the other two sides, the conclusion is absolutely decisive and irresistible. No possible addition of argument can render it more apparent, or add anything whatever to the strength of the conviction which it induces. It is a demonstration, and no other conclusion is even conceivable. It is absolutely impossible to conceive—much more to believe—that any conflicting proposition can be true.

But in probable reasoning, the case is essentially different. Here the force of the conclusion depends both upon the number and the relations of the parts of the argument. Take a familiar example. A watch, exhibiting evidences of design, has a designer. Hence it may be inferred that whatever exhibits evidences of design must have a designer. But the conclusion is by no means irresistible, as is the case in demonstrative reasoning. For notwithstanding anything that has as yet appeared, in the argument, it may be that everything else may exhibit evidences of design and still have no designer. If, however, another piece of mechanism be examined, and having evidences of design, is also found to have a designer, the argument is very materially strengthened. It may indeed be said to be twice as strong as before ; and yet the second example in itself and by itself is no more convincing than the first. And if, in pursuing the investigation, repeated instances are found of things exhibiting marks of design, and all having designers, the argument is evidently strengthened by every successive example, *ad infinitum*. And further, if a designer can be discovered wherever evidences of design are found, it may then confidently be affirmed that evidences of design universally indicate a designer. Nor will this conclusion be invalidated if in every instance the existence of a designer is not perceived, provided there is nothing in the nature of the case that necessarily precludes the possibility of a designer. But still, in any case, the conviction is not absolutely irresistible. It is at least conceivable that something may eventually be found with marks of design, where there is not and cannot be a designer. And a single such example, of course, would necessarily destroy the entire argument. Nor is it possible to accumulate such instances, and thus strengthen the conviction, until an exception is not conceivable, and the argument become a demonstration.

Thus far probable reasoning has been considered only in its cumulative character—as affected by the number of corollaries or minor arguments upon which it depends. But more than this is necessary. The relations of these corollaries must be taken into the account. It would be fallacious reasoning to

conclude that evidences of design do not indicate a designer, should an instance be found exhibiting no marks of design, and having no designer. The example would lack an essential relation—that of exhibiting evidences of design. And this relation is essential because involved in the proposition itself. There might be a great variety of other relations and characteristics, but no one, or all of them together, could by any possibility compensate for any one involved in the proposition to be proved. Nor would the absence of any or every other relation, or even the presence of a multitude of other characteristics, have any tendency whatever to vitiate the conclusion.

But while such reasoning, however perfect or complete, can never preclude the possibility of an exception, and thus arrive at absolute certainty, it not unfrequently induces a conviction entirely beyond the probability of error, and almost infinitely superior to all counter argument. In such cases doubting is far more difficult than implicit credence. Of this character are the arguments from design to a designer, and from effect to cause. It is possible that something may somewhere exist having marks of design but without a designer, or that there may be an effect without a cause; and yet there is not the slightest probability in favor of such a supposition. The most incredulous, or rather credulous skeptic—for nothing is more credulous than skepticism—could not hang a rational doubt upon it. It is impossible not to believe that fire will burn, and yet this conviction rests entirely upon probable evidence. So far as we can discover, there is nothing in the fire itself which demonstrates that it must burn, or that would lead to the conviction that it will burn. After it has burned, there is only probable evidence to prove that it will burn again. So far as can be determined by any other evidence, water would be as likely to burn as fire. But inasmuch as fire always has produced the effect which is denominated burning, it is hence concluded—and it is impossible to conclude otherwise,—that fire invariably will burn.

Hence while this species of argument and evidence may and does form a rational and conclusive ground of belief, and may settle a point beyond the power of cavil—so as to demand a far

greater credulity to disbelieve that to believe—still it cannot properly be termed a demonstration. Actual demonstration is necessarily excluded by the very nature of the argument itself. It is therefore a very palpable logical misnomer to term such an argument a demonstration. And yet palpable as it is, one of our ablest religious Quarterlies, a while since, contained an article elucidating with singular ability the probable argument for a future retribution, which, in its very title, was termed a "Demonstration;" while this and similarly related terms were profusely used throughout the entire article. Nor is it merely a logical fault. It is likely to excite expectations in relation to the character of the argument which cannot be realized; and the consequent disappointment, by being associated with the reasoning itself, is very liable to weaken the impression which the argument is really and legitimately fitted to convey. In this way it gives an advantage to the caviller. Being able to prove that the argument is not a demonstration, it is comparatively easy to interweave the subtle sophistry that the proposition not being demonstrated, as it professes to be, is therefore not proved; when, in fact, it may have placed its conclusion entirely beyond the reach of all counter argument, or of rational doubt.

The significance and force of this kind of reasoning depend upon the universal conviction of the uniformity of nature. Whether this conviction is an innate perception, or whether it is derived from the observation of actual uniformity in nature, is one of those tangled webs that metaphysicians are unable to unravel, and is of comparatively little importance. It is conceded upon all hands that such a conviction exists in every breast, and that all are swayed in their conclusions by its influence. Aside from this conviction, many of the simplest problems in nature could never be solved. Even astronomy, the most exact and demonstrative of all the sciences, is necessarily based upon it. Without assuming it, there could be no such thing as predicting an eclipse, or of estimating the annual motions or the density of the heavenly bodies. Without assuming it, there can be no assurance that day will succeed the night, or

that spring shall return and the flowers bloom again after the storms and frost of winter.

The idea of the uniformity of nature finds, as has been intimated, an exact counterpart in the actual operations of nature. These are so invariably uniform, that the slightest deviation becomes a miracle, sufficient in itself to stamp its author with Divinity. So true is this, that infidels, in cavilling at the evidences of the Savior's character and mission, have chosen unequivocally to deny the existence of miracles, *in toto cælo*, rather than to take the alternative of denying the uniformity of nature.

By the uniformity of nature, nothing more or less is intended than the certain and unvarying action of the laws of nature—or rather of God in nature; for it is both a logical and a real error to regard the law of nature as efficient causes. All matter tends towards a common centre, and this tendency is called the laws of gravitation. But so far from being an efficient cause, it is only the operation or effect of a cause which, lying back of all that appears to the senses, eludes our observation. "The laws of nature" is only an expression indicating the mode in which this cause—which of course must be the Deity—acts. Hence these laws are always significant of an all-pervading, ever-present Divinity.

But more directly to the subject in hand. The action of these laws implies consequences; and the ultimate character of these consequences will be according as the action is legitimate or perverted. The law of gravitation legitimately tends to preserve each portion of matter in its appropriate sphere. But its action may be perverted and thus made to produce a widely different result. If some huge rock be moved to the brow of a mountain, until the centre of gravity is beyond its extreme support, the law of gravitation, in itself acting in precisely the same manner and with exactly the same force as when the rock was at rest, now brings it tumbling and crashing to the plain; involving everything in its way in ruin. The moving of the rock to the brow of the mountain perverted the legitimate or primary action of gravitation, and the actual and disastrous consequences were the resultant of its legitimate action

and of this perversion; and perhaps might appropriately be termed a secondary action.

This interference of an extraneous force, or violation of the conditions of primary law, is always present, and is essential in every instance of perverted or secondary action; the result of which is physical retribution. Gravitation would never bring the rock from the mountain's brow, unless some force had thrown its centre of gravity beyond an adequate support. Fire would never burn the hand unless something extraneous both to the fire and the hand first brings the hand in contact with the fire. Nor would fire consume a city unless something besides its own intrinsic energies should kindle its flames. Water would never drown an individual, if it were not for some agency foreign to itself bringing the individual and the water into unnatural relations. Such an extraneous force must always be present in every perversion of natural or physical law, unless the same cause may produce dissimilar and often antagonistical effects; which, of course, is impossible. That such an extraneous force does act upon the primary laws of physical nature and produce a perverted action of those laws, which in turn produces physical retribution, the examples already cited, and the consciousness as well as the experience of every individual, sufficiently and conclusively evinces.

And not only must every perversion be caused by the intervention of an extraneous force, but every such intervention invariably and inevitably produces a perversion, which as certainly induces retribution. Every rock moved beyond the brow of the mountain, will inevitably dash headlong to the plain. There is no alternative. Nothing short of a miracle, produced by the intervention of Omnipotence, could prevent or arrest its fall. If we hold our hands in the fire they will as certainly be burned. If a torch be applied to a train of powder, an explosion is inevitable. If one unable to swim should plunge unassisted into the sea, he would as certainly drown. If air, infected with the plague, be inhaled into the lungs, disease, and probably death, will surely follow. There is, there can be, no such thing as an infraction of nature's law, however slight, without a consequent penalty or retribution. At least not a single



instance of such a nature has ever occurred, and there is no one who has sufficient confidence in the logical possibility that one might occur to risk the experiment of thrusting his hand into the fire, with the expectation or hope that it would not be burned.

It is true, however, that the action of this extraneous force may be so gradual that a portion of its influence may be arrested. A person falling into the water or the fire may be rescued before life is extinct; or the flames of a burning city may be extinguished before the city is entirely consumed. The influence of infected air upon the lungs may sometimes be arrested so that death or even disease may not be the result. But this is only the withdrawing of the cause, when of course the effect ceases; and not the remedying nor the prevention of the effect after the cause has acted. When an individual has lain in the water as long as the law of nature requires as a condition of drowning, there is no possibility of retaining or restoring life. When the flames have exerted their full action upon the burning city, it is as certainly consumed and gone. Other buildings may be erected, but those are irrecoverably lost. When infected air has fully exerted its influence upon the human system, the corresponding disease is a certain consequence. Nature may resist, or its recuperative force may heal, but still it cannot prevent, nor even compensate for the effect which the infecting influence exerted. There must be the pain and the struggle, and often lasting and fatal tendencies to subsequent disease.

But this point need not be pursued farther. It is not denied that every instance of physical perversion induces an inevitable physical retribution—that escape is absolutely impossible—and that this retribution is always in exact ratio with the perversion. The conclusion therefore is, that retribution is always and invariably a sequence of perversion—that wherever law is infringed there is a sure and inevitable penalty. But this conclusion, thus far, rests upon a single example. But if the same principle of retribution is also found in intellectual nature, a very material advance will be made in the strength of the argument and the force of the conclusion.

Mind, however differing from matter in its essential properties, is nevertheless intimately associated with it in the actual developments of life and action. It may therefore fairly and safely be inferred, that to the extent of these developments, at least, it must be under the influence of laws and relations harmonious with those which characterize the material world. Otherwise, there would result a perpetual conflict between the developments of man's physical and intellectual being, which would indicate a lack either of wisdom or of goodness upon the part of the Creator; either of which would be subversive of his perfections. But perversion may and does occur in physical action, and retribution invariably follows. It is therefore legitimate to predicate the same of intellectual action.

And whatever may be true of mind in itself, or whatever may be its ultimate manifestations, still, organized as we are at present, it is manifested only in connection with and through the medium of our physical organization. Hence it is impossible for it to act under the influence of laws opposed to those controlling that organization. Retribution being the inevitable consequence of the perversion of physical action, impunity cannot then be affirmed of the perversion of intellectual action. But if there is not impunity there must of necessity be retribution. Moreover, most of the perversions of physical law are the direct results of the interposition of mind. If a finger be put into the fire voluntarily, it is in consequence of a mental determination and interposition. The retribution which follows cannot be predicated exclusively of the physical perversion without assuming that a cause, which in fact was the principal cause, had no agency in determining the character of the effect produced; or that the responsibility of an effect may be attached elsewhere than to its cause. The retribution is therefore partially attributable to a mental perversion.

And this demand for retribution as the result of intellectual perversion, is fully sustained by the actual developments of intellectual action. That intellectual perversion may and does exist, both consciousness and experience teach so clearly and conclusively, that it is not and cannot be denied. Instances of it are

so frequent and so easily perceptible as to need no elucidation. Hundreds and thousands upon the back of millions, by nature gifted and noble, have prostituted intellect to perversions than which hell itself could not have conceived more diabolical and degrading. Here, there, and everywhere, intellect is prostituted to purposes as unlike its original and evident design, as are sin and holiness, satan and God.

Nor is the relation of cause and effect, which induces physical retribution as the sequence of physical perversion, less positive and unescapable in its application to mind. Wherever mental perversion occurs, there, sooner or later, will follow, and does follow, the retribution, no less certain or dire than that which follows physical perversion. Even the voluntary element of man's nature cannot separate effect from cause, when once the cause has been exerted—no less in the intellectual than the physical world. Volition may decide between causes, and thus indirectly control effects; but when once the cause has been selected, and its influence has operated, the volition of a seraph cannot prevent or evade the legitimate and determinate effect. Niagara's waters were as well rolled back to Erie's bosom, or to their pristine home in mountain dell or sequestered valley, as to escape retribution as the consequence of the abuse of intellectual law or action. All who have made the experiment, whether wittingly or unwittingly—for *ignorantia legis neminem excusat* is not less true here than in jurisprudence—have found to their bitter and irremediable cost that mental law is not less peremptory and unyielding than physical.

This truth, like that of physical retribution, is no doubtful dogma or fanciful opinion. It is based upon the direct testimony of universal consciousness and the broadest and most reliable induction. Illustrations of it are found upon every page of human experience, and in every conceivable variety of character and extent. One, by too intense mental action, causes the light of reason to go out in the dark, dismal inanity of madness. The cold, cheerless mantle of insanity, robbing life of all that it brings to man more than to the brute! is his retribution. Terrible indeed it is, and the very thought of it sends a freezing

chill of terror coursing every vein back to the deepest fountains of emotion. Another has become so familiarized to unworthy and degraded habits of thought, that noble and manly reflection is to him very near an impossibility. And this, too, is a fearful retribution. Another has so perverted his powers of perception as to see nothing on earth or in humanity but what is worthy of the deepest hell; and he flies off into the starless, rayless midnight of misanthropy. One perverts the power of faith until he sinks in the almost inextricable quagmires of superstitious credulity, and another doubts until faith is entirely lost in the bewildering mazes of infidelity. And thus the enumeration might be continued through every department of mental action. But it is unnecessary.

As might be expected, however, as the investigation proceeds from the more tangible to the more subtle and etherialized—from the material to the mental, and thence to the moral—the retribution gradually becomes more distant from the perversion, and the connecting links that still bind them in indissoluble relations are less obvious; and hence often escape the observation of the more thoughtless and superficial. If a finger is thrust into the fire, the retribution is immediate and most acutely perceptible; but when the laws of mind are transgressed, it is often years before the retribution is realized and even before it operates. But it is none the less certain. It attaches itself to one's identity, and clings to it amid all the changes of life; and sooner or later it will be developed. The lingering frequently seems to have been but to gather increased intensity for the inevitable blow. Nor, when the blow comes, is it always perceived from whence it came. It is this which oft-times induces us to charge Omniscience with the consequences of our own folly; when, if we should trace the sequence of events backward, we should find it to be a self-induced retribution. Too often the attempt is made to avoid responsibility by saying, "*it is my nature,*" when it is but a "second nature" which our own improper habits of thought have engendered, and for which we are, of course, responsible.

The perversion of intellectual law results likewise from something not inherent in either the character or conditions of

intellectual law. To affirm otherwise would be to charge God, as its author, with necessitating, if not directly performing, the most fiendish diabolism—not only of causing perversion, but of inflicting retribution, upon what this idea would make an already outraged object, for that which directly and necessarily resulted from the arrangements of his own will. The very idea of perversion implies something extraneous to the original and legitimate design. Fire was not originally designed for the destruction of human beings, but to minister to their necessities and convenience; but it can be made to answer an entirely opposite purpose. So mind was not made to minister to vice and pander to corruption, but it can nevertheless be made to subserve this end; and yet no one will think of regarding this as compatible with the design of its Creator, or that it would produce such a result if left to its own legitimate operation.

Finding the same principle of retribution, irreversibly and universally true in the domain of intellectual existence, the argument is now very much strengthened. Its significance is indeed so clear and strong that we shall be justified in predicating retribution as the result of perversion in any and every department of the universe, unless some one can point us to at least a single exception. One exception indeed would not prove that the principle might not be true in any given department of action, unless the example were found in that particular department; but it would disprove it as a general principle. But the argument is now significant enough to establish the principle as a universal law, needing no farther elucidation or proof until the caviller adduces at least one clear and undoubted example where perversion has not followed, and not only that, but cannot be followed by retribution as a consequence. As it is not likely that the task will ever be attempted, the conclusion is therefore safe and legitimate that moral retribution will universally and inevitably follow each and every instance of the perversion of moral law, or of wrong doing.

It has been seen that the intimate association of mind with matter, and the obvious fact that, organized as we are, the former can be manifested only through the medium of the lat-

ter, indicates that while retribution is confessedly predicable of the one, its opposite, impunity, cannot be predicated of the other. And as the one or the other must be true of all action, and as impunity cannot be affirmed of either, retribution as certainly must be predicable of both. But the same argument as conclusively evinces the demand for moral retribution, consequent upon moral perversion, when the still more intimate connection of our moral nature with both our intellectual and physical natures is considered; and also the still more evident necessity of these as media for the manifestation of moral character. Notoriously, moral qualities can be developed only in connection with mental action, and with our present constitution only through the medium of a physical organism. Another link is thus added to the chain of the argument, and so clear is the connection, that if a corresponding manifestation is not found to exist in fact, all our ideas of the unity and fitness of things will be most manifestly and grossly outraged.

But there is no need of being long detained with the inquiry whether moral retribution actually exists, as the result of moral perversion. Universal consciousness, as well as the unmistakable evidences of every-day experience, cries out in language so plain that none dispute that it exists. Every individual suffers more or less that is at once and unhesitatingly referred to wrong or moral perversion as its cause. There are indeed theories as various and fancies as wild as is easily conceivable, in relation to the manner of its manifestation, and its ultimate extent, but all agree that it *is* retribution. The consciousness that feels the smart, not only writhes under it, but invariably perceives, or at least admits, its connection with moral perversion.

The next inquiry is, does all wrong **do** merit and demand a consequent retribution or suffering? It will be perceived that the argument for retribution in morals is general, and hence its application to one perversion is as legitimate as to any other. If, therefore, it proves retribution at all, it proves it as consequent upon any, and hence upon every perversion. **And this alone is a sufficient reply.** But there is another

method of determining the point which is perhaps still more conclusive. Natural theology always goes, and always must go, upon the supposition of a Deity, infinitely wise, just and good. But it is impossible to reconcile infinite goodness or even justice with partiality in the connection of retribution or punishment with perversion or wrong. In fact, it is as evident as anything can be that God cannot be just, even humanly speaking, to say nothing of infinite justice and goodness, and yet maintain the relation of wrong and punishment in one case and not in all.

Upon this point there is an abundance of the most satisfactory evidence. If all other were wanting, man's instinctive consciousness would be amply convincing. The language of revelation, that to the sinner there is a "fearful looking for of judgment," is but an expression of universal consciousness. With the startling vividness of fast hastening reality, it causes us to feel, as nothing else can, that retribution is hastening in the steps of every wrong. And this consciousness is so universal and so powerful that all confess its sway. Nothing is able to evade it, or entirely to silence its voice. Seared and callous, and to a great degree insensible it may become; but extinguished it never is. Hardened though the sinner be, unfeeling wretch though he may become, until he can wantonly gloat over outraged justice, ravished innocence, and insulted but infinite mercy, yet something of the "fearful looking for of judgment" —of coming retribution, ever remains. And the conviction of its certainty is not unfrequently perverted to lead him with fiend-like daring to rush precipitately upon the consummation that is felt to be so certain and so dire. And this foreboding of retribution follows the knowledge of any and every wrong. The moment that the wrong is perceived, that moment the "fearful looking for" commences, and no lapse of time can obliterate, nor strokes of conscience satisfy, this fearful foreboding. Nor is it to be supposed that this consciousness of coming retribution is deceptive. Such a supposition would charge the most sacred and cherished element of human existence and knowledge with falsity, and of inflicting upon us in numberless instances the most unmitigated diabolism. If human conscious-

ness be false, man himself is a monstrous and irredeemable falsity.

Neither does moral perversion result from anything inherent in the moral nature, nor does it legitimately grow out of the operation of any of the laws by which it is governed. It is forced upon us by no necessity originating with the Author of our being. In the language of another :\* “If your infidelity or your theology makes sin a necessity, though admitting it to be a sin, yet a dire, unescapable necessity of creation and existence, an attendant, yea, a penalty of existence itself from the hand of the Creator, then again you thrust upon the soul the idea of a malevolent, malignant Creator; and you demonstrate, so far as you demonstrate anything, no other than a supreme, omnipotent ingenuity of evil; since what could be conceived more diabolical, than to invent a sensitive mechanism, exquisitely susceptible of suffering, inevitably producing sin, and as inevitably plunging itself into suffering because of sin! Why! the mind of the arch-fiend himself, the murderer and liar from the beginning, the accuser, hater, tempter, destroyer of mankind, the enemy of God and man, could imagine no refinement or hugeness of diabolism equal to this!”

It is not essential to the present discussion to inquire concerning the agency by which this perversion is produced. But it is conceded that the only efficient agent in the universe, the only original, primitive cause, is will. As has been seen, it does not, and cannot, originate with the will of Him who is infinitely wise, just and good. It could not originate with angels or cherubim, without hurling them from their thrones of purity and glory on high. It will scarcely be affirmed that it all originates with the arch-fiend of the pit. Consciousness as well as reason tells us that it originates with the human will. Says the author already quoted: “Natural Theology is a volume of depravity and suffering; depravity on the part of man, and suffering in consequence, under God’s righteous arrangement, proving that God is good.” And again: “If you make the depravity something else than voluntary sin, something else than an absolute hostility and

\* Dr. Cheever in the *Biblical Repository* for Jan. 1850.



declaration of war against God; if you make it a mere pardonable mistake, or an inevitable frailty, consequent on the very nature of a creature made weak and erring, or consequent on the circumstances by which the creature is surrounded, or consequent on the very relation between the body and the world which the creature is made to inhabit, again the suffering becomes unjust, and inconsistent with the demonstration of a God infinitely good. It is as wrong to inflict an injury on an intelligent being for a mistake or an evil, *which could not have been avoided*, which, from the circumstances which that being did not make, was an *absolute necessity*, as it is to inflict suffering where there is no sin."

These points being established—suffering, suffering as the result of sin, that all moral perversion induces suffering, and that moral perversion is produced by or is voluntary depravity—the way is now open to inquire concerning the nature of this suffering.

There are those who regard memory and remorse as the principal, if not the only, elements of moral retribution. But memory, very evidently, can have no retributive force save as it keeps before the mind that which excites or increases remorse or some other painful emotion; and is therefore not so much an element as a condition of retribution. Memory is a mere preserver and conveyor of thought, and seems to have little or no discrimination between that which is fitted to excite pleasant, and that which excites painful emotion. And how remorse is any more retributive in character than fear, shame, and a number of kindred emotions that arise from a consciousness of guilt, it is not so easy to perceive. This much, however, is true, that they all sustain very nearly the same relation to moral perversion; and hence remorse, as one of the most prominent, may legitimately be taken as a type of all the rest.

The relation which they sustain to moral perversion seems to be the same that bodily pain sustains to physical perversion. But in such a case the resulting pain is easily perceived to be but a part of the retribution. If a finger were consumed, the pain which the fire would cause would by no means constitute

all the retribution. When the pain had exerted its full force, and had ceased altogether, by far the most important part of the retribution would remain—the loss of the finger. Compared with this, the pain was of little consequence. Any individual would very much prefer to suffer far more pain than to lose the finger. And moreover, had the fire not entirely consumed the finger, it is probable that the pain, ere it would have healed, would have been far greater than in the former instance; and yet who would not have regarded it as the less retribution. So when remorse, or any or all of the emotions of which it may be regarded the type, has inflicted its severest penalties upon the moral nature, is there not a retribution still beyond this almost infinitely more appalling?—an injury or a loss to the very moral constitution itself, compared with which the remorse is insignificant? The drunkard and the libertine, notwithstanding the keenest pangs of remorse that they ever experience, are still overwhelmed with a moral degradation—a retribution that obviously denies them the full measure of manliness. Nor is this retribution any the less perceptible or terrible when the subjects may have steeled their hearts and consciences against the power of remorse. And this is not only the most emphatic decision of society, but it is alike endorsed by the consciousness of those who suffer it. They cannot look upon a virtuous man and feel themselves his equal; not merely when they feel remorse, but when their consciences are steeled against it. It is not therefore because they feel remorse, but because they are conscious of wanting that which is essential to ennobled humanity; and this consciousness is not only separable from, but is likewise superior to, the feeling of remorse.

Remorse, so far as it goes, is a consequence of real or supposed moral perversion; and hence can be entirely avoided by moral uprightness. But it is rather incidental to moral retribution, than that retribution itself. The fact that it results from supposed as well as real perversion, is not compatible with the idea of its embodying or even fully representing moral retribution. This follows every perversion, and can be experienced only where there is perversion or wrong; and it reaches far deeper among the elements of man's enjoyment. It trans-

forms the moral powers themselves from being godlike to being satanic. Is it not transcendently more retributive thus to lose some of those affections which most nearly ally man to his Maker than merely to endure remorse, however pungent? To feel the most embittered anguish of remorse with yet the consciousness of possessing all the ennobling elements of man's moral nature, is a retribution infinitely preferable to the consciousness of the irretrievable loss of some of the noblest of those elements, even if it were without the least remorse. Satan, feeling as only he can feel, the loss of heaven and of the moral affections which alone can fit any being for its enjoyment, and yet glorying in the rebellion by which he lost purity and heaven, is to the writer a far more perfect picture of retribution than could be drawn by satan suffering even an infinitude of remorse.

It is even questionable whether remorse and its kindred emotions should have much influence in making up our estimate of retribution. As has been seen, the idea of retribution demands a certain penalty, invariably commensurate with the character of the offence. But neither of these is true of remorse in this world. It is notorious that the repetition of offences steels the heart to the susceptibility of remorse. It must therefore be confessed that unless some sins are vastly overpaid, on the score of remorse, the great majority receive almost nothing in the comparison, and some none at all. Remorse thus decreases with the increase of moral obliquity; and hence the higher developments of remorse are always and only connected with the less degree of moral obliquity. The eminently pious man evidently experiences far more remorse for a comparatively trivial misdemeanor than does the hardened villain for the most flagitious crimes. It may be said, however, that remorse in another world will fully compensate for the obvious disparity in this. But this does not seem sufficiently evident to satisfy the idea of, and demand for, a certain retribution, exactly commensurate with the enormity of every crime; and hence to prove an adequate dissuasive to vice. It is a conjecture merely; and if proved at all, it must be proved by some other argument than the one we are now using. Analogy

indeed, seems to incline the other way. The dissolution of inert matter destroys no characteristic of its elementary existence. The gasses and other elements of which it was composed, exist and exert after dissolution precisely the same properties that they did before dissolution. The only difference is, that before, they exerted these properties in combination—after dissolution, separately. Not only is the same thing apparent in the decay of vegetable existence, but the vegetable principle never fails to produce after its kind; thus showing that though dissolved, its elementary principles are neither destroyed or changed. The crawling worm becomes a brilliant butterfly, and seems for a moment to destroy the analogy; but see! it has produced a worm again, identical with its pristine self. The same elementary vitality which gave character to its being, was all the while wrapped up in the habiliments of the butterfly.

If, therefore, any conclusion at all is deducible from this, it is that after death every elementary part of our being will retain the same characteristics which it possessed here. Remorse is only incidental to our moral nature, and is never felt aside from the action of the moral sentiments. Hence, if remorse does not invariably follow wrong, if here it is actually found to decrease with the increase of depravity, what else is to be expected in the coming world? If, by hardening the heart, it may be steel-ed against remorse, where is the evidence, at least from analogy, of a different and an almost opposite result in another world? What will soften the heart, and give it those moral sentiments whose action is essential to remorse? If remorse depended merely on an intellectual knowledge, the case might be different. But men do wrong when they know, intellectually, the enormity of the wrong, and yet do not feel remorse. It appears to depend upon a moral appreciation of purity, that is very nearly akin to that purity itself; and which the morally depraved do not feel, and, from the very nature of the case, cannot feel. Every wrong tends to obliterate in the moral character of the wrong doer such an appreciation of purity. To restore him this, so that he might feel the pangs of remorse, so far from being a retribution, would be to restore purity—would be, in

fact, to prevent the retribution due to the enormities committed after the loss of that purity.

This argument may not be absolutely conclusive, but it seems to possess some significance. The only objection that can be drawn from the kind of evidence in which we are now dealing, is the alleged fact that remorse is sometimes aroused to intense action, after it had apparently ceased to operate. But it is certainly susceptible of an inquiry, whether this is the case in relation to any point where the perversion has all along been attended by an intellectual knowledge of its character. Something may arise to give the idea of criminality where it had not been perceived before, and like the first criminal action, this of course would and must necessarily induce remorse. Does it not need investigation, at least, before it can be affirmed positively that an old offender, who, knowing the wrong of a given course of vice, has still steeled his heart against remorse for its commission, has afterwards been awakened to remorse for that crime, and for no other, where there was not a previous or simultaneous return to the path of virtue. For it is more than conceivable that a return to the path of virtue would reinstate such an appreciation of purity as would induce remorse for previous criminality.

It may be objected that the Bible represents the sufferings of the impenitent to consist very largely of remorse. This is really foreign to the discussion, yet it cannot be that nature and revelation are inharmonious; and hence the objection may properly receive a brief consideration.

It may be true that there will be remorse of the most pungent kind, and still that remorse be the attendant of the retribution, rather than retribution itself. There may also be suffering, and suffering of the intensest nature—that may properly be represented as weeping, wailing, gnashing of teeth, and the like, without remorse. But the perpetuity of the suffering threatened in the Bible appears inconsistent with our actual experience of remorse. It may be avoided, or eventually become inoperative, without expiating the wrong, or its subject being reformed; and hence as we only know it, it could not be a perpetual retribution; nor one according to our deeds. Again,

satan is never represented as feeling remorse, but on the contrary, as glorying as well as persevering in his opposition to God; and the final punishment or retribution of the impenitent is represented as being that "prepared for the devil and his angels." Hence, if his punishment does not consist in remorse, neither can ours.

The only remaining point which it is proposed to discuss is the extent of retribution.

According to any idea of the nature of retribution, nothing is more apparent than that in this world suffering is not always, if ever, commensurate with criminality. Theories and sophistry are of no avail in support of a different opinion. The fact is so plain that men will not—cannot be blinded in relation to it. Everywhere, in every department of action, the good often suffer extremely, while the wicked escape comparatively unaffected. It follows, therefore, that it must extend into another world, or the Deity is to be charged with the most monstrous injustice, in inflicting upon some men vastly more, or others vastly less, punishment than their crimes deserve. It has been said, that conscience unobserved in all cases actually inflicts suffering commensurate with criminality; and that, therefore, whatever may appear to be true, men really do suffer in this world according to their crimes. But this positively contradicts not only appearances, but every body's experience. Indeed the sophistry of the objection is so shallow as scarcely to deserve a notice. It is so contrary to fact and experience, that if the utterance of it be not followed by the keenest suffering, it would of itself evince the falsity of the objection.

But if retribution strikes still deeper than the mere infliction of remorse, and lays hold upon and violates the very elements of our being, then this most pitiable of all pretences, that some secret remorse this side of the grave compensates fully for all the apparent discrepancy between desert and punishment, is at once shorn even of a semblance of speciousness. For, however pungent or long continued remorse may be, retribution is still beyond and almost infinitely superior in its appalling dreadfulness. When remorse appears, at least, to be gone, this remains, and

remains, aside from religious influences, until we lose sight of the individual in the grave. Hence he who commits a wrong upon the very threshold of a future world, will not here endure so much in consequence as he who commits that wrong in earlier life; and thus also is evinced the demand, uttered by no means indistinctly in the analogy of nature, for retribution in a future existence.

Passing the bounds of the present life, few will be disposed to assert that retribution is restorative in its influence. If it possesses such an influence at all, it is to be supposed that it would be developed in this life. But so far from this, it is proverbial that one crime only prepares the way for the commission of another. Instead of tending to bring men back to virtue, it helps them on in vice. As well expect the tumbling of the rock from the mountain's brow to restore it to its primitive location—that the retribution consequent upon consuming the finger will restore the finger—that disease will produce health instead of paving the way for disease again—that death tends to restore life—that error promotes truth or leads to it—that wrong-doing tends to innocence—that vice promotes virtue—as to suppose that retribution tends to restore holiness and happiness! All of retribution that man ever suffers here still leaves him with the same consciousness of guilt, the same deficiency of moral sentiments and moral character, the same retribution. Wrong throws the whole moral machinery into confusion, and hurries its action off in a wrong direction; and there is as little probability of its adjusting itself and recovering from the shock, as there is that, when once on the wrong track, and in motion, the steam engine will restore itself to its proper position.

Nor is it likely to exhaust itself, and thus become inoperative. It certainly does not do it here. On the contrary, its power and dreadfulness increases, not only by a fuller perception of its character, but by tending to produce other and still other perversions. Give a steam engine machinery as durable, and a steam chest as exhaustless as are the characteristics and energies of man's moral nature, and set it going, and few would have much hopes of its exhaustion—even on the wrong track.

*is  
or penal  
not restorative*

It is only by separating the perversion from the characteristics of man's nature, that such an idea is ever conceivable. Neither can it be rationally expected that external influences will prevent retribution in the future world. No combination of extraneous influences in this world has ever been known to avert or even restrict retribution, and hence it is preposterous to infer that such a thing is to be expected in a future world. Moreover, such influences, in order to be effective, must necessarily be so adapted as to affect our capacities for enjoyment as well as suffering; and hence, would be as likely to prevent our enjoyment as to avert or even mitigate retribution. By proving too much, therefore, the argument proves nothing.

Inasmuch, therefore, as we go into another world with the same capacities for moral suffering or enjoyment that we have in this world, it is to be concluded that moral retribution, must be in a future world what it is here; and hence the hope of escape from a terrible and even an endless retribution derives little support from the light of nature. And besides, it is presumptuous and dangerous to place any reliance upon such a hope, unless it is absolutely free from doubt. It is unsafe to depend upon any proposition concerning which a reasonable doubt can be predicated, where, as in this instance, the falsity of the proposition will involve us in irremediable consequences. If it should be true that retribution will not be endless, an opposite belief will not in the least increase its dreadfulness; but if it be not true, a belief in its truthfulness would involve one in all the dread consequences of the opposite. In such a case the simplest maxims of common sense not only dictate the safe, path, but at the same time give us no insignificant or illusive indication of the side upon which truth is to be found; for truth is always safe—error never.

Nature, then, indicates no boundaries to the idea of retribution. It, like Revelation, imparts a fearful "looking for" of judgment; and points every wrong-doer to a sentence that seems but the counterpart of that appalling declaration of the Bible, that "the *soul* that sinneth *it* shall die." It meets the infidel not only in confirmation of the truthfulness of Revela-



tion as a whole, as is so admirably shown by Butler in his Analogy, but it also confirms one of the more important of its individual doctrines. No man can hope to sin with impunity without shutting his convictions to all the analogies of nature, nor even to think of avoiding a retribution appallingly dreadful.

---

**ART. II.—TYPICAL FORMS AND SPECIAL ENDS IN CREATION.\***

Those who have read the work by M'Cosh on the Method of the Divine Government, need no recommendation of the book before us, further than to be certified that the work is no less that of M'Cosh as to power, penetration and clearness, by reason of having another associated with him. Any man who reads this book will be ready to affirm this is truly after the style and power of M'Cosh in the former work. This book had its origin in an article, furnished by Mr. M'Cosh four or five years ago to the pages of the "North British Review," on the topics here treated. The article arrested the attention and commanded the praise of such men as Hugh Miller, who, in addition to commending it, encouraged the author to expand it into a volume. Mr. M'Cosh, in conjunction with Mr. Dickie, the associated author, has been prosecuting investigations upon the topics broached in the article ever since the time it appeared, and the results of their united investigations are embodied in the able and attractive volume before us. The publishers have, as usual with them, done their part well. The reprint is

\* **TYPICAL FORMS AND SPECIAL ENDS IN CREATION.** By Rev. James M'Cosh, LL. D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, in the Queen's University in Ireland, Author of the Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral, etc.; and George Dickie, A. M., M. D., Professor of Natural History in the Queen's University in Ireland; and Author of a number of papers on Zoology and Botany. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1856.

a volume of over five hundred pages, octavo, and in type and on paper such as to invite the reader to the intellectual feast these pages provide.

Among the multifarious and diversified objects presented to human contemplation, the mind would feel itself utterly overwhelmed and lost, if it were not for the hope that in this great diversity there may be found some principle of unity. Perhaps instead of calling this exercise of mind hope, we should convey our idea more accurately, if we should call it a spontaneous consciousness of the presence of the Creator in his works. This it is which not only prevents the mind from despairing under such circumstances, but gives it great pleasure in its instinctive perception of order and unity in the works of the Creator. This it is, and this alone, perhaps, that causes it to undertake to learn the principles upon which to classify the numerous objects presented in nature. It would be impossible to attain to anything worthy the name of knowledge without classification. If classification is requisite in order to study nature, it naturally presses upon the mind that He who made them, made them to be classified, and has, therefore, furnished in the objects themselves the appropriate characteristics by which they can be distinguished and classified.

It is the object of this work to reduce the principles of classification to their simplest form by directing attention to the two following inquiries: After what type, and for what end was each object of nature formed? He who created each object formed it after some pattern or ideal, in his own mind, and he made it, also, for some purpose. Not only are these principles set forth in general form, but the types and the ends are sought after in various departments of the kingdoms of nature. The two grand principles upon which the work proceeds, and which has been prosecuted with admirable genius and success, are well set forth in its first paragraph, which it is our duty to furnish to the reader.

“ In taking an enlarged view of the constitution of the material universe, so far as it falls under our notice, it may be discovered that attention, at once extensive and minute, is paid to two great principles or methods of procedure. The one is the **PRINCIPLE OF ORDER**, or a General Plan, Pattern, or

Type, to which every given object is made to conform with more or less precision. The other is the PRINCIPLE OF SPECIAL, or Particular End, by which each object, while constructed after a general model, is, at the same time, accommodated to the situation which it has to occupy, and a purpose which it is intended to serve. These two principles are exhibited in not a few inorganic objects, and they meet in the structure of every plant and every animal."

The second of these principles has been largely dwelt upon by Paley and others, who have reasoned from design to Him who manifests design. The first principle is not now for the first time broached. Its statement by Plato was full and clear. From time to time since, it has been remarked upon by various authors, but never before has it been so fully illustrated as in this work. Those who have hitherto given much attention to final cause have not unfrequently discarded that of typical form as antagonistic to the former, and *vice versa*. In this work they are both recognized, not as antagonistic, not even as paradoxical, but as friendly, and each is set in its proper relation and receives the importance belonging to it.

From the demand of the special end to be met, it follows that there must often be a departure from the ideal form, as, for instance, in the case of the flower, the different parts of which are after the general type of the leaf, yet to meet the end sought, those parts are so changed that it is not always easy to trace the proofs of the fact that they are transformed leaves. But these very exceptions prove the general principle of typical forms.

As types or ideals may have, in addition to form, respect to number, time, and color, the authors trace an order in nature in reference to these four points. Kepler discovered, for instance, three laws in relation to planetary motion: one that planets move in orbits, which are elliptical in shape. Here is an order in respect to form. The other two disclose an order in relation to numbers, as may be seen upon the bare statement of them. If a line be drawn from the planet to the sun, the areas described by that in its motion around the sun are proportional to the time employed in the motion; and, the other, that the squares of the periodic times are as the cubes of the distances. Order in relation to time is so manifest every-

where, that it is hardly necessary to specify at all. The planets have a given time for their revolutions; the plants a time requisite for springing and coming to maturity; and in embryology it is not less marked. Under the various kinds of order mentioned, the various facts of nature may be classified at length, no doubt, where, at first sight, there seems to be no regard to them. The apparent disregard of these principles will be found to be those kind of exceptions which prove the rule.

It will serve the object we have in view, to specify here some examples of the order in relation to number—examples from both the vegetable and animal kingdoms. Perhaps every reader has noticed that the number of rows of grains in the ear of Indian corn is definite for each kind. The number of teeth in the capsules in the various kinds of mosses is always definite, and what is more remarkable, the number is always of the series, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, &c., never 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, or 12; and still more wonderful, “the number of threads in a set of spirals in all corniferæ seems some one of the following numbers, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, &c., in which scale any two contiguous numbers added together give the succeeding one.” Ten is the number of fingers and toes of man, and it seems to be a typical number of the digits of all vertebrate animals. The exceptions are of such a nature as to prove the rule to be suspended merely in obedience to the higher law of special end, as in the case of the horse and ox, in the latter of which the law of number tries to assert itself despite the special end, or perhaps along with it. The joints in the necks of mamalia, whether in the case of the long neck of the giraffe, or the short neck of the elephant, seems to be seven.

Many examples of the order in relation to form recur to every one upon the bare mention of the principle. Planets and satellites are spheroidal, and they move, as before mentioned, in elliptical orbits. In the mineral kingdom, the definite angles of crystals testify the presence of the same law, each mineral assuming given crystalline forms and no other.

All animals and plants are classified after a given type, and a name assigned to each type. This type depends more upon

form than any other quality. The oak is readily distinguished from the pine by the leaves which respectively differ so widely, but these appendages aside, the quality of form still serves to distinguish it. It is manifest that the same principle is applicable to the different species of animals.

As the type of a given species of plants or animals, or other objects which we wish to study, is so readily taken into the mind, and as the mind so readily compares the individual with the type, and pronounces agreement or disagreement as the case requires, it is plain that He who created all things, created them after this type, and not only so, but that he constituted man's mind in his own image, so as that it might readily apprehend the type, and thus acquire a knowledge of creation. This correspondence between creation as to its typical forms and man's adaptation to apprehend those forms, clearly reveals the pleasant fact that He who created nature, created man to study the same. This has the force of an argument from design to prove the existence of a personal Deity, and, in addition, that man, by reason of his peculiar adaptation to study nature, is allied to that Deity. It shows Deity's regard, not simply in relation to the mere pleasure or pain of the creature, but in relation to the exercise of his intellectual powers. Had we time, it would be easy to show that the order with reference to time and numbers has the same argument with equal force. If we could not number times and seasons, as well as other objects of thought, and if God had not made them to be numbered, and us to do it, we could not do it. All would be an unintelligible chaos. The order of color, inasmuch as it adds to all the elements now under contemplation, that of regard to the sensations of man in reference to pain and pleasure, must not be passed on the bare mention of it.

The doctrine usually held by artists is, that there are three primary colors, red, yellow and blue. The combination of these in certain proportions produces white, while the absence of all of them is black. By a mixture of the primary, three secondary colors are produced, orange by a mixture of red and yellow, green from yellow and blue; purple from red and blue. Three tertiary colors arise from certain combinations of the secondary :

citron, from orange and green; olive from green and purple; and russet from orange and purple. From the combination of colors now described in certain ways, arise tints, shades and hues. Colors are said to be in melody when two contiguous tints, or shades, or hues, run insensibly into each other, as when purple deepens into dark purple. Two different colors are in harmony when their association is pleasant to the eye. Two colors are said to be complementary, when they together make up the white beam, that is, include all the primary colors; thus green (yellow and blue) and red are complementary. The eye is particularly delighted when complementary colors are beside each other, for though contrasting, they are in harmony. White and black associate pleasantly with every other color.

In nature it is found that however intricate these laws of color may seem to be, there is no violation of them. The predominating color in the vegetable kingdom is green, which harmonizes with red and russet. Thus the red of the rose and other flowers, of the ripe cherry and the fruit of the mountain ash, is presented to the eye in nature in the most pleasing association, and this is but an illustration of what prevails in nature, not only in relation to red and russet, but also in relation to purple with yellow and citron, and orange with blue and olive. This regard to the pleasure of the eye is had, not only in the individual flower, or tree, but in the disposition of the color of flowers as they are spread out on the wild prairie. On this wonderful law our authors have the following reflection: "Present to a skilful colorist an article of human workmanship, constructed according to the rules of simultaneous contrast in coloring, and he will at once say, Here are art and design. Place before him a piece of Gobelin tapestry, one of our finer carpets or the stained glass of a window, and he will perceive, at a glance, that the associations of color are not accidental, but that they are purposely suited to the physiological and psychological nature in man. We are convinced that there are equally clear proofs of contrivance in the coloring of natural objects, organic and inorganic. \* \* \* He who can trace up all these adaptations to Him who causes His work to make sweet

music by their harmony, has surely here a source of higher—we should rather say, of highest joy.”

We should be happy to notice the admirable argument of our authors drawn from the study of the skeleton of vertebrate animals, and “the traces of order in the form and structure of teeth,” and “the typical forms of molusca,” but the preliminary statements requisite to communicating these principles in an easy way, and especially without cuts to illustrate them, would take us too far out of our way. But we will do our best to do better for the reader, and that is simply to commend the book to his earnest study. But, that we may give the reader an illustration of the doctrine of typical forms, we will briefly refer to the articulata, as being more easily understood without illustrative cuts.

The articulata include that class of the invertebrate animals, which, like crabs and barnacles, insects and spiders, are made up so to say of different parts brought together in such a way as to show the seams where the joinings have been made. Now, the doctrine is, that each of these separate parts is formed after one and the same pattern (as to form, not size), and that any departure from it is in obedience to the higher law of adaption to an end which cannot be reached without varying the form. When these variations occur, they are the least possible in consistency with the attainment of the specific end. The type or pattern after which the different parts of the articulata are formed is said to be a ring, flattened a little at the top and bottom, or upper and under side when placed in a position to look through it. Perhaps the words of the book will be easier of comprehension. “It may be described as consisting of two arches, a superior and an inferior. The former consists of four pieces, arranged in pairs on each side of the middle line. The two upper, occupying a position on each side of the middle line, are called tergal because forming the back; those on each side are called epimeral, or flank pieces. \* \* \* The typical segment in the articulata may be compared to a segment of a tunnel, not merely arched in the roof, but having also a concave floor. A series of such rings constitutes the external frame-work of the animals under discussion, and protects the

nervous centres, which are placed near to the floor, and also the hæmal [blood] organs, which lie beneath the roof, and therefore differ in their position from that of the vertebrata."

In these extracts is described, not only the type or pattern after which each part is formed, but also the figure which these conform to when joined together in the skeleton. The latter may be considered as divided into three sections, the head, thorax, and abdomen. In crabs and other crustacea, it is stated that, each of these segments is made up of seven rings, twenty-one in all. In insects, the head is supposed to contain five of these rings, the thorax three, and the abdomen eleven. In the various appendages of the articulata, the typical ring is as clearly traced as in the main skeleton.

Here, as well as anywhere, we can present an illustration of departures from the type for the purpose of accomplishing specific ends. In the short-tailed crabs, for instance, the thorax is well developed and usually of great strength for the purpose of supporting its five pairs of ambulatory organs, which are also used for other purposes. To secure the requisite strength for this peculiar organization the rings undergo the requisite adaptation. The soft-tailed hermit crabs protect their defenceless abdomen in the empty spiral shells of molusca, and, therefore, certain appendages are modified to act as hooks, by which the animal holds fast to its borrowed habitation. "Not a few of the crustacea are parasites, that is, they attach themselves to other animals, and feed on their juices; those called fish-lice are examples. Such habits require special peculiarities of organization, and we are constrained to admire the wisdom which foresaw and provided for all the necessities of these singular beings. The mouth apparatus in some is fitted at once for piercing and sucking the juices of the foster parent; and certain of the appendages in other species, corresponding to those already alluded to under the name of foot-jaws, are constructed in such a way that they enable the little animal to keep fast hold of its foster-parent. In the curious serneadæ, whose grotesque forms have puzzled not a few observers, the young are furnished with a well-developed eye, and are provided with two large appendages, which serve as oars. Their pecul-



lar instincts lead them to fasten themselves to various fishes, some selecting one part of the fish, others a different part. Soon after they become fixed, the eye, no longer of any use, is lost, the oar-like appendages either disappear, or undergo a change of form suited to the new mode of life; in a word, there are several independent successional arrangements concurring to one end. Certain parts are necessary to the existence and comfort of the animal, and such are provided, and everything is in conformity with the position which it occupies in the economy of nature."

We have also an illustration of the departure from the typical ring to meet a special end, in the butterfly's appendages called maxillæ the sucking apparatus by which this animal extracts its food from flowers. "Each maxilla is composed of an immense number of short, transverse, muscular rings. It is convex on the outer surface, but concave on its inner, and the tube is formed by the approximation of the two organs."

The authors next trace the same principles in radiata, and in nervous, vascular, and muscular systems, and then follows a brief but admirable chapter, entitled, "Community of plan, with special modifications, in the development of organized beings." A brief paragraph from this will afford a clue to the line of thought pursued in it.

"If we enter a large ship-yard we may be able to discover a community of plan in the materials gathered together and cut out for use, and in the very first blocking out of every vessel. But it is as the fabric advances that we begin to detect—what, however, was all along known to the builder—what is the special purpose for which the ship is intended; whether it is to be propelled by sails or steam; whether it is meant for warlike or peaceful occupations; whether it is to carry articles of commerce or passengers. We are to show that it is the same in organic nature. Every plant and animal is formed after a general plan, while it is intended all along by its Maker for a special end, and no other; but it is only as it advances that *we* can discover that end."

After the minute examination required in the various departments to which we have alluded, at the end of this chapter the following conclusion is satisfactorily reached, which we commend to special attention, as it implies the whole system of the book.

“ We can trace throughout organic nature a system of homotypes, or serially repeated parts, in the *individual* plant and animal. We can discover *in each of the great leading divisions* both of vegetable and animal kingdoms, a system of homologues or answerable parts. In very *different organic structures*, we can find analogies, or different organs fulfilling the same function. But we can do more. *When we compare the various organic kingdoms one with another*, we can detect parallelisms in development, (Homeophytes.)”

Next geology, chemistry, and astronomy are summoned as witnesses. Fossil remains, chemical proportions, and special adjustments in securing harmony of the cosmical bodies, speak with unambiguous language of Him who formed all. Then, in an admirable manner, the correspondence between the laws of the material world and the faculties of the human mind, is brought in as affording the climax of testimony. And, lastly, in too hurried a manner, the light thus acquired of the Creator by the study of his works, is thrown upon the pages of his Word. As full as the book is in most of its departments, it leaves the reader with a keen relish for further investigations, not that he may be more certain of the great principles developed, but that he may more and more feast himself in communion with Him who in all things unfolds himself to the extent possible for the Infinite to unfold itself to the finite—to the extent the given medium will permit the Deity in nature to appear, where even He fails not to foreshadow the revelation of himself as Father in his Son.

## ART III.—DISCIPLINARY STATE OF SUCCESS.

In the great burial ground of the past, there are a very few mighty pyramids, lifting their towering heads from their broad bases far up into the sky, and defying, through ages and ages, the disintegrating fingers of time—as unchanging in their lofty grandeur as the earth they rest upon. Far and near around these, there are monuments of all heights and every size, some of them with the inscriptions, chiseled on them centuries before, still legible, whilst from others every letter, every hieroglyphic or symbol has long since been obliterated. Then there are broken tombstones, and moss-grown mounds to distinguish where the ashes of the sleeping dead repose. But the great, the vast majority who slumber in the silent land have neither column, stone, nor mound to mark the narrow bed of each one's final rest. And thus it is in the living, intellectual world of to-day. There are high monuments; there are low columns; but the uncounted, overwhelming majority are just about as much concealed by the curtain of oblivion, as they will be a few hundred years hence, when their graves shall have become levelled and grassed over, their humble head-stones broken down, or stolen away and converted to other purposes. Now, every one of these, in the ambition of youth, dreamed of something different. For it is not pleasant—the youth cannot make it seem so—

To die and soon to be forgot;  
 To know the world will be the same,  
 As 'twould have been had he lived not,  
 And that forever's lost his name.

Such an oblivious condition as this is never calculated upon. No man has ever sat down in his sober moments and deliberately planned it. No man has ever written his signature of acceptance with the ink of one pen. No man with one spark of manhood about him would hesitate indignantly to spurn such a dishonorable proposition back into the face of him proposing it. This is the spontaneous feeling of human nature. You may go into the workshops, out upon the farms, into the manufactory-

ries, or wherever you please; you may go to those in wretched poverty, to those who are forced to labor for a bare subsistence year in and year out, whom want awakens every morning, and drives from their rest into toil, whilst the day-star is still shining with undimmed brightness, and keeps wearily at work till long after the evening stars are visible, to those who seemingly are without time to read even the Bible or a newspaper, without time to study their own hearts, without time to reflect on their present or future condition, or with scarcely time to whisper a single hurried prayer to their God, so pressed are they in their always-beginning and never-ending toils by the stern necessities of every-day life; and you cannot find a man of them, not a single one, but what dreamed of a different lot in early life, not a single one whose imagination, as it looked forth into the future, did not see pictured out before him a better fate, and not a single one who feels not conscious that he possesses powers of mind, which, all uncultivated, are dormant within him, and which, under other circumstances, would have made him equal, nay, superior, it may be, to many whose names are trumpeted from land to land, and whose talents command high stations, and wealth in abundance.

Why is this so? he often asks, as he looks back into his past life, and forward into the future, and sees nothing but servile drudgery whichever way he turns. And sometimes he blames his friends; sometimes he envies those whom success has elevated above him, and sometimes he murmurs at his God for the unequal allotments of his providence, and then again, he despairs and wishes, in the bitterness of his feelings, that he had never been born. But the true reason he perhaps does not suspect. Though there are undoubtedly original differences between the intellects of men, yet the true reason may not lie here; for mankind do not differ half so much in their native talents as is often supposed. It may not be that his circumstances are more adverse than others. It is not because his God is partial in the bestowment of his favors. But, generally, the true reason lies principally with himself. His aspirations were high enough in early life, and he might have stood side by side with those successful ones whom he now envies, and

perhaps hates because of their success; but he would not forego a present gratification, small and momentary, for a future good, great and immortal; he would not deny the clamorous appetites of passion for the rewards of learning and influence; he would not arouse himself to activity when it was so pleasant to recline beneath the shady trees by the wayside of life, and upon the soft, grassy carpet under him, to be fanned by the gentle breezes, and lulled to repose by the murmur of waterfalls, the fragrance of flowers, and the singing of the birds of pleasure; and especially so, when it was so much sweeter thus to recline, lost in reveries of sensual day dreams, than with the rolled-up sleeves of labor, to go forth into the hot sun, and toil in the great vineyard where honor, wealth, and power are nurtured by self-denying effort and persevering industry. In short, he would not meet the competition, and pass through the disciplinary state necessary to success. And so he is what he is. Not because his circumstances forced him to be so, not because it was his fate, not because God ordained and willed it so; but simply and solely because consciously or unconsciously he himself has thus willed it. This is the secret key that unlocks the whole matter.

It is this subject—THE DISCIPLINARY STATE OF SUCCESS that I propose to discuss in this article.

I shall speak first of its EXISTENCE, next of its USE, then of its ABUSE, and finally of its AUTHORITY.

#### I. ITS EXISTENCE.

Every successful man has to pass through a severe disciplinary state. It may not be in the college, or in the shop, under the eye of some distinguished master. It matters not about this; but he must serve his apprenticeship some way. He must creep before he can walk. Every man has his boyhood when he is under tutors and governors, either of men or experience. He whose trained hand carves the rarest and costliest furniture that adorns the parlors of luxury, can show the scars on his fingers as a proof of his former awkwardness with the knife, and the severe discipline he has passed through. He whose scholarship has placed him on a lofty eminence, can tell

you of the midnight lamp, of aching eyes and limbs, of sleepless nights resulting from overtasked nerves. He whose eloquence thrills and holds breathless the public assembly, swaying his audience to his will as the wind waves the supple limbs of the willow, can tell you of long hours of severe thought; of written, erased, and re-written discourses; of orations delivered in some quiet retreat, to himself alone, and re-delivered again and again to the trees of the forest, or to the bats and owls, if you will, concealed in the thickets of the wildwood. The merchant, retired on the ample fortune of his own accumulating, still has most vivid recollections of the self-denial and anxiety he had to pass through in the beginning. And perhaps he could tell you tales from his own private history that would seem almost a full realization of Sinbad, the Sailor.

I know, once in awhile, there is an apparent exception to these; once in awhile, one who seems to jump into a fortune without forethought, labor or care; once in awhile, one like him they called Lord Timothy Dexter of Newburyport, who, even if he send warming pans to the West Indies, will find a ready market for them, at exorbitant prices, as molasses strainers and ladles. I know there is, once in awhile, one who becomes intellectually great without much seeming effort. Now and then, I know, the mantle of success falls upon one, seemingly, in spite of himself. Living in some low, damp, filthy cellar, or eating the scanty bread of his boyhood in the dingy garret of an old rickety house in the wilderness of the city, thrown at his birthright into a cesspool of vice, to sink beneath its putrid waters, or swim in corruption with his depraved associates, he does not become one of them; he seems to hear a voice they cannot hear, to see a hand beckoning him upwards which they cannot see. And without seeming effort, he goes on from one success to another, till he stands upon the pinnacle of earthly greatness. Or he may have his place of birth in the quiet of the country, breathing with his first breath the fragrance of flowers and new-mown hay; and but half protected in his log house from the storms and inclement weather. Poverty may bind its rags upon him; it may scant his food and take him from his book, and compel him to labor as a hewer of

wood and drawer of water. But all at once, apparently an astonishment to himself, and certainly to everybody else, he comes blazing forth like a comet above the brightness of the stars of the first magnitude. Men had worked by his side and never dreamed of his being an angel. They had drunk with him from the same mountain brook; they had slept with him; they had handled him, and knew that he was flesh and blood like other men; and when, like Patrick Henry, he outdazzled all his compeers, ignorant of his mental training, they cannot help exclaiming,—“Whence knoweth this man letters, having never learned?” But such persons, of even seeming exceptions, are very few in number. Men, if they rise to eminence at all, must rise by the slow, toilsome process of discipline.

That was a spectacle of moral grandeur seldom witnessed in this world when Luther defended his doctrines at the Diet of Worms, and came off victorious. There stood the bold champion of right on the rock of truth, his serene head raised above the turbid waters of superstition and persecution, with their dark waves raging at his feet, and openly defied Pope, clergy, emperor, and princes. Single handed and alone he commenced the greatest contest in the world since the Christian era, and, upheld by his own moral courage, he set at defiance the emperor's proscription, openly tore up the indulgences of the Pope, burnt the bull of his own excommunication, and in an age when religion, with everything else, fought all its battles with the sword, refused any protector save the God of truth, and finally stood a victor above the charred ruins of the Roman church in Germany.

But back of this sublime spectacle of moral heroism, there were midnight watchings, self-denials, agonizing prayers, and years of hard, unremitting study in the cells of Erfurt. He did not fly, or spring to the glorious eminence he finally stood upon before the gazing world; but, step by step he toiled to it, laying the foundation of each as he ascended higher and higher.

It was a proud position that Cromwell occupied, proud for worldly ambition, to be the lord of three kingdoms, the mighti-

est potentate in Europe, the greatest man in an age of great men, and to know that his name was spoken with awe by the sovereigns of the world, and that his threat that the English guns should be heard in Rome caused the Pope to tremble in the Vatican. But back of this, there were Preston, and Dunbar, Drogheda and Worcester, where, finally, at the head of his old Ironsides, he annihilated the army of the cavaliers. He did not ride in a chariot of luxury from his farm in Huntington directly to the throne of royalty in England. That was a glorious day for Columbus when he landed in Spain, the discoverer of the New World, and made his triumphal march from his vessel to the court of Ferdinand and Isabella. But back of this, there were disappointments, poverty, begging his bread from convent to convent, and long years of effort, under the most discouraging circumstances. It was a lofty fame which Demosthenes enjoyed and left behind him, that of being the prince of orators. But back of the forum was the cavern, where, with his shaved head, he shut himself up from all his friends, for months at a time, that he might practice and study the art of speaking.

And so Bonaparte, the Emperor of the French, when France seemed about the whole world, at the head of the imperial army, appeared on the very summit of human glory; or still higher, perhaps, when, with a few followers, leaving the island of Elba, where he had been exiled, he marched up to the gates of Grenoble, and, advancing in front of his troops, uncovering his breast, said to the soldiers of the garrison—*S'il est parmi vous, s'il en est un seul qui veuille tuer, son general, son empereur il le peut, le voici*; and received, instead of a shower of bullets piercing his bared breast, the cordial embrace of his old veterans, while, *Vive l'Empereur*, pealed forth upon the clear air of heaven from officers and soldiers, as they triumphantly bore him from rank to rank above their heads. But Napoleon did not win this power by knocking over cob-houses with a pop-gun in the palace of the Tuilleries. But he earned it at the Bridge of Lodi, at the field of Austerlitz, and many another hard-fought battle. And, without farther multiplying instances,

*Columbus*

*Audubon  
3000  
Napoleon  
Austerlitz  
0000000*



such has been the experience of all renowned men, or men of even fair success.

And just in accordance with our ambition to become influential, and good, and useful, may we arrange the severity of our disciplinary state. Every individual has a hard battle to fight, in which he either conquers, or is conquered. On the one side passions, prejudices, skepticism, indolence, temptations within and without, marshal all their forces to wage war against a man's conscience and judgment, and resolution to be something worthy of his manhood, and to do something to make the world the better for his living in it. It is a terrible struggle. I will rule myself, or die, is the only moral courage which will insure victory for the right; or in the language of the celebrated John Foster, "My soul shall either govern this body or quit it." Every one must enter this battle with the forces of evil within him. And again, I say, it is a terrible struggle, and where one fairly conquers, I fear, a thousand are shorn of their locks of strength. If we have guardian angels, they must be intensely interested whilst we are engaged in the fearful contest. Alexander wept because there was but one world for him to conquer; but never thought that there was a world within himself which required more power to bring into subjection, and then to keep it so, than to overcome the earth like a madman with fire and sword. Sometimes a man has a whole volcano of passions right in his own breast, which seem as though they were threatening to belch forth every instant. And there is a battle within him between the forces of good and evil which rages more fiercely than any of the kings of earth wage against each other, requiring more true courage than Bonaparte displayed at the Bridge of Lodi, when, seizing his standard, he rushed forth into the murderous fire of the enemy. At one time the right seems to conquer; again the forces of evil prevail; once more the right triumphs, and then its colors are lost sight of in the smoke of the battle, as temptation after temptation pours forth its heavy artillery; but once more the right emerges in sight with the excelsior banner of success, shouting victory. And so the contest vascillates till one side or the other yields up its opposition, and the man comes out, with a downcast look of shame, a

menial slave, conquered by passions and prejudices; or an independent, self-reliant, purified and elevated man, prepared for anything generous and noble. And this is the disciplinary state which we must all pass through, whatever our avocation in life, however high or humble our aspirations. Such is the voice of history; and our reason and consciousness approve it true.

## II. ITS USE.

This disciplinary state is indispensable to the good of the world. Success now elevates men's chins, and turns and overturns their heads quite enough, coming, as it does, as the slow reward of labor, care, and protracted watchings. Let men, as Byron said of himself, wake up some morning, and unexpectedly find themselves famous, and there would be an end to all enterprize, all improvement and virtue; and arrogant pretension and presumptuous dignity would carry aloft, out of sight and sympathy of common men, the few fortune favored ones in a balloon inflated by their own gas. And then, this disciplinary state invigorates the man; gives him a spirit of self-reliance and independence which no after misfortune can crush. In short, it gives him soul-freedom; makes him a free man in all circumstances in life. For the only real slavery is soul-slavery. Everywhere at the North we hear indignation and denunciation poured out against the oppression of our own country, and justly, too. But there is a slavery more to be dreaded than that. There are chains that gall more than the chains of the black men at the South. There are whips that leave deeper wounds and larger scars than those which any Southern master wields. The veriest black man on the most benighted plantation may be a freer man than his master with all his power over him. You may bind manacles upon my limbs; you may ply the lash upon my back; but you do not touch me; you only touch the house I live in; you have besieged that; you have chained it; you have become master of it; you may burn it, or cut it to pieces; but you have not enslaved the inmate. But soul-slavery, bread-and-butter slavery, office slavery, fetters the inmate with its enchantments, whilst the building he lives in may be all unbesieged.

Well, now, the man who has passed through a severe disci-

pline, and by his own resources has gathered a harvest of success from the sterile rocks of prejudice and competition, knows that he is not obliged to stoop to the bartering away of his manhood for the leeks and onions of Egypt. He spurns the base-born slave-thought from his strong soul. The loss of one coveted prize does not crush him; the disappointment but energizes him for higher efforts above the grovelling of low minds. His severe discipline has made him noble-hearted, and more valuable to the world; just as is more valuable, than the tree that grows in the sunny valley, the firm-set and close-fibered mountain oak, whose first tender shoot from the acorn was wrapped in a blanket of snow, whose lullaby was the hoarse howlings of the sleety storms, and whose trunk and limbs were early inured to the contests with the tempests, and toughened in the northern blasts. Such a man, who, in the warfare with the unhallowed passions within him, has extinguished their volcanic fires, or brought them into subjection to the law of right, who, it may be, has hurled defiance at grim poverty itself, or trampled under his feet the seductions of luxury, and lived down the prejudices and suspicions of little natures, spreading his broad arms of strength in every direction, and striking his feet deeper and deeper into public confidence, stands among the dolls of fashion, the enervated pets of wealthy friends, and the mushrooms of accidental birth, flourishing their brief hour of uselessness around him, like the mountain oak, towering its giant form above the tangled underbrush growing at its roots.

Again, this disciplinary state develops a man's energies; it calls forth into action the latent powers of his soul. Hercules, in his cradle, could not have strangled the serpent, unless there had been a serpent, whose attack excited him to self-defence. There is many a one who has equal power for strangling the serpents of error, dragging their slimy lengths all around him, and striking their poisonous fangs into suffering humanity, if he only had the courage to test his strength. And the contest would but develop his energies; and it is for this reason undoubtedly, that these forms of evil are left to be crushed out by human energies. There is many a one that knows it not, who has a perfect steam engine of power in him-

self, all fired up and ready to send him as a missionary of truth through the hills of error, which superstition has been piling up, stratum above stratum, for centuries. And if he would commence to make the track and lay the rails, his great power would develop itself. There is many another, who has within him a whole mountain of golden talent, which needs only to be quarried, and mined, and coined into pure eagles, to make him a Wall Street Broker in the moral currency of the world.

To illustrate. Our fathers aimed not at independence in the commencement of their Revolutionary struggle. Not the most radical republican in the country probably dreamed of such an achievement when they had their great tea party in Boston harbor, and steeped in salt water a whole cargo of tea at once for the codfish of Massachusetts Bay. But these little, preliminary skirmishes in self-defence developed resources and powers they had no consciousness of possessing, and so their ambition rose higher, their plans grew broader, their actions more heroic, until their country took its place among the independent nations of the earth. And so it is with many individuals. Conceiving of life as something higher than just to sleep and gratify the appetites, and live merely an animal sort of life, they commence an upward course of improvement in whatever may be their avocation; their strength increases; new powers are developed; the more they do, the more they find themselves capable of doing, and the greater improvement they make; resources all the time are being brought to light to which they were entire strangers; and they finally attain to heights of excellence, usefulness and influence, which they had never dreamed of in the beginning.

Little Benjamin West, the Quaker boy of Pennsylvania, punished at school for neglecting his lessons to draw profiles over the blank leaves of his books, and at home for cutting off the tail of his mother's favorite cat for a paint brush, never dreamed that one day he should be a painter in the palace of his king, and President of the Royal Academy at London. But one success developed the power for another, till he became the greatest painter of his time.

Jenny Lind, the Swedish Nightingale, when under the se-

vere difficulties of poverty and other trying circumstances, she persevered in her efforts to become a public singer in the hopes that she might earn a comfortable support, would undoubtedly have regarded it as a tale of the Arabian Nights, had she been told that in a few years she would have a world-wide fame, and that in a foreign country, speaking a different language, a sum more than twice sufficient for her support a whole year, should be paid, time and again, for a single seat at one of her popular concerts. But her persevering practice developed powers which astonished herself and everybody else.

George Whitefield, when, with his blue apron on, he worked with his mother in their public house, or when a member of Gloucester Grammar School, or when at Oxford, he waited upon the table of his fellow-students to defray his college expenses, little thought that he should become such an eloquent and renowned preacher, that no church in the old, or new world, could contain the crowds that flocked to hear his sermons. But the very efforts which he made to obtain an education, developed powers, it may be, which he had not even suspected himself of possessing, and shaped his future destiny. Precisely the same may be said in regard to our inventors and discoverers. All our improved farming utensils, household furniture and machinery; other application of steam as a motive power; the reduction of lightning to the servitude of man, and, in short, every advancement in the science of human progress, must be set down as the result of this law of great developments from small beginnings.

Now, there is more than one Benjamin West who dies all unconscious of the undeveloped genius within him. There is more than one Jenny Lind, warbling like a bird her native strains beneath the trees of her own wildwood home, or to the quite as unappreciative ears of her associates, who never suspects what her power of song might do for her, and what she might do with it for the world, and never will, because she will make no effort to develop what talent she seems to possess. And there is more than one George Whitefield, whose influence will be lost to the gospel, simply because he has not energy and enterprise enough to try to do what he thinks he

might, because it seems so small. And so it is in all the avocations of life. A majority of mankind plod on their weary way doing scarcely more to elevate themselves, or the world, than their entombed brethren in the church-yard; and all, because they have not moral courage sufficient to begin a persevering movement of real advancement. Now, if they would only once start, they would find the discipline which they must pass through just fitted to stimulate to activity their dormant powers.

But again. The disciplinary state is useful as a safeguard against imposition, by its enabling a man to give a reason for what he advances, and others, to judge of the correctness of his views on their own merits. Once the church, the state, and precedent, as such, had authority over men's minds, but neither of them possesses any such authority now. No intelligent man thinks a course of action is any more right to him, because he can find a precedent for it, or because the church and state have declared it lawful. What man feels any more bound morally to obey the letter of the Fugitive Slave Act, because government made it a law? Especially, when he knows that some of the Senators and Representatives who voted for it were too much intoxicated to have any realizing sense of their own actions? If all the churches in our nation should appoint delegates to a great ecclesiastical council to be held at Washington, and the majority of that council, after mature deliberation, should declare slavery an institution of God, do you believe it would turn the mind of one intelligent New England Christian who thinks differently now? Nay, verily. The authority of the church, and state, and precedent, as such, is gone. There is scarcely the shadow of their retreating forms to be seen with us. It is emphatically in its tendency an age of research, an age of reason, an age when everybody and everything must stand or fall by merit alone. Therefore, if a man would meet with success, he has something more to do than just to present to the world a recommendation of some high officer, or pious friend of a pious relative of influence, or a diploma purchased from some partial institution of learning, greatly in want of students and funds. This might do once, but that day is past.

The time is gone by when the real nobility of the world is hereditary, or when a graduated dunce can impose upon the credulity of the people. The world demands thoughts that are thoughts of wisdom, words that burn, heroic deeds as evidences of greatness, and not recommendations, diplomas, or genealogical trees. These are good in their place, but they are not enough to make a man of influence and usefulness. Now the disciplinary state is just fitted to give a man confidence in himself, and others confidence in him. Indeed, his lessons are never finished till the world says so, and dismisses him from school with his reward of merit written in public confidence. And for the reason—that he may do good—that he may have an influence—every man ought to make just as much as he can of himself. For it makes a great difference now who speaks, a man of approved reputation, a graduate from the people's college, or a mere adventurer. The same words, spoken with the same eloquence by a man of known reputation, who has by his faithfulness shown himself worthy of public confidence, weigh very much more than when spoken by one unknown to fame. It is so at the bar, in the senate, in the pulpit; it is so everywhere. The man must be tried before the world places the laurel crown of confidence upon him. But when he has passed through this trial, and gained respect, then the advantages are all on his side. He can speak with authority, for he has the confidence of the world. Such are a few of the good results arising from a disciplinary state.

### III. ITS ABUSES.

There are, at times, great evils resulting from the long disciplinary state which worthy persons have to pass through before they receive their merited success. Want of appreciation, cold neglect, the harrowing knowledge that others less worthy than himself are reaping a rich harvest of success from less labor of culture than he has bestowed on his own blighted grain-fields, have driven many a one to desperation, and reckless of all consequences, plunged him headlong into the suicidal jaws of death, or made him a poor, dissipated vagabond in the earth. There are some natures it will not do, it is dangerous, to push

to extremes. They may be goaded to madness; and then you <sup>same</sup> might as well attempt to chain an untamed lion with a gossamer thread. The intenseness of the chafed inward feelings lights up the countenance like a phosphoric sea in a night-storm. They *will* act; they *must* do something. If the world will not *receive* their blessing, it shall *feel* their curse. And so one rash act after another follows, which elevates them forthwith to the position desired; or, as is far oftener the case, sends them headlong into the whirlpool of ruin.

Now there are many who fall through just such trap-doors as these on account of the prolonged severity of their disciplinary state before meeting with success. They are often, too, persons of the most noble and generous emotions, and if they had met with a due appreciation and a proper return for their services, they would have become the world's best benefactors. But they were modest; they possessed most delicate feelings, and they shrunk from self-sought notoriety, and so were shoved roughly aside by others of coarser organizations, who scrupled at no means for success. Oh! by the holy desire of doing good, if ever such a one is found, do not pass by him carelessly, do not chide him and thus drive him to desperation; but soothe his ruffled spirit; encourage him to persevere; let him know that there is one who appreciates him, one who will do what he can for him; and perchance a multitude of sins, not yet committed, will be covered, and a soul saved from death.

Again. The long disciplinary state which is necessary to be passed through before receiving the diploma of success, tends sometimes to elevate too high a favored few, to depress others too low, and to rob the world, for awhile, at least, of the services of some of its best men. It is a hard lesson for the world to learn that a good thing can come out of Nazareth. In other words, that there is a bare possibility that a Mr. Nobody at no very distant day may be a Mr. Somebody, and that therefore it may be policy, if nothing else, to grant him all the merit we perceive, lest by and by, when he shall become known, the impression get abroad that the obtuseness which could not better appreciate him, is a sign of a feeble understanding, and a very meagre cultivation of mind. But this lesson is not yet learned



as it should be. The man is too apt to weigh more than the principles that he teaches.

To illustrate. There is a great deal of money paid into the hands of the lawyers; but almost the entire sum is received by a very few. The majority by far, get but a small fraction of it, and whilst their few elect brethren are rolling in luxury, many of the rest, with seedy coats and sleeves out at the elbows, stern necessity compels to fast oftener than the pharisee's twice a week. Now, among these great numbers of undistinguished lawyers, there are many well worthy of taking a front rank in their profession; but they are not appreciated. Their turn will come, however, by and by, if they only persevere. But it may not be with some till it is too late; till age or disease has broken down their constitutions; till their spirits are crushed, and death is before them.

The same thing holds true in the medical profession. If one has no more than a tooth to be extracted, he chooses rather to walk miles and have it done by a man of reputation. The young dentist, with a family to support, sees him pass his office, and thinks it rather hard; and it is hard, when perhaps the young man could do it, even more skilfully than the other, if he only had the public confidence. The same law holds good with the mechanic. The master workman, when he has gained his reputation, commands his five and ten dollars a day, when it not unfrequently happens that he has workmen under him for a single dollar a day, who are better qualified for his place than he is himself in all save reputation. This seems rather hard to them, and it is so, and hard for their families that may be suffering for the comforts of life, and educational advantages, which a just compensation for services rendered would bestow.

The pulpit, also, is no exception. Sacred as it is, it has its great men, and its small. And if ambition does not stand in the sacred desk, it certainly sits in the pews. A very few men, who have gained a reputation, are overworked with anniversary speeches, ordination and installation sermons, and almost innumerable other public addresses. They have more calls to become pastors of different churches than they can find time

conveniently to answer by negative letters; whilst many of their preaching brethren are without fields of labor, or are not half supported where they are, simply because the people have got the impression from their small reputation abroad that they are small men, and that small men have need of only small houses, small clothes, small quantities of food, small salaries, small congregations, and, in short, small everything. Now, it often happens that many of these small ministers have equally as much talent, and quite as deep piety, as their celebrated brethren, and could do equally as much good, if they only had the preaching fame so much coveted by the ambitious churches for their pastors. The same law holds true with the teacher; and, indeed, in all the departments of life. It is one of the almost necessary evils which results from a severe disciplinary state of reputation. And many a worthy man has died heart-broken under this neglect of appreciation. These are the martyrs—the real martyrs in the cause of truth. The age of martyrdom is not passed, and, till the millennium come, it never will be.

Were I asked to-day to point to the world's martyrs, I should not alone direct attention to the pages of Fox, every sentence filled with the groans and agonies of tortured Christians. I should not alone take the telescope of faith, and pointing it away towards that spirit-world, unscen by mortal vision, bid the eye look through it, and catching the refulgent spires of the New Jerusalem, behold those who sealed their earthly testimony by a gory death, or whose parting spirit was borne upward in a chariot of earthly fire, now glorious with the white robes of righteousness, and singing peans of heavenly praise upon celestial harps in those golden streets; but I should turn to the various avocations of actual life, and bid the inquirer look upon those laboring faithfully in obscurity, suffering in mind and body for the just rewards of their labors, yet toiling on patiently, and never complaining or shrinking from the humblest duty, banishing, as soon as its birth, every thought suggesting the violation of a principle for any advantage, however great, and though conscious that life itself is wasting away, and the lives also of those more precious than self are being sacrificed for

the want of those comforts which the less worthy consume in extravagance, who, nevertheless, falter not in their course, betray not their trust, and ward off every temptation, crucifying every suggestion to wrong-doing upon the cross of self-denial. These are the world's real martyrs. Buoyed up by the hope of an immediate entrance into the joys of heaven, the Christian may ascend the scaffold, or walk calmly to the stake. But to know that a slow poison is eating away the vitals when ambrosial manna has been merited; to die, as it were, inch by inch, through a protracted existence of years, and yet never give up in utter discouragement, and to do this voluntarily—this constitutes a real heroic martyr. And if the world has any real martyrs, they are those in all the avocations of life, who, conscious of being unappreciated and unrewarded, are, nevertheless, faithful to every duty, suffering deprivation and want with patience and fortitude. These are the rank and file that fight the actual battles, while the generalissimos and great captains are away in their tents, out of danger, their locks of strength shorn from them in the laps of wanton Delilahs. Would that the world had more discerning eyes for the sake of its unsuccessful great men. But it hears not the groans which cannot be uttered, it has no eye to see the flame that is consuming them, but brings fuel and mocks their agony,

“ 'Tis the old story—ever the blind world  
 Knows not its angels of deliverance,  
 Till they stand glorified 'twixt earth and heaven.  
 It stones the martyr; then with praying hands,  
 Sees the god mount his chariot of fire,  
 And calls sweet names, and worships what it spurned.”

But one more evil resulting from a severe disciplinary state before success is: It tends, in some temperaments, to harden the heart, to petrify the tender sensibilities, and freeze up the gushing springs of sympathy. The outside, the shell of the man, it is true, remains; but one after another of the happy family circle of the affections living there in his youth, has drooped and died. Its kindred have robed it in its winding sheet, and consigned it to its cold tomb, and then sat them down by their cheerless hearth-fire, and mourned its departure,

till the last one has died from neglect, and there was none to robe it or mourn for it. All now is desolate within; the chambers of the heart are all deserted; the hearth-fire of love has gone out; the cold winds of distrust and selfishness sweep dolefully through the empty apartments; serpents and deadly reptiles creep in and take up their abode; and birds of ill-omen build their nests and make the place hideous with their songs, in strange harmony with the creaking doors on their rusty hinges, and the clatter of loose clapboards in the wind. The shutters are all closed, and not a ray of light from the Sun of Righteousness can find entrance into the cold, gloomy cell of such a mortal dwelling. Such a man is shunned, shunned instinctively by the child in the street, lest his cold shadow should fall upon him, and shunned by all as a house haunted with evil spirits. But he was not always so. It is sad to think of the change that has come over such a one since he was a tender-hearted, frank, love-confiding child, the pride of a mother's heart, the joy of a happy home. Innocent as a little angel at the summer evening hour, when every flower threw him a fragrant kiss by the soft hand of the passing zephyr, how many times has his tender heart overflowed with tears as he saw a single rose-bud broken down. How sincerely has he mourned over the little bird found dead in his pathway, and dug a little grave for it, planting above it a flower, and watering it with tears. How many times has he crept noiselessly up to the cradle, and kissed his little sleeping sister. How often has he climbed into his parents' laps, and nestled in their bosoms. How many times, also, in perfect confidence in his God, with his little arms folded across his breast, has he fallen asleep repeating his infant prayer. But he grew older. He wished to be something worthy of his Creator, and do something good for the world. And he said in his heart, all good men will be rejoiced and give me a helping hand, and bid me God-speed. But bitter experience soon taught him otherwise. It seemed as though everybody was in opposition to him, and trying to keep him down. His trusted friends betrayed his confidence; jealous minds tried to circumvent him and crush him; the buyers and sellers cheated him when they could; the harpies of

of slander impugned his motives, and feasted on his abused reputation; temptations within and without came upon him. But these things could not stop his onward progress. They did, however, change his heart; they taught him to be suspicious of everybody, and to trust nobody farther than his self-interest would hold him. At length the hardening process is complete; his heart is entirely ossified. Self-interest, nay, the lowest selfishness alone, controls all his acts. He has no sympathy for any one; no interest in any one but self; not a tear if every relative, the nearest and dearest, should be taken from him by the hand of death. He would sacrifice the happiness, the health, the all of another, the man himself as quickly as he would an animal, so far as humanity is concerned. It is a terrible process of hardening he has been through; success has been purchased at an awful cost. He can rivet the chains of oppression, betray his friends, or sell his country for the loaves and fishes of selfishness. He has no more feeling, or sympathy for friendship or right, than an Egyptian mummy in Barnum's Museum. His withered feelings could not be galvanized into a spasmodic act of benevolence any more than one of the mummies of Egypt could be set to raising wheat for the hungry on the shores of the Nile. He is called a man, and he has the outside form of one, but there all resemblance ceases.

Such are some of the evils produced upon some men by the severe disciplinary state of success, the long, and in many cases, the life-long, apprenticeship they are obliged to serve before being acknowledged by the world as master-workmen. Now as there is no escape from passing through the disciplinary state, each one ought to guard against the evils incidental to it.

#### IV. ITS AUTHORITY.

The fact that one has not gained a great reputation, that he is seemingly neglected by the world, should not be taken as authoritative proof, either by himself or others, that he is worthy of nothing better. It should have authority enough, however, to prevent our trusting to him till we become acquainted with him; but it should never deter us from making that acquaintance, as soon as may be, both for his good and the good of

others whom his services might benefit. But no man has a right to take the silent or expressed opinions of others as proof positive that he never can do anything for the world, or be anything worthy of a noble respect; for he knows, or ought to know, himself better than others can. And let not the world be too hasty in condemning one to an oblivion of inferiority because his outward success is not immediately as great as some others. This is the unkindest cut of all. Crippled by adverse circumstances; without friends; fettered by poverty; weakened, perhaps, by ill health; with others depending on him for support; no time for self-culture; no money to purchase books; obliged always to stay at home and work, work, work from morning till night, week in and week out; and then, because under all these difficulties he does not show more than superhuman strength, and become more learned than others, more wise, more eloquent, and farther known, to hear the world whisper behind his back that his position is the result of his natural inferiority, is enough to discourage an angel.

But it is possible to rise above all this, when a man is conscious of his own innate power. "It is in me," said Sheridan, after making one or two failures in attempting to speak in the House of Parliament, "it is in me, and it *shall* come out;" and it did come out in his speech on the impeachment of Warren Hastings. Now, many of the greatest benefactors of humanity have struggled on for years under the most discouraging circumstances, too obscure to catch the eye and ear of the world, too poor to test practically their inventions and discoveries, or plans of improvement, deserted by their nearest and dearest friends, laughed at, sneered at by their fellow brethren as madmen, visionaries, or fanatics; and still seeing what others were too blind to see, conscious that their undertakings must succeed at last, they have not counted their comfort, their fame, friends, or life, dear unto them, but have persevered on till success has forced from the lips of the skeptical world the acknowledgment of their worth. This is the right spirit. It will not do always to be governed by the opinions others have of us. Take as an illustration the publishing of *Sunny Side*. The manuscript of that beautiful book, revealing, as nothing else had done, the home

struggles of the pastor's life, was successively offered to almost every book publisher in Boston, and, refused by them all, was published by the private subscription of a few friends. Its sale has probably amounted to thousands of dollars. Let every one, then, study himself, his own powers and capabilities; and resolve, let others say what they may, that he will make the most he can of himself. It is no use for a man to get discouraged because nobody seems to appreciate him or care whether he is rewarded justly or not. What if no one does care for him? He cares for himself; he knows himself, and for present purposes that is enough. Let him persevere if he believes he is right, whatever may be the opinions of others, and resolve that he will be eminent in his calling, if it is no more than a clam-digger, or a boot-black. If he is a mechanic, let him strive to stand at the head in his calling. If a farmer, to have the best cultivated farm around him! And whatever his avocation, let him strive to confer honor upon it. For if there is a sign of *littleness* in this world, it is that of a man throwing himself upon his dignity, and demanding respect because he belongs to a particular profession. Blowing his own trumpet by the peculiar badges of his office, he is just the smallest edition of humanity the world has yet published and bound in calf. If a man can confer no honor upon his profession by belonging to it, in the name of decency, never let him ask honor of that. And again, it is just as certain as it is that such animals exist, that if a man journeys very far, he will have, now and then, little curs barking at his heels. But his best way is, to take no kind of notice of them, but persevere on; for possibly, if he should attempt to demolish even the smallest, the little cur's yelping might bring others around him in scores, and perhaps a few large dogs, out of sympathy for their smaller brethren, might join in the attack, and make the fight too much for his immediate comfort.

Now a man must make up his mind either to be a cypher in the world, or to stem opposition. For there are some men whose understandings are encased in a shell of prejudice against everything new, and every new man, thicker and harder than the shell of a tortoise. Indeed, with some, it is only on extra-

ordinary occasions that we see any evidence that they deign to notice at all what is taking place around them: when, like a snapping turtle running out his head to bite his enemy, and quickly drawing it in again, they occasionally get off a sarcastic joke, a hissing sneer, or a red hot denunciation against an innovation or an innovator, and then throw themselves back into the cushioned chair of their conservative dignity.

Again: One should not be discouraged because he does not see the immediate fruits of his labors, or hear them acknowledged by others. It is said in ancient Scandinavian Mythology, that the fabled god at one time being commanded to strike with his hammer, struck with all his might, and although at the time he could scarcely perceive the dent, yet he afterwards saw that he had made the vast bed of the ocean, and shaken the earth by his blows. So I would say to every one, let him make his mark if it seems a faint one at the time, let him strike. Why, the world is ringing yet with the blows of Luther's hammer, nailing his ninety-five immortal theses to his chapel door in Wittenberg. Strike, then, for it may be that a spark of ethereal fire may follow the blow, which shall kindle a flame that centuries cannot extinguish. Strike, then, for as the Cyclops forged the thunderbolts which the mighty Jove hurled over the world, so the arguments and efforts which our God directs against the world of error must be forged by human instrumentalities. Strike, then, I say, for the God who has lithographed the raindrops, and the footprints of fossil animals as a historic account of the creation, will take good care that the effects of moral blows are not obliterated. Ages hence, geologists of the moral world shall discover their impressions, and read in them the history of man's redemption from ignorance and sin.

But finally: The fact that one has not met with expected success, while it should not discourage him from still persevering, it should have authority enough with him to cause most rigid self-examinations; enough to induce him also to harbor a suspicion, at least, that he has overrated his own powers, or, at least, certainly their manifestations to others. It is not always wise because a man fails, for him to settle it at once in his heart that the world is mole-eyed, or jaundice-eyed, or enclosed in an

•



impervious skin of crocodile insensibility; for the mole-eyes and the jaundice-eyes, and the crocodile-skin may be nearer home. An intoxicated man is apt to imagine that the ground comes up and strikes his face, when everybody else can see that it is his face that strikes the ground.

A man, therefore, who is wounded by unappreciative neglect, should examine the closer for his own defects, study the harder for improvement; and determine more firmly that he will excel, conscious that he is right. The fact that he feels that he is not fully appreciated should teach him the absolute necessity of another state of existence; another scene of action in the spirit-world, where the good man, pressed down with poverty and hard usage here, so that he had scarcely a moment's time for moral improvement, for the enjoyment of friendship, or the cultivation of his mind, shall have a release from his heavy burdens; and where, also, he shall receive a just reward of his deeds, which have been overlooked here in the great world-struggle for success. And rest assured that there are many such, many whom nature has highly endowed, and who might have been worldly great,

“ But knowledge to their eyes her ample page,  
 Rich with the spoils of time did ne'er unroll:  
 Chill penury repressed their noble rage,  
 And froze the genial current of the soul.”

But it will not be so above. It is said the fabled god, Himindal, could hear the grass grow in the fields, and the wool upon the backs of the lambs. But there is a God who is no fable, that has an ear so acute that he catches every silent aspiration of the heart for true elevation; and his eye notes every improvement, every victory over selfish passion, every good deed; and his recording angel writes each in the book of heaven, and follows their pilgrimage to distant ages, and writes down all their influence; and on the opposite page the just reward to each; and though heaven and earth should fail, that reward will come sooner or later, in this world or in eternity, and it will be only the sweeter for patient waiting.

## ART. IV.—CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD SERMON.

It is not our purpose in this article to delineate an *ideal* sermon, to discuss the question what a sermon may be, or ought to be, but what a good sermon *is*. Amid all the varieties of taste and degrees of cultivation existing in Christendom, there is still a standard, and an agreement upon the essentials of a good sermon. Compare a thousand sermons, of as many ministers, in every part of the world, delivered in every variety of circumstance, and esteemed good by their respective auditories; and they would be found to differ, indeed in many respects, yet they would be substantially alike. Our present labor, therefore, is not an investigation of theories, but a plain statement of facts. The compass of our subject precludes much detail or illustration. Yet, though our remarks must be quite general, they shall be practical.

The power of the pulpit always has been, and still is, very great. Whether we regard its antiquity, extending back at least to Noah, who was "a preacher of righteousness;" the list of those who have occupied the station, embracing many of the most illustrious names that have adorned the pages of history; the nature of their mission, as ambassadors of Christ, to proclaim the message of mercy to perishing sinners; the happy results of their labors in every age and clime, we should expect for the Christian pulpit a very high appreciation. And whatever drawbacks there may be arising from its commonness, the indifference to religion, and the worldliness of men, yet the influence of preachers of the gospel at the present day is surpassed by that of no other class. Would that all who occupy this sacred and responsible trust duly honored their calling.

1. We mention as the first characteristic of a good sermon, *that it be on a suitable subject*. This rule is violated in various ways. Some preachers never have any subject, but perpetually ramble. It is impossible for the chorister to select a hymn at the close applicable to the subject of the discourse, or for any of the congregation to tell what was the subject of the discourse; for the discourse had no subject. It may have contained impor-

tant truth, and possessed various excellent qualities; but it lacked one very important characteristic of a good sermon. The nature of the occasion, the design of the preaching, the laws of mind are all disregarded by such procedure.

Others have a subject, but it is not one suitable for a gospel sermon. What might be very proper for a scientific or philosophical lecture, an oration, or a Lyceum essay, may not be an appropriate subject for a sermon. The early preachers of Christianity are very good models in this as in many other respects. Gregory Nazianzen mentions the following among the topics commonly treated in the pulpit of his day:—"The universal providence of God, the creation, fall and restoration of man, the incarnation, passion, and second coming of Christ; the resurrection, judgment, and final state of rewards and punishments, the trinity." Chrysostom, one of the most successful of the early preachers, used such subjects as these: "The benefit of afflictions; not seeking to know all things, is supreme wisdom; the reproach of the world is glory; death is better than life; it is better to suffer, than to inflict injury; immortality, heaven, and hell, the long-suffering of God, pardon, repentance, true faith, mystery, heresy."

The apostle Paul confined himself to the subject of "Christ crucified," and his method of treating it we may learn from his epistles. But the best of all models is the preaching of Christ himself. He never selected a frivolous subject, or one merely to amuse the fancy, gratify the curiosity, please the vanity, or excite the wonder of his hearers; but such as pertained to their highest spiritual and immortal welfare.\*

\* With such subjects of discourse, compare those selected in the dark periods of the Roman Catholic supremacy, such as: "Whether Abel was slain with a club, and of what species of wood? From what sort of tree was Moses' rod taken? Was the gold which the Magi offered to Christ coined, or in a mass?" In a collection of sermons, composed in 1430, by the Theological faculty of Vienna, a regular history is given of the *thirty pieces* which Judas had for betraying his Master. For a considerable period before the Reformation, according to Ferrarius, the prevailing topics of the pulpit were: "The authority of the mother church; the merits and intercession of departed saints; the dignity of the blessed virgin; the efficacy of relics; and above

Again, a subject may be important, and suitable for a gospel sermon, yet not appropriate to a particular occasion. For instance, a discourse on the internal evidences of Christianity, or on Christian experience, would not be adapted to a congregation of impenitent persons; or one on the duties of parents or magistrates to a company of youth; or one involving deep metaphysical or literary difficulties to an illiterate audience. Very much here depends on good judgment. An eminent father in the ministry once remarked to us, that in the selection of his subject, he always considered first the circumstances of those he proposed to address, and what they most needed, and then sought to adapt his subject to their wants. Very much depends on appropriateness. It is a word *fitly* spoken, that is like apples of gold in pictures of silver. The usefulness of a sermon depends, in a great degree, upon its being adapted to the people and to the occasion. But more of this in the sequel.

2 The second characteristic of a good sermon is, that *it is based upon an appropriate text*. We do not affirm that a good sermon was never preached from an inappropriate text, or from no text at all. Doubtless there have been such, but they were faulty, at least in this respect. The custom of preaching from texts of scripture has long prevailed, and has many advantages. The Bible is the gospel ambassador's book of instructions; the only verbal revelation God has made to the world, the fountain of religious instruction, and our only infallible rule of faith and practice. It is due to such a volume, that the teacher of religion should derive all his doctrine from it. When he does so, he can speak with authority. Then, to adopt the idea of an old divine, it is not what I say or you say, or any other uninspired man says; but what the word of God declares. And the sentiments thus authorized must have weight with all who regard God and his word.

The good sermon has not only an appropriate subject and text, but one that develops the subject from the text. Professor *Stuart*, of Andover, used to say that some preachers might as

all, the terrors of *purgatory*, and the utility of *indulgences*." "Sermons," says Dr. Porter, "consisted of quibbles, fables, and prodigies; and religion consisted of external ceremonies.

well take the first verse of Chronicles for a text as any other. There is so little connection between the text and the sermon. Some will treat any subject from any text. An English preacher, on one occasion, took for his text Luke 2: 14: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." From this he discussed the doctrines of Calvin's Institutes.\*

The subject may be a good one, and the text a good one, yet the sermon faulty, from the fact that it is not a development of the text. This is a point of much importance. If from John 3: 3, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," the discourse should be upon the constitution of man, or the nature of the kingdom of God, all would at once see its inappropriateness to the text; for, although "man" and the "kingdom of God," are mentioned in the passage, they do not express its sentiment, which is the necessity of regeneration. As another less palpable example, we may refer to Rom. 7: 14: "I am carnal, sold under sin." Should the subject of discourse from this passage be this, The Christian is under the dominion of sin, violence would be done to the passage; because the apostle in that connection is not describing Christian experience, but that of the legalist, who has not yet come into the liberty of the gospel. See Rom. 6: 20, 22; 8: 1, 2.

It may be replied to such criticism, the sentiment is taught in other passages of Scripture, if not in the text. This is not sufficient. The gospel minister is set to expound the Scriptures correctly, not in general, but in detail. In this respect he should follow the example of the preachers with Ezra, who "read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." Neh. 8: 8. What propriety is there in selecting a text, which does not express the sentiment of the discourse? If one is at liberty to

\* Some are always seeking for obscure, eccentric texts. *Dr. Campbell* mentions a sermon on *faith and holiness*, with the text: "A golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate."—Ex. 28: 34. Faith comes by hearing, hence a bell, being *sonorous*, is an emblem of faith. Holiness is *fruitful*, and therefore represented by a pomegranate, which is an excellent fruit.

do it, another may. If truth may be taught in this way, so may error. One takes as his text 1 Cor. 15 : 22, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." From this he argues the final salvation of all men, though the passage in its connection plainly teaches the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. But the Universalist preacher may say, that his doctrine is taught in other passages, if not in that; and if I am in the habit of delivering my sentiments from texts which do not teach them, he is in this respect following the same example. And in this way who can tell what the Bible does teach, since any text may be applied to any sentiment, whether relevant or irrelevant? The confidence of the people must be weakened both in the preacher and in the Scriptures.

This does not preclude us from sometimes using a text by way of *accommodation*. Much of the Scriptures which previously had a local bearing, is still of general application, and may be so used, though with an understanding of its original connection. So general principles may be specifically applied, because genus must contain its species—the whole embraces its parts. But here all fanciful analogies, eccentricities, and private interpretations will be avoided by those of a sound and discreet mind.

It is evident from what has been remarked, that the selection of a text is no light thing. In scarcely any other way is the haste and carelessness with which sermons are often prepared more obvious than in this. Perhaps the discourse is prepared before the text is selected, and then, especially, it will not be found easy to select a text strictly appropriate to the subject and treatment. The subject may be, and generally is, selected before the text, but its treatment, the discourse itself, should be founded upon, and grow out of the text. Otherwise it can hardly be called a gospel sermon.

3. A good sermon is *perspicuous*. This rule is so obvious that it may seem unnecessary to mention it. To violate it is to violate one of the first laws of the mind. In the ordinary affairs of life, if one who wished to influence another, should be indifferent whether he was understood or not, and even labor not to be understood, we should question his discretion and

even his sanity. But because there are difficulties and mysteries in religion, (and, indeed, where are there not?) some ministers seem willing and desirous to be obscure.\*

When there is no false theory or unworthy purpose to mislead, a discourse may be lacking in perspicuity from various causes. From want of method. Some have no arrangement of their subject, but speak at random whatever comes uppermost. There is little connection in their thoughts, and much confusion and repetition. They may have a meaning, yet fail to make it intelligible or impressive for this cause. Others have bad arrangement, and so defeat their own purpose. Good arrangement is of great consequence. Why do some men succeed so well in business? Because of their skilful arrangements. Napoleon owed his victories over the veteran warriors of Europe to his powerful plans, combinations, arrangements, more than to any other cause. It was this mainly which enabled him so often with a much inferior force to overwhelm the armies of his enemies. No less essential to success is judicious method to the gospel minister. All know that the same truth when so presented according to the laws of mind as to have its full force may be very impressive, while from want of such presentation it may make little or no impression. So, also, of the combination of truths in a sermon.

Every subject has divisions and subdivisions. No one can write or speak rationally on any topic for half an hour without them. True he may not mark them numerically or otherwise, he may not be aware of them, and his hearers may not. Still they exist. Analyze the discourse, and they at once appear. Division exists everywhere in nature, and is everywhere conformable to the laws of mind. It is not, therefore, for the preacher to *make* divisions, but to exhibit them as they naturally appear. To understand the subject as a whole, and each part, and their relations to each other, is requisite to a proper understanding of it, on the part both of the preacher and the

\* This is often one of the easiest ways of establishing a reputation for profundity, on the old popular maxim: *Omne ignotum pro miraculo*. Many mistake the *muddiness* of the bottom for *depth* of the stream. A great obscurity is apt to be a great nothing.

people. This will frequently require deep study and extensive knowledge, but it will abundantly repay the labor bestowed upon it.\*

Perspicuity should be sought in each thought and each train of thought. Rarely should it be sacrificed in a single sentence to anything else. The Bible addresses the reason, and through that the conscience and the heart. Our relations and duties are practical, and truth should ever be presented in the most plain, clear, and practical manner.

4. A good sermon is *evangelical*. The great commission which Christ gave to his disciples was: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark 16: 15. Said Paul: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." 2 Cor. 5:20. Again: "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." 1 Cor. 2: 2. Equally explicit was the instruction given to the servants of God under the former dispensation. "Son of man, speak to the children of thy people, and say unto them, When I bring the sword upon a land, if the people of the land take a man of their coasts, and set him for their watchman. If, when he see the sword come upon the land, he blow the trumpet, and warn the people: Then, whosoever heareth the sound of the trumpet, and taketh not warning; if the sword come and take him away, his blood shall be upon his own head. \* \* \* But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand. So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou

\* All unnatural, artificial, uniform methods of division should be avoided. Some always have three divisions. Others divide all subjects on some fanciful plan, as having *seven*, because it is a sacred number, or *four* to correspond to the four evangelists, or *nine* for the muses, or *twelve* for the apostles. It is said that Bishop Latimer divided into four, corresponding to a pack of cards; saying that the Pope is King of clubs, and hearts are trumps. All such eccentricities are unworthy of the pulpit.



shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me."—Ezek. 33 : 2—7.

Such passages show with great clearness the duty of those whom God calls to the sacred office. The world lieth in wickedness. God, in his great compassion, sent his Son to die to open the way, so that whoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have eternal life. This gospel of reconciliation and salvation was proclaimed through the gift of prophecy during all the periods of the ancient dispensations. It was proclaimed by Christ himself, by his apostles, and has been proclaimed in every age since by his church, and especially by those called of God to the gospel ministry. This is their calling, their particular business, to warn the wicked, win them from the paths of sin, and guide them in the way to heaven. Truly a responsible and blessed work.

The work of the gospel is indeed a great work. To show men their sins in all their complicated forms, to expose the fountains of corruption in the heart, and the fearful effects and consequences of sin here and hereafter; to unfold the gospel scheme, and win them to the renouncement of all worldliness and selfishness, and the entire consecration of themselves to the service of Christ, is what an angel from heaven unsupported would be insufficient for, and can be fulfilled by those called thereto only through the aid of him who is pledged to be with them to the end of the world.

The gospel is full and comprehensive in its provisions, instructions, requirements. It extends to all the moral conduct, and to all the motives of the heart. It rebukes sin wherever found; exhibits, defends, enforces the truth in all its demands, repels wrong, and maintains the right. Jesus unfolded its objects in one of his first sermons. After his temptation of forty days by satan, he returned to Nazareth, and on the Sabbath went into the synagogue; and the book of Isaiah being delivered to him, he selected as his text the first two verses of the sixty-second chapter of that prophet. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted; to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the

blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." From this text he laid down the following proposition: This day is the scripture fulfilled in your ears. On this he preached a discourse of great power, many witnessing to the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. Luke 4: 16—22.

Ministers of Christ are not at liberty to confine themselves to a part, but are bound to preach the whole gospel, to declare all the counsel of the Lord. They are not to swerve from their course for fear or favor of man, because some sin is popular, or some doctrine of grace is unpopular; but to discharge their whole duty, and clear their skirts from the blood of souls. Thus will they preach the whole gospel, and not go beyond the gospel. They will preach not only the matter of the gospel, but also in the spirit of the gospel. One of the ablest ministers ever nurtured in New England,\* has spoken with great truthfulness on this subject. "Faithful ministers never preach mere philosophy, nor mere metaphysics, nor mere morality. If they discuss the being and perfections of God, the works of creation and providence, the powers and faculties of the human soul, or the social and relative duties, they consider all these subjects as branches of the one comprehensive system of the gospel. Hence, when they preach upon the inward exercises of the heart, they represent love, repentance, humility, submission, sobriety, &c., not as *moral virtues*, but as *Christian graces*. And when they discourse upon moral topics, they inculcate the duties of rulers and subjects, of parents and children, masters and servants, by motives drawn from the precepts and sanction of the gospel." These are words of deep import, though so often disregarded by those favoring one or another extreme.

5. The last characteristic of a good sermon which we shall here notice is, that *it is adapted to the circumstances of the audience*. A sermon may have all other features, yet failing in this, it cannot be pronounced a good sermon. It may be on an important subject, from an appropriate text, and treated according to the most approved rules of sermonizing; sound in

\* Dr. Emmons.

doctrine, logical, perspicuous, energetic, practical in itself; yet, failing to suit the occasion, be almost or altogether worthless. And this, we apprehend, is not only one of the greatest, but one of the most common faults of sermons, and detracts more than any other thing from the power of the pulpit. The widespread and growing indifference to the ministrations of the sanctuary is appalling, and demands investigation. Go into our courts, lyceums, political meetings, and you will find the deepest interest. Every word is listened to and produces its impression. Pettifoggers will wrangle for hours and days before an audience who are all attention to a case where a few shillings are involved. But in the sanctuary of God, where subjects are presented affecting the dearest interests for time and eternity, and by men, too, commissioned of God, well furnished for the work, of high ability and fidelity, some of the congregation are asleep, and many others perfectly indifferent. Such an anomaly cannot be wholly accounted for, by referring to the depravity of the heart. That surely has its influence. But the fault is not all with the people. When the laws of mind are disregarded, it is vain to expect that any intrinsic importance in the subject or occasion will supply the deficiency.

Sermonizing, and indeed the whole service of the sanctuary has in a great measure degenerated into *formalism*, the influence of which upon spiritual religion whenever and wherever it has prevailed, is well known. It is exacting upon the form of the surplice, or tie of the cravat, or minutiae of the ritual, or the elegance of the address; but of the state of the heart, the demands of truth, the adaptation to the conduct and the conscience, it makes little account. Indeed, the less positive quality there is in these respects, the better. Said a gentleman, who well knew, to us, respecting the orthodox pulpits of one of our large cities: "They are allowed to speak against sin in general, but must be very careful that their remarks shall not be personally applicable to any of their fashionable hearers. The minister who should dare to intimate that a gentleman or lady needed any other than baptismal regeneration, or could be exposed to the hell where vulgar sinners go, would be regarded as altogether too ignorant or unrefined to serve them."

Formalism and hypocrisy go together. The former never exists without the latter; and how God regards them, and those who require and delight in them, may be seen by a few references: "This is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord: Which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits." Isa. 30: 9, 10. "Bring no mere vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to hear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear; your hands are full of blood." Isa. 1: 13—15. "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." Matt. 23: 14. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." V. 23.

It needs no remarks of ours to prove that the succession of those above described has not yet become extinct. Men grow up in the midst of some of our churches, and listen to sermons every Sabbath, who have never heard their own condition as sinners described, or had Christ presented to them individually as their only Savior. Whole generations in the midst of the clearest light, can hardly be said ever to have enjoyed the faithful preaching of the gospel. Sin of the deepest dye luxuriates unrebuked in these congregations. Skepticism and vice abound and increase with very little check or hindrance. Unparalleled outrages upon the rights of men are committed, the ablest statesmen, and purest patriots are stricken down by ruffianly assault in the halls of legislation, towns are pillaged and burnt, and unoffending citizens flee for their lives, or are butchered by the mob, because they dare seek peaceably and lawfully to prevent the curse of slavery from rolling its deadly waves over a broad and

fertile domain consecrated by our fathers forever to freedom, but these pulpits are dumb!

No wonder if such pulpits are not only forsaken of God, but cease to influence men. While the highest practical wants of the individual, the community, the country, the world, are ignored, is it strange if people lose their interest in them, and begin seriously to inquire if they do not cost more than they are worth? What better are many of our congregations for all the instruction they receive from the sacred desk? Far be it from us to indulge in any indiscriminate censure. To their own honor and the glory of God be it spoken, that there are no more fearless and faithful men, and there never were, than some who occupy the American pulpit at the present day. And the number is increasing. But the truth should be spoken, that there is still a wide and most shameful delinquency among those professedly set upon the walls of Zion, a delinquency and subserviency which are doing more than aught else to bring reproach upon the gospel ministry, destroy the interest of their ministrations, and render them useless.

The sermon which is adapted to the purposes of the gospel is conceived in the spirit of the gospel, it recognizes the individual condition of those it addresses according to the instructions of the gospel, the immortality, accountability, sinfulness, exposure, the provisions for their salvation, and the conditions with which they must individually comply. With fidelity and discrimination it makes each one feel that this truth applies to him, and it is of the highest moment that he should immediately attend to it. While it is thus discriminating and faithful with individuals, it will of course take due cognizance of whatever affects the moral and spiritual condition of the community which individuals compose; with their various relations and connections.

No moral herbarium, no collection of stereotyped formularies, no essays or abstractions, can ever make a good gospel sermon. No two persons are entirely alike, nor the same person at two different times; much less two congregations, or the same congregation on two occasions. Hence the necessity of adaptation to the existing circumstances. A sermon adapted

to the circumstances can never be uninteresting. There may be, then, degrees of excellence, but the fact that a discourse is adapted to the present needs of those addressed, is so much in its favor as to counterbalance almost every other consideration. Then so far as it has merits in other respects, they will be felt and appreciated. While a discourse may have ever so many good qualities, yet failing to be adapted to the occasion, will fall powerless to the ground.

These topics, so imperfectly presented, might be unfolded and illustrated much more amply; also, kindred ones of equal interest. Our aim has been merely to give what we judged to be some timely hints. The subject of the *delivery* of sermons so important in its bearing upon the appreciation and influence of the sermon as to be justly regarded as a part of the sermon itself, must be passed over at this time. If we shall succeed in any measure in awakening attention to the means of rendering such an instrumentality as the pulpit more effective in its influence upon the highest interests of mankind, we shall be repaid for our feeble efforts a hundred fold.

---

#### ART. V—PASTORAL LABOR.

Every person, in charge of an evangelical Christian church, is supposed, from his position, to be devoted to its interests. If matters of private and personal importance, on the one hand, or of general and cosmopolitan importance on the other, at any time, claim his attention and crowd his sympathies, they are all supposed to be carefully subordinated to his pulpit, and pastoral usefulness. He lives for the church—and especially for the church local—the particular flock—“over which the Holy Ghost has made him overseer.” He is a shepherd—a bishop. And as the Great Shepherd “laid down his life for the sheep,” so is he to regard no attention to the interests of his flock too exclusive, no zeal for their welfare too great, and no sacrifice for

their sake too painful—whether of time, property, reputation, or even life itself. In a word, the under-shepherd, like the Great Shepherd, is to be exclusively absorbed in care for the flock. This we believe to be the just view of the duty growing out of the relation of the pastor to his people—a view which, however extreme it may seem, finds ample confirmation in the sacredness and responsibility of that relation. The man who holds the responsibility for a hundred lives, at the engine of a steam train, flying among the hills, must look only and constantly in one direction. Otherwise “Norwalk tragedies” stare and startle us on every page of our “dailys.” And shall it not be deemed vastly more imperative that the men who bear responsibility for the safe guidance of moral trains, freighted with souls, as they rush through the dangerous passes of this world, to sweep away into the next, shall also have an eye single and constant? Man has many a responsible care, but there is, there can be conceived, no care like the “*care of souls.*” And if, as one has said, “’t would take an angel from above to paint the immortal soul, it needs scarcely less than an angel to guide it from ‘this world’s bad coast,’ when backward bound for home.”

“The field is the world.” Upon all soils trodden by the foot of man, the seed of the word is to be scattered. In all places where sin abounds, however dark and obscure, there must the grace of life abound also. The gospel must be preached to every creature—to the Hottentot, the Afghan, the Kalmuck, and to the strange and savage men of whatever hitherto unexplored depths of continents and undiscovered islands of the ocean. The field is the world, and the church is bound to see that it is *all* cultivated—that *every* wilderness is made to blossom as the rose.

But man has only one single body through which his soul may act, and that body is, as a general rule, necessarily the centre of the narrow theatre of his useful activities. To be sure, some men have had, and evinced a wonderful power of self-multiplication, by tongue, pen, and otherwise; and to do this, every person should, as much as possible, aim. But after all, most men’s “feeble ray scarce spreads an inch around.”

The theatre of even Judson's *active* operations was for the most of his life narrowly shut up in the land of the Karens. And it was by an almost superhuman concentration of his powers upon that corner of the great "*field*," which Divine Providence evidently assigned him, that he succeeded so well, and secured to himself a name, above almost every human name. To be sure, Judson had a heart for *universal* labor; but his hands were but two, and his arms were short, like other men's. Though the world lay before him, he could thrust in the sickle only at some single point. Though he felt, like his equal brother, Rev. Dr. Sutton, that he could willingly submit to be cut into inch pieces, if every piece could become a faithful missionary in the great field, in a corner of which he was reaping, still, ubiquity was denied him. He must submit to see vast fields, "white and ready for the harvest," lying down-trodden and reaperless in "*the regions beyond*." And so with every faithful Christian laborer.

Whatever views may be taken of these remarks, they certainly cannot serve the sad end of narrowing any Christian's views of his possible usefulness, and thereby checking the aspirations of a truly Christian and world-wide benevolence. For the way to act most effectually in the whole world, is to act most *intensely* on a single point. Man acts by influencing, and the central fires of it are, generally, at the point where he *is*, in the circle in which he personally moves. And these fires must be kept briskly burning.

The *Christian pastor* moves in a comparatively narrow circle—it is his parish. There is his world. For the redemption of that he has assumed special responsibility. His flock is there, and he is to them as "a shepherd" in place of "the Great Shepherd and bishop of souls." He might have been an evangelist, and gone forth from people to people crying, "repent ye and be converted." He might have been a missionary, seeking amid the churchless wilds of heathenism, a people for God. But he has chosen to be a pastor, and pastoral responsibilities are laid upon him. His immediate field is marked out under his eye, and the burden of his holy ambition is to cultivate it well. And though this field seem small, it can well and profitably fill



up the laborious life time of the spiritual husbandman with seed sowing, and garnering. It

---

“ is large enough  
To fill up every cranny of his time,  
And leave him much to answer, if one wretch  
Be damned by his neglect.”

The numerous local evangelical churches of the world are more than its theological centres. They are schools of practical Christianity of which the pastor stands at the head. They are sources of the gushing waters of life which flow down from their sublime heights, and go sparkling to the ends of the earth. They are Divine radiators; and they radiate men. They are ever throwing off benefactors into every department of the field of Christian philanthropy. Missionaries are their sons and daughters. The parochial Christian church is primary to all that is excellent or powerful in the instrumentalities for the conversion of the world. *Its field is the world, most emphatically, and its mission is to send forth laborers into every part of it. It is a heart which pulsates through universal humanity; and its present forces may be learned, if a skilful finger but touch the wrist of a heathen nation. Such is the local church. How responsible its pastorate! What a theatre of usefulness! How much lies upon the hands of the man who enters it! Who more than he need be “diligent—redeeming the time”—be instant in season, out of season. He stands at the very fountain of the waters of life, destined for this world, to regulate their flow. For him indeed should much prayer be made. For no evangelist of early days, when churches were unknown out of Jerusalem, even to Paul himself, had greater reason than he to cry out, “Who is sufficient for these things?” And feeling the importance of the parochial to the universal field, and striving to intensify his action immediately upon it, he, if any man, will have abundant occasion to feel with his Savior, “The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up,” and, if not exceedingly careful, will be an old man at thirty-five.*

It may, indeed, be, that some reader of this article, in charge of a pastorate, has felt that his field is too narrow for him. His large heart has benevolently sighed for a wider range of

his activities. He would plant in all fields—"sow beside all waters." He would "go forth, bearing precious seed." He would flee the "pent up Utica," which, as he imagines, "contracts his powers." Now these promptings are indeed generous, but generally **sadly mistaken**. The theatre of the immediate personal activity of the Son of God himself was very narrow. It was confined to the limited suburbs of the heart of the world. But where the adorable Son of God did act, he acted intensely, and life-currents shot to the ends of the earth. So, the sphere in which any of his ministers go "*about* doing good," may be comparatively small, bounded by the limits of a parish—a local church with its suburbs. But let him but concentrate his endeavor and intensify his action upon that sphere, and he too shall, under God, force streams of living waters far out into the barren deserts of iniquity.

Faithful evangelical missionaries "to distant barb'rous climes," offering themselves, as they do, living sacrifices upon the altar of this world's redemption, have just and large claims upon Christian sympathy, and evince a moral heroism which must never be forgotten, or cease to be respected. But, that the humble and unpretending **pastorate** in which men ordained of God to preach the gospel move at home, affords no opportunity for an equal moral heroism, is entirely untrue. Indeed, in this very age, and in this New England, it is a question whether more moral courage and equal activity are not essential to faithfulness and success in many a parish, than on the very plains of India. The comparison will not be deemed insidious. We yield to no living man in our appreciation of the faithful foreign missionary. But we appreciate also the *faithful* Christian pastor, and, on reflection, believe all that is justly to be **inferred from what we have said above**, to be strictly true. The charge of the latter is, in importance, **second to no other ever committed to human hands**. And so it should be **regarded**.

Night lies upon the slumbering city. Balmy sleep is bathing with her soothing influence the weary limbs of her thousand inhabitants, when the lonesome alarm bell breaks upon the still deep shadows, and tells that somebody is in distress or danger. **Rushing out into the street, you soon discover a squadron of strong**

men, lustily heaving away at a gloomy-looking engine. Leaving them in their perspiration, you follow what seems a hard, round leathern tube, or cylinder, as it winds around among the buildings to where a fire is gathering rapidly in the second story of a rich mercantile block; and there, upon a ladder, at one of its windows, stands a man, struggling with the smoke from within, grasping hard the metallic end of that mysterious tube as it lies on his broad shoulder and sends a spiteful stream of water whithersoever he directs it. Now you understand the secret. This last man is indeed nearer the fire; but does its extinguishment depend more upon him than upon those brave men whose brawny arms ply the engine? Nay, if he is nearer the fire, they are nearer the fountain, and well represent pastors of churches relatively to foreign missionaries, and philanthropists generally.

Christ is the Shepherd of all flocks. By him all flocks are fed with spiritual food. By him they are all led into green pastures, and beside still waters. His voice they all know, and obey. But not so with the human shepherd of his appointment. He has his local "habitation and place," and duties. It is with a single flock that he has "to do." And his highest ambition is to do for them well. Nor, as we have already intimated, will he be oppressed with leisure, or want of care or of anxiety, if he have any just and serious apprehension of the duties of his position. Nor will he feel that a higher and more extensive usefulness demands any enlargement of his field. And if, in any case, he so overlook the duties at hand, as to sigh for duties distant, he thereby only exhibits the folly of the farmer who thoughtlessly covets more land than he can profitably cultivate; a thing which the wise pastor will never do. Though aiming, not less positively than the missionary to the heathen, at the conversion of the whole world, he feels no want of play for his benevolent activities in the narrow sphere of his own parish, so long as its saving resources are, to a great extent, still undeveloped or unapplied.

The above views will receive additional confirmation if we examine the laborious duties of the pastor in detail. Then will it be seen, if not before, that

“It is not a case of small import  
The pastor's care demands.”

1. The pastor ~~is~~, in this age, generally, also preacher. One day in seven, his charge gather before him, asking for instruction “in word and in doctrine.” And during the six days of every seven, he is to prepare himself to bring forth out of the treasury of wisdom “things new and old,” with the promptness of a “wise scribe,” instructed into “the kingdom of God.” And the labor and responsibility of this task, bear heavily upon both head and heart. All true Bible doctrine is to be inculcated, and all false doctrine to be crushed out of the minds of his parishioners by a skilful application of truth. And this will demand the labored preparations for the pulpit which are a weariness to the flesh; while the fear that error and skepticism will continue rampant in spite of him, will involve the preacher in anxieties, which, as he is Christ's servant, burn to his very soul.

It is, as we will soon attempt to show, a fault in the evangelical ministry of the present time, that so little strictly pastoral labor is performed. But a significant apology for this is sometimes found in the fact that the pastor is overwhelmed with the sense of his responsibility as *preacher*. It is indeed true, that the performance of a good share of pastoral labor is *one* of the best aids to his preparation for the pulpit. But he has not learned so to apprehend it, and therefore he is in the region of deep and wearisome thought, clinging to his book and his pen, when it were better for both him and his people that he should be abroad among them, pastorally ministering to their various necessities. Oppressed with the responsibility of instructing and persuading his people as a mass, he so far forgets or undervalues the duty of laboring with them as families and as individuals, that pastoral labors are neglected. While there is no reasonable doubt that many a clergyman is wanting in his attention to these latter labors, because he is indolent, or because he is heartless, or because, as he says, he has no taste for them, or from some other consideration, equally frivolous or vile, still we doubt not there are some, whose neglect of pastoral labor merits the above apology. Overwhelmed with their responsi-)

bility as preachers, they sit, and think, and sigh, and pray, in their studies, when they should be abroad among their people. But, be all this as it may, the pastor, looking out upon his people, as slow to learn the truth, and "prone to wander" from it, must feel that, as preacher, he has a great work upon his hands—so great that he has little disposition to ask a greater. As from the pulpit he trains men, not only for heaven, but for all the high places of spiritual "trust and profit," which the Spirit and Providence of God are everywhere through the "wide, wide world," sending forth efficient men to fill, he may well feel that he is doing a great work, worthy the highest exercise of all his powers, and ask for no higher responsibilities.

2. We have incidentally alluded to the prevalent ministerial neglect of pastoral duties, and charitably framed a possible apology for it. We might allude, scathingly, to a prevalent neglect of preparation for pulpit duty; though to find an apology for that might prove quite as difficult. But we pass that matter by for the present, as it does not enter into the design of this paper. The strictly pastoral field is an important one. Let us further examine it.

Preaching has to do with the masses—or with the parish as a whole. Pastoral duties have to do with individuals, or with individual families. In pastoral labors, the minister is always directly personal; in pulpit labors he is never so. His preaching is indeed to be close and searching. It is so to mirror forth the various shades of character, and set forth its relation to God, the Judge of all, that every auditor who will, may find the exact counterpart of his own, and learn whether smiles or sighs best become him. But still, the pulpit is no place for direct personalities. Those belong to the private walks of pastoral life. There the minister of the church "may examine thoroughly the situation and the wants" of every individual, and "be *his* pastor as assiduously as he is that of the *flock*." He may set down with his parishoners severally, in their own houses, and become acquainted with their opinions and feelings, learning their habits of thought, and reflection, and in what manner, and to what extent, they have been influenced by his labors from week to week, and from year to year. He may, by a discreet and affec-

tionate, but never low, familiarity, as a man of God, win them to lay open their hearts confidentially to him, freely discovering difficulties in the way of their becoming Christians, or *fruitful* Christians, with which he must otherwise have remained unacquainted, and which shall be richly suggestive of new and successful modes of doing them, and others, good; so that his preaching, hitherto a barren wilderness to their souls, shall become a fruitful field. Thenceforth his "doctrine" shall, to them, "drop as the rain, his speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the mown grass."

Says Vinet, "It is only an absolute impossibility that can justify the pastor in not occupying himself immediately with individuals. Solicitude for individuals is one of the characteristics of the New Testament and the new ministry. \* \* \* The gospel is addressed, the preacher is sent, not to peoples, to masses, but to all the individuals of which the masses or peoples are composed. If the preacher seek to act on masses, it is with reference to individuals; not that one individual is of more value than a thousand, which is an absurdity, but more than a people, as far as it is a people, more than a mass as such." Of individuals the same writer further says, "The minister seeks them in worship, or in public, only because he is not sure of finding them elsewhere, or because he has things to say which he can speak only to assembled individuals, or, finally, because the public assembly symbolizes equality, the community of interests, the communion of hearts. But so far as he may hope to find them elsewhere, he is to seek them elsewhere. This is the first duty, the first form of pastoral ministration; public preaching is only its complement."

These remarks are so judicious, so in keeping with the truthfulness and exactness of their celebrated author, and so commend themselves to reason and common sense, that it is not in man to gainsay them; though it is feared that it is, in many a man and minister of the gospel, to set them practically at naught. Yes, this is more than *feared*. It is realized most sadly, in the weakness and sickliness of many a flock of Christ—in the spiritual debility of many a proud and imposing congregation, whose minister knows them only as a mass, and who,

though he often converse with them individually upon every-day matters, approaches them *as pastor* only in the vague generalities of popular discourse. Alas for such pastors—and more sadly, alas, for their flocks. The former will do well to ponder the following question: “With what eye will the whole parish look upon a pastor who is a pastor only in the pulpit, who does not, so to speak, descend from the pulpit, and who, though he may know individuals, wishes [as pastor] only to know the mass?” With what judgment shall the sinner judge the man who is zealous for his salvation when he meets him with the multitude at the church, but perfectly indifferent to it, when he meets him isolated, in the street, or at the family fire-side? And how can he but become suspicious whether his clerical friend is as sincere as in the pulpit he seems to be, in his protestations of zeal for his welfare? Alas, such suspicions do often arise, and it is feared are now prevalent through many a congregation, in reference to the incumbents of their pulpits. Would that it were otherwise! For, “as much as pastoral zeal in the care of souls adds force to preaching, so much does negligence in the pastor enfeeble the preacher.”

And the Christian, too—how must he look upon the spiritual guide who is ever zealous in the pulpit to guard him against backsliding, and enforce upon him the duty, and indicate the means, of growth in grace, but who ever manifests an indifference to these things in his private social intercourse? His large charity may say that his minister is only peculiar, but, can he fail to suspect him also of gross negligence? He may excuse the matter by saying his minister lacks *taste* for private pastoral labor; but can he fail to suspect that he also lacks *heart* in his Master's work? The true Christian will, however, judge charitably in this, as in all other matters.

But our discussion is taking a wider range than we intended. However, and for whatever consideration, pastoral labor may be neglected, experience everywhere shows “a constant proportion between diligence in the care of souls, and the life of the parish.”

Preaching is to very many more agreeable than praying. The vilest men on 'change, worshipping a golden deity, can

preach good doctrine to passers by. And equally true it may be, that it is because preaching from the pulpit is more agreeable, involving, as it does, less self-denial, than preaching from "house to house," that the latter is so much neglected by men attentive to the former. It is very easy to harangue upon religious topics, an audience who have assembled together to invite your eloquence, and no one of which ever recognize a "*thou art the man!*" save for the special benefit of some neighboring pew. But to say to one of these easy worshippers, in the seclusion of his own fireside, "*Thou art the man,*" though this be done in the most affectionate and friendly manner, requires far more than a mere pulpit zeal for God. It requires a zeal, the lack of which is to-day a prominent cause of the lamentable dearth of church prosperity. The bell calls the minister to the pulpit—he must be there timely and zealously. But no bell calls him to admonish his backsliding brother alone—no bell calls him to the private dwelling to cheer by his counsels and prayers the drooping spirits of the feeble whom satan is sifting as wheat—no bell calls him to look after the poor and the destitute, who will apprise his sympathy, or the indifferent who will respond to his kind visits, perhaps, by greeting his eyes on the subsequent Sabbath in the house of God. No bell calls him even to the bed-side of the sick, (though a special message may.) No, the bell calls him only to the pulpit, and to perform funeral service over bodies forsaken of their spirits. And hence, the more zeal and thoughtfulness necessary in the minister to ensure his activity in doing good, outside the pulpit, to families and individuals! And hence this latter work, though the most truly Christ-like and all divine, is, too frequently, most of all neglected.

Pulpit labor has its general outline drawn by the church and congregation whom the pastor serves. The preacher fills it up cheerfully, and as matter of course with perhaps two discourses on the Sabbath. Having done this, he is likely to feel that "the letter of the law" is met. And if he visit the sick so officially and regularly, as to stifle the voice of complaint in that direction, he is taken to have answered the claims, and, perhaps, expectations of his parishioners. But, then, as to their *expectations*, he need pay little regard to them, for they are always



extreme! So he is likely to reason. And thus, that sincere pastoral labor, which, from its very nature, being infinitely various, and forever varying, admits of no previous specification, is easily passed slightly over. The presence of the preacher in the pulpit, at intervals, must be regular as the rising of the sun. But his presence in the families of his parish, exercising a quiet and saving ministry there, regarded as a sort of generous gratuity, is easily dispensed with, or easily excused! He has been exceedingly busy; or, if he has been positively negligent, it has but been the fruit of a forgetfulness which he deplores; and so he has only now to be the more sociable to wipe out the default.

But though it be very much easier for the pastor to answer for a neglect of pastoral than pulpit duty, to his *people*, it is not easier answering to his *God*. And, therefore, the man in holy orders, under absolute consecration, who has the fear of the judgment before his eyes, who is pressed with the constraining love of Christ, and who feels deep spiritual yearnings for the salvation of his people, will be no less zealous in his pastoral, than in his pulpit ministrations. He will address himself, as a servant of Christ, to his people individually, with no less earnestness than he exhibits when addressing them collectively. For his object is not to satisfy his parishioners, but to do them good, and satisfy the high court from which, by the grace of God, he is sent forth an ambassador; and as "ambassador for Christ," he prays sinners, *individually*, to be "reconciled to God." For him, it is but a small thing to be judged by men. Conscious that he is a minister, "not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead," he seeks the path of duty in the will of Him by whom "he is separated unto the gospel of God," and faithfully pursues it. He knows no conventional arrangement which can interfere with his highest usefulness. It is nothing to him that he has satisfied his parish, unless he has also satisfied his conscience and his God. As no man marks out his duty for him, so no man may say unto him, "*it is done*." He advises with his people, but takes counsel of him whom he serves "night and day." His life is a moral sublimity, second only to that of Him "who

went about doing good," wept in the "garden," and died on the "cross." Were all ministers of the gospel like him, the world would be very unlike what it is, parochial communities more holy, and such discussions as the present quite unnecessary. Every parish would then be sending abundant streams of living waters to cheer and renovate the moral wastes of the earth, and "make glad the city of God."

But, alas, it is not so. Pastors are but men. As men they are prone to wander, and often feel it most sadly. They are not always found occupying the high and commanding moral position we have been indicating.

The strictly pastoral field is susceptible of very great fertility. It rewards labor, judiciously applied, with a rich and luxuriant abundance. Every spiritual husbandman may be a gatherer of its endless handfuls. But in the very fact of its extreme fertility is found the reason why it demands so much care and labor. If it may produce an abundance of wheat, it may also produce an abundance of tares. And these latter, it surely will produce, inasmuch as they spring up spontaneously, and spontaneously become rank and tangled, unless much labor be expended in keeping them down. As, therefore, no labor of the minister of the church pays so highly, in the fruits of salvation, as does the truly pastoral, so the neglect of none, visits a parish with sudden evils—evils under the pressure of which many of our churches are groaning at this very hour. The minister whose zeal for God warms only when he enters the pulpit, and ever cools off as he comes out of it—who is, while in the pulpit, willing to die for the souls of his parish, but who, when out of it, is unwilling to *live* for them—who, when in the pulpit, weeps *over* his people, and when out of it, laughs and jokes *with* them—in a word, the minister who is zealous as a preacher, and careless as a pastor, may expect but small fruit of his labors, or that it shall be as volatile as he is himself.

But with the faithful *pastor* it is far otherwise. Employing, as he does, that part of the five week-days which he can spare from his study, in visiting the families and individuals of his flock, and enforcing upon them privately and pointedly the truths and exhortations of the discourses of the previous Sab-

bath, thereby expressing a permanent sympathy, and commending himself to their consciences, as he commends them to God—he is *certain* to win their respect for himself, and can scarcely fail to win their souls to Christ. Coming to them privately, with all the freedom, and simplicity, and frankness of a true and *every-day* friend, he enters deeply into their feelings, touches with his fingers the springs of religious sensibility, and lays his hand on their very hearts. Seen to be no mere *pulpit-arian*, but a true “man of God,” always and every where “an ambassador for Christ,” whatever the people may *say* about him because they are *wicked*, they can but *think* the same thing of him, because they are not *fools*. The pastoral labors of such a man can but meet a large reward. What he is ever sowing in his field, while the enemy who sows tares can scarcely elude his sleepless vigilance.

And just here it may be well to throw in a word of caution and discrimination. But this, with some other considerations, must be left to a future occasion.

---

ART. VI.—DOCTRINE OF THE UNIVERSAL SLEEP OF THE DEAD, AND OF THE FINAL DESTRUCTION OF THE WICKED: CHARACTER AND TENDENCY OF THIS DOCTRINE IN DISTINCTION FROM THAT OF THE EVANGELICAL FAITH.

In the two preceding articles, we have finished our remarks upon four general topics bearing upon this subject—the fundamental features and elements of these doctrines as distinguished from those of the evangelical faith upon the same subjects—the evidence of the truth of the latter doctrines in opposition to those of the former—and an examination of the scripture arguments in favor of the doctrine of destruction. We now advance to a consideration of the only remaining topic, to wit, *the character and tendency of this doctrine*. If this doctrine is untrue, its tendency must be exceedingly pernicious, as it gives

a view so opposite to that presented in the scriptures, and which is taught in the system of evangelical faith, in regard to the soul, its state after death, and in eternity.

Without further introduction, we now proceed to the accomplishment of our present object, some general remarks upon the character and tendency of this doctrine. On this subject we remark :

1. That this doctrine, as far as the nature of the soul is concerned, is opposed to the intuitive convictions of the race upon the subject. It has its exclusive basis, as we have seen, in the dogma of the proper materiality of the soul. Hence the idea of the final destruction of the soul by fire. Now, there is not a tribe of men on earth, however savage they may be, that has not made a proper and fundamental distinction between the soul and the body, between mind and matter, the very distinction which, as we have seen, the scriptures themselves do make. Mankind, in their intuitive convictions, no more confound the two than they do scarlet color with the sound of a trumpet. On the other hand, there are no two classes of objects which they more universally distinguish as fundamentally unlike and opposite to each other than mind and matter. Yet that which universal mind has separated, as thus distinct and opposite, this dogma confounds, and affirms to be one and the same. There is nothing to commend it to our regard but its monstrous absurdities.

2. This doctrine is equally opposed to the most absolute deductions of science. Substances are and can be known to us but through their phenomena or qualities. The only laws by which substances can be known as fundamentally alike or unlike, in their nature, are the following, to wit, substances in their fundamental qualities alike are identical in their nature, while those which are, in their fundamental phenomena, unlike, are, in a corresponding degree, dissimilar in their nature. There are no principles by which different substances can be known as similar or dissimilar in their nature but these.

Now, what are the fundamental phenomena of mind, on the one hand, and of matter, on the other? Those of the former are thought, feeling, and voluntary determination. Those of

the latter are extension, form, color, &c. These are the only means by which these two classes of substances are or can be known to us. If these phenomena do not undeniably mark these two classes of substances, not only as being, in their nature, unlike, but opposites, no two substances can be distinguished, the one from the other. To confound a substance known only as possessed of the powers of thought, feeling, and willing, with one which is as exclusively known merely as having extension, form, color, &c., is the most palpable violation of every law of scientific deduction known in the sphere of science. This is precisely what the dogma under consideration does, in fact, and in form. It is very difficult reasoning with individuals, who have thus repudiated all the laws of valid scientific deduction. With that portion of the community, however, not yet divorced, in their laws and principles of thinking and reasoning, from all the principles of science and common sense, our arguments will have weight.

3. The bearings of this dogma upon the character of God, next claims our special attention. If mind, as this dogma affirms, is nothing but matter in a certain state of development, then God himself is and can be nothing but some inhering law or principle of material existence. There is no escaping this conclusion, and the advocates of the doctrine under consideration, some of them, at least, admit it, and none who are consistent in their deductions with their own fundamental principles, profess to deny it. If mind is material, as this dogma affirms, God is material. If the advocates of the doctrine before us, affirm the antecedent of the above proposition, they must affirm the consequent. If they deny the consequent, they must deny the antecedent, and give up their own system of belief. The latter, we fear, they will not do. They will, therefore, take the first position, and affirm God himself to be nothing but some form of material existence. What are the consequences of this assumption? One is this: God, like ourselves, must, of necessity, be limited and finite in his capacities. Matter, in its own nature, is limited and finite, and must be so. It must, therefore, be limited and finite in all its developments alike. God, then, God the infinite and perfect, has no existence. In the

place of that all-perfect Being, we have as our only object of reverence and obedience, a being of finite and limited capacities, a finite and limited something we know not, and cannot know what. God, on the other hand, may be, as one of the advocates of the doctrine under consideration remarked some time since, electricity, or some other of the mysterious agencies around us. Further, if God, as this doctrine teaches, is a finite and limited, he is also an *erring*, being, and implicit confidence in the scriptures, even supposing them a revelation from him, is no longer demanded. Coming from an erring source, the scriptures are no longer of absolute authority in matters of doctrine and practice. God, we remark further, is either a progressive being, or he is not progressive. If progressive, he is already infinite and perfect, for progression with him, if it exist at all, must have been from eternity, and therefore infinite. But this is prohibited by the nature of matter which is, and ever must be, in all its developments, limited and finite. If God is not progressive, then his creatures who are so, will ultimately become superior to their Maker, for they, from the nature which they possess, must progress to eternity. These conclusions, monstrous as they are, necessarily result from the fundamental principles of the system we are now considering. In its fundamental bearings, that system leads to absolute atheism and nothing. It commences with profound reverence for revelation as from God, and ends when its principles are carried to their logical consequences, in blank atheism.

4. We now advance to a consideration of the necessary bearings of this doctrine upon the principles of morality and religion. If the soul of man is material, then all its activities of every kind must be subjected to the immutable laws and principles of matter. In other words, such activities, intellectual and moral, must be subject to one unchangeable law, that of absolute necessity. The intellect, sensibility, and will, are only parts of our complicated machine, every movement of which can, by no possibility, be otherwise than it is. Mind, then, can no more be subject to moral obligation, or susceptible of moral right or wrong, or of the desert of moral retribution, than a steamboat. The former is as much a machine, and as unadapted

to subjection to any form of moral government as the latter. All of man's thoughts, feelings, and acts of will, are borne onward, with resistless force, in one fixed channel, and he can no more change their course, or be obligated to do it, than the Mississippi or Amazon can change or be obligated to change theirs. The final judgment is as uncalled for, as far as any purposes of moral retribution are concerned, relatively to human conduct, as it is for the solar system, relatively to the motion of the sun and stars. Sin is a mere misfortune, and not a crime, in any form or sense, if this dogma is true.

These are the necessary consequences of the fundamental principles of this system, and there is no escape from them. If mind is material, all its activities are the exclusive result of chemical, and other kindred affinities, and we might as properly adopt codes of moral legislation for the direction of the action of the acids and alkalies, or of the forces of electricity and galvanism, as for that of the human will. There is no such thing as moral government, right and wrong, obligation, moral desert of good or ill, if this dogma is true. Morality and religion both are chimeras, born of ignorance and error, and the judgment would be nothing but a senseless farce. No one can show that these are not the necessary bearings of this system upon the eternal principles of morality and religion. It annihilates totally every sphere for the action of the moral and religious principles and sentiments. Those who hold this dogma, and yet believe in either morality or religion, do so in violation of the fundamental principles of their own system.

5. Our next remark is, that this system of belief is held in opposition to the most direct and express teachings of scripture conceivable. The doctrine of the materiality of the soul, for example, is held in opposition to the express and formal affirmation of Holy Writ, that the spirit, as distinguished from the body, is not dust, that is, material. It is held, too, in opposition to the plainest teachings elsewhere. Everywhere, as we have seen, the scriptures place the soul in contrast with the body, affirming, that while man can destroy the one, God only can destroy the other. The doctrine of the universal sleep of the dead is maintained, in opposition to the express teachings

of our Savior, that the souls of the dead are not now *dead* but *living* beings, and equally so to the express teachings of the spirit of God, in the epistles of Paul, that the present inhabitants of heaven are made up in part of "the spirits of the just made perfect," that is, perfected in glory, and finally to the equally express teachings of inspiration in the Revelation, that the spirits of departed saints are, with the four-and-twenty elders, now in active worship before the eternal throne. The doctrine that the death threatened to the wicked is annihilation, is contradicted by the most undeniable and formal definitions of the meaning of the term, when thus employed, to wit, that that death is "evil," "misery," "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish." There is no subject on which inspiration can be shown to be more specific than it actually is on all these. Never was a system of doctrine developed with less regard to the plain and fundamental teachings of the word of God, upon the specific topics embraced in that system.

6. The character of the proof texts selected to sustain this system of belief, should not be passed unnoticed in this connection. In general, let us remark, that were the system of the evangelical faith true, and this system false throughout, no change whatever would be demanded in the phraseology of any one of the numberless proof texts which the advocates of this system adduce to sustain it. That the utter loss of all good, and a corresponding subjection to all evil, that a total and eternal separation from the favor of God, the proper life of the soul, should be called death, destruction, perdition, &c., is simply what is demanded by all the laws of language. Suppose, now, that these same forms of expression are adduced to prove a specific form of destruction, to wit, the termination of existence, annihilation. Nothing conceivable can be a more palpable violation of all the laws of correct interpretation. And this is the exclusive character of all the proof texts adduced to establish this system. There is not an absurdity that can be named, that may not be proved incontrovertible from the Bible, if such principles of interpretation be admitted as valid.

7. We allude to but one additional consideration. It is this: To understand many of the declarations of scripture in accord-



ance with the fundamental teachings and principles of this system, would render the word of God one of the most senseless and absurd books that ever was written. Let us look at a few passages in illustration, passages, some of which have been already cited. "Then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was, but the spirit shall return to God who gave it." Suppose, now, that the spirit, as well as the body, is constituted of nothing but dust, and, with the body, as this system affirms, returns to dust, at death. What conceivable meaning attaches to this passage? None at all, but an absurd and false one. Again, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." What does this mean, if the death of the body, as this system maintains, implies also the death of the soul, and the one just as much, and for the same reasons, as the other? "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst, but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life," that is, if this system is true, into everlasting existence. Death, say the advocates of this system, means destruction, in the sense of non-being. Everlasting life, then, means simply unending existence. The Savior first affirms, that those "who drink of the waters which he shall give shall never thirst," and then assigns, according to this system, this reason for that fact, that those waters shall induce an unending existence. Is existence synonymous with never thirsting again? "He that loveth his life (existence) shall lose it (existence), and he that hateth his life (existence) in this world, shall keep it (his existence) unto life eternal," to unending existence. "He that believeth in the Son, hath everlasting life (existence); and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life (existence), but the wrath of God abideth on him," that is, continues to rest upon him after he has ceased to exist. "And this is life eternal, (everlasting existence,) that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." We cease to multiply examples. How any persons can read the sublime and impressive language of the Bible on this subject, and then embrace a system of belief which empties it of all its impressive meaning, and brings that meaning down to such senseless puerility as this, is

to us a wonder. Such, however, is human wisdom. Such, too, is the love of system. Let individuals adopt certain systems of belief, and how will they bend and pervert the language of inspiration to make it square with that system. Instead of testing the system "by the law and the testimony," they boldly override the latter, and torture it, till to them it is made to speak the sentiments of the torturer. If there is anything in respect to which we should listen with implicit confidence to the teachings of inspiration, it is to what it reveals in reference to our destiny hereafter. Nothing is or can be so perilous to all the immortal interests of the soul, as a perversion of what God has revealed on this subject. It is for this reason that we have written what we have in this and the preceding articles on this subject. To the reader, what we have written is now commended, with the hope that he will "buy the truth and sell it not."

---

#### ART. VII—NORTH CAROLINA FREEWILL BAPTISTS.

In the two preceding articles on the history of the Southern General Baptists, most that could be found respecting their origin and their progress for several years, has been laid before the readers of the Quarterly. It has already been shown that this little community of Baptists was nearly destroyed by the defection of most of its churches to hyper-Calvinism; and it is proposed to show here how this work was accomplished.

About the year 1751, Robert Williams, a Calvinistic or Regular Baptist minister of Welch neck, S. Carolina, visited some of these churches and preached among them. This was some twenty-four years after the organization of the first General Baptist church in North Carolina. Though the labors of this minister were the commencement of the breaking up and remodelling of the churches, it is not known whether or not he

went among them by invitation from some of their members, nor can the extent, character, and results of his efforts be given, as no record of them has been found. William Wallace, a layman, commonly called the sley-maker, also took an active part in the matter, and his conversation and efforts were attended with considerable success. The time when his labors were performed is not named, but probably it was soon after the commencement of the mission of Rev. Mr. Williams. In the summer of 1754, Rev. John Gano was sent out by the Philadelphia Association, with general and indefinite instructions to travel in the Southern States, &c. Under these instructions he visited the General Baptist churches, and Morgan Edwards, says Benedict, thus describes the visit:—

“ Mr. Gano, on his arrival, sent to the ministers, requesting an interview with them, which they declined, and appointed a meeting among themselves to consult what to do. Mr. Gano, hearing of it, went to their meeting, and addressed them in words to this effect: ‘ I have desired a visit from you, which, as a brother and a stranger, I had a right to expect, but as ye have refused, I give up my claim and am come to pay you a visit.’ With that he ascended into the pulpit and read for his text the following words: ‘ *Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?*’ This text he managed in such a manner as to make some afraid of him, and others ashamed of their shyness. Many were convinced of errors touching faith and conversion, and submitted to examination. One minister, hearing of this, (who stood well with himself,) went to be examined, and intimated to his people, that he should return triumphant. Mr. Gano heard him out, and then turning to his companion, said, ‘ I profess, brother, this will not do: this man has the one thing needful to seek.’ Upon which, the person examined hastened home, and upon being asked how he came off! replied, ‘ The Lord have mercy upon you, for this northern minister has put a *mene tekell* upon me!’ ”

This visit was made about two years after Mr. Williams began his proselyting labors, and it seems evident from Mr. Gano’s visit, and what followed, that the work was carried on in a very zealous manner, and, in some instances, in utter disregard of propriety and Christian courtesy. The refusal of the ministers to have an interview with Mr. Gano, when he requested them to meet him, was an act of disrespect towards him; but it is presumed that they intended nothing of that nature. Their course shows that they were utterly opposed to the object of his visit, and they probably refused to see him, not on

account of intended incivility, but through desire to avoid discussion on an unwelcome subject with one who possessed abilities far superior to theirs. Most ministers, on being regarded and treated as intruders, would probably have ceased from further efforts at proselyting, and departed from the place, but Mr. Gano took a different course. He went to a meeting of those who, as he well knew, had met for consultation, and did not desire his presence. Not content with this, he obtrusively entered the pulpit and preached a disparaging sermon to the dissatisfied and simple-hearted auditors. Being thrown into confusion by his great ability and ingenious handling of the words of an "evil spirit" as a text, they seem to have lost their independence, and were made to believe that their doctrines were unsound, and that their hearts were unrenewed. This led some of them to renounce their former faith, and to receive his opinion of their spiritual state as decisive on that subject. Mr. Gano's efforts seem to have unsettled the minds of a considerable number of the ministers, and finally led to the defection of most of the churches and ministers to hyper-Calvinism. On his return, he represented what was regarded as their deplorable condition to the Association, who appointed Messrs. Miller and Vanhorn to complete the work of proselyting them. These men engaged zealously in the work assigned to them, and a great change was effected among the people, which, it is asserted, consisted not only in reforming their creed and purifying their churches, but also in reviving the power of godliness among them, and in the awakening and conversion of many who needed such a change. What was left unfinished by these two men, was zealously carried on by the newly converted ministers, who were anxious to lead others to adopt their views. The work was prosecuted so energetically, that in about four years after Robert Williams commenced his efforts among these people, all the ministers, except Elders Joseph and William Parker, and an Elder Winfield, and all the churches except two or three under their care, had embraced the views of those who had taken so much pains to convert them to the Calvinistic faith. Thus it is seen, that in some less than thirty years after the commencement of their denominational existence

in North Carolina, these people were so much scattered that it seemed nearly impossible for them to survive their calamities, and it was feared by the remnant, and hoped by their enemies, that such would be their hard lot.

It has already been stated, that about the year 1752, some thirteen years before the revolution above named was completed, this little branch of Baptists had increased to sixteen churches. Probably some others were organized during the thirteen years just named, but if so, no account of them is now to be found. Benedict states that the ministers were considerably numerous, but their number is not given.

This unfortunate body of Baptists commenced its existence in North Carolina fifty-three years, and was mostly absorbed by the Calvinistic Baptist denomination twenty-eight years, before the rise of the Freewill Baptists at the North.

The enemies of the Arminian Baptists in North Carolina were greatly elated at the revolution, and regarded it as a great and beneficial change. Indeed, Benedict seems to think that, on account of the lax views and discipline of the churches, the innovation, or reformation, as he calls it, was necessary and useful. But considering the manner in which the revolution was brought about, and the unhappy results of it, there is much room to doubt the propriety of the measure. Had the zealous and well-meaning New Lights, as the Calvinistic Baptists were then called, been invited to visit and remodel these churches, no objection could probably be made to their course; but going among them uninvited to proselyte them, was obtrusive and provoking. There was surely work enough to be done in North Carolina by the Baptist ministers without interfering with a few churches who felt that they had a right to their organizations, and to labor unmolested in the fields they entered peaceably and had occupied some twenty-five years without molestation. It is asserted that these churches were so lax in their discipline, and held such erroneous views of conversion, that they actually needed the renovation through which they passed. There is reason to fear that they were negligent in discipline, and that their views in regard to conversion were erroneous; but in these respects they seem to have been as well off as the

Episcopalians, who were their only religious neighbors when the churches were organized. The relation of a Christian experience was in no case required as a condition of admission to membership in the Episcopal church, and there was nearly or quite as much laxity of discipline in that large and popular sect as there was among the General Baptists. Swearing was so common among church members, as well as others, that an aged Freewill Baptist minister in North Carolina informed the writer of this article, that he did not know till he was seventeen years old that the practice was sinful, and he then learned it from a Baptist minister! His uncle, with whom he was brought up, though a member of the Episcopal church, and in the habit of reading prayers in his family every morning, was much addicted to this sin. On one occasion, while engaged in his usual morning devotions, having an eye to the world as well as to God, he saw through an open window two horses eating corn at one trough, though it was a slave's duty to see that they ate separately. This so enraged him that he swore at the slave for carelessness, and ordered him to separate the horses, after which he mechanically said, "God, forgive me," and then resumed the reading of his prayer! It is not supposed that all Episcopalians would, like the one just named, interlard their praying with profanity; but what has just been said above, indicates that the views of members of the church were then painfully lax and erroneous on the subject of morality and religion. The profligacy of the hypocritical, sensual, and voluptuous Charles II. and his depraved courtiers, corrupted the manners and religion of the people of England beyond all precedent in that country. The Episcopal church was national at the South, as well as in England; and the communication between the colonies and the mother country easily admitted the introduction of the corrupt state of morals and religion to the former. This was effected the more readily and generally in the Southern colonies on account of the absence there of the Puritan influence which was so potential in forming a much purer morality and religion at the North. As they were surrounded with such corrupt religious influences and examples, and were greatly inferior in learning, wealth, and respectability to the English

church, it were unreasonable to expect these Baptists to be morally and religiously in advance of that body. Hence, though they baptized members "without an experience of grace," and were sadly deficient in discipline, they were more deserving of sympathy than of the censures thrown upon them by their Calvinistic enemies. Nor is it strange that they have never adopted their practice of receiving members by the relation of a religious experience, but by asking the candidates questions something after the manner of the Methodists.

The Episcopalians were as lukewarm, formal, and destitute of the power of godliness as were the Freewill Baptists; why, then, did the energetic New Lights pass by the larger body and obtrude themselves upon the weaker? The proselyting of this body is justified on the ground that it needed a thorough renovation. If this view of the case is correct, the Philadelphia Baptist Association should have looked after the spiritual interests of the Episcopal church, as well as after those of a far smaller body. Dr. Gano ought to have sent to their leading "ministers, requesting an interview with them;" and on their declining, he should have treated them as arrogantly as he did this feeble band of Baptists, and similar efforts should have been made for the renovation of those as were used for the conversion of these. But nothing of the kind was done, nor need the cause of this neglect be indicated.

The divisions and secessions of the Freewill churches, which were caused by proselyting members of another denomination, left the adhering remnant in a sad state of discouragement, distraction, and ill-will towards those who were the authors of their troubles. Their most active, intelligent, and efficient ministers and members had seceded, and were laboring zealously against them. Though considerable numbers of the members retained their original views, and would not go with the seceders, they were only the scattered and unorganized remains of the churches that had left them. They were not disciplinarians, and were in some sense like the fragments of a routed and dispirited army after its principal officers and soldiers had gone over to the enemy. Public opinion was pretty strongly against them, as it is often against the weak and unfortunate. They

were regarded by many as deceived and deceivers in regard to the matters of religion; they were also considered as heretics and classed with Universalists.

A deep seated dislike, amounting almost to abhorrence, was created between the two parties formed by this division. Each body regarded the other as holding damnable errors—the extremes of Calvinism and Arminianism—and each cordially hated the tenets of the other. To the Arminians the name of New Lights was odious, and the name of those was equally odious to these. The relation of a few incidents may serve as an illustration of the views and feelings of these two opposing bodies of Baptists. In 1784, as Eld. Wm. Parker was reading his text, he was stricken with the palsy, and falling in the pulpit, he is reported as saying: “Blessed be God, I have fallen in a good cause.” His reason then departed to return no more, and two or three days afterwards he “breathed out his soul into the hands of the Redeemer.” So say Messrs. Burkitt and Read. Some seven years after this incident occurred, a Baptist minister, whose name was Frost, “came from Europe,” [probably from England] and commenced preaching in the Calvinistic Baptist church in Portsmouth and Norfolk, Va. He soon began to “preach the doctrines of *freewill*,” supposing, it is alleged by the New Light writers, that man has power to work himself into a state of favor with God. A committee was appointed by the church to convert him; failing in this, another was chosen to silence him, but with no better success. Shortly after that, he went to a place to preach; but while reading his text, his voice faltered, he cried, “Let us pray,” fell on his knees speechless, and died in less than three hours. Thus, say the historians named above, “did God avenge his suffering church in these towns, for the fox was spoiling the tender grapes.” When Elder Joseph Smith died, who was the pastor of the church at Pungo river, a Calvinistic minister asked a colored member of that church, “Now your *plaster* is gone, what will you do?” This was in 1812. Some twenty years later, several copies of a selection of hymns by Eld. John Buzzell, were sold to the North Carolina Freewill Baptists. One of the hymns commences as follows:



“ Come all who are New Lights indeed,  
Who are from sin and bondage free'd ;  
From Egypt's land we've taken flight,  
For God has given us a New Light.”

The hymn, which commends all New Lights, and refers to all true Christians, was read by the purchasers with grief and almost indignant astonishment. It was supposed to be a commendation of that order of Baptists who had, nearly three-quarters of a century previous to that time, broken up the Freewill Baptists, and caused them a great amount of distress, an act which they had not forgotten nor forgiven. They were pacified only with the assurance that the obnoxious hymn was not a commendation of their New Light enemies, but was designed to approve and encourage faithful Christians of all orders.

At the time of the invasion and scattering of the Freewill Baptists in North Carolina, the uncharitable and in many instances malevolent feelings between the two bodies were general and mutual. A lapse of one hundred years has somewhat softened the acrimony of these feelings, but it has not eradicated them. Twenty years ago there was a deep-seated dislike of the Regular Baptists among many of the Freewill Baptists. At that distant period, they had heard so much of the breaking up of the early churches, that they could hardly regard the descendants of those who did it as Christians, and were but little disposed to fraternize with them. The views of the two sects in regard to doctrine and church building, were nearly as variant as at the commencement of the separation, each party being confident that its views were right, and those of the other ruinously wrong.

Had the Regular Baptists been more prudent in their zeal to proselyte this people, and sought to accomplish their end in a less overbearing manner, it would have prevented much mutual ill-will, and also a great amount of distress among those whom they failed to convert to hyper-Calvinism. Burkitt and Read regarded it as very wicked in Eld. Frost to attempt to proselyte the church in Portsmouth and Norfolk, Va., to his Arminian views. Their sympathies were much awakened in behalf of

that "distressed" and "suffering church," and the sudden death of that minister was considered by them as an act of Divine interference in its favor. But no pity was felt for the Freewill Baptist churches that were overwhelmed with confusion and distress by the unfraternal efforts of the misguided men who subverted them. The long-continued hatred and contentions that followed that subversion, leave but little room to doubt that, on the whole, its results were more injurious than beneficial to the cause of morality and religion.

The Kehukee Association, which traces its pedigree, not from a Calvinistic Baptist source, but from the General Baptists who, it is said, came to North Carolina from England by way of the colony of Virginia, has, for many years past, says Benedict, been decidedly hostile to all benevolent institutions. Its churches do not occupy a particular location, as is usually the case, but are widely scattered among those who are favorable to the missionary enterprise, and other departments of Christian benevolence. Upon these churches, though they belong to the same denomination, the churches composing the Kehukee Association wage a fierce warfare. In this contest, much of the intolerant spirit is manifested towards the churches favoring missions, &c., that was shown about a century ago towards the unhappy Freewill Baptists. So the body that was formed by a great amount of proselyting effort, and was long regarded as a very valuable acquisition to the Calvinistic Baptist denomination, has become almost as annoying to many of the sister churches as its founders were to the Freewill Baptists who were broken up by their intolerance and sectarian zeal.

But little is known of the church discipline of the early Freewill Baptists in North Carolina, more than the assertion by their enemies that it was very negligent. The following statement, made eleven years ago to Mr. Benedict by Dr. Wheeler of Murfreesboro', N. C., probably contains most that can now be learned on this subject: It is much to be regretted that no historical sketches of any of these churches can be found except those of that gathered by Eld. Paul Palmer, which is the first Baptist church that was organized in the State. As this church was organized in 1727, the records named below stop thirty-

one year short of its commencement; but they, no doubt, describe a state of things in the church before its defection to Calvinism. Dr. Wheeler's statement is as follows:

"I have procured the records, which go back to 1758, when John Burgess was pastor, and the business of the church was managed by 'elders or overseers,' while the private secular matters of the members were under the direction of the ministers and six members, who were constituted the 'Court of Union.' The churches had several arms or branches in the adjoining counties, to which the ministers, attended by the overseers and the clerk, regularly repaired. In a few years the 'Court of Union' was dispensed with—but the churches being dissatisfied with its extinction, nine members were chosen, who were considered to be permanent elders, if found faithful, while the former overseers or elders were elected annually."

Such, says Benedict, was the complex machinery in ecclesiastical affairs at that early period with this well-meaning people. This statement rests on the supposition that the ecclesiastical machinery of the other churches was as odd and cumbersome as that contrived for the government of the Perquimans church, and there seems no reason to doubt that such was the case.

---

#### ART. VIII—STUDIES FOR THE MINISTRY.\*

We have copied below a large portion of a very full title-page, as perhaps, the most just and economical way of inform-

\* History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence. Containing the masterpieces of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Flechier, Abbadie, Taylor, Barrow, Hall, Watson, M'Laurin, Chalmers, Evans, Edwards, Davies, Mason, etc., etc., with discourses from Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, Athanasius, Wickliffe, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Knox, Latimer, etc.—Also sixty other celebrated sermons from as many eminent divines, in the Greek and Latin, English, German, Irish, French, Scottish, American, and Welsh churches, a large number of which have now, for the first time been translated. The whole arranged in their proper order, and accompanied with historical sketches of preaching in the different countries represented, and biographical and critical notices of the several preachers and their discourses.—By Rev. HENRY C. FISH. Author of "Primitive Piety Revised." New York: M. W. Dodd, 1856. 2 Vols. 8 vo. pp. 613, 622.

ing our readers of the nature and design of these two somewhat bulky and imposing volumes. Nothing of this kind, with an object so comprehensive, has been before attempted;—though, in commending this undertaking, two somewhat distinguished professors of theology in New England, express themselves as having meditated the preparation of a work on a plan almost precisely similar to that which has been adopted in the publication before us. The author's task was evidently undertaken from high Christian motives, and his best powers were directed to its accomplishment. Anxious to increase the real efficiency of the ministry, he has laid at its feet an offering which will not wholly fail of being welcomed with thankfulness.

There are in all eighty-three discourses, from as many authors, all of whom acquired a living eminence and a posthumous fame, to each of which is prefixed a brief biographical sketch of the author, and in most cases some notice of the sermon selected to illustrate his spirit and method. The moral and spiritual air of Mr. Fish has doubtless so affected his choice, as in some instances to induce the selection of a discourse which fails to develop the leading mental and pulpit characteristics of the author. The sermon from South is an example in point, and in a less degree the same may be said of those of Chalmers and Irving. Besides, some men are many-sided,—no single discourse being capable of setting forth an adequate idea of themselves or their preaching. Of course the author's own pulpit ideal would, perhaps unconsciously, operate to decide his mind, both upon the men from whose discourses he should select, and the specific discourse that should be brought forward to reveal the author. To avoid such a bias would be next to impossible, and an attempt to satisfy all minds would be unavailing. And then again, there is a design to have each selected discourse exhibit, to some extent at least, the leading characteristics of the period when, and the people among whom it sprang into being—to set it forth as the product of a previous religious history, and the index to a contemporaneous religious status. Added to all this was the aim to select that each single portion of the work, as well as its complex whole, should be adapted to meet the wants and properly educate the spirit of the present ministry.

With so many varied ends to subserve, it requires no small wisdom to cull judiciously from so broad a field. Few minds will probably be wholly satisfied with this result of Mr. Fish's labors; and the work will doubtless be condemned most severely and lauded most extravagantly on account of the same things. In the technical sense of that term, it is rigidly "evangelical." There is great variety, even if the complaint may be made that it lacks comprehensiveness. There is an immense mass of valuable religious thought to be found here, and there is not a little to suggest the grateful fact that many of the richest and noblest mental endowments have been held sacred to the service of spiritual religion.

The "Historical Sketches" of the pulpit of various countries, considering their necessary brevity, are generally felicitous, discriminating, lucid, and instructive, and suggest much philosophical thought. They consist chiefly of outward facts, but they are index facts, that lead the mind beneath the surface of life, and disclose the working of all those subtle elements and forces that deal with the springs of being, and ride royally, though unseen, in the van of revolutions.

Among many discourses which it will puzzle the reader to tell why they should be termed "Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence," there are not a few productions whose inherent vitality will bear them on over many added generations. It will be impossible to look on them as petrifications, for the living spirit of genius and the deathless energy of truth are in them. The most magnificent production, judged from a literary and oratorical rather than an evangelical stand point, is perhaps the Funeral Oration of Bossuet, over the Prince of Condi. There is not a little fulsome adulation in it; any degree of evidence that he was aiming at oratorical excellence and effect: there is the very perfection of elaborate polish; every abrupt transition and sudden ejaculation was evidently framed and set in its place before hand; the pathos had been measured carefully, so that there might be neither too little to show proper deference to the court, nor too much for the proper exhibition of his own greatness:—all this artifice is so obvious that every page exhibits it; and yet a first reading takes the soul captive almost in spite of

itself. One can believe almost anything that is stated respecting the impressiveness of the discourse, when delivered by the great French orator, in the great cathedral of Notre Dame, hung with the symbols of woe, crowded with the royalty and nobility of the empire, who reflected but faintly the deep grief which that extravagant nation was giving itself up to suffer over the loss of a Prince who embodied every element that entered into the French idea of human glory. Few things have come down to us that exhibit the grandeur and sublimity of speech in so great a measure as this. No man of sense would try to imitate it; but no man with a soul could read it without catching a sort of lofty enthusiasm from the grand and solemn majesty with which the Christian Pulpit lifts itself up before his inner eye, as Bossuet magnifies its functions. The discourse from Massillon is richer in its deep religious sympathies and sincerity, and is perhaps, really superior in whatever is peculiar to true Christian eloquence. The human brilliancy dazzles less, but the heavenly unction is deeper by far. We have spoken of these productions the more at length, because the style of the French pulpit has generally seemed to possess much that were far better absent, and to lack that which gives to preaching its highest and most permanent power. For the most part it has been vivacious without vigor, possessing fancy without fervor, and passion without power.

Edward's sermon, entitled "Sinners in the hands of an angry God," is selected to represent the Northampton divine, and the American metaphysician. It is said that when he first preached it to his own people, shrieks and groans resounded from all parts of the house, men instinctively caught hold of the braces and pillars for protection, and their uttered terror compelled him once to pause till the people were quieted. Taking all the circumstances into account, we are not surprised at these effects. Few persons of strong moral sensibility can even read it now uninterruptedly at a single sitting. *It is transcendently awful.* It is all simple; its sentences are for the most part brief; there is no search after epithets, but rather an avoidance of them.—It abounds in Saxon terms, and as step after step is taken in the argument, one forgets the language, the preacher,—every

-thing but the terrible condition into which sinful men are put by the stern pleader for the sovereign dealings of God. We should seriously question the wisdom of preaching such sermons very often under any circumstances; and he who should look upon it as a general model we presume would exhibit a sense of propriety different from the author, and defeat the design of the compiler. But we have no space in which to put down our ideas of any considerable number of these pulpit compositions.

True preaching is a profound science, a difficult art, and yet the simple natural outgoing of an earnest religious soul.—The order of developing its elements is the opposite of what we have stated. The apprehension of religious truth through experience, and a deep yearning to see its influence pass redeemingly into other souls around us; the conviction that what we have seen may and must be communicated, and what we have felt may and must be shared—that is the first great condition of becoming successful ambassadors for Christ. An earnest spirit, seeing that a thing is to be done, realizing clearly what it is, and conscious that the responsibility of its accomplishment rests with himself, will not be wholly a fruitless toiler. Sympathetic souls will communicate through a seen or unseen, a perfect or a partial medium. A living thought with which a spirit travails will somehow come to the birth. An impressible conviction will incarnate itself in a gesture or a glance. Deep Christian love gets convincingly eloquent in the meek silence which it forbids us to break. First of all it is requisite, when one would enter upon the work of preaching, that he be under the influence of such thoughts as these. “Here are men occupying such a sphere of life; the culture they receive from their surroundings is blinding them to their deepest necessities; here is a power from heaven waiting to pass into their spirits and wake them to a deeper self-consciousness, and illuminate their life with unseen splendors; I am set to show them the hidden chasms in the soul, and paint out the source of their strength and life; it must be done speedily, for the eyelids droop with increased heaviness, and the form of the Helper casts a slighter shadow on their path as the false culture goes on; let me hasten to them and show them to themselves, and lift the veil from

the fountain of light and power, that they may be glad with new joy and strong with a celestial might." He who feels that,—not simply as a spasm of excited emotion, but as the perpetual outgoing of his heart, making his eye moist amid the gladness of home, and his tones gentle amid the din of business, has the first horn of consecrating oil dripping from his head, and the first pledge of triumphant sheaves over which he may swell his anthem at the garner of God.

He who has this inward impulse will soon become an observer of methods, a student of the forms in which Christian success is gathered. Whoever shows himself a master of the human heart, able to sweep all its strings, will be watched by such an one in order that the divine skill there abiding may be induced to give up its secrets, and put him in possession of a similar power. He will repeat his own successful experiments, as well as copy the triumphant policy of others; and he will eschew the forms which have once disappointed him. But mere artifice is defective. Empirical rules are not long applicable to the sphere of voluntary life. The methods which yesterday's triumph glorified, may bring only mortifying disasters to-day.—Another step is needed.

Then comes the study of the human soul; the inspection of its forces, the effort to comprehend its movements, to think the varied thoughts which others think, to put his soul into their soul's place, to wrestle with their temptations, to be filled with their sympathies, to idealize their life so vividly as almost to feel its actualities, to generalize the facts of histories, and educe general principles from individual experience. And thus at last the work of preaching has risen to the dignity of a sublime science. Then the preacher seeks to gauge the divine forces that play perpetually into human life, estimates the strength of those barriers that hinder their free flowing, attempts to find how many points there are where the infinite may touch the finite, and what element of the truth may most readily restore the broken line of communication, and by what cords the straying spirit may be led back soonest and most dutifully to the forsaken Father's house. Well is it, if in doing this last work, the spontaneous zeal do not abate, and the indi-



viduality and direct simplicity of the soul be present to animate the artistic and scientific worker.

Real and protracted pulpit efficiency can never be the result of any set extraneous culture. The best systems of theology may be furnished, rules for the composition and delivery of the sermon may be never so judicious and familiar and rigidly adhered to, the doctrine may be sound according to all the accredited standards, the logic faultless, the arrangement rhetorical, the style fitting, the manner properly serious, and the gestures timely and expressive, and yet the sermon be almost wholly destitute of informing life and practical power. No guilty and self complacent worlding may be frightened at the revelation of his own dark self, no sensual ear may catch the clear tone of eternity, no grinding oppressor may find his sceptre quivering in his chilly fingers, no pharisaic religionist may discover the lifelessness of his forms, and no aspiring soul feel afresh the impulse of a mightier faith and the magnetism of a heavenly life. Out from beneath that pulpit teaching, men may go to the exchange to maintain even a fiercer and more selfish competition, to plot as contemptibly in the caucus as ever, and grow fat as before on the spoils of violence and the acquisitions of intrigue. And so long as that is the case, of what practical value is soundness of doctrine, skill in sermonizing, a faultless pulpit rhetoric, a well filled sanctuary, or an available religious reputation? The fact is, these crystallized proprieties, sanctified as they may seem, are sometimes positive hindrances to the success of the gospel. Religion seems an isolated and distant thing, having very little connection with the daily habits of human thought and spheres of common activity. It is an ideal existence to be gazed at in prayer, and sighed after in misfortune, and hoped for in a distant heaven. That it implies a just and humane and reverential spirit, and a heroic endeavor by means of the offered helps of Christ to incarnate the spirit of the New Testament in all the spheres of action, is not the leading, practical impression which it leaves on the spirit of the hearer. Preaching is the earnest speech of men filled with the great ideas of justice, of duty, of holiness and of love, addressed to spirits within which they have need to grow. It must deal with living men and with

actual experience. It must touch the specific prejudices and difficulties of those who listen to it. It must be a clear voice heard in the temple of each man's consciousness. Its definitions of sin, and its portraitures of righteousness must be given, not in theological generalities, but conform to the individual thought. Not for the sake of conforming to a standard or of preserving an ideal pulpit dignity, are men to be left to doze in mysticism or sent away in perplexity.

Mere words are often all inadequate to set forth the characteristics of the true style of preaching. No collection of printed sermons can do it, whatever be their excellences. The best thing is to sit beneath a master of this divine art, and feel how the heart is laid bare, to feel the self-imposed sophistries breaking away under the strain of the truth, and realize how, without apology, the everlasting law of God tramps into our own sphere of life, and brings out our hidden iniquities, utterly refusing to compromise with them for an hour. It is in seeing the working of this high power that we perceive its greatness and learn how it is summoned into action. Then the mere proprieties of the place sink into contempt. There was scarcely ever a man of mark in the pulpit but offended perpetually against every system of homiletics, and rose in his manly earnestness and vigor, above all empirical rule. When a preacher's soul is on fire with his theme, and he is feeling that his powers of persuasion must stop no where short of bringing his hearers to the beginning of the new life, it were as fatal to pinion his utterance and manner down to formulas, as to compel a criminal pleading for his life to declaim a part practiced under the criticism of a rhetorical professor. The movement of a water current through an artificial race-way may be regulated, but let Niagara loose and what are all your appliances there? There are times when the perfection of art and the dignity of science are discovered in the hiding of themselves so that nature may reach the grand result to which the whole trinity are pressing on.

Next to the privilege of listening to the masters of pulpit power, is the study of their ministry in the circumstances that surround them, in the words they spoke, and in the results thus gathered up. It is an inferior method, but the very best

we can have in most cases. It requires not a little discrimination to learn aright the lessons that are thus taught. To attempt to make any man a model is to misread and fail. It was the spontaneousness that gave the power at first; servile copying will be sure to result in a caricature. The study of eminent models is intended to be suggestive, to furnish us data, to show what elements are available, and when, and how far. It should enlarge the sphere, and multiply the methods of pulpit effort, instead of curtailing the range of its forces.

Studied wisely, these volumes will prove, no unimportant acquisition to our younger ministers. They furnish more or less a history and a portraiture of the Christian Pulpit. They mark with something of distinctness the successive phases of religious thought and experience, under the discipline of the gospel, the changes in civil rule, and the fluctuations of civilization.— They show how general life and religious teaching have reciprocally acted on each other. They show how crises have quickened souls into a truly heroic service, and how royal minds, choosing religious thoughts as symbols of power, have pulled down and set up with wonderful haste and vigor. They show the stream of holy thought which has been flowing downward for ages, and exhibit the eddies and counter currents which have retarded its movement. They tell us by what methods the best and strongest men have done the human part of that work which has incorporated Christian thought into the life of nations. A careful and earnest student should not fail of instruction and profit with such opportunities as these.

Nearly every people and age gives us a characteristic style of preaching, and these differ not a little. The homilies of the Fathers would be very poorly adapted to most modern congregations. The influence of Aristotle and the Gnostic philosophy upon the thinking of that early age is easily discernible in the discourses which come down to us from that period. Fanciful interpretation, hidden meanings sought after, attempts to spiritualize every sentence and fact, no matter how simple and incidental—these features and such as these disfigure their discourses, and indicate that the severe simplicity of the gospel narrative was very far from being retained in the religious

instruction of the first three centuries after Christ. The intrinsic merit of those patristic productions is not very great, though they indicate the existence of a large mental power, and the thoroughness with which the Fathers were pervaded with the influence of the new revelation.

The American ministry has a theatre and an opportunity never equalled. The influences which appeal to and aid it are numerous and varied. It is an agency of the people, and makes its appeal directly to them. The pulpit is untrammelled by prescription or venerated and long continued methods. It has the history of all the ages and lands for its instruction. Every noble preacher leaves it a legacy. It has an audience made up of representatives from every nation, and it is fitting, therefore, that it should borrow an element of efficiency from every land and century. There can be no single model for it. Our civilization is unique, and calls for a unique religious teaching. It can never consent to repeat the past literally without doing violence to its own spirit and being recreant to its high trusts and opportunities, while the truth it employs must ever be the doctrines of the Bible, its method of illustrating and enforcing them must be the choice of a manly wisdom and the outgrowth of a free and earnest spirit. An unyielding conservatism on the one hand, and a presumptuous egotistic radicalism on the other, will be our disaster or our ruin. Reverently listening to the past, diligently studying the present, and heeding the beckoning of the future, are all needful to the fashioning of a style of pulpit thought and address which shall make the American ministry such an element of force as it is exhorted to become.— Without incurring the charge of egotism, we may say that the pulpit of New England will even now compare favorably with that of any other land or period, both in the strength of thought which it exhibits, and the moral power over society it is wielding. Reckless skeptics, we know, sneer at it, and demagogues read it passionate lectures on propriety; but the sneer is often only an attempt to cover up an anxiety, and the passionate protest betrays the fear of its stern verdict. If the American pulpit can but comprehend and fully accept its mission, it will write a page of this world's religious history which will be read

with thanksgiving through many an age of the time to be. And to such a comprehension and attainment the wise and judicious study of these volumes will make no small contribution.

---

### ART. IX—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

**SERMONS FOR THE PEOPLE.** By F. D. Huntington, DD., preacher to the University, and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in the College, at Cambridge. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co., &c., 1856.

Prof. Huntington and his religious opinions have been the subject of not a little somewhat earnest discussion, especially since his election to the newly created Professorship at the Harvard University. His previous positions, coupled with his fine and highly cultivated abilities, have given him prominence, and rendered his utterances influential; but it is especially since he exchanged the pulpit at Boston for the Chair of Christian Morals at Cambridge, that the earnest inquiry has come up from many quarters, "What is Prof. H's theology?" The long and earnest controversy between the Orthodox and the Unitarian parties in Massachusetts, touching their respective rights of control over the affairs of the University, and the mutual jealousy which has been engendered, do much to explain the wordy interest with which he has been criticised in one quarter and defended in another. Add to this the fact, that he is generally understood to represent a very decided and growing tendency in a portion of the Unitarian Denomination, toward a more evangelical position, and more than any other man is leading that movement, and it no longer appears singular that he should be narrowly watched, and his opinions be eagerly looked after and freely commented on.

Under these circumstances there is announced, as in press, a volume of his discourses, and this announcement is soon followed by the appearance of the volume. The discourses are twenty-six in number, and a glance at the subjects discussed, suggests that there is no disposition to shrink from the presentation of his views on the deepest and most interior themes of the gospel.—The following are some of the titles of the discourses. "The Soul's Search"—"The Soul's Coronation"—"Acceptance of the Heart"—"Salvation not from suffering but by it"—"Divinity of Christ"—"Doctrine of the Spirit"—"Asking and Receiving"—"The Soul's dependence on Christ, and Victory by Him"—"The Hidden Life"—"Spiritual Heirship"—etc. These were mostly preached as sermons to his congregation in Boston, in the ordinary course of his ministry; and so may be regarded as the spontaneous expression of his views of the gospel. Their publication was an after-thought, and designed in part, as a testimonial of his sympathies and affection for the people to whom

he ministered for thirteen years. That the volume should be widely circulated and carefully read was little else than a moral necessity.

The first thing, perhaps, which would strike a reader, is the high literary excellence and finish of these productions. The second thing is the peculiar freshness and individuality of the thoughts, the methods of discussion, and the expressional style. The third, is the deep, serene, unaffected spirituality of their tone, and the indications which they give of a strong and delicate religious consciousness in their author. The fourth, is the prominence assigned to the experience of the heart as a witness to religious truth, as the harmonizer of doctrines which a merely intellectual logic cannot unify, and as the really vital thing in all religious life.

Sermons are proverbially dull literature. Few of them stimulate a reader's interest or improve and gratify a true literary taste. Instead, they are read as a sort of penance under the pressure of duty, and their prosiness is often tolerated out of respect to the acknowledged importance of their object: For striking and powerful thought, for vigor of discussion, for excellences of style,—indeed for almost every element which lays a powerful grasp upon the spirit of a reader, almost the last place one would be likely to go would be to a volume of sermons. Those which have been read most widely and with most interest are probably those which have been very obvious departures from the ordinary model and routine of pulpit composition. Either the themes have been peculiar, as in the case of Chalmers' *Astronomical and Commercial Discourses*, or the style has been unique and striking, as in the case of *South*. Allowance is to be made for the natural repulsion which the heart feels for strictly religious themes, but we do not regard this as the whole explanation of the fact we have stated.

This volume is a noble exception. Superficial readers and moral triflers would not indeed, be attracted by its title or fascinated by its contents; and some of its themes and discussions belong rather to the domain of critical theology than to the sphere of common and daily thought. But the amount of dry dogmatic discussion in the volume is quite small, and even those topics which suggest dryness and dogmatism wear here a living freshness, and make a fervid appeal to the heart. A most earnest and affectionate spirit pervades the entire book. One feels in reading, that he is in contact with a teacher who understands the human heart, who has power to lay its deepest experiences bare, and give them a most distinct and impressive development; and that he has also comprehended the path along which one passes out from mist and perplexity to the brightness and peace of a spiritual morning. There is not a little in the spirit and method of the volume, that suggests the gospel and epistles of John. We think the Professor found much to sympathize with in the writings of that disciple, and he talks of Christ as the believer's support and life and satisfaction, like one whose chief ambition it is to lie on the Master's bosom. With much clear and striking and philosophical thought, there is still more of the spontaneous speech of faith; logical proofs are not despised, but spiritual insight is, perhaps, still more deferred to. And yet there is not a particle of transcendentalism in the book. He keeps wholly clear of the vagaries and Pythonic sentences of those who claim special illumination, and

set themselves up as seers. His developed experiences are all seen to be human, and his deepest utterances are more or less interpreted by all hearts. He often and generally leaves the beaten track of thought and expression, but only that he may enter an avenue where others can follow him with more certainty and ease. Full of the fervor that commands sympathetic attention, he lets fall no sentence that suggests artifice or cant. Reverencing man for his capacities, he has no suspicious apology for his crimes and sensuality. Touching with the pleading tenderness that seeks the reconciliation of the human soul, he never lets down the authority and sanctity of the divine law. Tolerant and charitable of varieties in religious sentiment where the spirit reveals the image of Christ, he will nevertheless plead for the great leading truths of the gospel as he would plead for his own soul. Employing a style captivating to all men of taste and culture, his constant aim is to show how relatively worthless are all natural and acquired abilities where the Christian spirit is forbidden to be royal. The volume will gain a wide respect for the pulpit where it has been denied honor, invest religious themes with new interest and significance where they have been treated cavalierly, and prompt to a deeper and more earnest spiritual life, where a few formal services have passed for the discharge of Christian duty.

As to the theology of the book, or of the author, we feel not much inclination to speak of it at length. It will be impossible to find any adopted formula of faith on these pages. For technically constructed creeds, ancient or modern, he has evidently no very strong affection. He does not probably believe that the full religious ideas of any great number of earnest and independent souls can be put into any rigidly stated creed. He adopts his own language; he would have others do so. The same terms imply different things on different lips; he has therefore, no hope of unifying conviction by the enforcement of a common formula. We might not always agree with him,—we are confident we do not; but we see no reason for magnifying the petty points of difference. His pedobaptist views we cannot accept: and his expositions of the Abrahamic covenant, as well as his inferential plea for the membership of infants in the church, seem to us wholly untenable. But let that pass. Even while constructing the arguments that seem to us fallacies, he is displaying a spirit we may well covet, and dropping suggestions full of Christian wisdom.

His Sermon on "The Divinity of Christ" will probably be studied with the greatest care by many readers, and excite here grateful and there grievous surprise. We attempt no analysis of his views or reasonings on that subject. There is very little in it that corresponds to the prevalent ideas of Unitarianism. So far from this, the impression one is likely to derive is that it was written with a specific design to repudiate and disprove what is supposed to be the Unitarian theory. Not a few claim him on the Trinitarian side;—and it would seem as though he could mean little less than the strongest advocates of Christ's essential Deity have meant. We quote a few sentences on that point, and dismiss the subject.

"There can be no half way statement here without a wrong to philosophy and faith both. That in Christ which is not human is God,—verily, literally, and strictly, God; as truly God, and in the same sense God, as the Father is God. All the biblical lan-

guage seems to me to preclude the conception of any intermediate nature. He is spoken of as man, and he is spoken of as God. That mystery is insoluble to the understanding. But this is clear: while God, to whom all things are possible, may enter into human conditions, and pass through a human experience, and thus 'become man,' man can in no sense become God. The difficulties in the way of receiving our Lord and Savior as God are as nothing compared with the difficulty of receiving him as not God."

But the least design or tendency of the book is to awaken theological controversy. Its spirit and aim take the reader up into too serene an air, and on to a height too lofty for that work. It is for the strength and freshness of its thoughts, for the high type of pulpit teaching it reveals, for the fervid and Christian earnestness of its spirit, for the noble stimulus it offers to all that is best and richest in human endeavor, and for the clearness and fulness with which it sets forth Christ as the great and only Redeemer,—it is for these things that we commend it to the attention of our readers, as one of the best and most grateful contributions to our religious literature that has recently been made. To the younger ministry of our land it will prove no small blessing if its legitimate influence is cordially and fully welcomed, and its lessons practically learned. We hope this contribution of the distinguished author may be soon and frequently followed by others worthy of such a herald.

CHAPEL AND CHURCH ARCHITECTURE: With Designs for Parsonages. By Rev. Geo. Bowler. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co.

The caves and grottos of the mountains were fitting sanctuaries for the worship of the old saints or martyr memory. There they came into more sensible presence with God, than would seem possible in temples made with hands. They were not only God's temples by consecration, but the architecture was all his own, fashioned, too, by his own hand. In later times, in our own country, when hearts were warm, and there were neither the means nor the opportunity for spacious and elegant sanctuaries, there were glorious times, for the presence of the Holy One, in the mighty old forests, or at other times in the most convenient barn of the farmer. Even in the latter, there were the associations of the Savior's birth—and many a long remembered scene of religious joy and triumph has transpired in such a place.

But yet no one can seriously suppose that any of these is a proper type for the ordinary outward sanctuary of God. They are manifestly exceptions, made proper and necessary by the pressure of peculiar circumstances—not the rule. God would have us worship in such, only when we can not be provided with places of worship more congenial to the ordinary condition, culture, and spirit of the Christian church. He who thinks otherwise, needs again to ponder the histories of the Jewish tabernacle and of the building of the first Jewish temple. God's will was—*The tabernacle in the wilderness: a TEMPLE as soon as it is possible, through their settlement in the promised land.* So it is now.—A barn when no better can be had: but something quite different so soon as it is possible to obtain it. And if some prosperous Solomon, busy in planning and perfecting his own dwelling, or in enlarging or improving his own farm, shall be inclined to be slow to believe it "possible" to erect a more fitting



sanctuary, let him read the words of the Prophet: "Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and this house (the temple) lie waste?"

Some one may say, "Why can't we worship in a barn now just as well as in days gone by?" Why, we ask, does not such a one think also to inquire: "Why can't we *live* now in such houses as were used in days gone by?" and the latter inquiry is certainly quite as pertinent as the first; and until it is *practically* answered, by which we mean, until the objector actually lives in such a house, we shall spend no time in answering either of them. Having no fears that any such thing will be attempted, except at the demanding of a pretty stern necessity, the point may be dismissed, and the conclusion accepted that at least quite as much taste and elegance ought to be displayed in our houses of worship as in our dwellings, and if God is to be first in *all* our thoughts, it would be hard to prove that the elegance of our sanctuaries ought not somewhat to exceed that of our dwellings.

There is another point to which we wish to allude. When a church eventually concludes to build a house of worship, the actual or virtual inquiry often is: "How cheap a building can we make answer our purpose?" and especially if the church is weak and asks assistance, there is too much inclination to insist that only the barest minimum of expense shall be incurred—just enough barely to squeeze along for the present. In our judgment this is all wrong, and very nearly the reverse of what should be. The crimping policy is almost invariably a bad one. Build a little, inelegant house, and it never satisfies, either the community generally, or those who build it; and generally results in what is often thought, a mysterious lack of efficiency and success in the church.

Little-heartedness is in no shape a product of Christian culture, and where the manifestations of it prevail, they will eat out the Christian spirit, and guarantee a failure. He that would reap bountifully must not sow sparingly, and this is quite as true of the externals as of the internals of the Christian life. Any other course is not only wrong, but in the highest degree impolitic.—What is done at all ought to be done well. Every church edifice erected, ought to be a *good* one, one of the first class; it will be better than a dozen inferior ones. If it be necessary, we would rather let half our churches die, and other denominations take their place, and let the remaining ones be strong, noble, generous, thriving churches, than to live along "at this poor dying rate," with a name to live and scarcely any thing else. And so we would, also, if there is necessity for it, rather see half our churches without any church edifice at all, and the rest with first rate ones, than to see all have each a more or less highly finished barn that some shrewd carpenter may have misnamed, and *not* shrewd ministers may have dedicated, a church. Indeed, many of our churches were actually better off with no houses of worship at all, than with those they have. For then there would be at least a little prospect of their getting fitting ones, while as it is there is no such prospect; and for the lack of it, there *is* prospect of a dwindling life and a lingering death to the church.

The true policy of the church, like that of the farmer, to whose operations the Savior so often likens spiritual things, is to cultivate no more ground than

can be cultivated well. Whatever is done, let it not be on the most stinted, but the most generous, policy. If there is but a ton of fertilizing agency, don't scatter it all over creation, but concentrate it somewhere, and you will see its effects. When you put your plow to a field, put down the beam, turn up the subsoil, tear out the roots, pulverize, manure, sow and cultivate thoroughly, and something worth while will come of it, not otherwise. So, too, when you build a house of worship, build a good one,—convenient, commodious, tasteful, attractive. As to what is said about extravagance in church building, we would like always to hear it preceded by a preface against extravagance in eating, drinking, dress, and dwelling houses,—a practical, or rather *practiced* one, we mean, and then an equally practical introduction concerning covetousness, and we should not often find the author getting farther without being reminded of the passage: "He that is without sin," &c. ; or of some other, that would prevent his going on, and leave the preface and introduction gloriously by themselves.

But we did not think of running on at this rate. We must stop. We commenced to commend to the notice of our ministers and churches, Mr. Bowler's excellent work on church architecture. Not because it fills our ideal of what such a book might be. It has obvious architectural defects. But, because it is far in advance of everything for the purpose, except a similar work got up by the Congregationalists, and in our judgment it excels that. Its cost is ten dollars, but more than that amount would be saved to every church that is building or repairing, by the purchase and use of this book. It will not prevent the need of an architect in building anew, but it will enable committees to decide that anterior question of style, which an architect cannot decide for them, or, if he attempts it, is more than likely to produce much if not permanent dissatisfaction.

There are a very large number of plans and drawings, beautifully lithographed, and we most heartily thank the author and publishers for this timely, superior, and most excellent contribution to church architecture—hoping our churches will largely profit by it.

#### OUT OF PLACE, AND OUT OF JOINT.

The following passage occurs in a new work from the pen of the Rev. Wm. Arthur, entitled "The Tongue of Fire." He is speaking of the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost :

"One word as to the mode of this baptism. In this case we have the one perfectly clear account contained in Scripture of the mode wherein the baptizing element was applied to the person of the baptized. The element here is fire : the mode is shedding down—'hath shed forth this.' 'It sat upon each of them.' Did baptism mean immersion, they would have been plunged into the fire, not the fire shed upon them.—The only other case in which the mode of contact between the baptizing element and the baptized persons is indicated, is this : 'And were all baptized to Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' They were not dipped in the cloud, but the cloud descended upon them; they were not plunged into the sea, but the sea sprinkled them as they passed. The Spirit signified by the water *is never once promised under the idea of dipping*. Such an expression as, 'I will immerse you in my spirit,' 'I will plunge you in my spirit,' or 'I will dip you in clean water,' is unknown to the Scripture. But, 'I will pour out my spirit upon you,' 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you,' is language and thought familiar to all readers of the Bible. The word 'dip,' or 'dipped,'

does not often occur in the New Testament ; but when it does, the original is *never* 'baptize' or 'baptized.'"

1. The book is put forth as a practical and devotional one on the work of the Holy Spirit, and hence, to say nothing of its logic, the foregoing seems sadly, painfully out of place. You are invited to sit down to a communion of pious thoughts, on one of the most sacred themes of the Christian faith, one concerning which all evangelical Christians are agreed, and in the midst of it, this parenthetical and partisan fling at the tenets and reasoning of a large portion of the church, is unceremoniously hurled at your head. We do not know but this is Christian etiquette, brotherly kindness of the highest degree. But, somehow, it strikes us as somewhat questionable. Our Methodist friends *might* perhaps complain, if we should invite them to unite with us in Sabbath school services, in the midst of which we should introduce a tirade against Episcopacy. Perhaps they wouldn't. We don't think of trying it, however.

2. But, if it were ever so much in place, the reasoning is strangely fallacious. It takes it for granted, and its whole force depends upon the assumption, that baptize, baptism, &c., are never used in a figurative or secondary sense. For to say that the figurative or secondary meaning of the word is just like the primary and ordinary, is obviously equivalent to saying it has no figurative or secondary meaning, since things precisely alike clearly cannot be different. But things different—as are the primary and figurative meaning of words—just as obviously cannot be alike. Therefore, if baptize, and baptized, &c., may be used in a secondary sense, that secondary is not precisely like, but only similar to, the literal meaning ; and if, too, in the instances quoted, these terms are used in a figurative sense, then Mr. A.'s argument is pointless.

That these terms *are* used figuratively, and not literally, in those texts, even the Rev. Mr. Arthur himself cannot seriously question ; and if he does not, why does he reason as if he did ? Does he deceive himself, or does he mean to deceive others ? They do not mean that there was a literal baptism in the cloud, or in the sea, or even on the day of Pentecost ; but only that these events, each in many important particulars unlike the others, alike bore a striking resemblance to the idea of baptism. And, though Mr. Arthur may not have noticed it, it is from their resemblance to the idea of immersion, that their striking beauty comes. Take this idea of being surrounded, overwhelmed, swallowed up, by the cloud, the sea, and the Spirit, and reduce it to a mere sprinkling, and how almost infinitely these subjects are belittled ! Their very soul is abstracted—there is hardly anything left of them. They are brought down from the heights of a divine sublimity, to a point scarcely above the ridiculous. Associate them with the fulness, the quantity, the pervadingness, the all aboutness of immersion, and then the description of Israel's walking safely through the sea means something, the cloud becomes the mysterious bearer of the divine presence, and the presence or baptism of the Holy Ghost is all round about and a glory in the midst. Query. How did Mr. Arthur ascertain that the Israelites were literally "sprinkled" by the Red Sea, as they passed through it ? We don't remember any such statement in the sacred record. Pray, where did he get it ? Of course such a literalist didn't mean figuratively "sprinkled."

It is difficult to see what relevancy the assertion that βαπτισμὸς is "never" rendered "dip" or "dipped" in the New Testament,—but βαπτισμὸς,—if true, has to the argument he is so unsuccessfully endeavoring to use.

Mr. Arthur is a better rhetorician than logician, and succeeds better in devout exegesis than in critical controversy. He would, in our judgment, do well to stick to his forte. With the exception we have noted, this book of his—published by the Harpers—is a valuable work, written with an excellent spirit. Hence the more glaring the exception.

THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES EXPLAINED by James M. Macdonald, D. D. New York. 1856. M. W. Dodd.

The author gives a new translation of Ecclesiastes and places it in parallel columns with the old for the convenience of comparing. The translation differs very little from the received version, in some points being made simpler and more modern in style. We have noticed one verse in which the old version is changed for the worse, no doubt: 3 : 12, is made to read "enjoy good," instead of, "do good," though the latter is strictly literal and communicates an additional idea. Otherwise, so far as we have noticed, the changes aid the common reader in obtaining a clear view of the Spirit's meaning.

The introductory essay, to show that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is taught in the Old Testament, is able, just, and timely. The author clearly apprehends the design and local circumstances which produced Ecclesiastes, and thus is enabled clearly to illustrate the book. Whoever reads this commentary will feel quite at home with Ecclesiastes afterward, and it is no less adapted to the common reader than the scholar.

THE PROPHETS AFTER RESTORATION: Or, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. A new translation with notes. By the Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian church, Richmond, Va. Robert Carter & Brothers. 1856.

This volume is one which we love to commend to our readers. The new translation gives additional interest to this interesting portion of the Bible.—The expositions are clear and far removed from that indefiniteness so prevalent among commentators on the prophets. The author happily illustrates the position of these three prophets as the prophets of the restoration, thus giving in a general view the proper point from which to study them.

The new translation is evidently the result of much study, and, what we think will generally strike those painfully who attempt to follow him in the study of the Hebrew, is, that the author shows so little of the process by which he has arrived at his conclusion. It would have been better for ministers generally if the author had dwelt a little more on the grammatical relations of the Hebrew terms, but probably less attractive to the general reader. Most commentators, and this one included, give these readers much more credit for learning than they deserve. In this book, for instance, if the author had lent the helping hand to the student rusty in the Hebrew, he would have induced many more ministers even to follow and appreciate him, who, unaided, will make no attempt.

There are some passages of rare beauty and force for any book, but much more rare in commentaries. We could hardly refer to a passage in any book that has thrilled us more than the author's at the close of the eighth chapter of Zechariah. This is a book of the right kind to aid the minister and comfort the people.

**A CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS**, by Francis S. Sampson, D. D., Professor of Oriental Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, Prince Edward, Va. Edited from the manuscript notes of the author, by Robert L. Daleney, D. D. Robert Carter & Brothers. 1836. New York.

The little time we have been able to give to this book does not prepare us to speak of this work as we desire, but our impressions are of the most favorable kind as to its research and ability. The author was a man blessed with good talents as a commentator and almost every outward advantage, and this is the work to which he devoted his mature years.

**THE GOSPEL IN EZEKIEL: Illustrated in a series of Discourses.** By the Rev. Thomas Guthrie, D. D., Edinburgh, author of "Pleas for Ragged Schools," etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1856.

Perhaps the above title might lead some to expect something like an exegetical work on Ezekiel. If so they would be misled. It is rather a series of discourses on the leading themes of the Gospel: the texts selected from the 36th chapter of Ezekiel, commencing with the 16th verse. The Messenger, the Defiler, man sinning, man suffering, God's punitive justice, God's motive in salvation, are the themes in their order to the sixth. There are twenty-two discourses in all, as before observed, on the leading doctrines of the Gospel. The peculiar feature of this book, it strikes us, is its power of illustration. Many apprehend these truths as clearly as the author, but few are so happy in expressing them, especially, few have the power of expressing them in a form so adapted to awaken the emotions which the heart ought to experience when the intellect is brought into contact with divine truth.

**PERVERSION: Or the Causes and Consequences of Infidelity.** A tale for the Times. By Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M. A., Author of "Life and Epistles of St. Paul." New York: Wiley & Halstead.

When an author has gained eminence in one department of literature, he hazards much if he makes an attempt in another and totally different field. Universal genius is seldom realized, and excellence in one direction is often the proof of inability to excel in another. Hence the old classical proverb, *Ne sutor ultra crepidam*—let each man stick to his trade; he may excel there, but hardly elsewhere.

It was under the influence of some such considerations as these that we took up Conybeare's new work, the title of which is given above. His *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* was a decided success, and has at once passed to an unchallenged position among the very choicest and most important theological works of any age or country. It were even difficult to name a single one to stand before it. But that was anything rather than a work of imagination.

It required patient investigation, laborious research—days and nights of discriminating, wearisome, plodding toil, to sift out and arrange its multitudinous details; and then the clearest and profoundest philosophical insight, to mould them into the proper, real, and living proportions of the Life and Writings of the great Gentile apostle. When, therefore, the man who had done this, with such wonderful success, proposed to lead us into the walks of fiction, we felt like saying, “Beware!”

Nor were our forebodings altogether groundless. Conybeare in “A Tale for the Times,” certainly is not equal to Conybeare in the walks of exegetical and historical theology. Especially the first part of his new work flounders dragglingly along, in a way that betrays both a new hand and also one that can scarcely make itself the master here that it is elsewhere. Yet the latter portion of the volume evinces improvement, and throughout the whole the working of principles and systems is vividly and strongly portrayed. He succeeds in making you feel as he feels, and elicits from you a storm of indignation for the principles or the systems that fall under his condemnatory inspection—and his scalpel is unflinching. Though the red blood follow its every incision, there is no relenting, no hesitation. It cuts right on, until the venomous core is exposed and separated. In this is his strength. Artistically, his book would not excite attention. One feature alone, that of two heroes, pursuing quite different courses, would be enough to destroy its value in this respect. Its plot is poor, its management is not dramatic, and its artistic denouement, or rather denouements, insignificant.

Another thing will detract somewhat from the credit its author might otherwise receive. It reminds one of the Eclipse of Faith, so that he can scarcely help feeling all along that the idea of the work was borrowed from Rogers; while it certainly suffers in the comparison with Rogers’ work. In so far as such a comparison is made, it is an imitation that, like imitations generally, is inferior to the original; and on that account may not receive the credit it intrinsically deserves.

But after all this, and as we have already intimated, the book has merit, and that, too, of a high order. Upon the whole, it considerably surpasses the impression with which we took it up, and the feeling with which we finished it exceeded the estimate of the first few chapters. It will be read, will create something of a sensation, and will make a mark. It is intended to expose the rottenness of the English boy boarding school system, and does it effectually. It makes one feel that if that is the way English boys are trained, the good Lord deliver us from being an English boy. Upon the University system, it is more sparing, but says enough to evince that there is a reason for a friend to deal tenderly, and that an enemy or reformer would find work to do in earnest. For our own part, strongly and decidedly as we cling to the importance, as essential to a full training, of a classical culture, we are convinced that the English University system is quite as rotten as its boarding school system.

But this is only one point among many. Various features of High Church and Low Church, of Puseyite and Evangelical, and of society in general, come in for a full share of unsparring exposure—as contributing to the infideli-

ty of the times. No doubt some points are overwrought—some things painted in too brilliant colors; but we presume the work will awaken attention to real defects, and draw out effort to remedy them; and by a general incitement to seek out the causes of infidelity and evil, do much toward remedying them.

COLTON'S AMERICAN ATLAS, Illustrating Physical and Political Geography, accompanied by Descriptions, Geographical, Statistical, and Historical. New York: J. H. Colton & Co.

The above named work, we do not hesitate to say, combines many more excellencies than any other work of the kind extant. It forms Vol. I. of an Atlas of the World—a second volume being taken up with the Eastern Continent, and contains sixty-three different maps, of different portions, and, together, of all of the Western Continent and contiguous islands. The maps are finely engraved, and are exceedingly accurate, both topographically and in having all the latest changes fully noted. And, moreover, to keep pace with these latter, the publisher has arranged so as to furnish at a trifling expense new and altered copies of any map where changes may have been made, and which can be inserted in the Atlas in the place of those they supersede. This seems to us an especially valuable feature. Then the maps are drawn on a large scale, and name even small villages, sometimes where there is scarcely more than a store and a post-office. Another valuable feature is maps of the larger cities, by which any street can be found at a glance, and the localities of public points of interest easily comprehended.

Added to all this, there is a large amount of accompanying letter press description, some of it such as is not elsewhere easily accessible, and yet is extremely valuable, and enough in quantity to fill several ordinary duodecimo volumes. Indeed, the work is a complete encyclopedia of Geography, in which the maps are far beyond anything before attempted. The price, fourteen dollars for the volume, at first seems considerable; but when one comes to consider the number, accuracy, and convenience of the maps, the amount, variety, and importance of the descriptive matter, and then remembers that a *single* mounted map, with no descriptive matter—and really no better than the corresponding one of the sixty-three maps in this Atlas—costs from five to eight dollars, the price of this dwindles into insignificance, and one only thinks of its exceeding cheapness. It is both by far the best and cheapest work of the kind to be found.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCRIPTURE: Suggested by a tour through the Holy Land. By Horatio B. Hackett, Professor in Newton Theological Institution. Boston: Heath & Graves.

There are many passages in the Scriptures that are obscure, if not meaningless, without some knowledge of Jewish customs, characteristics, or geography. What idea, for instance, would one gain from the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, if he knew nothing of the marriage customs of the Jews. And so of a great number of other passages; some, where the allusion is sustained through a whole passage—as in the case referred to—and

others in which the reference is the briefest possible. Hence, whether these allusions are briefer or more extended, there is need of some explanation of these facts, before we can properly understand the Sacred Volume.

Prof. Hackett's Illustrations of Scripture are admirably fitted to impart such information. The work throws a flood of light upon the Bible, and every page presents that which will cause us to see more beauties in it, and to love, cherish, and study its sacred truths more ardently than before. It is admirably adapted to Sabbath school teachers and Bible classes; and ought indeed to be secured by all who would understand the will of God to man. With its help, too, one can walk over, in mind, those hallowed scenes, where patriarch, and prophet, and apostle, and the Son of God himself, lived and walked, and ate, and drank, and slept, and see, in imagination, the men and the influences with which they came in contact, and which drew out from them, through the divine inspiration, those living words which are now set as diadems in the living oracles of God—and thus draw a fuller supply from the divine treasury, from which human wants are supplied, and the soul guarded against evil.

**HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY**, Revised and brought down to the Present time. By W. P. Strickland, D. D. With an Introduction by Rev. N. L. Rice. New York: Harper & Brothers.

This is a revised edition of an old work, which has already met with quite general favor. The importance of such a work is obvious, both in order to understand how much claims the Bible Society has upon us, and also to comprehend the condition of the world as it respects a knowledge of God's word; and Dr. Strickland has executed it in a highly satisfactory and creditable manner. Beginning with some account of the condition of the country prior to the establishment of the Society, and of the causes which prepared the way for it, he treats of the organization of the Society, its officers and managers, auxiliaries, methods of procedure, of Bible distribution among the different classes of society, and in foreign countries, of translation into foreign languages, of the annual publication and work of the Society, of benefactors, legacies, agencies, library, life members, anniversaries, addresses, &c., &c., thus furnishing a large amount of matter that can but be valuable and interesting to every lover of the Bible. Its perusal will heighten our love, both for the Bible Society and the Bible itself.

**THE TONGUE OF FIRE; Or, the True Power of Christianity.** By William Arthur, A. M. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The author tells us in the preface, that this book is "the fruit of meditations entered upon with the desire to lessen the distance painfully felt to exist between (his) own life and ministry, and those of the primitive Christians," thus giving it an eminently practical character. It is virtually a treatise on the work of the Holy Spirit, and exhibits, in a pleasing and forcible manner, the true elements of the power of the church. Its spirit is eminently devout, evincing that the author has a practical acquaintance with the marvellous power he describes. Its style sometimes wearies, through being a little too



uniformly rhetorical, and sustained too continuously upon the same key. There is less of cant about it than in most books with a similar purpose, its positions are more clearly taken, and more distinctly defined. Everything is not left in the mist, half obscured to the author's own vision, and more than that, to that of his readers. There is intelligibility about it—such as we seldom get upon such a subject. We think no one can read it attentively without deriving a large measure of profit therefrom.

We are, however, sorry to observe an unworthy partisan sling in it at Baptist sentiments—and this seems the more to be reprobated, since the author went out of his way for it, and fairly lugged it in; and in doing so the key of his own spirit is sadly changed from what it is in the rest of the work.

LECTURES UPON THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. By William G. T. Shedd, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Andover: W. F. Draper.

Prof. Shedd, though yet quite a young man, has ran a brilliant career—first professor at the Vermont University, then at Auburn Theological Seminary, and now at the culmination of New England Congregationalism at Andover. In the literary world he is favorably known as the editor of Harper's excellent edition of Coleridge's works, and in the world of listeners he is gratefully remembered as the author of several thought-stirring addresses. He now comes again before us, in the shape of the publication of a brief course of lectures on the Philosophy of History.

The professor has a very active and acute mind, strongly grasping and readily discriminating the essential and fundamental features of a subject. He is also an earnest and somewhat self-reliant thinker. His mind has not the momentum to proceed far in an entirely unbeaten track; but it has that penetration to distinguish between the true and the false in the more advanced fields of speculation, and the synthetic grasp to evolve the good into fairer and juster proportions, which are nearly akin to absolute originality, and which are often even more useful than it. He is one of those men, we apprehend, that read only a select circle of authors—those who work at the original mines of thinking, and throw out the most vigorous seeds of thought, and who are, in fact, the real kings and leaders of men. As a result, his thoughts are ever exalted, and come to us with rare freshness and interest. His style needs a little familiarity, ere it becomes to us a full medium of his conceptions. This arises largely from two causes—the frequent use of peculiar or peculiarly used abstract terms, and the brevity and number of his metaphors. These latter are seldom, if ever, expanded into comparisons, and are sometimes used with such profusion that a new and widely different one, illustrating the same point, is upon us ere we have fairly grasped the first.

His views of the Philosophy of History are substantially a clearer and fuller evolution of the speculations of Neander, Bunsen, and others. History, he maintains, is not a picture; but a development, an evolution—as the leaf, the stalk, the flower, come from, and were-contained in, the germ. But depravity has substituted a false germ for the pristine one, and its development is secular History. Christianity re-instates a true germ—working, however, in some measure, along with the false one introduced by depravity—and pro-

duces Church History. Man, by means of depravity, is the author of the one; God, through the ministration of his truth and spirit, is the author of the other. Neither can develop anything not in the germ itself, though unfavorable influences may, in some measure, in some cases, prevent the evolution of all that is in the germ. Another feature of his views is, that all history, but especially church history, needs an *a priori* test to give us a clue to its right appreciation. In the case of church history, this test is the Bible. A comprehensive and true knowledge of its teachings and principles is essential to a right understanding of church history.

We have given but the barest and therefore an imperfect epitome of the views elucidated in these lectures; but we may suggest the possibility that while the theory is essentially true, and the apprehension of it gives—as the history of church history for the last quarter of a century shows—a higher and truer dignity to the subject, yet that the professor makes it too mechanical, and insists upon too literal an application to the subject of the laws of development that obtain in the material world. He gives, to be sure, a place to the workings of depravity, in determining the germ to be developed, but perhaps allows too little for the working of free-will in the actual process of evolution, and for the consequent interacting during the process of complex forces—by which secular and church history approach much nearer in their actual development, than the theory would seem to imply. Moreover, the rigid application of an *a priori* test is liable to mischief, arising from the inherent imperfection of the human mind. Antecedent knowledge of Christianity will undoubtedly contribute largely to our understanding of its history; but the mind only imperfectly grasps even Christianity, and thus looks through a medium more or less highly colored—one contemplates church history through Romish and another through Protestant glasses—and of the latter, one with prelatial, another anti-prelatial, another Calvinistic, another Arminian conceptions, and so on; and each reading the history wrongly, by so much, at least, as his *a priori* conceptions are erroneous.

THE  
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

NO. XVI.----OCTOBER, 1856.

---

ART. I.—THE HOLY SPIRIT, HIS MANIFESTATION AND  
FUNCTIONS.

The human soul under bondage to flesh and sense, when once made conscious of its degradation, longs for deliverance as the aim of all its holy exertions,—for a state in which it shall not fulfil “the lust of the flesh.” To encourage it in this aim, there are numerous promises given in the Bible, that on condition of appropriate exertion it shall be conducted by the Omnipotent Spirit to its peaceful home—to sanctification realized on earth, the foretaste and sure pledge of heaven.

For the sake of a distinct conception of this Omnipotent Spirit, let us observe that, as Jesus Christ is God manifest in the flesh among men,—God manifest in a body in the world of bodies, so the Holy Spirit is God manifest a Spirit in the world of spirits. Under this conception we can think of the Holy Spirit as infinite in all capacities, just as we can think of the disembodied human spirit in its limitations.

When spirit makes manifestations of itself in this world of bodies, it does so through *media*. This point we assume as a simple fact in relation to both the Divine and created spirit, and turn now to speak of the *media* through which the Holy Spirit manifests himself in his influences over the human soul.

If an intelligent man had been permitted to look upon the old chaos, the lifeless and commingled materials for the world,

the principle of causality in his nature would have necessitated him to admit God's creative power. Chaos itself, incarnating, if we may thus safely use the term, to human perceptions, the attribute of Omnipotence, would serve the Holy Spirit as medium, under the circumstances supposed, for influencing men to an appropriate course of action toward the Creator. We use general terms, our only point being to give our view of the Spirit manifesting himself to human mind through media.

To the limited perceptions of the human mind, chaos could have borne no testimony, however, of God's design and order, and, therefore, in chaos the Holy Spirit could find no media for influencing the human mind in reference to the attributes implied by design and order. But the Holy Spirit brooding over the mingled mass, separated at length, through the medium of the Divine Word, light, air, and water from the land, clothed the fields with vegetation, and caused earth, sea and air to abound with animal life. The Spirit, through the medium of the Word, changed the chaos into the cosmos,—the shapeless and lifeless mass into the creation which manifests, if one may say it reverently, the physical attributes of God under the direction of his intellectual attributes, disposing of all things according to the laws of order, harmony, numbers, color, beauty, and life. If the old chaos proclaimed God's omnipotence, much more does the arranged creation declare his wisdom, "for the invisible things of Him, from (that is, by means of) the creation of the world are clearly seen—being understood by the things that are made—even his eternal power and Godhead."

In respect of these attributes, eternal power and Godhead, the Holy Spirit by incarnating them in creation, finds in creation itself the media of manifesting himself to the human mind to prompt it to the duty of revering and worshipping the Creator, revealed now to human perceptions, not merely as the Omnipotent, but also as the Omniscient. We carry along in our minds here, the case of the creation as Adam first looked upon it.

When man was introduced to the creation, incomplete hitherto only by reason of his absence, the process of incarnation

proceeded beyond the physical and intellectual attributes. "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness; and let them have dominion." In this "image" and "likeness," the Divine Spirit, through the medium of the Divine Word, incarnated, in a faint degree, at least, the attributes of Affection and Dominion, Conscience and Holiness. Through man the Spirit found the means of manifesting himself to the mind of man, influencing him to the course of conduct due to a Creator possessed of the attributes implied in the creation of man himself. Adam in his holiness served the Holy Spirit as the medium of manifestation and influence in reference to all the Divine attributes yet revealed to us, save those peculiar to Redemption.

But the cosmical Adam through the influence of Satan fell by sin, the moral ruin constituting a new chaos. But a promise was given, that the second Adam, of woman born, should come and enter into conflict with Satan, and, for the fallen Adam, conquer the great arch-foe. While this promise waited for its fulfilment, the Holy Spirit hovered over the new chaos, as formerly over the old. He spoke through all the media left him in the marred physical and moral creation, convincing men by "the things that were made" of Jehovah's eternal power and Godhead and shadowing forth, also, through the media of prophets, sacrifices and rituals, the moral perfections and coming mercy.

At length came the fulness of time. The Spirit said to the Eternal, "sacrifices and offerings thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me." The second Adam, begotten of the Holy Spirit, and virgin-born, made his appearance,—not like Minerva from the brain of Jove, full grown and armed,—but the helpless babe of Bethlehem, to be made perfect and crowned through sufferings. "The Word," the same medium through which the Spirit acted in creation, "became flesh and dwelt among us." "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell." "In him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." This is the Incarnation, not in the pantheistic sense in which we have used the word to denote an

objective embodiment of the Divine attributes, and in which it is said

“ Whose body nature is and God the soul,”

but the Incarnation, in the sense that all the fulness of God dwelt consciously in the second Adam.

At the time of the Savior's baptism, phenomena were permitted to occur by which men might know the relation of the second Adam to the Holy Spirit. That Spirit's power he enjoyed without measure. That Spirit is the chrism by which he is consecrated the Christ forevermore. It was with that Spirit with which he was destined to anoint (or, if our language would permit it, to Christ) his people as with a holy flame. Immediately after the baptism, the second Adam entered into the conflict long foretold with Satan and proved himself to be the stronger than the strong man armed, for he took from him all the armor wherein he trusted and divided the spoil. Significant of this victory in the spiritual world, phenomena were presented to human eyes in Christ's victory over demons permitted to manifest themselves, perhaps, for this very reason when our Savior was on earth. Christ's easy triumph over disease and death was significant of the same victory in the spiritual world. To us in the body phenomena of this character are necessary, for human beings could not, like Christ, see by direct vision Satan fall from his high place of power.

Though in Christ the cosmical Adam re-appeared, though in him dwelt consciously all the fulness of the Godhead, and, though his was the Spirit without measure, still his relation to the Spirit, till after the ascension, seems to have more that of recipient than that of bestower. While he was on earth he pointed to the near future as the commencement of the dispensation peculiarly the Spirit's. “ It is expedient for you,” said he to the sorrowing disciples, “ that I go away ; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.” The following passage in John's words is to the same point: “ This spake he (the Savior) 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.” It seems to have been requisite for Christ to

announce from the cross "It is finished," before poor man could perceive in him the incarnation of the attributes concerned peculiarly in redemption. The Spirit's manifestation seems to depend upon previous incarnation, so that not till, to human perception, these attributes were incarnated in Christ, could the spirit find even in him a perfected medium of manifestation to man.

When Christ was glorified, the medium for the Spirit's manifestation perfected, such was the freshet of the Spirit's power poured on the day of Pentecost, that it is said by way of indicating the fulness of his manifestation, as compared with the past, the Spirit was then given. When the house wherein the disciples were praying in the name of the glorified Christ for the outpouring of the Spirit, was filled with the mighty rushing wind, Christ's favorite symbol for the Holy Ghost, then began the Spirit's dispensation. The presence of the Spirit invoked in the name of the Crucified, convicted his murderers of the sin of unbelief; proved that they had put to death the Righteous One now in the Father's presence; and revealed the condemnation and penalties which await impenitent sinners in the Judgment, for Satan, their prince, was manifestly overthrown and, in the fate of his prince, the subject reads his own doom. "When he (the Spirit) is come he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment;—of sin, because they believed not on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." Such are the functions of the Spirit toward the world, and how clearly were these offices discovered on the day of Pentecost! But, on the other hand, how different were the offices of the Spirit toward the disciples in that great outpouring! By it they knew they were adopted of the Father, "for if earthly parents know how to give good gifts unto their children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" by it they knew Christ, their dear absent friend, to be alive; by it they knew their joint heirship with Christ to the universe was made sure, for they had heard him say what implies that the gift of the Spirit, infinite in resources, is precisely equivalent to the gift of all

“good things;” and by it they knew they could at once begin to appropriate to themselves from their boundless inheritance, being certain their prayers were henceforth to be answered, inasmuch as by the Spirit’s presence they could ask according to the will of God. The presence of the Spirit, for the disciples was the spirit of adoption; it was the unction, consecrating them to Christ whom the Spirit unfolds; it was God’s own signet, sealing them unto the day of redemption; it was the earnest of their future inheritance, revealing unto them the things that God hath provided for those that love him. Such are the offices of the Spirit in behalf of Christians.

We pass now to speak of the soul’s progress under the conduct of the Spirit, through conviction, conversion and sanctification.

We have already seen that the Holy Spirit reached the fulness of his manifestation only when to our perceptions the Divine attributes of Justice and Mercy, as concerned in redemption, were incarnated: we have seen, also, that the Spirit’s office in his full manifestation is toward the world to reprove it of sin, righteousness and judgment; and, we have seen still further, that his office toward the Christian is to comfort in respects indicated by the terms adoption, unction, seal and earnest. If now, we bear in mind that the man of the world upon conviction may become the disciple, and, then add together the functions of the Spirit toward the world and those toward the disciple, we shall have the sum which indicates the stages through which the soul passes, under the aid and guidance of the Spirit, from its first conscious impenitence to the heights of sanctification. Before we proceed to speak in detail of these, it is well to make two preliminary remarks.

Though we speak of the functions of the Spirit after conversion as distinct stages, we do not wish to be understood as teaching a precise chronological order, nor that only one of these functions is performed at once, nor, still farther, that these are always perfectly distinct. Still, many may trace in their soul’s history greater or less conformity to the ideal type we present.

The other remark is this: that, though at the great out-



pouring of the Spirit, the miraculous and ordinary functions of the Spirit may be with difficulty distinguished, yet it is our purpose to keep clearly within the latter. It is true, no doubt, the latter received a greater fulness and, perhaps, distinctness, so far as we propose to trace them, from their association with the miraculous, but we see no more objection to availing ourselves of this light in this study, than can be reasonably made to the use of the microscope by the botanist. As in the latter's study, an ideal type may greatly facilitate his discovery of truth, so the same thing in ours may be of equal service, if judiciously employed. We now proceed to the detail proposed.

First, of conviction. Through the glorified Christ as medium the Holy Spirit comes into powerful contact with the guilty human spirit. The result is, as before stated, conviction for the sin of unbelief with reference to Christ; a sense of unlikeness to him, the Holy One, of whom the Spirit testifies; and, a fearful looking for of judgment. Thus in the impenitent heart is begotten by the Holy Spirit, the only fit prayer for the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner." "What shall I do!" Like the sinking Peter, it cries in its distress, "Lord save, or I perish." This is the beginning of true prayer in the soul. The soul is learning to call Jesus Lord by the Spirit. The phenomena in the soul are not alone of the soul, but of the soul in contact with the Divine Spirit. It is thus the soul makes its first protest against the dominion of the flesh. Its declaration of independence has yet to be made good by an arduous war, but, blessed be God, the war need be of no doubtful issue, as the struggling soul can, if it will, have the Omnipotent Spirit as an ally. What though the guilty one comes forth from his grave of trespasses and sins bound hand and foot with grave clothes, and face bound about with a napkin? The Spirit, who has begun the good work, utters the omnipotent word, "loose him and let him go," and, "more than conquer through the Beloved."

We turn our attention to adoption, implying of course the previous forgiveness. As to forgiveness, it is worth while to observe in passing, that when the penitent cried to the Savior on earth for forgiveness, his own gracious lips responded, "Son,

be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee." Now the Spirit, everywhere present through the mediation of the glorified Christ, answers the penitent's prayer by presenting the Savior as still having the power and will on earth to forgive sins. If the Spirit does not utter with a voice the word "Son," it helpeth the soul despite its infirmities, to say, "Father." "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts crying Abba, Father."

Here we obtain a view of the soul in its rest. Hitherto, it has been like the waves of the sea. But it has been forgiven, it has been adopted, it has entered upon its rest. By its march under the Spirit, it has made its declaration of independence good. The Son has made it free indeed; he has cast out the strong man armed; he has restored the soul to the possession of itself. It does not now fulfil the lust of the flesh. The convicting Spirit, having changed his functions, now comforts the adopted and pardoned soul.

Next, of the Spirit in his office as unction. The mariner, exhausted and almost lifeless, snatched from a sinking wreck by an unknown friend, and borne to a place of safety and repose, when partially restored, asks, what next? Who is my benefactor? How can I serve him? So the soul, conducted by the Holy Spirit to the rest of adoption, asks, what next? Who is my benefactor? What are my obligations? If hitherto we have seen the guilty soul forgiven, if we have seen it conducted to the consciousness of its high parentage, we shall now see it consecrating itself forevermore in conscious obedience to Him whom by the Spirit it has learned to call *the* Christ. In this consecration, it still feels its dependence upon the Spirit. The Spirit dwells in the redeemed one as the Shechinah over the ancient mercy seat. The hitherto secular man, by this sacred chrism is set apart as a priest. Giving up all claim upon himself, he devotes himself to his priestly office, offering by the aid of the Spirit, in his priestly ministrations, himself a living, holy, and acceptable sacrifice. By the indwelling Spirit the redeemed one knows the things of God, as he knows the things of man by the spirit of man in him. By the indwelling presence, there arises a oneness of mind with God, out of which springs, what

one may call, an intuitive perception of things, congenial or uncongenial to the Savior. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." "The anointing which ye have received from him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but, as the same anointing teacheth you of all things and is truth and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you ye shall abide in him."

Under the guidance of the Spirit as unction, the soul does not content itself with a general consecration. If in adoption, it learns it has some one to serve, it now finds out how it can serve. If before it felt disposed to serve, it now finds out its specific post. Out of the chrism arise the chrisms in which the active powers of the soul find their specific spheres. "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." He divideth "to every man severally as he will." To one he assigns the privilege of endowing professorships, to another that of teaching, to another that of becoming pastor, and to another, an evangelist or missionary. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit."

Again, of the Spirit as seal. As the soul in this life is joined with a body, so it is not satisfied until its purpose is embodied in deeds. It is not enough that it comes to a knowledge of its sphere,—that it heirs a kingdom. Faith without works is dead, being alone. A king without a kingdom is an exile. A temple without priest and ritual, a ruin. The soul longs for deeds as the seal of its own state. If in the consciousness we trace the evidence of the Spirit in adoption and unction, we need the seal, by which his presence is signified, to address itself to the eye of the beholder. Of what avail is the presence of the Spirit, if after all, the soul presents to observers only human phenomena? Of the vine, if it bear no clusters? "Let your light so shine, that others seeing your good works may be led to glorify your Father in heaven." "Ye shall know them by their fruits." "Without me ye can do nothing." True works become the seals to the eye of others—the phenomena which cannot be referred to a merely human subject. Without the seal the prayer of the Spirit as unction is unanswered. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed

unto the day of redemption." "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God?" Pray, how shall we know a given building is a temple, if, instead of the presence of the priest and the ascending smoke of the sacrifice, foxes peer from the shattered windows and wolves howl dismally from the ruins! Like unto this desolation is the Christian, so called, without works as the seal of the Spirit's presence. "If we live in the Spirit let us also walk in the Spirit."

Lastly of the Spirit as earnest. Distant blessings are presented in present reality to the soul by the Spirit. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for those that love him; but God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." The Spirit of God in man helps him to "know the things that are freely given us of God." "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance unto the redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of his glory."

By the presence of the Omnipotent Spirit in the consciousness of the believer, searching "the deep things of God," the pilgrim feasts upon the clusters of Eshcol; though the outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day; with eye not dim, nor force abated, he looks from Nebo over the Jordan, upon the hills crowned with verdure and the plains clad with the golden harvest; the Spirit opens the way through the swollen Jordan to the vision of his faith: "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies by *his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*" "Now he that hath wrought us for the self same thing—that mortality might be swallowed up of life—is God who hath also given us the earnest of the Spirit."

We pass to a few remarks in application of the principles which we have, though imperfectly, developed.

According to our views of Christ as the perfected medium for the Holy Spirit, the more we know and trust Christ, the more varied and efficient are the functions of the Spirit in our hearts. Every new view of Christ, is the condition for a new

and comforting manifestation of the Spirit to the heart of the believer. This binds us in utter dependence during this life upon the Bible as the sole means of introduction to Christ, and a knowledge of his relations to us. How does this view bind the heart of the believer in living union with the glorified Redeemer? Because he lives, we live. In his name our prayers are answered. The soul, under the conduct of the Spirit, in its progress from the bondage of Egypt to the heights of Nebo, prays in one stage by the aid of the Spirit, for blessings which the Spirit confers in the next. The prayer in conviction is answered in adoption; that, in adoption, is answered in the holy anointing, and that of the last, by the fair flowers and mature fruits of the Spirit in his sealing power. The earnest is answer to all previous prayers, as heaven is the answer of the prayers begotten by the Spirit as earnest. The Spirit is the power of prayer, and the power to answer prayer; the gift of all good things is only equivalent to the gift of the Spirit. How comfortably does this system contrast with that which discards the Spirit in conviction, conversion and sanctification, and which reduces Christianity to the likeness of a system of machinery, skilfully designed, and well-wrought, but wanting the power to put the great wheel in motion, upon which the utility of every part depends! The system which discards the Spirit, inevitably entangles the man of prayer in the meshes of "fixed laws," and silences his voice in the death of gloomy "Fate." The presence of the Holy Spirit, through the mediation of Christ, renders all prayer, in the Bible sense, as Omnipotent as the will of God.

To reprove the world of sin, righteousness and judgment, is the office of the Spirit, while for the Christian, his office is, to comfort in the respects described. How sad to reflect that so great a portion of the so-called church is precisely in the relation to the Spirit that is assigned by our Lord for the world! But we cannot develop and apply this criterion of character, our space only permitting this hint.

On the other hand, this march of the soul under the Spirit is precisely its normal condition. Here it finds all its great normal wants supplied. Here it is free from apprehension on ac-

count of past transgressions; it is put in possession of itself with the assurance of ability to maintain its freedom; it is led forth into a sphere of activity with aims and motives worthy of its nature; it finds in the company of the redeemed the congenial associations requisite for bliss, if not for virtue; and, at the same time, it has the unwavering assurance that its present bliss shall be eternally changeless, save that like the rill, it is to change to the deep river, and the river to the limitless ocean.

According to these views, sanctification is not merely a state of pleasant repose. It consists, not less in successful activity, than in the rest after the day of toil. "The rest of the laboring man is sweet."

Finally, the great characteristic of the New Dispensation, is that Christ baptizes his people with the Holy Spirit. It seems to us there is a great want of definite views, however, in relation to the media and laws of the Spirit's manifestation and his functions. If our hints shall turn the attention of the Bible student to this subject, it will not be in vain that we have presented them, though not so well digested as we could wish on a subject of such importance. But it seems certain, that the great object of the Spirit's manifestation is, if one may so speak, to re-incarnate Christ in his people, so that the church which is his body shall present him anew to the world going about doing good. "Ye are the body of Christ and members in particular."

## ART. II.—THE PROSPERITY OF THE CHURCH.

The Christian church has had her enemies in every age, and there are those still who are bitter in their denunciations of her. All this our Savior distinctly foretold, in the last touching address to his disciples. "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you. The servant is not greater than his Lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you."\* The occasion of this persecution is, that the church, like its divine Lord, testifies to the world "that the works thereof are evil."

Others are indifferent to the claims of the church. Iniquity abounds, and the love of many waxes cold. The world abounds with novelties, schemes for obtaining salvation in some other way than that which Christ has provided. In the midst of prevailing error and sin, of formalism, rationalism, mysticism, spiritualism, skepticism, there is danger that sincere inquirers, and true believers may get bewildered, and be caused to stray from the path of life. But we would honor the church of Christ, and say with one of the old Israelites: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth: if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."†

We proceed to give some reasons why we should cherish the interests of the church of Christ.

1. Because it is a divine institution. As early as the days of Enos, the third from Adam, we have this record: Then began men to call upon [*Heb. call themselves by*] the name of the Lord."‡ Even Adam's sons offered sacrifices. The services of religion were maintained throughout the patriarchal age, each man being priest in his own house. Under the legal dispensation, a nation descended from pious ancestors, and

\* John 15: 18—20.

† Ps. 137: 5, 6.

‡ Gen. 4: 26.

themselves devoted to the service of God, were made his chosen people, to whom were committed the rites and ordinances of religion, who, in the midst of idolatry and corruption, sustained for many centuries, the form, and, in a measure, the spirit of true religion, and introduced the Messiah. Christ established the gospel church, and authorized its perpetuity in his last commission to the disciples: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."\* Other references might be made; but these are sufficient for those who acknowledge the authority of the Bible. The church, then, is a divine institution. God established it, has sustained it, and has pledged himself to sustain it through all the changes of the world to the end. Thus it has not only his sanction, but it is his appointed means of conferring spiritual blessings upon mankind—the salt of the earth and the light of the world. So much can be affirmed of the Christian church, and of that alone.

2. The church should be cherished in view of its influence upon temporal prosperity. This has been in a high degree salutary. To show this we might appeal to history; compare the condition of the Jews with that of the heathen, or Christendom with the rest of the world since the introduction of the gospel dispensation. Every one acquainted with history knows what would be the result of such comparison; he knows the superiority of Christian nations over others, and that they owe their superiority mainly to the Christian church and the Christian religion. The state of the heathen is well known, the debasing influence of every pagan and of every other false religion. Our ancestors in England were, twenty centuries ago, pagans, and very low in the scale of debasement. What has raised us to our exalted position? What has raised us from the vilest idolatry—from worshipping brutes, stones, and vegetables to worship the only living and true God? What has led us, in-

\* Matt. 28 : 19, 20.



stead of offering human sacrifices to the gods, to present to Jehovah the spiritual services of a pure heart? What has elevated woman from being a slave, to be the companion and equal of man? What has provided our almshouses, hospitals, and other benevolent institutions, unknown to the heathen world? What but the Christian religion has infused the spirit of adventure and enterprize among us, securing such success to commerce, the arts, and every branch of progressive industry? Trace the course of any Christian nation, and you will find that its worldly prosperity has almost uniformly advanced with the progress of the Christian religion, and declined with its decline. The history of Palestine and Asia Minor furnishes striking though sad examples on the one hand, while that of England and America furnishes those full of hope and encouragement on the other.

But we need not employ so remote or extensive illustrations. The experience and observation of almost every one will furnish them. We knew a town where an efficient church once existed. The Sabbath was honored, the sanctuary crowded. And the people were highly prospered. But there came a change. The church declined, the public worship of God was abandoned, or maintained only meagrely, at intervals; the sanctuary became a ruin. Mark the result. The intelligence of that people declined, their morals were vitiated, business dull, enterprise and thrift failed; and from being one of the most respectable and influential towns in the county, it became one of the weakest and basest.

Some capitalists undertook to build up a village on one of the great thoroughfares in New York. They resolved to do nothing in the place for religion. They provided for a lyceum and other sources of amusement, but erected no temple for the worship of the Most High. The natural advantages of the location were good, and by the stimulus of capital and enterprise a flourishing village grew up; but one without a sanctuary, a minister of the gospel, or a Sabbath. The consequences were such as might be anticipated. Even worldly prosperity cannot endure long without God. The Sabbath was of course profaned; intemperance, gambling, theft, and kindred vices in-

creased and abounded. Good citizens found the state of the community intolerable, and abandoned it; business declined, real estate depreciated, and the whole undertaking proved a failure.

An opposite instance came under our observation, an instance which we rejoice to know has many parallels. In a certain locality in New England, possessing some natural advantages, business twenty years ago was at the lowest ebb. There was no stated public worship, no Sabbath, not even a prayer meeting for years. There were but two or three professed Christians in the place, and their light was invisible. Some Christians from a neighboring village interested themselves in behalf of that community, visited from house to house, set up a prayer meeting, then a Sabbath school and public worship. A revival followed, a church was constituted, a minister settled, a meeting house erected. The influence of this religious prosperity was soon visible in its effects upon the morals, intelligence, industry, and enterprise of the people. Now, instead of dilapidated buildings, prostrate fences, farms run to waste, and no business, as formerly, you see there neat cottages, smiling fields, tasteful gardens, and every indication of thrift, and comfort.

A large landholder in Arkansas, several years since, was desirous of procuring the more speedy occupation and settlement of his lands. To aid in his purpose, though himself a skeptic, he repaired to New York to obtain a minister. He made application, and offered to be responsible for the salary, if a minister would return with him. Though an unbeliever himself, he knew that the labors of a minister would improve the state of society, and thereby forward the settlement, and increase the value of his lands. To test him, he was asked why he did not apply for one of his own sentiments, one of the "free-thinkers," or at least a Universalist or Unitarian? His practical experience forbid it. He wanted a thorough going, evangelical, revival minister. Truly, the men of this world are often wiser than the children of light.

3. Consider its influence upon learning. A degree of knowledge is essential to religion. We must know something of

ourselves, of God, and of his requirements, in order to be Christians. And as knowledge is essential to religion, so is religion essential to the most successful acquisition of knowledge. There may be science which takes no cognizance of God, but it must be science very imperfectly developed. He who properly studies nature, beholds God pervading it, and looks through nature up to nature's God. It may be objected, that the church and religion have sometimes exerted an unfavorable influence on learning. Not the true church, not true religion. In the dark ages, religion declined, and learning declined, until both became nearly extinct; but even then, what learning remained, existed chiefly in the cloister. And when religion revived, learning revived also. The dawn of the Reformation was the dawn of a new day to science and literature. As the Reformation advanced under Wickliff, Huss, Luther, Zwingli, and Knox, learning advanced in their respective countries, and down to this day, those nations in which religion has enjoyed the greatest prosperity, have been most enlightened, and vice versa.

The Christian religion sheds great light upon the problem of human destiny. It shows us what we are, and what we are to become. It dignifies the pursuit of knowledge, and furnishes the highest incitements to study. If we are immortal, and the acquisitions of mind are to be as lasting as the mind itself, then the more knowledge we obtain and properly employ, the greater will be our capacity for happiness. Science should never be divorced from religion. They are natural helps. Let the school and the church stand side by side: So our fathers placed them, when they planted these shores, and thus have they stood hitherto. They are the glory of our land, and of all lands when they are thus sustained. It is not to be denied, that great attainments in science and literature have been made in the midst of false religion. Witness ancient Egypt and Arabia, Greece and Rome, and modern France. The heart is not always in harmony with the intellect. Not every learned man is pious. Still the truth remains, that true religion is favorable to learning, and the influence of the Christian church has ever

been highly salutary to the interests of learning; and she is therefore deserving of our confidence and love.

4. Regard also the influence of the church upon morals. Compare the morality of the Jews, imperfect as it was, with that of the surrounding nations—even with those that were in most other respects greatly their superiors. Compare the morality of modern Christendom with that of Mohammedan and heathen nations. Compare the morality of the gospel and its votaries with the moral systems and professed moralists of the world. The gospel is the only system of pure morality. It encourages every virtue, and strikes at the root of every vice. Its influence is best seen and felt in its operation on the individual heart and life, but its happy influence on communities is also visible. True, there is much vice in Christian nations; but it is never the fruit of the gospel, but exists in spite of it; because the people are not all, nor wholly subdued to its power. Very few have ever assailed the morality of the Bible;—none but those ignorant of its principles, or prejudiced, or themselves immoral. Most of the more candid infidels and skeptics have conceded the superior moral excellence of the Gospel.

Still it is objected that the church is not what she should be; that there are self-deceived and hypocrites within her pale. Allowing the fact, who is responsible for it? Will you make science, and literature, and art responsible for all the charlatans and quacks who have professed devotion to them? The church is to be judged by the character of her true votaries, not that of pretenders.

Again, it is said that the church is responsible for intemperance, slavery, and other enormities. We deny the charge. They did not originate in the church, they have never been sustained or countenanced by the church. On the other hand, she has done much to mitigate, subdue, and subvert them, which she will yet fully accomplish. It is not to be denied that individuals professing membership in the church have countenanced and supported these wrongs, though this is not to be ascribed to religion, but to the lack of it. Nor, that some sections of the nominal church have been delinquent with reference to these great sins, and as a consequence, have been shorn of their

strength, and brought deep reproach upon the cause of Christ. The gospel is wholly opposed to intemperance, slavery, war, and all their kindred abominations. Its tendency is to their utter extermination. Did the gospel have its rightful influence on earth, they could not survive an hour. The great precepts, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," if universally obeyed, would remove them and all other wrongs which man commits upon his fellow man. And the other great precepts, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," and, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," if obeyed by all, would remove sin from the world. In this enlightened day, it is a shame for an intemperate man, a slaveholder, or a votary of unrighteous war, or for any advocate or apologist for such enormities to profess Christianity. The church should wash her hands of all such guilt, and purge herself from it equally with every other form of infidelity and irreligion. Every portion of the nominal church must vindicate her honor, and exhibit itself as a true representative of Christ, in exposing and removing every sin; or Christ will disown such delinquent body, and raise up those in its stead who will do his work. "Ye are the light of the world," "Ye are the salt of the earth," are declarations applicable to the *true* church. There is no piety without sound morality. It is incumbent on every professed follower of Christ to see that he sheds a clear light and a healthful influence around him. As sure as the word of prophecy, the earth is to be purified, and that through the instrumentality of the church of Christ.

5. We should cherish the church in view of her influence upon our immortal welfare. The church organization is essential to the very existence of religion on earth. Much, then, as we prize her usefulness to our temporal prosperity, to learning and morals, yet her crowning excellence has connection with our spiritual and eternal destiny. Through her God communicates his richest blessings. How vast the number, who, through her instrumentality, have been redeemed from sin and death; even an innumerable number of such shall finally surround the throne of God. The friends of Zion are promised

prosperity in this life; and in the world to come, an incorruptible inheritance.

Let us briefly consider some ways in which we may seek to promote the prosperity of the church:

1. By prayer. "*Pray for the peace of Jerusalem.*"\* Mistakes are often made respecting the elements of the church's prosperity. It does not consist in numbers, or wealth, or popularity, or a splendid house of worship, or an eloquent minister. A church may have all these, yet without the spirit of prayer and faith, and vital godliness in the membership, she will be extremely weak. Not that we would at all disparage their importance. Numbers, wealth, and influence, with spirituality, and fervent piety, are of much consequence; without them, they but add to the weight of guilt of those who have them only to abuse them. Eloquence, without grace, is but as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. Do you know what sustains the vitality of a church? Not a magnificent edifice, fine toned instruments, an imposing ritual, cushioned seats, a large or fashionable audience, and the patronage of distinguished names; but the prayers, and sighs, and tears of its faithful ones, even though few and unknown. A church pervaded with the spirit of prayer is strong through Him who has power to answer prayer. Instead, therefore, of resting on outward forms, seek first of all the life-giving spirit. Instead of finding fault with your minister, pray for him. Instead of cherishing envy, or any root of bitterness, pray for each other. Remember these expressive lines:

" Prayer was appointed to convey  
The blessings God designs to give ;  
Long as they live should Christians pray,  
For only while they pray they live."

2. We should seek the prosperity of the church by union and active co-operation. Every one who desires her prosperity, should belong to her communion. "But," one may say, "I am not fit for membership in the church." If you are not, whose fault is it? Numbers in almost every community, who

\* Ps. 122 : 6.

ought to belong to the church, from various vain excuses, stand aloof. By this course they do the church and themselves great wrong. The church needs their aid, and they need the aid of the church.

Union is essential to the strength of the church. Coldness, division, and strife, are destruction to any body. We do not say there should never be strife or division. The interests of truth may require it. The gospel enjoins that we be first pure, then peaceable. If there is error or corruption in the body, contend earnestly, though in love, for its removal. "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell."\* No sacrifice is too great to be made for the demand of truth and right. Moral principle should not be sacrificed to any demand.

Disunion and division in the church generally spring from the coldness, the worldliness, the selfishness of members. While in such a state, they are very apt to magnify trifles. All such divisions are sinful, and, together with their causes, should be put away. Union in the right is strength everywhere; and the church needs all the strength that union can give, to wage successfully her great conflict with the powers of darkness.

Again, in order to the efficiency of the church, there must not only be harmony, but also active co-operation. Appropriate means and instrumentalities are to be provided. God works by means, and by those appropriate to the end sought; and it is presumption to expect the end without the means. One of these means, which every local church should have, is a suitable *house of worship*. In this particular, there is often marked delinquency. A people will do without a meeting house, and worship in a school house, barn, or some inconvenient, dilapidated old building, in an out-of-the-way place, yet wonder why they have no more revivals, and no more prosperity. They have no right to expect prosperity under such circumstances. The rebuke of the old prophet might well apply to them.

\* Matt. 5 : 29.

“This people say, The time is not come, the time that the Lord’s house should be built. \* \* \* Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and this house lie waste.”\* In all such cases the first labor should be to build a suitable house of worship. And the very effort will often reveal the ability, where it was not before thought to exist. And if they cannot do it alone, it is a worthy charity for sister churches to aid them, as the churches of Asia Minor and other provinces used to send their benevolent contributions to Jerusalem.

Another requisite is a faithful pastor. God has ordained by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. Again, every member should be a lively stone in the spiritual temple. Each should bear his appropriate burden, and fill his proper place. It will not do to lay all upon the minister. If ever so faithful, he can perform no more than his own work, and can release no other one from duty. The minister needs the warm sympathy and earnest co-operation of the membership. If, by their inconsistent lives, they neutralize the effect of his labors; or if they depend on him to do not only all the preaching, but also all the praying, exhorting, and visiting: and that, too, perhaps in the midst of embarrassments arising from their meagre and tardy pecuniary support, hard, indeed, must be his lot, and deplorable their condition. But where the members exemplify in their daily deportment the excellence of the gospel, where they are ready to every good work, in the Sabbath school, the conference room, the chamber of affliction, and in all the walks of life, we may look for a prosperous and growing church. If we love the church, and pray for it, we should use the means which God has ordained for its prosperity—we should live and labor consistently with our prayers.

3. The prosperity of the church is to be sought by revival efforts. To these the church owes her existence, and continued efficiency. Revivals have marked her history throughout, from the scenes of Pentecost unto the present hour. Most of her numbers owe their membership to revivals. No church can maintain its vitality without laboring for the salvation of sinners.

\* Hag. 1 : 2, 4



Religion is love, benevolence. It prompts us to seek not our own good alone, but also the good of others. The spontaneous utterance of the renewed heart is: "Draw near, all ye that fear God, and I will tell you **what** he has done for my soul." "O, taste and see **that the Lord is good.**" "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst, Come. And whosoever will, let him **take the water of life freely.**" Every church should be a fountain of revival influence, sending forth vivifying streams on every side—never relaxing her efforts while a sinner remains in impenitence.

The prosperity of the church is to be sought by the use of benevolent and reformatory efforts. Her field of labor is the *world*. She is to convey the tidings of mercy to every nation, tribe, and family of man. Her tardiness in this great work is one cause that she prospers no more.

Her warfare, also is with all sin. The church is God's appointed instrumentality for the overthrow of sin in all its forms. If, therefore, she would enjoy prosperity, she must be faithful to her mission in this respect; she must cast her influence on the side of God and humanity in the great moral conflict. The fountains of intemperance must be sealed, every band and fetter of the slave broken, and the sound of violence, outrage, and war be heard no more. The gospel of purity, freedom, and peace, must be proclaimed to every land, in every tongue the world around; and the means of grace universally diffused. So much God requires through the agency of the church at large, and of every branch of the church, according to its ability. The apostolic and primitive church engaged fearlessly, faithfully, and most successfully in this work; but alas! in the degeneracy and declension of later times, it has been sadly neglected, and in consequence the church has been fearfully shorn of her strength and glory. Still there have never been wanting a faithful few, who have sighed over prevailing abominations, and nobly contended for truth and right. We trust their number is increasing, and that soon a brighter day is to dawn upon Zion, and upon the world. It is incumbent on every

friend to her interests to say that he does his duty to hasten the time.

God has promised to bless those who love his church. "They shall prosper that love thee." "They shall be like a tree, planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."\* "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."† Whatever we do for one of Christ's disciples, for his sake, he esteems as done to himself. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."‡ "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones, a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward."§

---

### ART. III.—IDEA, OR THE DOCTRINE OF RETRIBUTION.

"How deeply seated the conscience is in the human soul," says Coleridge, "is seen in the effects which sudden calamities produce on guilty men, even when unaided by any determinate notion or fears of punishment after death. The wretched criminal, as one rudely awakened from a long sleep, bewildered with the new light, and half recollecting, half striving to recollect a fearful something he knows not what, but which he will recognize as soon as he hears the name, already interprets the calamities into judgments, executions of a sentence passed by an invisible judge, as if the vast pyre of the last judgment were already kindled in an unknown distance, and some flashes of it darting forth at intervals, beyond the rest, were flying and lighting upon the face of his soul. The calamity may consist

\* Ps. 1:3.

† 1 Tim. 4:8.

‡ Matt. 25:40.

§ Matt. 10:42.

in the loss of fortune, or character, or reputation, but you hear no regrets from him. Remorse extinguishes all regrets, and remorse is the implicit creed of the guilty."

A company of young men were passing one morning, in an omnibus, into a city, from one of the suburbs, where they had spent the night in dissipation. They were, of course, exceedingly noisy and boisterous, a thing quite necessary, in their circumstances, to keep up their flagging spirits, and hush down the voice of that inward monitor with whom the guilty so much dread to hold converse. As the vehicle passed along by the vast cemetery, one of the youth, pointing to the place, exclaimed, "There, boys, is what I hate; soon we shall all be there, and what then?" The question, "what then?" breaking so unexpectedly in upon those young men, was indeed as a "sudden flash from the vast pyre of the last judgment" upon their consciences. The voice of revelry was instantly hushed. All were silent as the house of death; not a word was spoken by a single individual, till the narrator of the above incident left the vehicle. This startling effect upon the minds of those youth was nothing but the waking into distinct consciousness, in those minds, of the idea of retribution, an idea existing in the breasts of all intelligents alike, and which continually points to the solemn future for its full realization. No one is destitute of this idea, and no one can escape from its presence. We cannot reason it down, or permanently silence its voice. In it, in the very centre of the soul, are heard the footsteps of the eternal Judge coming to reward "every man according to his deeds." Every fundamental idea in the human mind implies the actual existence of a corresponding reality. To know what the essential character of that reality must be, we must carefully analyze that idea itself. This conducts us to the great object of the present article: *The elucidation of the Idea, or doctrine of Retribution.*

1. In all minds in which reason is developed at all, a fundamental distinction is made between actions as *morally right, and morally wrong*. This distinction is made alike, by the child and the man, the ignorant and the learned, the Christian and the heathen, the believer and the unbeliever. However

men may differ in the application of the idea of right and wrong to particular classes of actions, external actions particularly, they all agree in this, in making the distinction above referred to, and thus evincing the actual existence, in their minds, of the ideas themselves. This idea which thus has a dwelling place in all minds, is totally unlike all others, and is incapable of any form of comparison with any other idea. The idea of space exists in all minds, and it exists there in the relation of total and absolute unlikeness to all other ideas. There is no other idea with which you can compare it, and by which it can be elucidated. The same is true of all such ideas as those of time, substance, cause, and of the infinite. Each exists in the mind, as far as likeness is concerned, in a state of total separation from each other, and from all other ideas. The same holds true of the idea of right and wrong. The element of moral rightness and wrongness is absolutely unlike any element existing in any other idea. You pronounce an action right or wrong. You have, in that affirmation, attached a peculiarity to it, which totally separates it from all other forms of activity, and from all other subjects. There the act stands, in the light of an all-overshadowing idea which is wholly distinct from, and unlike all other ideas.

This idea has also the characteristic of absolute *universality* and *necessity*. When we have affirmed certain actions [ultimate intentions] to be right or wrong, it is absolutely impossible to separate that one particular element from them, or to conceive them to be the opposite of what we have affirmed them to be, any more than we can conceive of the annihilation of space. Certain external actions we may, at different times, pronounce different, and even opposite, judgments upon. Not so with ultimate acts of will, or states of the heart. The same act or state we can no more, at one time, affirm to be right, and at another to be wrong, than we can conceive that the same thing can, at the same time, exist and not exist. That ultimate act of will which is at one time right or wrong, can, by no possibility, ever lose or change its character. It must, at all times, and under all circumstances, be what it now is. In other words, the idea of right and wrong has the characteristics of

absolute universality and necessity. Those characteristics, together with that just named, attach equally to each of those hereafter to be named and elucidated.

2. When an act is affirmed to be right or wrong, another element equally distinct and peculiar, and equally universal and necessary, inseparably attaches itself to it, that of *obligation*, which we express by the words *ought and ought not*. The principle of obligation is always absolute, and wholly overrides all other considerations which may be opposed to it. The moment the sentiment of obligation attaches to an act, all considerations and all excuses for non-compliance, disappears at once and forever. The attempt to make an excuse is itself, in the judgment of the universal intelligence, only a new violation of obligation which is itself absolutely inexcusable. When we have shown that an act ought or ought not to be done, we have presented the highest reasons known in the universe for its performance or non-performance. Absolute respect for the law of duty, as the exclusive principle of all forms of activity to which that law is applicable, is the absolute condition of moral virtue. Without this respect, virtue is impossible, virtue which consists exclusively in obedience to the law of right, from respect to the principle of moral obligation. Till the will has placed itself in harmony with the law of duty, as the exclusive rule and principle of all its moral activity, and that from universal respect to the sentiment or principle of obligation, real virtue can have no place in the mind. Such is the nature of conscience in all moral agents. All its behests are absolutely and wholly exclusive. For the least form of disobedience, it admits of no excuse or apology. You knew the act, as morally right or wrong, and yourself as bound to its performances, or non-performances, by the all-sacred and exclusive principle of moral obligation. You are in disobedience, guilty of crime which knows no excuse and admits of no apology. The attempt to form an excuse or apology, is itself a crime for which no form of excuse can be offered. Thus every criminal, every violator of moral obligation, stands arrayed at the bar of his own conscience. When, in its unveiled presence, he stands self-condemned and trembling there, with

“flashes from the vast pyre of the last judgment lightning upon the face of his soul.”

3. Necessarily and inseparably connected with the conception of the law of duty complied or not complied with, is the idea of *desert of good or ill*, that is, of merit or demerit. When a moral agent has fully met the demands of the law of duty, he knows absolutely in himself, that for this reason alone, he has a most sacred and inviolable claim to the high esteem and good will of every intelligent in existence to whom his character shall be revealed, and that that claim must be affirmed as correspondingly sacred, by the united verdict of the conscience of the universe. He knows, and cannot but know, that if provisions exist in the universe for his perpetual blessedness to the full extent of his capacities, his moral virtue gives him an absolute title to all that *good*. When God himself fills out to the full the capabilities of such a being for blessedness, “the reward is not reckoned of grace but of debt.” This full measure of good cannot be withheld from him, without a violation of moral obligation. Such are the express teachings of Revelation and reason both on this subject. The claims, also, of moral virtue, as affirmed by the universal conscience, are paramount to all others. Indeed, virtue is the only proper object of esteem. We may admire what is beautiful; but virtue only demands esteem and veneration. In its unveiled presence, a sentiment of awe and sacredness overshadows us, a sentiment which nothing else can excite, and to which nothing else can present a title. Nothing else can present a claim to universal good-will so high and so absolute. Finally, if provisions exist in the universe for the blessedness of moral agents, the morally virtuous present a claim to their enjoyment which absolutely excludes all opposite and antagonistic claims. No being can offer so high a reason for the possession of happiness, as he who can present an unsullied character for moral virtue. Indeed, so high and so exclusive are its claims, than none others can be brought into comparison with them. Its claims are always absolute.

When, on the other hand, the law of duty has been violated, the consciousness of the fact is always attended with an abso-

lute conviction of the remediless forfeiture of the claims above referred to. This conviction of forfeiture pertains exclusively to the *act* itself, and not at all to the prior or subsequent conduct of the criminal. In his own breast the individual, in the distinct remembrance of the act, experiences feelings and sentiments of shame, self-reproach and remorse, which constitute a state of pure mental agony of an intensity and intolerableness with which nothing else can be compared. Nor does the degree of agony which the conscience has power to inflict, depend at all upon the *interval of time* between the act and the remembrance of it, but wholly upon the *distinctness* of the remembrance. The violation for a time may slumber in forgetfulness, and its moral character may be veiled from the vision of the mind. But when it finds itself in the unveiled presence of the act, when the vision is removed, as it may be, at any distance of time whatever, and that with the same distinctness of remembrance, as the next moment after the deed was perpetrated, the sentiment of self-reproach, and the agony of remorse and shame, will be renewed with the same intensity as at the first. In itself the mind has no remedy whatever for the consequences of moral obligation violated. In the act itself, there is a fatal wreck of the moral nature, absolutely irreparable, except through a remedial system beyond the power of the subject. Conscience, from its irreversible law and constitution, is absolute in its behests for obedience to the law of right and duty, and equally inexorable in its inflictions when that law has been violated. The reproach and remorse which it burns into the soul, when duty is violated, have no self-healing power, but may, if we may judge by observation and experience, be renewed with undying, undiminished intensity, on every remembrance of the act.

Every individual, also, is perfectly aware that the verdict of his own conscience will be re-affirmed at the bar of the universal conscience, wherever and whenever the act and the character of the act is made known. Hence there is in his mind a perpetual dread of such adjudication. He trembles at the thought of meeting the public eye in the light of that deed. To every moral agent he knows himself really accountable for the act,

just as he would have a claim upon the *good* will of such agent, had he continued obedient, and he dreads the idea of standing in his presence with his character unveiled. A sense of the forfeiture of the right to the moral esteem and good will of all moral agents alike, is a necessary accompaniment of a consciousness of moral guilt, whatever the form of it may be. While moral virtue creates a sacred right to the enjoyment of all *good* of which the capacities of the subject are susceptible, moral guilt, on the other hand, occasions a remediless forfeiture of that right, a forfeiture which no subsequent act of the violator can repair. Having once displaced himself from that right, he can never *demand* a restoration to it as a matter of justice or right. If he attains it at all, he must seek and receive it as a gift of mercy and grace, a gift therefore, which, on the score of justice, may properly be withheld. To this statement there is absolutely no exception. The violators of moral law can, at no distance of time subsequent to the act, appear at the tribunal of the individual or public conscience, much less come into the presence of God, the Judge of all, and demand, on the score of justice, a restoration to the good which, by guilt, they have forfeited. They may supplicate for *mercy* and *grace*. This, however, can be done acceptably, only as it is accompanied with a sincere acknowledgment of the fact, that the good which they ask may be justly withheld from them.

The verdict of the conscience of the violators of moral law is perfectly responded to by that of every moral agent in existence. The perpetuation of the crime is contemplated by all alike, as necessarily involving a total forfeiture of the good to which moral virtue entitles the subject, and there is, in every mind, a sentiment that violators of right and justice ought not to enjoy that *good*, and hence a feeling of uneasiness and deep dissatisfaction, when they are permitted to enjoy it. When important trusts are betrayed by crime, the public mind is shocked, if those trusts are continued in the hands of the traitors, after their crimes have been disclosed. Nothing tends more effectually to the corruption of public morals, than the failure to meet the demands of justice in such cases. Now a sentiment precisely like the above attends all violations of



moral obligation whatever, when the *morality* of the act is placed distinctly under the eye of the mind. The moral law is everywhere absolutely sacred in its claims. When its principles have been disregarded, when the law of duty has been trampled on, demerit, the forfeiture of a right to the enjoyment of good, is the necessary consequence, whatever the mere form of the act may be, a forfeiture which is permanent and remediless, as far as the violator himself is concerned. Yet the *degree* and *magnitude* of the guilt incurred in particular acts of morally wrong doing is always proportionate to the *known claims violated* and the *known interest* disregarded in the act. This principle universally obtains in the judgments of all men in such cases. All, for example, regard it as a greater crime for a child to strike a parent, than to do the same thing to a brother or sister; and that for the obvious reason that the claims of the former are higher than those of the latter. By the same principle, we judge of the guilt involved in the violation of all claims, human and divine. Hence "the first and great commandment" of conscience as well as inspiration is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," &c., and the second, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

4. This prepares the way to consider directly the great idea to be elucidated in this article, that of retribution. This idea has its basis exclusively in that of *merit* and *demerit* as *intrinsically* attaching to right or wrong moral action. The conception of such action as we have seen, is always attended with the absolute conviction that the former creates, and the latter annihilates, a right to *good* or happiness. When those who obey, and those who disobey the law of duty, occupy a place in the universe in exact accordance with their moral deserts, when the obedient enjoy the good they merit and the disobedient are separated from the good which they have forfeited, then the idea of retribution is realized. When the obedient enjoy blessedness to the full measure of their capacities, then, and only then, has virtue its full reward; and when the disobedient are separated from that good, and meet the appropriate reprobation of the moral universe, then vice has its punishment. A state in which the idea of retribution is fully realized is

called a state of moral order, the two ideas being perfectly synonymous in their signification. Not only is there a conviction in all minds that a state of retribution according to deeds or a state of moral order, is right and just in itself, but also that such a connection between moral action and desert *ought* to exist, and that if any being or class of beings in the universe have the power to realize the idea, they are bound to do it. That idea perfectly realized is the great *good*, the summum bonum, the *Το Καλον* about which philosophers have reasoned so much. It is not found in mere happiness irrespective of its cause and source; for there is a universal dissatisfaction at the idea of happiness being the lot of the guilty and ill-deserving. Nor is it found in virtue by itself; for equal dissatisfaction is felt at the idea of virtue associated with unhappiness. But this idea is fully met in a state of perfect moral order. To the idea of that state the moral nature of universal mind is so correlative that its realization is a fundamental demand of that nature. When the virtuous are happy to the full extent of their capacities, and guilt meets its appropriate reward, the moral sentiment of the universe is perfectly satisfied.

The idea that virtuous moral agents cannot be happy if any are miserable, is a chimera and nothing else. No such being is rendered miserable at the idea of any degree of unhappiness endured by the guilty, when it is known that it is a demand of justice and absolutely requisite to the moral order of the universe. All such beings would themselves be rendered unhappy, if such retributions were not realized. Virtue is no enemy to justice. It raises no voice against anything being done, that is requisite to satisfy the moral sentiment of the universe. The idea of retribution, instead of being naturally abhorrent to the mind, especially to the benevolent mind, is in full harmony with all the elements of the purest virtue, and with the changeless laws of rational existence. The capability of conceiving of the idea, and of acting relatively to it, is one of the distinguishing characteristics by which man is qualified to take his place among the great intelligences of the universe. Great virtues can exist only in its presence, and under its immediate influence. No character into which the love of justice, of moral

order, or of retribution does not enter, as one of its conspicuous elements, can command our deep moral esteem and veneration.

5. The last idea connected with, and rising out of, that of right and wrong, that claims our attention, is that of moral government, an idea which now admits of a very ready and distinct elucidation. Moral government is a system of administration exercised over moral agents, on the principle of moral desert, and having for its end the realization of the idea of retribution or moral order. Under a system of moral administration absolutely perfect, there would throughout be an entire correspondence between the condition of each moral agent and his desert. The moral nature of all intelligents is so constituted as to demand such a government, and under the Divine administration, conducted, as it is, by infinity and perfection, this great end will, with unerring certainty, be most fully and absolutely realized. No considerations of individual or private interest, will induce a departure from this great central element of the idea of a perfect moral government, to wit, retribution according to deeds, or moral desert. To suppose the opposite would imply, not perfection, but weakness and imperfection, in God, as the moral governor of the universe.

Under such a government, while administrated upon purely legal principles, there could be no such thing as the *pardon of sin*, which implies a departure from the very principle which constitutes the perfection of the system of administration. A moral government of a purely legal character administrated upon the principle of pardoning the actually guilty and ill-deserving, is a contradiction in terms. Instead of existing and acting to promote the ends of justice, and to secure the peace, order and harmony of the moral universe, by such means, it is administrated for another end entirely, and will, with infallible certainty, fail to accomplish even the end at which it aims. The efficiency of such a system, to promote the virtue and consequently the good of subjects, depends upon this, an absolute assurance of an infallibly certain connection between right or wrong doing, and corresponding retributions. Just as far as the principle of pardon to the guilty is introduced, excepting

under a system like that under which we now exist, a system avowedly remedial, there is everywhere created the hope of impunity in crime, and a consequent necessary relaxation of the reins of moral government.

Punishment under such a government would not, of course, have for its end the *reformation* or *good* of the *violator* of law in any form. On the other hand, its supreme aim would be to meet perfectly the demands of the moral sentiment of the universe, and the ends of public justice. If these ends can be accomplished, and the others too, by any given system of administration, both, of course, should be included. But when one is incompatible with the other, the less must always yield to the greater. Government must aim directly and immediately at the realization of one end, retribution according to deeds. But when this end can be realized, and others too, such as those above named, they of course should not be overlooked. But those last named are never, excepting under a system avowedly remedial, to be sought to the sitting aside of justice or the ends of moral order.

The fundamental *reason* for punishment under such a government will always be the *moral desert* of the criminal, and not the *utility* of the punishment. Punishment is not just, because it is useful, but it is useful when, and only when, it is just, and for that reason. Intrinsic justice, moral desert, must lie at the basis of the entire procedure of moral government, would it accomplish the ends for which its existence and exercise are demanded.

No one can reasonably doubt the strict correctness of the above analysis of the conscience, as it exists in all moral agents. No such agent can avoid making the distinction between actions as right and wrong, nor avoid the consciousness of the absolute moral affirmation that the one ought and the other ought not to be done. Equally impossible is it, not to attach the desert of good or ill, to those who obey or disobey the law of duty as revealed in the universal conscience, and hence to affirm the justice and necessity of corresponding retributions. Moral government, then, administered upon the principle of awards according to deeds, and thus realizing the idea of retribution

or of moral order, is a changeless demand of the moral nature of all intelligent existences.

Under such a government, administered upon such principles, and acting for such high ends, the consequences of a violation of obligation must be to the transgressor absolutely remediless. Mercy or pardon, in a system of pure moral legislation can, of course, have no place, the exercise of pardon being a total reversal of the fundamental law of the system, and proceeding upon the principle exclusively, that violators of law shall not be treated according to their deserts, and upon no other principle than that of mercy, can they be restored to the place which they have forfeited. They can, as we have seen, at no distance of time, subsequent to the act, and for no acts which they can perform, *demand* such restoration on the score of justice, nor can such a favor be conferred but as an act of grace and not of justice. Then *guilt absolutely infinite*, not only in its nature, but in degree, is always incurred in all violations of moral obligation. The claims of God, for example, to the love and obedience of creatures, must always be as His *known perfections* and *relations*. But these are, and are recognized as being, absolutely infinite. Violations of such claims must involve a corresponding degree of guilt, or none at all. Nor is this demerit at all diminished by a consideration of the *finiteness* of the creature. On the other hand, it is this very fact that renders the guilt of disobedience strictly infinite. A creature distinctly recognizing himself as finite and imperfect, finds himself in the presence of absolute infinity and perfection. His own knowledge is limited and fallible. Now how great must be the obligations of the finite and fallible to yield to the control of the infinite and infallible? It must be infinite or nothing at all. A creature finds himself an inhabitant of a realm whose interests are strictly infinite, and which consequently throw around him corresponding obligations. If he disregards those interests, and wantonly violates the laws upon which all these interests depend, the righteous forfeiture is a final loss of all claim to share in those interests. The consequences of sin, then, must be remediless to the violator of moral law, unless those consequences are removed by the operation

of a principle unknown in a system of pure moral legislation, a system which ought permanently to prevail throughout the moral universe, unless to meet some exigency of infinite moment, it is temporarily, in some isolated cases, suspended.

There are three ideas of the doctrine of retribution, and consequently of moral legislation, directly and fundamentally opposed to those above elucidated, which require a special notice in this connection, to wit, the doctrine of natural consequences—the idea that punishment should be inflicted but for one end, the *reformation of offenders*—and the assumption that the government of God is not strictly *moral* but *parental*. We will consider each of these hypotheses in the order just stated.

#### DOCTRINE OF NATURAL CONSEQUENCES.

According to the doctrine of natural consequences, all the evil which moral agents do or can deserve, for any form of crime whatever, is the *unhappiness* they experience *in the act of perpetration* itself, and in the consequences necessarily connected therewith. Positive punishment, or governmental inflictions of every kind are unjust. It would follow, as a necessary deduction from the principles of the system, that God and all other beings are bound to treat the most virtuous and wicked, in all respects alike, and to continue to them, at all times, and under all circumstances, the same facilities for happiness. Any departure from this course of treatment would involve the infliction of positive retributions fundamentally differing from natural consequences. Such are the essential elements of this system, against which we urge the following considerations.

1. It is, in all its essential elements, directly opposed to the necessary dictates of the universal intelligence. Every one believes and cannot but believe, that flagrant criminals, aside from the evils which they experience, as the natural consequence of their crimes, are amenable to the law of public justice, and may there, and ought there to receive such retributions, as justice and the interests of the public demand. There is no conviction more deeply rooted in the moral nature of universal mind than that of the justice and necessity of positive governmental retributions over and above the natural consequences of

crime. The man who asserts the opposite doctrine, does not and cannot himself believe it. The doctrine of governmental retribution is, if any other is, a first truth of the universal intelligence.

2. If this doctrine is true, no such thing as real merit or demerit attaches to the actions of intelligent beings, whatever they may be. To say that a consequent which cannot but follow from a given antecedent, ought to follow from it, is surely to use words without meaning. To say, then, that all the reward or punishment that right or wrong doing deserves, is the happiness or unhappiness which cannot but follow from its commission, is to say that real desert of good or ill attaches to no such acts of intelligent beings whatever; in other words, that the ideas of obligation and moral desert are chimeras, and nothing else.

3. According to the fundamental principles of this doctrine, neither God, nor any intelligent being has any right to *express*, either in *word* or *act*, any disapprobation or abhorrence of the character or conduct of wrong-doers, whatever their crimes may be. This would be the infliction upon them of positive pain, over and above what they suffer, as the natural consequences of their crimes. If it is right and the duty of all to give such expressions at all of their convictions and feelings in respect to wrongdoing, it must be because the intrinsic demerit of the crime, and the public good demand it. Now, if these reasons permit and demand this form of punishment, they permit, and demand any other form, which intrinsic desert and the public good require; and the doctrine under consideration is and must be false.

4. According to this doctrine, no individuals have a right to expose to public reprobation the character and conduct of any class of wrong-doers, even when such disclosures are indispensable to save multitudes from falling into fatal snares which are being deliberately laid for the destruction of their virtue, peace and prosperity. This, too, would be a positive infliction upon the wrong-doers over and above the natural consequence of his crimes. If this is permitted and demanded, so is any form or degree of punishment which justice and the public good require.

Who would dare to take the ground that the crimes of the guilty shall not be exposed, even when the salvation of the innocent demand such disclosure?

5. According to the legitimate consequences of this doctrine, no one is bound, nor has God or the public any right to require the criminal to *repair any injuries* which he may have inflicted upon others. Suppose that an individual, who is worth millions, has set fire to the dwelling of a neighbor, and thereby stripped him of all that he possesses. According to this doctrine, the criminal is under no obligation whatever, nor has God or the public a right to require him to part with a single farthing of his great estate to repair the injury he has done. He has already endured, in the very act of crime, all the evil that his crime deserves. He owes the injured man nothing at all, and to compel him to do anything to repair the injury he has done, is to inflict a positive penalty upon him over and above the natural consequences of his crimes, an infliction which would justify any form of penalty which justice and the public good demand. Who is prepared to embrace a doctrine legitimately and necessarily fraught with the consequences detailed above? We must adopt them, or abandon the doctrine under consideration. If we do adopt them, we assume that the necessary intuitions of the universal intelligence on the subject are false. For that intelligence affirms that the wrong-doer is bound to do all he can, and may, of right, be constrained to endure all that is requisite to repair injuries which, by crime, he has perpetrated.

6. If this doctrine is true, God and all other beings, as stated above, are bound to do all they can to render all the circumstances and facilities of the most virtuous and wicked, for the enjoyment of good, in all respects absolutely equal, the character of each continuing what it is. Any departure from this principle would imply governmental retributions, over and above the natural consequences of good or ill-doing. Now every intelligent being cannot but know that any doctrine necessarily involving such consequences as the one under consideration does, is not only false, but infinitely impious. Yet no one can consistently hold the doctrine of natural consequences,



without receiving these conclusions in all their length and breadth.

7. Finally, if governmental retributions do not enter, as fundamental elements, into the divine government, God's character for wisdom and goodness can hardly be vindicated. Man, as a rational being, is evidently constituted to be influenced by such considerations, more than by almost all others. I do not here refer merely to the principle of hope and fear; but to the ideas of merit and demerit, and consequently of retribution according to deeds. Character developed in harmony with these ideas, is the most beautiful and perfect of which the mind can conceive. Consequently, no ideas so strongly influence mind as the hope of good and fear of ill, resting upon the ideas of retributions according to deeds. If human nature demands anything, it is such a form of government as this. If God has failed to institute such a government, He has failed to adapt his administration to the fundamental laws of the minds to which he has given existence. How can his character for wisdom and goodness be vindicated on such a supposition?

IDEA OF PUNISHMENT EXCLUSIVELY FOR THE REFORMATION OF OFFENDERS.

The second form in which the idea of retribution has been announced is this:—Retributions, as far as criminals are concerned, shall have a fundamental and exclusive reference to the *reformation of offenders*, and shall be administered only as a means to this one end. Whatever the crimes of the offenders may have been, all the punishment he deserves, all that God or any intelligent beings have a right to inflict upon him, is merely what is necessary to restore him to happiness and virtue. In all punishment, according to this theory, neither the intrinsic demerit of the criminal, nor the interest of the public, are to be taken into the reckoning at all, but simply and exclusively the reformation and peace of the offender. If the former ideas are to be taken into account at all, then we have another theory than the one under consideration. Punishment could no longer have even a primary reference to the good of the offender. Intrinsic justice and the public good involving a much higher in-

terest than that of the individual, if these are to be taken into account at all, retribution of course should have a *primary* reference to them, and only a secondary to the individual. Further, if the former are to be taken into account, then *all* that intrinsic justice and the public good demand, should be inflicted, even though the interests of the individual should be wholly sacrificed thereby. If the greater and less become incompatible, the former, of course, should supercede the latter. The doctrine of retribution, therefore, for the good of the offender can be consistently maintained, only to the exclusion of all fundamental reference to any other considerations. Against such a theory, I urge the following, to my mind, insuperable objections :

1. This theory totally excludes the idea of intrinsic merit or demerit, as attaching in any form, to moral action. To say that all that vice, in any form, deserves, is what is requisite to its own correction, is to affirm that it deserves no form or degree of punishment as such. If an individual is afflicted with disease, and any remedy exists, it ought to be administered. What if we should say, for that reason, that the subject *merited* the remedy, and the disease *deserved* it? We should certainly, in that case, use words without meaning. Equally idle and unmeaning would it be, on the theory under consideration, to talk about crime meriting its own remedy, and the criminal as deserving to be restored to virtue and happiness. The truth is, that the fundamental element of the idea of demerit is intrinsic desert of punishment as such. Any theory that fundamentally contradicts this idea, as the one under consideration does, stands directly opposed to the necessary intuitions of the universal intelligence.

2. According to this theory, if the offender should become perfectly incorrigible, and reformation become hopeless, no punishment, in any form or degree, could be justly inflicted upon him. On the other hand, he should be treated, in all respects, as if he were purely and perfectly virtuous. Punishment, according to this theory, is in itself an evil, and is to be inflicted only as means to one end, the reformation of the offender. If the end ceases to be an object of hope, this ceases to be a

means, and cannot be justly employed as such. All, then, who are confirmed in virtue, and incorrigible in crime, should be treated, in all respects, alike. If the latter should be treated with less kindness than the former, this would be punishment inflicted, not as a means of reformation, and therefore, according to the theory under consideration, unjustly inflicted. Need I add that any theory that, in its necessary logical consequences, as this one does, requires that the best and worst beings that do or can exist, should be treated, in all respects alike, must be false, and of most fatal moral tendency?

3. Punishment inflicted according to the fundamental principles of this theory, can have no reformatory tendency whatever; but must possess, in all respects, an opposite tendency. Take from crime, as this theory necessarily does, the idea of *intrinsic desert* of punishment, and punishment, in the estimation of the subject and public alike, becomes nothing else but tyranny and oppression. It can have no reformatory tendency whatever; but must, in all respects, exert an opposite influence.

4. If this theory is true, let an individual commit any crime conceivable, and the next moment repent of it, and he neither deserves any form or degree of punishment for what he has done, nor can he be justly deprived of any privilege or immunity on account of it, how much soever intrinsic justice and the public interest may require it. The end of punishment, in every form and degree, has, in the case supposed, been answered. None, therefore, is deserved, or can be justly inflicted. Now every one cannot but know, that the ill-desert which attaches to crime, pertains exclusively to the *act itself*, and not at all to the conduct of the criminal after the deed has been perpetrated. His liability to public justice depends exclusively on the former, and not at all upon the latter circumstance. No principle, in moral legislation, can possibly be of more fatal tendency than this, that an individual may commit any crime conceivable, and then free himself, by any act after the deed, from all desert of blame or punishment, on account of that crime.

5. If this theory is true, all confession of ill-desert, all petitions for pardon addressed to God, or other beings for any offences whatever, when real reformation has been effected, are

wholly improper and criminal. Ill-desert, according to the theory, does not exist after reformation is completed. To confess it, when it does not exist, is itself a crime. All confessions of desert of punishment, all petitions for pardon, therefore, on the part of those who have truly repented, are unlawful and criminal, if this theory is true. Now, who is not deeply aware, that an essential element of true repentance is a hearty admission and confession of the fact of ill-desert, as still attaching to the subject, notwithstanding his return to virtue, and a consequent earnest supplication for pardon? That does and must enter, as a fundamental element, into reformation, which, according to this theory, is rendered unlawful and criminal by reformation. A theory involving such consequences must, of course, be false.

IDEA THAT THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT IS EXCLUSIVELY PARENTAL  
IN ITS CHARACTER.

The third theory we are to notice is this, that the government of God is purely parental in its character, acting always for the reformation of offenders, as the first and great end, and yet blending with it the principle of retribution to a limited extent, as circumstances may require. It is in view of the parental relation involving, as it is affirmed, all others, that the doctrine of atonement, as the basis of pardon, is denied. The violator of law, it is said, needs but throw himself upon the parental grace of God, and he may approach Him without fear, even though no atoning mediator stands "between God and man." On this scheme, I present the following considerations, as demanding very special attention:

1. Instead of being itself a system of moral government, with well ascertained and established principles, the idea of a parental government, as conceived by the Most High over the moral universe, presents us with no such principles. If the parental is the only form of government which justice permits, the ill-desert of sin is essentially denied, and there is no such thing, properly speaking, as forgiveness. If its principles are not the necessary demands of justice, then an imperfect has been substituted for a perfect system of moral government, to wit, retri-

butions according to real moral deserts. If it is neither the one nor the other, but a commingling of the two, then it is a system without system, that is, without well established and intelligible principles. As far as I have been able to understand the meaning of its abettors, the latter is the true idea of the system. The term parental, without any well defined ideas of its real import, has been adopted, as a popular term, having the greater influence for its indefiniteness, on the one hand, and from the fact that it suggests one idea which makes a strong appeal to the domestic affections, and, on the other, this term, I say, has been adopted, as a popular term, to be used in opposition to the idea of atonement. Now the true system of moral legislation cannot have its basis in principles undefined and indefinable.

2. All the well defined principles found in this system are identical with those of the two last considered, retributions for the reformation of offenders, and natural consequences of wrong doing. All the objections therefore, adduced against them lie, in all their significance and force, against this.

3. In this system, that is the rule which should be the exception, and that is the exception which, in fact, should be the rule. In every system of moral legislation, retributions according to deeds should be the rule, a rule departed from, only on extraordinary occasions, if ever. The efficiency of such a system depends upon a steady adherence to these principles. In that under consideration, however, these principles are perfectly reversed. Pardon becomes the rule, and retribution the exception, which is, in fact, the abrogation of moral government, instead of its establishment. Making pardon the rule, and retribution the exception, in a system of pure moral legislation, the final result will, almost of necessity, be, that under the system, disobedience will be the rule, in practice, and obedience the exception.

4. In this system the good of law breakers is the fundamental aim, instead of the interests of justice, the harmony of the universe, and the highest good of the great whole, and especially of the morally pure and obedient, the great end sought in every wisely framed and conducted system of moral legisla-

tion. No legislator who should construct such a system, with a wise reference to the demands of moral order, the efficiency of law to secure the obedience of the subject, and consequently to the highest interests of the great whole, would ever make, in his system, pardon the rule, and retribution according to real moral desert, the exception, as the parental system does.

5. This system is based upon an exceedingly narrow and contracted view of God's actual relations to the universe, and this I urge as my main objection against it. Man, as a moral agent, sustains relations quite various and diverse to intelligences around him. In the first place, he stands as an individual, then as an integral part of the circle comprehended in the domestic relations, then as a constituent element of the state, and finally, as a member of the great realm of intelligences constituting the moral universe. The interests of the family are higher than those of the individual; those of the state are far higher than those even of the family; and those of humanity as compared with those of the universe, are to human calculation as finite to infinite. The principle of retribution applies to moral agents in more and more absolute and exclusive degrees, just as we rise higher and higher in the scale of interests. The individual unrelated to other intelligences, is almost exclusively subject to the operation of the principle of natural consequences. In the domestic relations, pardon is the rule, and retribution the exception. In the state the principle is reversed; retribution is the rule, and pardon the exception. In the system of pure moral legislation for the entire moral universe, retribution becomes the exclusive rule unless there is a temporary exception by means of a principle unknown in law. Now the primary and all overshadowing relation which God sustains to moral agents, is that of the *centre* of this higher sphere, as the moral Legislator, Governor and Judge of the moral universe. To draw our ideas of a system of moral government proper to God, as the Legislator, Governor and "Judge of all," from what would be demanded of a father towards offspring in the domestic relations merely, cannot but lead to manifest and fundamental error. Such undeniably is the idea of the divine govern

ment, as purely parental, instead of moral in its principles and character.

6. Hence I remark, again, that this system is fundamentally opposed to the laws and principles of the *moral nature* of all moral agents. If we begin, as we are bound to do, in this case, with a careful analysis of the ideas of right and wrong, of obligation, moral desert and retribution, and then, in view of their fundamental characteristics, deduce our ideas of the moral government of God, as the moral Legislator, Governor and Judge of the intelligent universe, the last idea of such a system to which we should ever arrive, would be that of a merely parental, instead of a morally legal government.

7. Finally, the true idea of a parental government on the part of God, has its basis in a principle, but which is wholly denied in that under consideration, that of atonement. In this system "mercy and truth meet together, and righteousness and peace kiss each other." Not so, by any means, in a parental government, without provisions for the pardon of sin.

We have examined the above systems somewhat fundamentally, for the reason, that they are not only fundamentally erroneous, in themselves, but till overthrown, stand as open antagonisms to the principles of the remedial system revealed in the scriptures, and which is intrinsically involved in the mysteries of the incarnation. The true idea of the principles of the divine moral government, that is, the doctrine of retributions, revealed in the scriptures and affirmed by reason, may be thus announced.

1. It has its basis in the principles of *merit* and *demerit*, as *intrinsically* attaching to right and wrong moral action.

2. The degree of ill-desert attaching to wrong-doing is always in exact proportion to the *known claims violated* and the *known interests* disregarded in the act.

3. The ill-desert of crime can, in no degree, be changed or modified by the conduct of the perpetrator subsequent to the act.

4. Retribution for wrong-doing, should have a primary reference, in all cases of pure moral legislation, not to the good

of the offender, but to *intrinsic justice*, and the *interests and rights of the public*.

Three remarks of a general nature will close this article.

1. The only condition on which God can command the esteem of the moral universe, is the perfection of the laws of His moral government, the exact correspondence between the real merit and demerit of obedience and disobedience, and the retributions held in readiness for all who obey or disobey the laws of rectitude and goodness, and the steadiness and absolute impartiality with which he adheres to the principle, in His moral administration of awards according to deeds. He may be admired for His wisdom, feared for His power or wrath, but He can be the object of esteem and veneration, but upon one condition, the absolute perfection of His character, as moral Legislator, Governor and Judge.

2. One important fact connected with our present subject, deserves a passing notice here. It is this: Whenever the idea of retribution has dropped out of men's conceptions of the divine government, the idea of the *divine existence* itself has, as a matter of fact, in a corresponding degree, faded from the human mind. The divine existence has either been formally denied, or has evaporated into certain forms of materialism, idealism, pantheism, or nihilism, in which all conceptions of God, as a real substantial existence, have disappeared altogether. We state this as a striking fact which the history of human opinions fully verifies. If an inquiry is made in respect to the reason, or ground of this fact, we would present the following suggestions as deserving consideration: If we entertain such thoughts of God as render him worthy of our esteem and veneration, we cannot but conceive of Him as, in the language of Cousin, "holding ready rewards and punishments for those who have fulfilled or broken his law." When men dissociate from their conceptions of God, the idea of retribution, they of necessity, in their inner being, cease to entertain any sentiment of respect or veneration for Him. In the presence of flagrant crime, to lift our thoughts to the throne of the eternal, with the conception that He will not render deserved retributions to the guilty, is so abhorrent to the internal sense of justice



and truth which exists as a necessary law of universal mind, that under such circumstances, men will either wholly deny the reality of the divine existence, or disrobe the Most High, in their conceptions of Him, of all those attributes by which He is qualified to act at all, as a moral governor. Reason as well as revelation affirms the great truth, that when men entertain the idea that God will not require of creatures according to their deeds, they will, however wicked they may be, contemn him in their hearts.

3. We see, finally, that under a system of pure moral legislation, humanity is absolutely without hope. If God's government towards man is not parental, and therefore not purely legal, "no flesh can be saved; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." The conviction of infinite guilt and ill-desert lies upon the conscience of universal humanity, and hence, all flesh trembles at the idea of meeting God as "the Judge of all." Under the pressure of this conviction, the great inquiry is, "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousand rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" But this conducts us to the great theme of the next article, the idea of atonement.

## ART. IV—EDUCATION.

“The Heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work”—was the exclamation of the Psalmist; and the revelations of modern science not only afford abundant confirmation of these words of wisdom, and enable us to appreciate their beautiful force and appropriateness much more clearly than our forefathers could, but also reveal a new and striking significance in the language of the seraphim, declaring that “the whole earth is full of His glory.”

We are taught by geology that the condition of our world has not been always that in which we now behold it. We are assured that the human race has existed upon the earth for only a comparatively short period of time; that, previous to the introduction of man, our globe had for myriads of years been the abode of numerous and strange forms of animal and vegetable life,—that at a period yet more remote vegetables alone lived in our world,—and that still farther back in the dim distance of antiquity *no* organic forms whatever could be found,—that the earth was emphatically “without form and void,”—a mere chaotic mass of mineral matter. We think the supposition commends itself very favorably to the enlightened understanding that the great reason for the creation of the visible universe was that the divine attributes, the all-sufficiency of the Creator, might be manifested. But the only attribute, it would seem, which could have been suggested to the spectator by the wild and tumultuous heaving of the yet incandescent mass, flying through space with sixty times the velocity of a cannon ball, or by the terrific bursting and crashing of its solid crust at a later period, is that of Power.

In the organic structure of the vegetation introduced subsequently, there might have been traced not only the indications of power, but also of wisdom, of intelligent design.

Afterwards, when animal life made its appearance, it was developed in forms in which there was manifested such adaptation to circumstances,—such care to secure the highest enjoy-

ment and the least possible suffering,—as inevitably to suggest the idea of benevolence on the part of the Creator.

Finally, coming down to our own epoch, if we should scan with careful and philosophic eye the history of the human race, even leaving entirely out of view the gift of revelation and the light of Christianity, we could not fail to recognize the hand of God in the history, and to acknowledge the manifestation of the attribute of justice in His dealings with men.

But there is no necessity to leave these things out of view, and no propriety in doing so, for we have no more certain knowledge of *any* events in human history than we have of the circumstances connected with the establishment of Christianity, including, of course, the Divine origin of the Bible. And in the clear light of revealed truth we cannot fail to see in the moral government of God a continual manifestation of his holiness.

Now, in respect to these four Divine attributes,—power, wisdom, benevolence and holiness,—if we attempt to class them according to their intrinsic excellence, we must intuitively arrange them in the order in which they have been mentioned. Wisdom will take a higher rank than power,—benevolence or goodness higher than wisdom,—and holiness will occupy a position above all the rest.

It should also be observed that each step in the development of the creative process seems to be a sort of necessary preliminary to the following one, and the reason for each step is to be found in that which comes after it. Thus, the production of the mineral mass of the earth seems to have been necessary to furnish a foundation upon which to build the structure of organic existence. So, also, the vegetable world seems to have been necessarily brought into being before the creation of animals, that they might be provided with sustenance. In like manner, too, the introduction of the animal kingdom was necessary to the complete preparation of the earth for the reception of man.

But we cannot consistently anticipate the future introduction of any higher order of beings upon the earth, having a relation to man similar to that which man has to the lower animals. It might be interesting to notice the reasons for this conclusion,

but our limits will not permit. Let it, however, be remarked, that if, as seems most reasonable, we consider each step in the creative process as designed especially to manifest some one of the attributes of the Creator, the manifestation of power will appear to have taken place as a preparation for that of wisdom,—which, in its turn, was a preliminary or means to the manifestation of benevolence,—and this also, in like manner, is not an end in itself, but a means to the manifestation of holiness. This last, however, is not to be regarded as subordinate, or as sustaining the relation of a means to anything else. It is an absolute and perfect end in itself, and the highest end which can be imagined.

We are aware that happiness has sometimes been considered as the ultimate and chief good,—the great end of existence. We do not regard this view as having any good foundation, but here again time and space forbid us to pursue the discussion as we would like.

We have next to observe that each succeeding stage in this progressive development of the scheme of creation not only brings to view some new attribute of the Divine architect, but includes substantially within itself all the previous manifestations. In the second stage we perceive not only wisdom, but also power; in the third, not only benevolence, but also power and wisdom; and in the fourth is manifested, not holiness only, but also power, and wisdom, and goodness.

Thus man, the great and crowning work of creation, is a sort of epitome of the whole, and his wonderfully complex nature furnishes an opportunity for the display of all the Divine attributes. In his physical organization we trace the power and wisdom of God; in his social nature, and in his adaptation to the circumstances in which he is placed, are seen the benevolence or goodness of his Maker; while his intellectual and moral nature furnish an appropriate field for the exercise of God's justice, and whatever other attributes are involved in the idea of his holiness.

But man is not only a kind of microcosm,—a little world in himself, an epitome of creation, he is also an image or likeness of his Creator,—“created in the image of God.” It is some-

times unfortunately necessary to remind man that he is only the image of God,—not a God himself. It is high praise for man that he is such as to suggest any resemblance or likeness to his Maker, and he should remember that this likeness is only as that of the shadow to the substance, of the type to its fulfilment, of the finite to the infinite. The likeness will be found rather in his capacity than in his actual development. But a resemblance to God, however faint and humble it may be, is surely discernible in respect to each of the four great attributes already named.

Man is the image of God, 1st, in respect to his power; 2d, in respect to his intelligence; 3d, in respect to his affections or susceptibilities; and 4th, in respect to his capacity for virtue or holiness.

We have a sort of natural regard,—an instinctive reverence for physical strength when exhibited by our own species. A strong man is an object of almost universal admiration, and many on this ground alone have been thought worthy of distinguished consideration. In fact, multitudes of the heroes, both in ancient and modern times, who have been regarded with the greatest admiration, and rewarded with the highest honors, have been distinguished for nothing else,—at least nothing else commendable,—than great physical strength and power of endurance. How many of the heroes of Homer, and even of Virgil, depend wholly or mainly upon their gigantic size and wonderful strength for all the interest which attaches to them, and for all the honor bestowed upon them. It is sometimes supposed that it is the courage and bold daring of such heroes which excites our admiration and makes them interesting. But this is not the case; for, in the first place, this very courage which is so much lauded, and sometimes envied, is generally but the natural outgrowth and result of the great physical development which it so frequently accompanies; and, in the second place, if we were to imagine these very heroes who have commanded so much of the attention of the world to exchange their huge and symmetrical bodies for dwarfish and deformed ones, and their strength for weakness,—though they

should retain all their courage and daring,—they would cease to excite any interest, and under such circumstances, should they attempt any of those exploits which have rendered them so famous, they would simply appear ridiculous.

This regard for physical strength was carried by the ancients to an unbounded extent. They admired it in their heroes, and finally deified it in their Hercules, and gave it a place among the stars as an object of perpetual worship and adoration.

Even the heroic characters of modern writers depend, for their interest and the admiration which they excite, very much upon this same brute force, as it is sometimes called. For instance, the Douglass, in Scott's "Lady of the Lake." Who, that has ever read the description, has not admired the character? And yet, taking away the idea of his great size and strength, how little there is left to excite admiration! And in our own country, in the middle of this nineteenth century, it is surprising to consider how large a share of public attention is bestowed upon men who have absolutely nothing to recommend them except their great bodily strength. But however much of deference we may yield to mere physical development and strength, we necessarily regard intelligence and mental power with still higher respect.

1 / Of two individuals, one of whom is physically a giant, with  
 2 very small intelligence, and the other an intellectual giant with  
 but little physical power, we always give the preference to the  
 latter.

3 } But, again, suppose a third individual included in the compar-  
 ison, in whom the affections are fully developed while he pos-  
 sesses very little of either mental or physical power. Suppose  
 that he is distinguished for strong social attachments and sym-  
 pathies,—that he is filled with sorrow at the sight of suffering  
 and distress,—that he has a keen perception of, and love for,  
 the beautiful in nature and art,—in short, that he is full of be-  
 nevolence, kindness and good humor, while the other two are  
 entirely deficient in this respect. In this case, the last individ-  
 ual will certainly be more highly esteemed, and will be consid-  
 ered worthy of a rank superior to either the physical or men-  
 tal giant.

4 Once more, however, let another new character be introduced. Weak in body, and feeble in mind, and altogether wanting in the refined sensibilities of the one last described,—possessing a kind of natural stoicism which renders him unsusceptible to the gentle and tender emotions, and having no relish for the beautiful and picturesque, we will suppose that he *has*, nevertheless, a supreme regard for the right; that his moral sense is acute; that his conscience is ever vigilant and active; and that in all his actions he is careful to do what his conscience will approve; that in all his dealings with others he is perfectly upright and just; that never does his tongue utter a falsehood or his lips speak deceitfully; that he reverently bows in submission to the will of his Creator; in brief, that he steadily pursues the path of duty, faithfully discharging every obligation which he can perceive as resting upon him,—while the other three persons are wholly deficient in this upright conscientiousness. This last character will command our approbation, and receive our commendation in preference to any of the rest. We shall be compelled to assign him a position in the scale of excellence and honor far above them. Even the man of sympathy, of tender and refined sensibility, capable of being an affectionate friend and pleasant companion, may be quite regardless of moral uprightness; he may even trample upon right and justice in the very gratification of his sympathies; he may have no love for truth or reverence for his Creator; he may mingle his speech with falsehood and blasphemy; he may give himself up to the control of his animal appetites and passions; he may, in short, be a perfect monster of iniquity and vice. Now, if he be thus regardless of rectitude, though, in addition to his sympathetic refinement, he were a very Samson for strength, and a very Newton for intellect, he yet must rank almost infinitely below the humble individual, already described, who is governed in all things by the rule of right.

It seems hardly necessary to say that the cases just mentioned are such as can scarcely ever occur; for these several elements of human nature sustain such a relation to each other that the development of the first is a necessary preliminary to

that of the second; the second, in like manner, to the third; and the third to the fourth.

It is in vain to look for any great degree of mental power without a physical development in some measure corresponding. It is not by any means intended to affirm that there is necessarily such an exact and precise correspondence between physical and mental development, that the one may be taken as the measure of the other. In order to secure the highest possible degree of mental activity and power, it is not necessary to secure absolutely the greatest possible size of body and strength of muscle. But there seems to be a certain degree of physical development which may be regarded as a kind of normal type, or standard, which *is* necessary to the complete development of the intellect. Thus the physical nature sustains to the mental, the relation of a means to an end. This is still farther evident from the fact that the first actually precedes the second in the order of time. Till a certain physical development is acquired, the infant manifests no sign of intelligence, and the maturity, or perfect growth of the body, is attained before the complete maturity of the mind.

In a manner quite analagous, a certain standard in the progress of the intellect must be reached in order to the complete and harmonious development of the affections or susceptibilities. As in the former case, we may here also notice that the germinating of the intellect precedes in the order of time that of the affections. Till the infant acquires a certain amount of intelligence, we discover in him no sign of the existence of the emotional susceptibilities. The intellect, in this comparison, clearly sustains the relation of a means to an end. But it is not the intellect alone which is a necessary condition of the development of the susceptibilities. The completion of the physical organization is also a necessary means in this case, as well as in relation to the intellect itself.

Advancing another step in our investigation, we shall find that the conscience, or moral part of our nature, appears to germinate at a later period than any of the others, and that all three of them are necessary means to its perfection. The complete development of our moral capabilities, or the attain-



ment of a state of holiness, is the complete and entire perfection of our whole nature.

This is the great object which is good in itself,—which constitutes or contains in itself the essential reason for the existence and development of all our other capacities,—which is necessarily accompanied by complete and perfect happiness—but which is not to be considered as a means for the accomplishment of any purpose, or the attainment of any end, unless it be that which contains in itself the reason for the creation of the world. This is itself the immediate end and purpose for which man was created, and for which all his capacities and powers were given.

It would be interesting, perhaps, to discuss more minutely the relation of holiness to happiness, and to the “Glory of God,” but we cannot do it without going far beyond our limits.

We are now in a position to consider the nature and the great object of education. Education is a development. To educate a human being is to *draw out* and bring to perfection, in harmonious unity, all his powers and capabilities,—each in its proper relation to all the others. This is the task which the educator should propose to himself, and to which he should devote his constant and untiring energies. He should firmly fix in his mind what ought to be the final result of his labor, and, so far as possible, make everything tend towards that result. He should contemplate human nature in its perfection, as a symmetrical and harmonious whole, and endeavor to mold the plastic material committed to his charge, after that beautiful model.

What would be thought of the statuary who should devote the largest part of the block, from which he is to bring forth the complete human figure, to the formation of a huge gigantic hand? or of the painter who should make the head of his figure exceed the body in length? or of the architect who should make the capital or the base of his column longer than the shaft? Why, simply that he had produced a monstrosity,—a work wholly without symmetry or just proportion. And so, in the work of education, if any one department of our nature is singled out and cultivated to the exclusion or neglect of the

others, the result will be a deformity, a monstrosity of character, altogether wanting in symmetry and beauty.

It is incumbent, then, upon the educator, not to confine his attention exclusively to any one department of the nature of his pupil, lest he should either fail entirely to accomplish his object, or, succeeding, should produce a sad deformity of character, instead of that perfection which is desirable.

There is a constant danger, in all systems of education, of falling into this error; of bestowing an undue attention upon the culture of some one department of our nature, while others are partially or wholly neglected.

In our own time and country the tendency seems to be to cultivate exclusively the intellect, while in other times and countries the same exclusiveness has been observable in relation,—now to physical,—now to social,—and now to moral culture.

It is evidently unwise to attempt to cultivate the intellect exclusively, not only from the fact that the character thus produced would be incomplete and monstrous, but also because such an attempt must necessarily prove abortive. In fact, we should not have to go far to find multitudes of examples illustrating the position that the want of physical training often renders all attempts at mental culture fruitless and vain. And what intelligent observer does not know that still more frequently the process of mental culture is completely obstructed by the want of moral training? It may have more frequently escaped observation, but it is, nevertheless, equally true, that the neglect of social training, or the proper development of the emotional part of our nature, casts a sickly shade over the operations of the intellect, and utterly precludes that complete development of it which might otherwise be secured.

He, then, who would secure the highest *intellectual* superiority for his pupils, must not neglect their physical, social, or moral education. But with us the danger is not so much that physical education, &c., will be neglected, and that consequently mental vigor will not be attained, as that mere intellectual strength and attainments will be considered the great object and end of education, instead of being merely a means for the attainment of a nobler and a higher object.

There are not wanting indications of danger that in our country may spring up a sort of bold and skeptical rationalism, a weak and vain pride of intellect, which shall lead to the denial of God and moral obligation, and that it may hereafter justly be said of us, as of some anciently, that "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

Let every educator, then, while he endeavors to secure the mental improvement of his pupils, consider this improvement as an object of secondary importance, and as subservient to a nobler end, and let him not fail to impress this idea upon the minds of his pupils. It may often be necessary, in order to secure the necessary diligence and perseverance, to set before them many other and subordinate motives for mental improvement,—motives which, to their yet undisciplined minds, will seem of far greater weight and prove much more effective; but for the educator himself who takes a consistent view of his calling, the considerations which have been mentioned must prove a powerful stimulus to faithful and persevering effort.

We have now to make an observation which has already been partially anticipated, viz.: That not only is each department of human nature, taking it in the order in which it has been mentioned, a sort of necessary condition, or means, to that which comes after it, but it also exerts a reflex influence upon that which precedes it. Thus, a certain amount of physical development is a necessary condition of mental power, but this mental power being secured, it acts reciprocally upon the physical nature, and becomes, in its turn, a condition of more perfect physical development. Thus, other things being equal, it will be found that a man of cultivated intellect possesses a greater power of endurance and greater bodily strength than another with the same original constitution and physical culture, but without the mental training. He may therefore reasonably expect a longer life. It has been observed by physicians that educated men usually attain a greater age, and also retain their faculties better in old age, than those who are uneducated. It can hardly have escaped the observation of any careful person, that illiterate people often betray unmistakable signs of senility and decay at an age in which the educated

*Educated men live longer and retain their faculties better than the illiterate.*

and refined can hardly be said to have passed their prime of vigor and usefulness. It is, then, a great mistake to suppose, as some do, that mental culture is inconsistent with physical health. So far is this from being true, that, when properly conducted, it is eminently favorable to health.

In like manner, too, is the physical nature improved through the proper cultivation of the social and moral natures. In short, we may say that *each* of these four grand divisions of human nature is to a considerable extent dependent, for its complete development, upon the development of *all* the others. Hence, again, we may see still more clearly the folly of endeavoring to educate the intellect exclusively. The process may be carried far enough to produce a very unsymmetrical and deformed character, but the greatest perfection, even of the intellect itself, cannot be secured in this way. Similar results also must necessarily follow all attempts to cultivate exclusively the social or moral faculties.

We have thus far considered, to some extent, the effect upon character of the simple non-development of either of the essential elements of human nature, but there is another view of the case, and a very important one, yet to be taken.

There is such a thing as a perverted, abnormal, or diseased development, which almost always takes place in the absence of the proper natural and healthy one; and thus the want of the right kind of culture results, not merely in the production of a deformed and unsymmetrical character, but in the complete destruction of the individual in respect to his moral, social, mental, and even physical nature.

The want of a proper physical education frequently results not only in a weak and feeble development of the body, thus rendering the unfortunate subject incapable of respectable mental attainments,—of engaging in any great or noble enterprise, or of being in any way useful, either to himself or the world, but also in the contraction of positive disease which cuts short the thread of life, and lays the sufferer in a premature grave. How many bright buds of promise have we not seen thus cut down and blasted forever!

Again, the neglect of intellectual culture, and even gross

mistakes in the manner of conducting it, often result in positive mental disease, in insanity, either partial or total; a fate which can only be regarded as even more terrible than physical disease and death.

So, too, in respect to the emotional part of our nature, the neglect of proper and judicious culture results in a vicious development which is worse than a mere deformity of character. If the benevolent affections are not carefully fostered, their place is sure to be supplied by a host of malignant passions. Instead of friendship, love, and generosity, will be found hatred and selfishness; instead of confidence and honor, will be found suspicion and treachery; instead of sympathy and compassion, will be found sternness and cruelty; instead of a love for the beautiful and pure, the good and the true, will be found a relish for the gross and sensual,—the corrupt and depraved; in short, instead of a delight in, and an inclination towards whatsoever is pure and lovely and of good report, there will be found an attachment for, and a proclivity towards, whatsoever is polluting, and hateful, and base.

Finally, if the conscience is not enlightened, developed, and brought into healthy activity, it will become either depraved or dormant. If the habit of consulting and obeying its dictates is not formed, the opposite one will be, and the individual, instead of being governed by the rule of right, will submit to follow the rule of wrong; instead of bringing his desires, appetites, and passions, into subjection to the moral principle within, he will bring that into base subordination to them,—thus violating the great law of his nature and of his God.

As the complete development of the moral part of our nature requires and presupposes the harmonious perfection of all the other parts, so the perversion of the conscience, or the destruction of its authority leads directly to the entire perversion and destruction of the whole man. Thus, the sense of moral obligation being taken away, the great restraint upon the gratification of evil inclinations and perverted sensibilities is removed, and the whole social nature becomes depraved, which leads to the degradation of the intellect, and the undermining of the

physical constitution, and the miserable wreck of humanity sinks into utter perdition.

We are now prepared to comprehend the distinction between education of the intellect and instruction,—a distinction of much practical importance, but one which is often entirely overlooked.

Education has already been defined as a development. It is drawing out, unfolding, or bringing into active exercise, the inherent powers and capabilities of the subject. A man should be educated in order that he may be a perfect and complete *man*, and, consequently, fulfil the great purpose of his existence.

Instruction, on the other hand, is a setting in order, a preparation, accoutrement, fitting out, equipment, or furnishing, for some purpose or occupation. Particularly, it is a furnishing or fitting out with the knowledge or information necessary to the prosecution of some particular business or employment. A man should be instructed in order that he may be a skilful workman, a successful business man, a good carpenter, shoemaker, lawyer, physician, merchant, &c.

A man may be very well educated, and yet be very poorly instructed for any particular occupation; and, on the other hand, one may be most thoroughly instructed in some particular business or profession, and yet be most miserably educated.

It is evident that in respect to excellence, education must rank far above instruction. By means of education a man acquires a healthy vigor, and strength of body and mind; by means of instruction he is enabled to apply that vigor and strength to some economical purpose. By education one is enabled to reason well; by instruction, to work skilfully. By means of education one is fitted to become an intelligent and agreeable companion; by means of instruction he is qualified to become a useful servant. By means of education one is enabled to produce a "Novum Organon," a "Principia," or a "Paradise Lost;" by means of instruction the same person might be enabled to make a "wooden clock," to calculate interest, or fill out a summons. Colleges are usually designed for education, but professional schools for instruction.

After all, however, education and instruction stand in very

close and peculiar relations to each other. It is evident that the more thoroughly one is educated, the better is he prepared to profit by instruction, and the more skilful is he likely to become in whatever business or profession he may adopt. Hence, the college course is reckoned necessary, or, at least, extremely desirable, as a preparation for the professional school. But, on the other hand, again, in almost all cases, instruction itself has more or less of an educative tendency. In general, one cannot receive instruction without having his faculties more or less developed in the process. Instruction may, however be given in such a way as to be of the very highest importance as a means of education, or so as to be almost useless in that respect. Almost everything depends upon the manner in which it is given. If the "pouring in" process is adopted, the mind may be filled, and even overburdened and oppressed with a multitude of facts, while its native powers lie dormant, and, like the dry pump into which one pours a copious stream while the piston is not moved, it can only discharge that which is poured in, and that somewhat diminished in quantity, and deteriorated in quality. If, on the contrary, even a small amount of instruction is given, while the mind is stimulated to action,—like the dry pump into which one pours a little water to moisten the valves while he vigorously plies the piston,—it will presently discharge an abundant and refreshing supply from its own deep and unfailing reservoir.

We have defined instruction as the furnishing, or fitting out with the knowledge necessary for some particular business. It should, however, be observed that some branches of knowledge are almost equally necessary for several different occupations, while others are restricted in their applications to individual pursuits. Hence, instruction may be regarded as either general or particular. We suppose that our public schools are established with primary reference to general instruction. We think this is the prevalent idea in regard to them in the minds of the mass of the people,—and it is well that it is so; for these schools are instituted for, and belong especially to, the common people, and, with them, *instruction* is the first necessity. In general they have each to provide for his own support

and physical comfort, and that instruction which will enable them to do this must necessarily appear to them of the first importance, and, in fact, *is* so, as must readily be seen from what has already been said.

We conclude, then, that in the common school, the leading object should be to furnish that instruction which is of a general nature, and to communicate it in such a manner as to make it serve, as far as possible, the purposes of education.

The poorer classes of people, if they are educated at all, must, to a great extent, be self-educated; and, to enable them to educate themselves, it is necessary that they should be so instructed as to make it possible for them to support themselves and obtain the means of education. Thus, in another sense, we perceive instruction to be an auxiliary to education.

It will be observed, that, in making the distinction, and in drawing the parallel between education and instruction, we have had especial reference to *intellectual* education, &c. It might be interesting to make a similar distinction in reference to physical, social, and moral education, &c.; but, as we design our discussion to be suggestive, rather than exhaustive, we leave that for the reader to do, and close with the few practical remarks which follow.

It is evidently in accordance with nature and reason that the parent should be the educator and instructor of the child. We regard it as self-evident that this is a part of parental duty. Hence it follows that parents are under obligation to be qualified, as far as possible, for the discharge of this duty.

In the first place, the parent is responsible for the physical education of his child. This requires that the parent should understand the conditions upon which a healthy physical development depends, and that he should exact, on the part of the child, a constant observance of those conditions, thus carefully forming his habits in accordance with them.

Secondly, the parent is responsible for the intellectual education of his child. This requires that the parent should understand the necessary conditions of a healthy intellectual development, and that he should exact their observance on the part



of the child, and carefully form his habits in accordance with them.

In this department the parent may call to his *aid* the acquirements, and talents, and experience of others, and may derive great assistance from schools and colleges, but yet the influence of the parent in the mental development of his offspring may, and ought to be, paramount to all others. It is a business which he cannot safely commit to other hands. There are obligations resting upon him and relating to it which he cannot escape.

Again, the parent is responsible for the education of his child in respect to the social or emotional part of his nature. Here almost everything depends upon what are called influences particularly the influence of example. The parent will, almost of necessity, stamp his own social character upon his offspring. Let parents see to it, then, that their example, and all the influences of home, be of the right kind.

Finally, the parent is responsible for the moral education of his child. This requires that the parent should himself recognize the supreme authority of conscience in all his actions, and that he should carefully cultivate and develop the moral sense in his child by constantly appealing to it as a motive to action, and teaching him to regard it as the highest one.

In regard to instruction, we hold it to be the duty of the parent to see that his child is thoroughly instructed, 1st, in the laws or necessary conditions of health; 2d, in some honest and useful calling or business, by which he may be able to supply himself with the necessaries of life; 3d, in the proprieties and amenities of good society; and 4th, in the doctrines and duties of Christianity.

Evidently the same obligations must devolve upon others just so far as they may be called to fill the places, and discharge the duties of parents.

## ART. V.—STATE OF THE DENOMINATION.

## A LETTER TO THE REV. SILAS CURTIS.

——— SEPTEMBER 17, 1856.

DEAR BROTHER CURTIS:—I take the liberty of thus publicly addressing you, concerning the state of the Freewill Baptist denomination, because you have been long familiar with our denominational developments, and are now perhaps more intimately conversant with all parts of our operations than any other man. I do not arrogate to myself that my perception of denominational wants or remedies, is in all respects, or even in any respect, correct. I shall simply present such thoughts as I have upon the subject, and leave others to decide upon their propriety.

It is a significant fact that up to 1843 there had been a constant and pretty steady increase of the denomination, until in the Register for 1844, the returns for which were made in the spring of 1843, it attained the maximum of 61,372. But the next four years there was a decrease of between nine and ten thousand members. Nor is the tendency to decrease yet fairly arrested. The denomination still numbers some eleven thousands less than it did in 1843. Now, what is the cause of this?

As the same causes always produce the same effects, the decrease evidently was not the result of the same forces and the same state of things that had before produced the increase. And as the change was both very sudden and very great, it must therefore have been the result of a new and powerful cause.

That cause obviously was not the loss, by death or otherwise, of any unusual number of ministers or leading men. Upon this point there can be no question. Nor was it in consequence of any marked inferiority in the intellectual and moral calibre of the ministry and leading men of the denomination, dating from that point. On the other hand, there has been from before this period an acknowledged improvement in this respect.

I would not boast of it; but for the present purpose it may properly be stated.

Nor was that cause the change of spirit and method, which confessedly has taken place among us. The paying of stipulated salaries, the better education of the ministry, the giving of more attention to the demands of philanthropy, and the like, have without doubt absorbed more of our attention and efforts of late than heretofore. But the favor and attention they have received has been gradual,—in most cases very gradual; beginning sometime *before* 1843, and have not yet culminated. Now it seems plain that such a *gradual* cause as this never could have produced such a *sudden* effect. Moreover how will those who find the reason for our denominational decrease in this “transition state” of our denomination, account for the fact, that instead of the least success being attained where there has been most transition, it is just there where this tendency to decrease has been the most successfully resisted, and just where there has been least progress has there been the most loss. It is not the new measure ministers nor churches, nor those verging to new measures, that have been least successful, even numerically; but just the reverse. This transition theory is therefore untenable.

At this point, I will refer you to the fact that other denominations have suffered in the same way, and from the same time. The Christian Baptists, or Christians, have decreased very much more than we—beginning at the same point. The Baptists and Methodists have decreased but little if any, but their rapid increase, particularly in the case of the latter, was arrested in a marked manner at that period. The Congregationalists, also, then felt a severe shock. This indicates clearly that the cause operating on us, and causing our decrease is a general one, and is to be sought for outside rather than inside the denomination.

In looking for such general cause, you will not find any wonderful or new development of technical infidelity at the period named, which by open or actual contact with the forces of Christianity produced the result. Nothing of the kind then appeared, nor has the position or relative loss the church has

since sustained embodied itself in any form of organized or open infidelity. Infidelity, as such, is therefore excluded from the list of possible causes.

It has doubtless occurred to you that this change took place simultaneously with the culmination of Second Adventism. There was no other disturbing movement which at that time laid hold of the general forces of the church, especially in New England, with sufficient strength or extent of grasp, to accomplish such results as have been contemplated. That this movement did acquire such wide-spread and controlling influence as to be *powerful* enough to do it, there can be no question. It swept over the land like a tornado, and there was not a denomination, or a church, that did not feel its power. Where it assumed no recognized technical form, it still attracted attention, excited anticipations, and gave a new tone to the manifestations of the religious life. There probably was not a preacher anywhere in the land whose sentiments, whose spirit, or whose manner, was not directly or indirectly more or less affected by it. It is unquestionable, therefore, that it acquired forces enough to produce this change. Did it actually produce it?

Of those who left evangelical churches and associated themselves in Advent organizations, it is notorious that few ever returned, though those organizations have mostly become extinct. Many of their members have entirely backslidden from any kind of religious profession; and the larger bulk of the rest subsided into a religious inactivity, which seems to be the result of a feeling that is to the religious life very much akin to disappointed ambition in other departments of human activity. Then, too, very nearly the same influences operated on those who came largely under the influence of the Advent movement, but did not sever their previous church relation; and, of course, with similar results. Most of them have either backslidden, or are characterized by such indifference as renders them little more than dead weights upon the influence of the church. These things alone would well-nigh account for the effects—the causes of which we are seeking.

But this is not all. The Advent movement appropriated to it-

self all the ordinary methods of religious propagation, and clothed itself with the commonly received developments of a religious life. It preached, it wrote, it prayed, it sang, it shouted, it became ecstatically happy, and for a time, at least, it reformed men—often the most incorrigible, whom other sentiments, in other hands, had not effected. Moreover, it affected to be Biblical, *par excellence*, and to the observation that measured the matter simply by the number of professed proof texts presented, it seemed to be clearly such in fact. Its advocates always had their well-used Bibles in hand, and were ready to ply your incredulity with any number of scripture quotations. Indeed, in all these respects, whatever difference appeared, seemed to be altogether in favor of the new movement. Judged by its professions, by its appearance, or by its immediate effects, it possessed a much higher type of piety and purity than the old established churches; its manner was more earnest, was characterized by a more implicit faith, and had at least the semblance of the most impenetrable logic, and which, from the nature of its premises, it *was* impossible for the common mind to penetrate, and it also appealed to what seemed to be the most practical and the most immediate necessities of men.

Under such circumstances, the movement very naturally became, especially in the minds of worldly men, identified with the cause of religion; and when it so evidently and signally failed, they felt that it was a failure of the gospel itself—that its history had proved Christianity to be a blunder or a delusion, utterly inadequate to satisfy the demands of the human spirit, inducing false hopes, delusive enjoyments, mistaken habits of living, and tending to incorrect views both of this and the future life. In this way, it gave advantage to the irreligious, and repelled the non-religious portion of the community, and did for the church an injury, which no recognized and outward foe could have effected. Men were thus induced absolutely to refuse to hear the gospel at all. In their estimation, they were already in possession of the most conclusive of all evidence—because coming from its own history and workings—of the falsity of Christianity; and what need, they felt, of any further witness? Not hearing, of course they did not be-

lieve, and so accessions were prevented. Or if, from habit or otherwise, they still listened, they reasoned much as follows: "It sounds well, and seems conclusive; but so sounded and so seemed what I now know is false. I know not how to distinguish between them, and it is fair to presume that this is no better in fact than that." If they did not formally reason thus, a sort of intuitive perception led them to substantially the same conclusion.

Thus audiences were diminished, and, of attendants, the proportionate number of conversions were lessened; and if the church did not absolutely decrease, as was the case with us and the Christian Baptists, it did relatively, as was the case with the Methodists, Baptists, and others.

A marked feature of Adventism was its appeal to the sensibilities. Whitfield himself never more successfully touched the sympathies and awakened emotion. In all those features which characterize an emotional development of the religious life—in earnestness, in excitement, in awakened apprehension, in fervor of address, in pathos of appeal, in ecstasy of experience, in intensity of conviction, the Advent movement was pre-eminent; and another line of connection between this movement as a cause, and the change under consideration as an effect, is traced in the fact that just those denominations in which this characteristic has stood out most conspicuous, have suffered the most severely—first the Christians, then ourselves, then the Methodists, then the Baptists, and least, perhaps, the Congregationalists.

At first the Methodists may seem to be an exception; since they manifested as high a development of the emotional nature as ourselves, or perhaps any other. But it did not produce the same effect on them, *because it was more mingled with other characteristics than with us.* The Methodists have never been distinguished for logical power. They never have had an eminent logician among them. The nearest approach to it was Olin, but Olin was only a fragment. Nor have they been distinguished for refined culture. If they had possessed it, they had never been so numerically successful. No Channing has ever grown up among them, and will not for sometime to come.

But while Freewill Baptist ministers were scouting education, and therefore, with few noble exceptions, were themselves neglecting it, Hedding, and other leading Methodist spirits, without forgetting or neglecting—or failing—to arouse men's sensibilities at each of their daily appointments, and that to as high a pitch as was often done by ourselves, were also marking their horse-back journey from appointment to appointment by assiduously studying a well used grammar or dictionary.\* In addition, they were students of such exegetical works as those of Wesley, Clarke, Watson, Benson and Fletcher. The result was, not polish, not a high degree of logical power, but strong, rugged, earnest common sense—natural and simple enough to be received by the most untutored minds, well informed enough not greatly to trip in the presence even of learning itself, earnest and powerful enough to tear away the barriers of worldliness. Hence its reliance on its appeals to their sensibilities was by no means so exclusive as ours. When, therefore, that proved less effectual, they still held more of other elements of influence than ourselves; and consequently did not so greatly suffer.

A point here, perhaps, needs guarding. A large development of the emotional nature in Christian experience is not of itself wrong, or an evil, but on the other hand, in the highest degree desirable. A religion that does not reach and affect the sensibilities can scarcely be said to be a religion at all. There are, moreover, men that can scarcely be approached through any other channel; as there are also periods in the history of the Christian church when this element of the religious life is almost the only one that can lead men to Christ. Such a period was the days of Whitfield. But it is to be remembered that our sensibilities are among the blindest of our faculties, and are least subject to the direct command of the will. They are therefore most easily misled, most liable to wander into mistaken paths; and consequently constantly need the presence and guidance of other and stabler characteristics. Our fault was not in having too much of the emotional element of the religious life, but in having too little of other qualities.

\* Hedding's Life and Times, by Dr. Clarke, pp. 125, 126.

Thus, it seems to me, is our denominational decrease to be accounted for. I pass now to give my conceptions of present wants.

The way in which the Methodists have escaped the full measure of an evil that has befallen us, may not be insignificant here. If study saved them, it will also benefit us. I use the word study instead of education, because I mean by it what is often not understood by education. We want more college graduates, more alumni from our Theological Institution, and our young men—and older ones, too—should be even more persistently urged to educate themselves, both in the college and the seminary. But *all* cannot go there—by far the largest half *will* not go there; and it is on this larger half, more than on the few technically educated individuals, that our efficiency or our inefficiency depends. The greater want, therefore, is not so much education for the few, as something in its place for the many—not a college course, not a longer or shorter residence at school, which they cannot or will not enjoy, but the studying of grammars and dictionaries, and expositors, and books that contain the seeds of thought, at home, on horseback, or amid what for a time may be the necessary avocations of daily toil. This I designate study, in contradistinction from education, which, at once suggests schools, teachers and appliances, such as the majority cannot enjoy. And what, think you, would have been the different result, if, instead of any measure of the spirit of one of our ministers, who once wished the opportunity to crawl half a mile on his hands and knees to apply the torch to all the books in the world, all had from the first devoted themselves to such study as I have described?

But we labor under a disadvantage in this direction. We have no considerable literature of our own. We must take what comes along, or must make such a selection from the literature of other denominations, as pre-supposes in the selection a comprehensive acquaintance with the literature of the religious world, which the one making the selection does not, and from the nature of the case, cannot possess. The pioneer Methodist minister, however ignorant of general religious literature, knew at once what to get for his saddle-bags library; and it



must be said, too, that it was not only pretty homogeneous in character, but did not lack some of the noblest and best elements of systematical and practical theology. Moreover, the best informed among us cannot make a homogeneous and fit selection for us from the literature of other denominations; for the very good reason that no such literature exists. We can find exemplifications of some of our doctrine and practice, piecemeal, in the works of others; but they are diluted and muddled with other and what we believe pernicious sentiments. Even at that, we cannot get *all* our doctrines, from the literature of others.

So, then, we want books; and not books merely, with clear type, faultless paper, and unexceptionable binding, but books with thoughts in them—not histories only, for if they be the history of forceless things that can produce nothing higher, they are as valueless as other valueless things, but books of such clear insight, sterling thought, and far-seeing comprehensiveness, as to be at the same time both a prophecy and a history. And I believe we have not only the readers to purchase, but the means to publish, and the men to write them. The forces to produce the result are not lacking. It is only their proper conjunction, and the turning of attention in the right direction, that are wanting. We do not need original researches in any new department of science. Agassiz, if we had him, would be of little value to us—only a sort of fifth wheel, more expensive than useful. Nor, for the purpose in view, do we need to make new contributions to any special department of theological inquiry. That would only be a drop in the bucket—appreciable neither for quantity nor distinctive quality. Nor yet do we want some one to introduce among us even the excellent and effective peculiarities of other denominations. That were only to mingle things not possessing inherent affinity—to take them from places where they are efficient because of their affinities and connections, and to put them where they will be dumb idols, because in connection with forces with which they do not and would not naturally and of themselves grow up. The result might be a pretty mosaic—it could not be a living and life-giving force.

But what we do want is a clear eye to distinguish what are the inherent and vital, and not the merely incidental forces of the denomination, and the ability to grasp and mould them into just proportions, and to give them plain and earnest expression—an expression on which faith in their genuineness and power has breathed the life of earnestness and deep conviction. It is, if you please, a want for a living embodiment of Freewill Baptist-ism—not as a sect merely, but as the marshalled array of our scattered elements of force into a systematic and compact form, that they may exert their influence for good upon the world in the most effective manner. No such thing now exists; when it does, and not till that time, we shall have a *denominational* literature—such as we want for ourselves, to give direction and efficiency to our powers, and such as is needed to render our influence upon the world outwardly the most potential.

I do not doubt that if even a fragment of such a literature should present itself to the managers of the Printing establishment, they would be ready to give it as favorable an introduction to the denomination and the world as possible. Nor do I doubt but that ere long they will have some such self-presentations. But you know full well that increased earnestness of demand stimulates supply, and what is sought for is more readily secured than when we wait for it to come without the seeking.

But I do not see how such an effort can be put forth by our Printing Establishment without a considerable increase of its working force. It has done, and is doing, a noble work. Those who have directed it are above praise. But they cannot do all things. Samson and Hercules were personifications of strength, but there were tasks too great for them, which yet might be accomplished by an aggregation of strength. The present work of the establishment absorbs all its strength. Indeed, there are those, as you know, who question if more and more varied strength could not now be profitably employed upon the work already in hand. Where, then, is the superabounding energy for this new and not slightly arduous work? Moreover, it may *be questioned* if any one mind, however active or effective, and

no matter how large a clerical force may be under its direction, can properly inaugurate and carry on so much and so varied operations as the real wants of as large and wide-spread a denomination as ours demand. It may do what it does better and better each successive year; but will it not find itself unable to enlarge its activities beyond a certain point, outside of which there will be other half-developed forces that will not be employed, and undeveloped energies that will not be called into action. Stagnation will ensue, and unemployed capabilities will for a time clamor for occupation, and eventually seek other channels of activity for themselves; and thus there will not only be a failure to do the work, but a loss of the effective strength by which it might have been done. In mercantile life it is rare indeed for any considerable business to be carried on without partnership. The Methodists almost from the start have had two agents in their establishment, and so far from receding from this policy, they have carried it farther, dividing and subdividing the labor, and creating new departments, until, instead of merely two leading minds and positions in the establishment, there are some fifteen or twenty. My point is not, therefore, a complaint of the agency now used—with that I am more than satisfied—but simply a conviction that it ought to be augmented, that additional force ought to be employed, now dormant energies awakened, and unimproved facilities pressed into active service.

But notwithstanding my conviction that but little more can be done by the establishment than has been done, and that it will only jog along pretty much on the present level, without an augmentation of its working force, yet I will not press the point. If the present force can and will do more—I only ask that it be done, and shall rejoice if other men and other strength may be left to other labors. It is not at all a question of men, or of positions, but solely the higher one of efficiency.

Can sufficient patronage be secured for an enlarged list of publications? That is certainly a practical and important question. Judging merely by the success of some of the publications already issued, the prospect would not look so flattering. But let us look at some general facts, lying at the root of

the question. We have over a thousand ministers, and some fifty thousand communicants. Grant that they do not read as much as many others. Yet they do read some. You cannot find a factory girl among us without some books. There is not a parlor table in the denomination that has not several dollars' worth of books upon it. There is not a minister without some kind of a library. And what kind of books are they? They are indeed mostly good books, *but not Freewill Baptist books*. The proportion, in value, of books issued by our establishment is *not so much as one to twenty*. And what is the significance of this? Why, clearly, that the demand for literature among us is at least twenty times as great as the supply from our establishment. "Why, then," you ask, "do they not more extensively purchase the books it does publish?" Obviously, again, *because we do not publish the books our people want*. There is no prejudice against purchasing books from our establishment. On the contrary, there is a strong denominational feeling among us, not at all lacking in confidence toward the establishment, that would *prefer* to patronize it, if it could but supply the books they desire.

It is true that this demand for books is of a more varied character than could at once be supplied by the establishment, and many of the books demanded by it, are not demanded to an extent to justify publication. But our denominationalism—the homogeneousness of thought, action and spirit, that characterize us everywhere, and mark our distinctive life and position among the Christian elements of the world—is a guaranty of a sufficient homogeneousness of demand, among these thousand ministers and fifty thousand members, to find a sale for whatever is fitted to supply it. What is wanting, therefore, is what I have indicated in another connection, books that shall be in themselves a response to the prevailing spirit and wants of the denomination, and shall embody and supply its forces in the most effective manner; and when the establishment shall give them us, we shall be more ready to buy of it than we are or have been of any other source.

But it will not do to wait for the slow growth of denominational literature, before something is done to promote the study

I have described as necessary. The conviction needs to be pressed home upon the attention of every minister, that however desirable a course and place of study may be, that study may still be pursued without them, by every minister, and *must be pursued* by every one who, having them not, would either be successful among the people, or approved of God as a gospel workman. Just how that conviction can be most vividly impressed upon the minds of the eight hundred or more of our ministers who have not and will not enjoy the advantages of colleges and seminaries, or even of the higher academies, I do not know. But I do feel that unless it can be realized, and these ministers shall *study*—shall pursue knowledge and mental discipline through difficulties and into the cornfield, the workshops, and other avocations which many of them follow—pursue it at all hazards, and at whatever cost, until it is secured—until, I say, this is done, there is not much hope of a greatly increased success.

Perhaps something that should bear to ministerial pursuits some such relation as Teachers' Institutes do to teaching, might tend to the necessary result. Let a meeting be arranged, to last several days, and let all the ministry, far and near, make it a point to attend. The course of lectures on Systematic Theology, usually given at New Hampton might—at least a part of them at a time—be given by the professor, who for such a purpose could well be spared for a short time, from his ordinary duties. At another time, the other professor might be called upon. Other individuals—some in and some out of the denomination, and whoever could best dispose of the topic in hand, but none from any source unless master of his subject—could present other and leading topics; while a portion of time could be spent in general discussion. Much would obviously depend upon the judiciousness and forethought of those to whom the getting up of such an affair should be intrusted; but I do not see why something of the kind might not be made useful. The distinctive feature of the plan, over ordinary ministers' conferences, is the engagement of a lecturing force—of the highest ability and largest acquisitions.

In my zeal for the many, I have not forgotten the few that

can enjoy the advantages of the schools. Because they are, and for the present, at least, will be, the few, therefore their attainments should be of the highest order. On them mostly, it will devolve to produce a denominational literature, and they will need the most ample qualifications therefor—qualifications of mind and of heart, of analysis and of synthesis, of insight and of reason, of common sense and of erudition. They are also the standard for the many; and the higher these few go, the higher the many, who will always approximate but never reach them, will go up after them. A course of study for them ought, therefore, to be of a very high order, and they ought, by every possible appliance, to be pressed up to it. It were a sad mistake to graduate the standard of attainment for them by the real or supposed necessities of the many. As they, and not the many, will alone avail themselves of its advantages—however we might desire it to be otherwise—the standard ought to be, not what the many will reach, or can reach, but *the highest point of desirable attainment*. This the few can attain, and ought to be made to attain.

Thus far I have spoken mostly of increasing the forces of the denomination. Yet I mistake or we have already more force than is used in the most effective manner. There is ministerial talent, equal to that which is efficient in other denominations, which is not employed; and there is also material for strength and influence in the churches, which has not been incited forth into the most efficient operation. One marked feature in this direction, is, that there are both good churches wanting ministers, and good ministers wanting employment. Obviously some agency is wanting to bring them together. Can such an agency be devised and set in operation? Our polity will not admit of bishops—in the modern sense—nor of presiding elders, or of anything of the kind, and hence anything which partakes of their prerogatives is inadmissible.

You have very likely observed, in some of our Yearly and Quarterly Meetings, that a committee has been chosen, which is to constitute a kind of agency or bureau of demand and supply—to which both unemployed ministers and unsupplied churches are to report, and which will thus bring complemental wants

into correspondence. Thus far it seems to have worked well. Through this means many ministers have been put into positions of usefulness, and many churches supplied with the means of success. And does not this arrangement contain the germ of an idea, that, put into practical and systematical operation, would both harmonize with our polity, and at the same time arouse and direct a large measure of now dormant energy?

Such an idea would, however, naturally seem to require a still more central agency—to understand and equalize the demand and supply, in all parts of the denomination. It often happens that there is a superabundance of ministerial force in one Quarterly or Yearly Meeting, and a great lack in others. It also is frequently the case that there are ministers whose labors, from purely local causes, are not in demand in one section, who might be eminently useful in another. A central agency for the denomination, without any authority but that of advice, could regulate and equalize such things, and thus give a greatly increased efficiency to the forces already developed among us.

Such an agency, too, would harmonize finely with the operations of our Home Mission Society. Its Corresponding Secretary would naturally be the central committee; and most of the facts necessary for the distribution either of the funds in the different parts of the country, or of any excess any where of ministerial force, or supplying any deficiency, would serve almost equally well for the other purpose; so that the double function would not necessarily require so greatly increased work.

But there is still an additional want that might be met by the same agency. In different parts of the country, there is need of counsel as to the most feasible and influential points for effort to be concentrated upon, and also as to the kind and amount of effort to be expended in a given locality. Promising localities, too, need to be looked out, and energy diverted from the less to the more promising points. I conceive, also, that the erection and character of houses of worship are objects that would not be foreign to such agency, and would prove a channel through which not a little good could be accomplished.

Already—you will permit me to say—the Home Mission Society, and also some of our ministers, on their own responsibility, have accomplished not a little in these directions; particularly at the West. But why may not the matter—without at all curtailing the efforts or the energies of any one acting unofficially—be combined with the work already mentioned.

And then more funds might undoubtedly be secured for these several Home Mission purposes, were there only a sufficient stimulant to call them forth. Something evidently needs to be done to awaken increased interest in this direction; and without instituting a permanent soliciting agency, might not the presence, in different parts of the denomination, of a brother in whom large confidence is placed, to promote at the same time the several homogeneous interests just indicated, bring in a large and rich harvest of results.

Obviously all these interests committed to one person would demand all his energies, and therefore necessitate the increased expense of his support. But would it not be one of those germinant investments that bring back thirty or sixty, if not an hundred fold? Would it not pay almost incalculably well, in the increased activity, confidence and efficiency of our denominational forces? Moreover, not only is the work to be done obvious, but I opine there would be but one voice as to the man to do it. Providence seems in this case to have made a providential conjuncture.

Pardon me for lingering a moment on this point. The recent history of our educational operations has manifested that there were dormant energies and forces among us, that but needed a proper stimulant to call them forth into the most gratifying efficiency. But do you think that the different interests I have adverted to, clustering around the central idea of Home Missions, and involving the occupation, prospects, and success of so many ministers on the one hand, and the permanence, as well as the prosperity of so many churches on the other, do not have as firm a hold upon the denomination as the idea of education? The question is answered in being put. There is no other interest upon which the dormant energies of the denomination can be so easily rallied. Every unemployed minister



would rejoice at it, and many would by it be drawn from serving tables to the Lord's service; every unsupplied church would pray for it, and welcome its agency as a mission of Christian love, that would receive the most grateful return; every struggling outpost, dying for lack of counsel, guidance, and assistance, would hail it as a deliverer, and pour its benedictions upon it; the generous spirit of Home Missions would be inspired with a confidence of efficiency, and would be stimulated to activity by a feeling of assurance that its contributions *would tell*; while the whole body would feel it to be a new element of life, to quicken and invigorate the whole system, by which, therefore, each would receive profit and strength.

Both our polity and our tendencies do not seem to harmonize with the idea of a permanent itinerancy. And still there are many parts of the denomination, where a distribution of ministerial force, that approximates somewhat to an itinerancy, is often thought to be desirable. Indeed, the habits of our fathers, and the present practice in many places, differs from an established itinerancy principally in that they are self-directed—are not subject to an appointing power. In many places, the minister must preach to several churches, or not be supported, and a rotation of localities, if not desirable, is at least very general. Now it is manifest that the Quarterly or Yearly Meeting committee already suggested, by being appointed with sufficient judgment, might do considerable towards stimulating and systematizing itinerant labors in destitute places and among small and weak churches—and probably at the same time do something towards eliciting a more adequate compensation for the labors of the ministry.

If desired by the churches, such an arrangement as has been suggested might be worked into a system of itinerancy. I say, *if desired by the churches*; for no such thing could be very effective without a pretty general co-operation throughout the locality for which it should be adopted. With such co-operation, a committee might arrange a given territory into circuits or stations, another committee could determine the respective fields of labor for the year, and the committee before designated could be a tribunal to arrange all questions arising in the

interim of the conference. Each committee, holding its position only for one conference, or one year—without a new appointment—would feel its immediate responsibility to the churches, and their pro tem. prerogatives could not be regarded as infringing upon our congregational polity, any more than do the prerogatives now exercised without question by important committees.

I have directly spoken more of wants than of forces. But the assertion of the need of larger results necessarily implies a conviction of the existence of forces large enough to produce them. Otherwise proposed operations are mere chimeras—wild in conception and impossible in practice—and such I have not intended to recommend. Hope and expectation preponderate over discouragement and fear. There is a large measure of vital force in the denomination, and notwithstanding wants, I feel assured that upon the whole it is working out good results, with even less mistakes than in the case of many others. After all, the wants I have indicated are only more advanced points in the road we are already travelling. But I must close. I had wished to introduce another topic, but forbear.

Yours in Christ Jesus,

A FREEWILL BAPTIST.

---

#### ART. VI.—THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

“Who in the days of his flesh when he had offered up prayers, and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared.” Heb. 5: 7.

This verse sets forth the sufferings of Christ in as strong a light as perhaps any passage in the word of God, though commentators and Biblical critics have found as much difficulty in satisfactorily explaining it, as perhaps any one passage in the New Testament. The object of this verse, together with the context, seems to be, to show how Christ suffered—and

through his sufferings became eminently qualified for the great work he came to accomplish. The natural inference then is, that sufferings were an important part of the work of atonement. The inquiry then arises, why was it necessary that Christ should pass through such intense sufferings as the passage placed at the head of this article indicate ?

*The necessity of Christ's sufferings.*

It became necessary for Christ to take upon him human nature, in order to make the atonement, as without shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin. Not that we suppose there was any efficacy to atone for sin in simply shedding of blood—but the life of the victim must be offered.

There is no reason to suppose that Christ could not have offered his life for the world without its being attended with such intense sufferings. How many martyrs die without much apparent suffering. It is true Christ died on the cross a most painful death, but he was not on the cross as long as the malefactors with him, or as was common to be before expiring. Pilate was surprised that he died so soon.

But the word of God does teach us that there was necessity of his suffering. "It became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." It was not only necessary that the life of the victim should be sacrificed, but in the case of Christ it became necessary that he should pass through intense suffering, in order that he might know how to sympathize with frail, tempted, suffering humanity. We are to bear in mind, however, that this suffering and experience, which was so eminently designed to qualify him for his great work, was in his human nature. As God he needed no experience, but as man he did.

"Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." Heb. 2: 17, 18.

"For we have not an high-priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities ; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Heb. 4: 15.

Surely here lies the great mystery of godliness—"God was manifest in the flesh"—and has taken upon him our infirmities, and experienced our weaknesses and temptations in his human nature, and knows how to sympathize with us, and succor us in the hour of temptation. It is said of him, "Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered: And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Heb. 5: 8, 9. Or, as Stuart has rendered it—"Although a Son (he) was made acquainted with obedience in a state of suffering. Then, when exalted to glory, he became the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him." That is, he was put to the trial of obedience in the midst of intense suffering, and learned obedience under those circumstances, or was obedient, and thus became fitted to become the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him. His long and intimate acquaintance with human nature, and in its suffering state, too, admirably qualified him for the work of mediation. He can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities. Another important inquiry arises:

*What was the nature of Christ's sufferings?*

His sufferings were not those of a sinner, either in kind or degree. For he was without sin. The sufferings of a sinner must consist of a consciousness of guilt and remorse, and of the displeasure of God, and all holy beings; as well as a fearful foreboding of the future. And further, it cannot be that Christ *endured the displeasure of God against sin*, as is commonly held. For so far as our ideas of justice are concerned, it would be infinitely unjust for God to turn away in displeasure from his Son, while engaged in the great work of human redemption. On the contrary, God expressly declares that he was his "*Beloved Son, in whom he was well pleased.*" That he always looked upon him with pleasure. Then how could he turn away from him in displeasure, or give any appearance of doing so, without being hypocritical?

I know it is said in Isa. 53: 4, "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted." Now this passage does not say that he was "*stricken, smitten of God and afflicted,*"—but

that we esteemed him afflicted of God. This whole chapter most graphically describes the sufferings of Christ. And that he suffered as our sin-offering, or as if he had been a sinner.—That is, he suffered at the hands of wicked men, as though he had been the greatest sinner in the world. Not that God visited his wrath against sin upon him. How could he do this? But he was made a sin-offering—the innocent suffering for the guilty, the same as the innocent lamb suffered in sacrifice for the sins of the people. I know, also, that it is said in Isa. 53: 10, “Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou should make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.” Now Barnes has rendered this, “Yet Jehovah was pleased with his being crushed by affliction.” This makes it harmonize with the whole chapter in which it is found, and shows how Christ suffered at the hands of the wicked, and that God was pleased with his sufferings, because he saw that it was necessary that he should pass through great sufferings in making the atonement, and to qualify him to become our Mediator. The Father was pleased with his sufferings; not because he delighted in sufferings, or was displeased with his Son, but because his only Son *voluntarily* submitted himself to such sufferings to save the guilty. His sufferings were those of a holy being, voluntarily submitted to for benevolent purposes. “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye are healed.” 1 Pet. 2: 24. This is in perfect keeping with Isa. 53, or rather refers to it. Again it is said—“Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” Gal. 3: 13. This passage refers to Deut. 21: 23, “His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day, for he that is hanged is accursed of God.” 2 Cor. 5: 21, “For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” This is the strongest passage which can be adduced to prove the doctrine of imputation, *i. e.*, that Christ was *guilty* by impu-

tation of our sins, and that we are made holy by Christ's righteousness being imputed to us. Luther held that Christ by imputation became the greatest sinner in the universe. Now this very passage under consideration, and which is adduced to prove that God imputed all the sins of the world to Christ, and then manifested his wrath upon him—says that he (Christ) "*knew no sin,*" *i. e.*, that he was not a sinner in any sense, and consequently he was in *no sense guilty*. For no one is guilty who is not personally a transgressor of the law. If Christ was in any sense *guilty*, he deserved to die, and hence his death and sufferings could make no atonement for the sins of others. But the best critics now generally agree that this passage means that he was made a sin-offering for us. Or, as Bloomfield paraphrases it—"For he hath made him to be a sacrifice by which he *expiates* our transgressions." We will now inquire into

*The extent or amount of Christ's sufferings.*

This, of course, is what we can never fully know, or comprehend. We can only approximate towards a just estimate of the amount of his sufferings. We have good reasons for believing that he did not suffer the penalty due the sinner, or the elect, as some hold it. For he must then have suffered an eternal punishment, multiplied by the whole number of sinners—which would have been impossible, as Christ suffered only a limited time. In reply, it is contended that he being infinite, could suffer as much as an indefinite number of finite beings would eternally suffer. But this is overlooking the great design of the atonement, which is evidently to save suffering; but if Christ has suffered as much as all mankind would have suffered had there been no atonement made, then there has been no saving in suffering—but, on the other hand, there has been a vast amount more of suffering in consequence of it, as Christ suffered an equivalent for all, if all were saved—but as all will not be saved, there must be suffering twice over for all the lost. Or if, on the other hand, it be contended by those who advocate this view of the sufferings of Christ, that he suffered only for the elect, then why are we taught that they (the elect) must be pardoned in order to be saved. This would be making the

prisoner, or his substitute, suffer out the penalty of his crimes, and then receive pardon. Or if Christ obeyed for us, and his obedience be imputed to us, then why does it require our obedience on pain of eternal death?

*How the sufferings of Christ constitute the atonement.*

His sufferings were *vicarious, i. e.*, voluntarily *substituted* in the place of the sinner. As his sufferings were in no way deserved by him, they must have been by substitution in the place of the sinner—and if not voluntarily, they must have been unjust. The Bible every where represents Christ as suffering for us. See Isa. 55. God accepted the sufferings of Christ as satisfaction to *public justice*. We are ever to bear in mind that substitution and imputation are very different things. On the one hand, he who was perfectly innocent, by a voluntary substitution of himself, is treated *as if* he were guilty; that is, subjected to all the sorrows, and sufferings, and death, which, if he were guilty, would be a proper punishment for sin. And on the other hand, they who *are guilty*, and deserving of the wrath of God, and eternal death, are on account of his vicarious, or substituted sufferings, on repentance of their sins, and faith in Christ, are treated *as if* they had never committed sin. The whole plan is therefore that of substitution—the innocent voluntarily suffering for the guilty. There is no injustice in this, but on the other hand, infinite love and compassion are manifested.

This principle is often acted upon in human governments. For the sake of Christ we are treated with forbearance and compassion. Without him, God could only manifest his utter abhorrence of sin, by punishing the sinner according to his deserts. Out of Christ God is a consuming fire. How could he be otherwise without winking at iniquity? Then we are ever to bear in mind that for the wonderful work of love Christ has performed, we are permitted to share the divine favor, and to be treated as righteous, and deserving of God's favor. This principle is very simple, and easy to be understood—and one that is every day acted upon in human society. Persons are treated with consideration, not on account of any merit of their own, but because they are the children, or relatives, or friends,

of some distinguished and worthy person, and for their sake many others are treated with great respect. And often very unworthy persons receive great kindness because they sustain certain relations to others whose worth is known. Governments often act upon this principle, in bestowing appointments upon the children or relatives of those who have performed some important public service. This is on a very different principle from that of imputing the worthy deeds of the distinguished parent to his children. This idea does not enter into the account. There must of course be some regard to the qualifications of the person. But the great reasons for doing it is because they can safely do it, and at the same time show their gratitude to the person who has conferred so great favor upon the public. Now Christ by his suffering and death has satisfied public justice in the case of condemned sinners; and conferred an infinite favor upon the government of God, by showing the nature of his moral government, and the real character of the ruler of the universe, so that God can safely for his sake show mercy to sinners. Hence in all our prayers or petitions to God, we say for *Jesus' sake*. Let it magnify him, because we know that God delights to hear prayer, and grant favors for the sake of his dear Son.

*What sufferings in particular Christ feared, and was delivered from.*

This involves one of the most interesting and perhaps most difficult questions in all the range of Biblical Theology.

We have seen, from what has been said, something of the nature of Christ's sufferings in general—but here we are called to consider what the particular sufferings were which he so much feared. It was so intense that it called forth "prayers, and supplications, with strong crying and tears, to him who was able to save from death, and was heard in that he feared"—or as Prof. Stuart renders it—"was delivered from that in which he feared." Some Biblical critics adopt the marginal reading "was heard for, or on account of his piety." Tindol translated it—"Because he had God in reverence." Whiby—"Was delivered from his fear." Luther, "And was heard for that he had God in reverence." Beza, "His prayers being heard, he was



delivered from fear." But Stuart, who has evidently thoroughly examined it, rejects them all. And in his *excursus* on this passage found in his commentary on Hebrews, his exegesis may be found on this verse. I will give his *excursus* on this passage, as it may not be accessible to all who may read this. *Excursus* 11. "But what was that which Christ feared? And how can it be said that he was delivered from it? Questions which commentators, for the most part, passed by without any serious attempt to answer them. If, now, we turn to Luke 12: 50, we shall see that a view of sufferings then future, produced in the mind of Jesus an oppressive anticipation, a sensation of distress and dread. As the scene of crucifixion approached nearer, these sensations were evidently increased, until they became almost overwhelming; as we may see by consulting Matt. 26: 36—39, Luke 22: 40—44, Mark 16: 34—36. What the agonies of the cross, which Jesus endured actually were, we can never fully know; but we may draw the conclusion that they were very dreadful, if we read the account of the complaint which they forced from him, as it is recorded in Matt. 27: 36, Mark 15: 34. It is, indeed, unaccountable that a character such as that of Jesus, pure, spotless, firm, unmoved by opposition, and contumely, and persecution, and unawed by threatenings and dangers, during the whole course of his public ministry, should exhibit such despondency, such an oppressive, overwhelming sense of pain and distress: I mean it is unaccountable by any of the ordinary principles which apply to virtuous sufferers, who possess fortitude of soul. That Jesus possessed this quality in a most distinguished manner, we know certainly, from the whole tenor of his life as portrayed by the evangelists. How then could he exhibit such an overwhelming sense of dread at the prospect of crucifixion? Thousands of men, nay, thousands of the more delicate sex, in prospect of like sufferings, or apparently greater ones, (such as the rack, the wheel, or flames, occasion,) have been perfectly calm, collected, and even triumphant. The very thieves on the cross, at the same time with Jesus, exhibit no such signs of desponding and oppression. Thousands and millions of common men, without God and without hope in the world, have undergone sufferings greater than

those of simple crucifixion, without even uttering a groan. Yet Jesus was not only supported by a consciousness of spotless innocence, but had before him the certain prospect of a speedy resurrection from the dead, of exaltation to the right hand of God, and of being a King and a High Priest for ever, unto all his people. Still, he was in such an agony at the prospect of the cross, as to sweat, as it were, drops of blood Luke 22 : 44. And when actually enduring the suffering which he had anticipated, his exclamation, Matt. 27 : 46, shows that he had not overestimated the dreadful hour. If Jesus died as a common, virtuous sufferer, and merely as a martyr to the truth, without any *vica-rious* suffering laid upon him, then is his death a most unaccountable event, in respect to the manner of his behavior while suffering it, and it must be admitted that multitudes of humble, sinful, weak, and very imperfect disciples of Christianity, have surpassed their Master in the fortitude, and collected firmness, and calm complacency, which are requisite to triumph over the pangs of a dying hour. But who can well believe this? Or who can regard Jesus as a simple sufferer in the ordinary way, upon the cross, and explain the mysteries of his dreadful horror before, and during the hours of crucifixion.

Such, then, was the *εὐλαβεία*, *object of dread*, to which our text adverts. But how was Jesus *εἰσακουσθεῖς*, delivered from it? Pierce, in his commentary, says that he was delivered by being raised from the dead, and advanced to glory. But this would make the object of fear or dread to be, that he should remain in the state of the dead. This fear we can hardly suppose Jesus to have entertained, in as much as he had often foretold, to his disciples, not only his death, but his resurrection, and exaltation to glory. Nor could it be the sufferings of the cross that he was delivered from, for he endured them to a dreadful degree. What, then, was it, in respect to which he was *εἰσακουσθεῖς*, *heard or delivered*. The context necessarily limits the *hearing*, or *deliverance* to something in his petitions which appertained to his *suffering*; which was an object of *dread*. What could it be, but the dread of sinking under the agony of being deserted by his Father? Matt. 27 : 46. Great as his agony was, he never refused to bear it; nor did he shrink from

tasting the bitter cup, Luke 22: 42, Matt. 26: 39. And does not Luke 22: 43, explain our εἰσακουθεῖς ἀπὸ εὐλαβείας? "Then appeared unto him an angel from heaven *strengthening him, ενισχυων αυτον.*" This was the only kind of deliverance he sought for, or on the whole, desired; Luke 22: 42, *πλην μη το θελημα μου αλλα το σοννεσθω.* The dread in question was, like all his other sufferings, incident to his human nature, but he did not shrink from it, and so he was *heard, or delivered,* in respect to the object of his petition in regard to it. In the explanation of a passage so difficult, confidence would be unbecoming. I can only say, if this be not the right interpretation of it, I am ignorant of its true meaning, and will most thankfully receive from any one a more probable interpretation." Stuart's view then is, *that he feared sinking under the agony of being forsaken, or deserted by his Father.* Now let us inquire whether we have sufficient reason for believing this to be the right exegesis of it. It would seem that Matt. 27: 46, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" indicated that he was forsaken by the Father—but why should he fear sinking under it? unless he endured the wrath of God, as many hold? But was he not conscious that he was the favorite of his Father? and had he not testified that he was well pleased with him. And does he not say in Jno. 11: 42—"I know that thou hearest me always." Was he not always conscious of being innocent, and consequently undeserving of suffering the displeasure of his Father? that his sufferings were vicarious and voluntary? Why then should the Father turn away from him in displeasure? It may seem irreverent in us to make this inquiry! Have we not, at least, some reason to think that the cup which he feared, and prayed to be delivered from, was not so much the fear of the hiding of the Father's face, or sinking under it, as it was the fear of the *powers of darkness*; or the devil and all the hosts combined against him. That Christ was about to have his final and most desperate struggle with the devil, seems more than indicated. What else could he mean in Luke 22: 53, "But this is your hour, and the *power of darkness.*" Bloomfield, in his critical notes on this passage, admits that "This is the time destined, and permitted by God, and this is the power of iniquity, *i. e.,*

iniquity, has obtained this power. \* \* \* It should seem that *ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοτοῦς* (*the power of darkness*) is, as it were, a *personification* of the *Prince* of darkness, the devil. (Eph. 2: 2.) And so Eph. 6: 12, *πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοιμωκρατοράς τοῦ σκοτοῦς*. Indeed, *ἐξουσία* is often used for *ἀρχών*, see Rom. 13: 1, 1 Cor. 15: 24, Eph. 1: 21, 3: 10. Thus the complete sense is, "This is the time when the power to destroy me is granted you by the providence of God; and in which the power or Prince of darkness is permitted to exercise his rage against me." The devil made his first effort upon the Son of God in the wilderness; which he continued forty days and nights—and was so severe then that he eat nothing, neither hungered during the whole time—for it is said that, "when they were ended, he afterward hungered." Luke 4: 2. We are told in Luke 4: 13, "And when the devil had ended all the temptations, he departed from him *for a season*," plainly indicating that he was to return and make another effort. And the return of satan, and the awful scene which was to follow, was evidently anticipated by Christ. He often conversed with his disciples about it. He said to them, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, how am I straightened till it be accomplished." Does this not indicate that he looked forward with dread to that hour when the powers of darkness should be combined, and the last mighty struggle be made to overcome him. Christ knew his foe; he had met him before. But satan evidently had not tried his utmost, or he would not have come again. In Jno. 12: 31—33, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me, (this he said, signifying what death he should die.)" Showing plainly that the casting out of the prince of this world, was to be connected with the cross: or at the time of his death. And further on he says, in chapter 14: 30, "Hereafter I will not talk much with you, for the *prince of this world cometh*, and hath nothing in me." The context of this passage, shows that he was speaking of his departure and return to his Father. Satan had the plotting and execution of his crucifixion. "He entered into Judas," Luke 22: 3. We are distinctly told that, as the dreadful

agony in the garden was coming upon him, he warned his disciples of danger, and besought them to watch and pray with him. Matt. 26: 36—45. Luke 22: 39—45. "Then saith he unto them, my soul is *exceedingly* sorrowful, even unto *death*." By his *soul* we are to understand his human nature, in which he suffered. This was the strongest language he could use—he was sorrowful even unto death. Evidently, here is where his last and fearful struggle commenced, in the garden, and ended on the cross.

And is it not most wonderful to tell, that he who could command twelve legions of angels to his assistance—is now in weakness, and agony, and apparently alone, for an angel comes in love, and sympathy, to sustain him under the crushing weight of his burden. O! the man of sorrows!—and who was acquainted with grief. It is impossible for us to know what this form of temptation was—but we know that it must have been most fearful, yea, terrible beyond description. The apostle must refer to this scene when he says, "Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers, and supplications with *strong crying*, and *tears*, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was delivered from that which he feared." The words rendered, *strong crying*, *καταγρησεν εν χυδα*, means *strong*, *mighty*, *powerful*, *vehement*. Rob. Gr. Lex. What a scene is here presented, and what an illustration this gives us of the great power of satan. And what a desperate effort he made to overcome and crush the Son of God. No doubt his aim was to lead him to sin, and blaspheme the name of God. Satan very well knew that if he could plunge him into sin, the work of the atonement would be forever at an end—and he would be left to maraud at large, as formerly. His efforts with Christ in the wilderness were to lead him into presumption and sin. See how wily, and subtilly, and perseveringly, he tried to effect his object. Indeed, the whole transaction as recorded in Matt. 4: 1—11, is most awful and mysterious—showing that satan was determined on success, and to make Christ his prey.

Of course satan must be finite, and limited, as there can be but one infinite being, and as no created being can ever reach the infinite. But if there could be any medium ground be-

tween the finite and infinite, we should think that satan must occupy it. He is said to have the power of death—"That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil." Heb. 2: 14. What power satan may have in inflicting death, we know not. It is certain that it is a part of his dark work, and was by him introduced into the world—and what a world of misery and death has been produced by him. And he very well knew that, "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil"—to break the power of his rule, and despoil him of his prey. But satan did not intend to yield—at least without first measuring swords with Christ, and trying his strength. He who was acknowledged as the prince of this world, as well as of darkness—and who had legions at his command; was not disposed to yield the field, and acknowledge Christ as the rightful ruler, until he was compelled to.

It is an interesting inquiry—why satan was permitted to thus afflict the Son of God, and why the Father seems to have left him, as it were, in the hands of satan for a time? For aught we know, it may have been for the same or similar reasons that he was permitted to afflict Job—to give him an opportunity to do his utmost, and then be compelled to retire from the field vanquished; and to acknowledge his inability, and the power of the Son of God. He was permitted to rob Job of everything but his bare life, and confidence in God—and then be compelled to acknowledge that there was none like Job, in all the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feared God, and escheweth evil, and still he holdeth fast his integrity." Job, while in the hands of satan, and passing under the cloud, and hiding of God's face, was led to cry out, similar to what the Son of God did when he exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me." He (Job) exclaimed, "God hath delivered me to the ungodly, and turned me over into the hands of the wicked, I was at ease, but he hath broken me asunder; he hath also taken me by the neck, and shaken me to pieces, and set me up for his mark." "Know now that God hath overthrown me, and compassed me with his net." Our heavenly Father had a wise end to secure in allowing satan to thus af-

fict Job—he was to be an example to the world, and thousands were to be encouraged by his example to trust in God in the midst of the deepest adversity. So we are led to think that in the great work of the atonement, it was necessary that Christ should be thus left to the buffetings of satan, that he might know how to succor the tempted, *i. e.*, be a perfect Savior. “It became him”—that is, it was necessary to fit him for his great work. This may appear a great mystery to all who do not understand the great object to be secured by it. They wonder why the Son of God should be left to suffer so much. And is it any marvel, that it should be a mystery to mankind, when angels desired to look into it. The selfish world does not understand the sufferings of Christ—especially the heathen world does not. The Jews, with all the prophecies pointing to him, and describing his sufferings—in their hands, and read by them every Sabbath day—did not understand why the Messiah should suffer. And many of them took his sufferings as evidence that he was not the Son of God. The Mohamētans, at least many of them, regard his sufferings and poverty as evidence that he was not the Son of God. Said a munshee (Mussleman pundit) to me, “Why did Christ suffer? if he was the Son of God, as you say, why did he not come as the son of a king, then we should believe that he was the Son of God.” At the cross, the Jews said, “If thou be the Son of God, come down, and we will believe on thee”—but when the earth did quake, and the rocks rent, and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose, and come out of their graves, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God.”

In conclusion, we say, since we have such a formidable enemy as satan, who is capable of afflicting us most severely, and at whose hands we need expect no mercy—what a source of unspeakable joy it should be to us, that we have such a friend as Christ, who has triumphed over satan, and will by and by drive him from the earth, and shut him up in the prison-house of the universe—and he has also triumphed over death, having entered his dark domains, and conquered him, and risen from the dead. And further, he has had experience in sufferings,

and temptations, which have eminently fitted him to sympathize with and succor all who are tempted—

“ He knows what sore temptations mean,  
For he has felt the same.”

---

ART. VII.—COMMON SCHOOLS IN NEW ENGLAND.\*

It is not necessary at the present day to shew the importance of, or to advocate the extension of education; for all now admit the necessity for it, and even absolute monarchies, such as Austria and Prussia, have their national systems of education, by which they make provision for its universal diffusion in their respective countries. There is still, however, much difference of opinion as to what constitutes education, and what are the results to be sought in connection therewith. It would seem that in the countries already referred to, the design is to diffuse a certain amount of knowledge, and to secure obedient and willing subjects. In this country, the aim appears to be, to train the rising generation to be intelligent, virtuous, and patriotic; and while there is no provision in our common schools for a *religious* education, yet by causing the Bible to be read in all of them, the distinct idea is conveyed that the education shall be based on the principles of that book, and therefore have a religious direction.

There is danger, however, that we rest satisfied with the admission of an important principle, and with the supposition

\* SECOND ANNUAL REPORT of the Superintendent of Common Schools of the State of Maine. 1855. Augusta. pp. 60, 162.

NINETEENTH ANNUAL REPORT of the Board of Education, (Massachusetts,) together with the Nineteenth Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board. Boston: 1856 pp. 80, 148, 100.

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT upon the Common Schools of New Hampshire; the same being the Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education. June, 1856. Concord: pp. 96, 296.



that we have a good State system of common schools which is certain to produce its desired results; forgetting that in order to the proper working of any machinery, there must be constant supervision; and that in education, as well as other things, improvements may be constantly made.

The Reports before us are interesting and instructive, and suggest much matter for profitable reflection. We think that no parent can read them without feeling ashamed that he has not taken more interest in the school which his children attend; no teacher without seeing many things in which he can improve his mode of instruction; no member of a town or district committee without gaining many valuable hints for the proper discharge of his duties; and no friend of education without being encouraged with the past, and stimulated to greater efforts for the future.

One of the prominent features in the Massachusetts volume is the Report of the late Secretary of the Board of Education, Rev. Barnas Sears, D. D., now the President of Brown University. He had in the previous year given a review of the six years during which he had been connected with the Board, and states it as an obvious conclusion that "a great advance has been made in our means of education." He regarded the six years as "a period of *growth* rather than of invention, of the application of principles, rather than of discovery." Among the things in which there had been "advance," he names: the settlement of the question as to the relation of common school education to religion—the bringing the mass of the people to a juster appreciation of the inestimable value of a high order of public schools—an increase in the number of well-qualified teachers—the abandonment in many towns of the system of hiring teachers by Prudential Committees, and devolving that duty upon the Town Committees—an increase in the number of Graded Schools, and High Schools—and especially the increased liberality in sustaining schools.

This being the course pursued by Dr. Sears in his former report, he very fitly supplements it in the one under review by pointing out such defects, and suggesting such improvements as are not already suggested in former reports. As we think that

every friend of education, while thankful for what has been already accomplished, should seek to improve our schools to the utmost extent, and as most of the defects pointed out in this, are referred to in the reports of the other States, we take a brief survey of them. The first to which attention is directed is the frequent striving after rapid progress, the attempt to secure great results in a single term of twelve or fifteen weeks, instead of laying the foundations deep and broad. It is urged that while "the show made at the close of a term is well enough to amuse children and their fond parents," this "frost work of the school-room is soon dissolved, and generally passes away with the occasion."

The danger of overlooking the limitations of the teacher's power is next referred to. It is shown that the teacher has to do with mind not marble, and that however great his power, and however skilful he may be in the use of it, there may be under-currents in the minds of his pupils which, unobserved by him, may lead to results wholly unlooked for. It is shown further that the peculiar temperament and character of the teacher himself may limit his power, and as few would come up to our ideal views of what a teacher should be, we must beware of expecting too much. But the greatest obstruction to the teacher's success is asserted to be in the home and social influences, by which children of the present day are surrounded. Among these are named the increase of wealth and luxury; the presence among us of a foreign race of men, some of them ignorant and profane, and others more intelligent and refined, yet treating the Sabbath as a day of amusement, and religion with levity and disrespect. Another of these adverse influences referred to, is the rush of the young from the country to the cities and villages; and still again, the contaminating influence often exerted by the company into which children are thrown, either during their absence from school, or after they leave it, and lastly, the equivocal character of much of the reading, and of the public amusements in which the children of the present age share with others, is spoken of as injurious. With reference to newspapers it is said, the angry quarrels of editors and the bitterness of political controversy must have an injurious influ-

ence, while "many of the short, spicy paragraphs are addressed to the sensual passions, in language and tone so lascivious that no pure minded father could read them in the presence of his family." Reference is also made to much of the lighter literature and the popular amusements, which must be adapted to low and vulgar tastes in order to attract the multitude and be made profitable. In view of all these facts, Dr. Sears thinks it is not surprising that teachers do not accomplish all that is sometimes expected of them.

A word here on some of these topics. We have seen the deleterious influence exerted by the kind of reading referred to, in the thirst manifested for a further supply, and the distaste created for reading of a more solid and useful character, and we have mourned that there were so few public amusements of unexceptionable character. A few years ago, it was announced in the very small country village in which we resided, that a large bear from California, and some other animals, would be exhibited. Here we thought the children might safely go, and be amused and instructed, but on accompanying them to the exhibition we found that we had unwittingly exposed them to the hearing of boisterous music, and rude and indecent songs. We have since resided in a large manufacturing village, where public exhibitions are common, and were obliged to keep away from the most of them. When, however, it was announced that a panorama of the North River, New York, and some mechanical figures would be exhibited, we thought this would prove safe for the children, but on the return of our son, who was permitted to attend, we learned that songs and language of a *very* questionable character had been introduced here also. We are glad that Dr. Sears has raised his voice against these evils, and only regret that being in the pages of a report, very few are likely to read, and receive the benefit thereof. We think it time for all parents, and especially all Christian parents, to begin seriously to inquire into the character of the associates of their children, of the books and papers they read, and of the amusements they attend.

Large portions of the volumes before us, and especially of those from Massachusetts and New Hampshire, are occupied

with abstracts of the reports from the Town School Committees. These treat on numerous subjects, and are richly freighted with valuable suggestions and records of experience from many minds. One of the most prominent topics in those from Massachusetts, is the question, Who should engage the school teachers? We believe the usual plan in all the N. England States has been for the prudential committee of each district to do this. A large number of town committees in Massachusetts unite in condemning this mode, speaking of it as embarrassing to them, and detrimental to the best interests of the schools, and to the teachers themselves. They urge that prudential committees are frequently selected, not with reference to their qualifications for the office, but because of an understanding that this unpaid office must be held by some one, and it has become the *turn* of the person selected to serve in that office; that persons accepting the office have frequently a brother, sister, nephew, niece or cousin, if not a son or daughter, to whom they offer the school, not on account of their fitness, but because the patronage belongs to them for the time being; that even where this is not the case, they have not usually the general acquaintance with teachers which would enable them to select those best qualified for their particular school. Is it asserted that these difficulties are met by the fact that the question of approval or disapproval still rests with the town committee; they reply that the teacher being first hired by the prudential committee with the expectation that he or she is competent, and there being often a family interest in the matter, they are naturally unwilling to reject without the strongest reasons for so doing; that the difficulty is increased by the fact that teachers so engaged frequently present themselves on the day before, or on the morning on which the school is to commence, after it is known in the neighborhood that they are to teach; and sometimes they actually keep school a number of days before presenting themselves for examination. In such circumstances, the granting of certificates to incompetent teachers is only the least of two evils, for to reject them would be to expose them to disgrace, would annoy the committee who had made the engagement, create parties in the district, and break up the school

for the time, and perhaps for the term, and even if all these evils did not occur, still, at that late period there might be no opportunity to secure a better teacher.

It is further urged that many who are not qualified for the particular school for which they present themselves, might with advantage be appointed to other schools in the same town, if the town Committee had the power of selection and appointment, and that while on the present plan the question has to be decided with each individual, if the power were with the committee they might appoint a day previous to the commencement of each term for a general examination, when they would have the opportunity of selecting the best qualified teachers from among those who presented themselves, and appoint them with especial reference to their adaptation to the different schools, while at the same time they would have a reserve list from which to fill vacancies. With reference to the objection that it would be undemocratic, they urge that as the town pays the teachers, it has the right, through its own agents, to appoint them.

In the reports for Maine and New Hampshire, the evils just referred to have a large share of attention, and the same remedy is suggested in both reports, but in that for New Hampshire, more especial stress is laid upon the duty of choosing the right man for the office of "Prudential Committee," and the absolute necessity for those holding that office to discharge it wisely and well; for the general good, and not to meet any personal or selfish ends.

Closely connected with the foregoing is the recommendation of a large number of the committees in Massachusetts and of some in the other States to abolish the district system altogether, and let the town committee arrange the schools with reference to the real wants of the town. In this way, it is said, there would be a better opportunity of grading the schools which is spoken of as a matter of great importance, and many small schools could be united with others, and the general facilities for education be increased. On the question of "small schools" there are some curious particulars. The report from Coleraine, Mass., states that one of the summer schools would not probably number more than three scholars, and two or

three others would not probably embrace more than five or six each, and the report for the previous year from the same town stated that "in one school during the summer term the average attendance was three, in another seven, in another eight. For the winter, the average in each of these schools was nine, while in yet another district we find but three pupils." In the report from Hinsdale, Mass., 1853—4, it was stated that one school numbered but six during the winter, and that the school of four months cost \$59,25, or nearly \$10,00 per scholar. In the same year, the New Marlboro', Mass., committee report, that one district expended during the year about \$60. on an average school of 4 4-7 scholars, making the cost 13,12 1-2 for each scholar. On this subject, the Orford, N. H., committee, say, "To teach three or four scholars is a dull business. How is it possible for a teacher to be enthusiastic or animated, for six long hours, shut up in a gloomy school-room with three or four, or even six, weary scholars?"

The grading of schools has been already referred to as important, and this is urged in each of the State reports before us. It is thought that in this way children of similar standing and studies would be brought together, and might thus help each other, while the teacher having fewer classes might devote himself more fully to the advancement of his pupils. The Roy-alton, Mass., report says, "There are few schools in town that do not have more classes than scholars. As near as we can now ascertain, the average recitations, per day, during the last winter, have been between twenty-five and thirty. Several schools, numbering only about twenty scholars, had over thirty recitations. We will call the average twenty-five,—which, however, is too small. This gives fourteen and two-fifths minutes for each recitation, allowing for no recess, and no interruptions whatever, during the six school hours of the day."

Another question which we regard as of great importance is, the evils of a frequent change of teachers. This arises partly from the fact, that as a new prudential committee is chosen every year, each one chooses to exercise his prerogative of hiring a new teacher; but we think it also arises from the habit of the thing, and from the neglect of parents to examine for

themselves the qualifications of the teacher, and taking instead the hastily formed or selfish opinions of their children. But from whatever cause it may arise, the system is a common one. One of the Massachusetts reports says, "We believe that the last three years does not furnish us with but one instance where the same teacher has continued for two successive terms in the same district." This system is very detrimental to the advancement of education. The new teacher comes into the school quite unacquainted with the character and acquirements of his scholars, while he at the same time appears awkward and strange to them. In the meantime, he has either to allow the scholars to arrange themselves in classes, and take what studies they please, or he has to guess at the position in which it is best for him to place them, and half his term has usually expired before he has prepared to set about the work of education in earnest. The next term another teacher comes in to go through the same process, or perhaps to avoid trouble he has all the scholars commence their text books, to get by the end of the term as far as they went in the preceding one. Furthermore, the teachers do not expect to remain, and hence there is no inducement for them to lay broad foundations, but rather to fit the scholars for a shining examination, which proves to be no test of real progress. On this subject the Massachusetts report justly observes, "If the principle of change which has prevailed in our common schools were applied to other concerns, we should at once see its mischievous influence. What if writers in banks and insurance offices, merchants' clerks, preceptors in academies, professors in colleges, gave way every six months to new incumbents of their offices?—would nearly as much useful work ensue as at present?" The New Hampshire report very pertinently says, "It is a plain dictate of common sense, therefore, to retain the services of a good teacher as long as possible in the same school. The period of childhood is too brief, the time of our children too precious, to have any of it wasted by an unnecessary change."

Another subject of great importance is the deficiency of moral training in our schools. Dr. Sears thinks there are greater defects in the moral than in the intellectual training of the

young, and that because it is either neglected or treated in a desultory manner. None but persons of moral earnestness, who study their own hearts, ought to be selected for the responsible office of teacher, because "the mind that is to infuse moral life into others, must itself have great vitality, must abound in all the elements of positive goodness." The New Hampshire report also refers to this, and says, "The boy who utters obscene or profane language, and who will not be reclaimed from the vile habit by reasonable measures, should be excluded from the school without delay or misgiving. The safety of the school demands his expulsion, just as the safety of the body requires the amputation of a mortified limb."

Numerous other subjects are discussed, as, The advantages of Normal Schools and Teachers' Institutes—the necessity of a good supply of proper school apparatus—the comparative merits of male and female teachers—whether young children should spend as much time in school as older ones—the neglect of parents to show a proper interest in the schools—irregularity and want of punctuality in the attendance of the children—the need of improvement in the character and condition of many school houses—the evil of allowing party spirit to influence in the selection of school officers, &c., &c. But we have not room to go into these.

The tables in the Massachusetts and Maine Reports are very full, and those in that of New Hampshire contain considerable information. We have found a comparison of them a profitable and interesting study, but we have only room to give a few of the general returns from the several States.

	Maine.	Mass.	N. Hamp.
No. of towns in the State,	384	331	298
“ Inhabitants in the State, 1850,	577,502	994,514	317,976
Valuation of property,	\$96,269,231	\$597,936,995	
No. of school districts,	3965		2276
No. of Public Schools,		4215	
No. of children between 4 and 21,	236,248		
No. of persons between 5 and 15,	236,248	213,934	
No. of scholars in Summer Schools,	123,641	189,997	58,203
Average attendance,	91,894	143,973	48,712
No. of scholars in Winter Schools,	142,220	202,709	67,103
Average attendance,	100,560	157,657	56,970
Mean average in Summer and Winter,	96,927	150,815	52,341
No. of male teachers,	2,559	1809	1,077
No. of female teachers,	4,137	5,325	3,042
	Exclusive of board	Including do.	Exclusive do.
Average wages of male teachers per month,	\$20.57	\$41.45	\$18.45
“ “ “ Female “	\$8.14	\$17.29	\$3.42
Average length of schools in the year,	18 9-10 weeks	7 1-2 months	20 6-10 weeks
Amount raised in towns for support of schools,	\$333,019.76	\$1,137,407.76	\$213,346.17
Amount required by law,	\$281,148.00	1	\$300,000.00



Amount paid for State funds,	\$54,398.96	\$58,102.71	\$23,348.33
No. of school houses built during the year,	128		49
Cost of these,	\$62,808.00		
Highest am't per child raised by any town in the States	\$4.08	\$18.48	
Lowest do	36 cents	\$1.50	
Average do	\$1.36	\$5.32	
No. of towns that have raised more than \$3. per scholar	3	244	
No. of towns that have raised less than \$1. per scholar,	22		

Here we leave the subject. We think we have said enough to show that while in our New England system of education we have very much to be thankful for, it is yet capable of much improvement, and it is for us to seek to make what improvements we can, and thus increase its efficiency. Above all things, let us hold to the Bible, and never consent to any system which is not in accordance with the teachings of that book, nor allow it on any consideration whatever to be excluded from our schools.

---

#### ART. VIII.—THE SEA AND ITS TEACHING.\*

The sea has always been an object of attention since the first wave of emigration broke upon its shore. Its vastness has made it the symbol of the Infinite; its ebb and flow have suggested to the poet the pulsations of the Living Universe; its billows have personified the terrors of Power; its products have made it to be blessed for its beneficence; while trade and luxury have grown rich and corpulent in the possessions it has granted. It separates and unites nations; distant peoples clasp hands in amity on its highway; ambitious and selfish princes select it as a theatre whereon to test their prowess; and Christian philanthropy crosses and re-crosses it on its God-like errands, Misanthropes, sick of life, seek oblivion in its caverns; and invalids, dreading the grave, crowd around to


\* The Physical Geography of the Sea. By M. F. Maury, LL. D., Lieut. U. S. Navy. Third edition, enlarged and improved. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1855. 1 Vol. 800 pp. 287.

woo the vigor which dwells in its breath. The same wave tosses up a fractured spar, the sight of which unmans the sternest seaman, and lays at the feet of a gentle woman a sprig of sea-moss, or a delicately-tinted shell, which ministers to the love of the beautiful deeper than the heart ever knew till now.

Such is the sea. But its meaning and its mission are not yet wholly fathomed. Of its many, and great, and varied uses in the economy of nature, there is much yet to be learned. Of the broad and complex relations it sustains, few of its observers have dreamed. Of the great laws which it is obeying even in its most fitful moods, and which it reveals in the most monotonous of its aspects, not many of those who have always dwelt by its side, have had any just apprehension. It is a department of study which few philosophers have explored. It is only recently that its phenomena have been classified, its movements comprehended, and its influence widely traced out.

This volume of Lieutenant Maury's will seem to many like the opening of a new apartment of science. It appears almost unheralded; it is marked quite as much with modesty as with scientific enthusiasm and independent thought. It is not, to be sure, his first contribution to science and to navigation; he does not write a name on the title page hitherto entirely unknown; but the real ability of the author has never been generally understood as this work will render it. We know of no man in this country who has recently seemed to come forth quietly and take his place among the devoted and honored brotherhood of science, in a manner so similar to that of Hugh Miller in Scotland. We have no fear that his welcome in the New World will be any less cordial than was that which greeted the author of the "Old Red Sandstone."

The style of Lieutenant Maury is picturesque enough to please a poet, and yet exact enough for the commendation of a metaphysician. His metaphors increase his clearness, and his illustrations simplify abstruse theories to the common understanding. He is never dogmatic; he always speaks with the spirit and air of a learner. In exploding an old theory you see no egotism, and look in vain for a sarcastic word. He states the case, classifies the evidence, and leaves his reader to render the



verdict. He is forward to acknowledge his obligations to every previous explorer, and takes no pains to say that any idea presented is unique or original. He is evidently a sincere seeker after truth, and a reverential bestower of homage at the feet of HIM whose paths are in the deep waters. To reveal the ways and perfections of the Creator, and to save man by the opening of new avenues to joy and profit, is evidently in his estimation the great two-fold object of all scientific inquiry. It is not often that a book so well adapted to invigorate the understanding and stimulate all that is best and noblest in the heart, comes from the laboratory of science, or from the temple of philosophy.

After a brief "Introduction," giving an account of the method of procedure in collecting the data on which the reasonings of the volume are founded, and some explanations of the plates which accompany the text, the author opens the work by devoting a chapter to the "Gulf Stream." As a specimen of his style, as well as for other obvious reasons, we insert a few paragraphs with which the volume opens.

"There is a river in the ocean. In the severest droughts it never fails, and in the mightiest floods it never overflows. Its banks and its bottom are of cold water, while its current is warm. The Gulf of Mexico is its fountain, and its mouth is the Arctic Seas. It is the Gulf Stream. There is in the world no other such majestic flow of waters. Its current is more rapid than the Mississippi or the Amazon.

Its waters, as far out from the Gulf as the Carolina coasts, are of an indigo blue. They are so distinctly marked, that their line of junction with the common sea-water may be traced by the eye. Often one half of the vessel may be perceived floating in Gulf Stream water, while the other half is in common water of the sea; so sharp is the line, and such the want of affinity between these waters, and the reluctance on the part of those of the Gulf Stream to mingle with the common water of the sea.

What is the cause of the Gulf Stream has always puzzled philosophers. Modern investigations and examinations are beginning to throw some light upon the subject, though all is not yet clear.

Early writers maintained that the Mississippi river was the father of the Gulf Stream. Its floods, they said, produce it; for its velocity, it was held, could be computed by the rate of the current of the river.

Captain Livingston overturned this hypothesis by showing that the volume of water which the Mississippi empties into the Gulf of Mexico is not equal to the one-thousandth part of that which escapes from it through the Gulf Stream.

Moreover, the water of the Gulf Stream is salt—of the Mississippi, fresh ; and those philosophers forgot that just as much salt as escapes from the Gulf of Mexico through this stream, must enter the Gulf through some other channel from the main ocean ; for, if it did not, the Gulf of Mexico. in process of time, unless it had a salt bed at the bottom, or was fed with salt springs below—neither of which is probable—would become a fresh water basin.”

Several other hypotheses are stated, and disposed of in the same quiet, modest, and conclusive way. The various influences operating to produce this current are then stated, and their individual and collective influence illustrated with great clearness and force.

In the second chapter, “the influence of the Gulf Stream upon climates” is considered. After describing the apparatus for warming houses by means of hot water, he thus proceeds :

“Now, to compare small things with great, we have, in the warm waters which are confined in the Gulf of Mexico, just such a heating apparatus for Great Britain, the North Atlantic, and Western Europe.

The furnace is the torrid zone ; the Mexican Gulf and the Carribean Sea are the chaldrons ; the Gulf Stream is the conducting pipe. From the Grand Banks of Newfoundland to the shores of Europe is the basement—the hot-air chamber—in which this pipe is flared out so as to present a large cooling surface. Here the circulation of the atmosphere is arranged by nature ; and it is such that the warmth thus conveyed into this warm-air chamber of mid ocean is taken up by the genial west winds, and dispensed, in the most benign manner, throughout Great Britain and the west of Europe.”

It is this stream chiefly that renders the climate of western Europe so much milder than in the same latitudes on the eastern coasts of North America and Asia. And the same cause operates to prevent the West Indian Archipelago from being afflicted with the hottest and most pestilential climate in the world.

A large number of facts are adduced to show that the relation of the Gulf Stream to storms is very intimate and important ; and some most striking illustrations are given setting forth the importance of a knowledge of the movements of this current to commerce and navigation.

Chapter III is devoted to “The Atmosphere ;” and is one of the most interesting and valuable in the volume. No analysis

could do it justice; and indeed, an analysis is nearly impossible. "Fickle as the winds," is a phrase that loses nearly all its force after becoming familiar with the laws, to which the air currents conform, as they are here exhibited. He shows that the Southern hemisphere is the place where evaporation chiefly takes place, while the Northern has the greatest fall of rain; explains the long dry and rainy seasons in specific localities; accounts for the perpetual drought in others; tells us why there is more rain on one side of a mountain than on the other; and closes the chapter by an exhibition of the adaptations of the air currents and the configuration of the earth's surface to each other. It is a chapter to be diligently studied, and is full of food for thought. Then comes a chapter on "Red Fogs and Sea Dust," in which direct proof is adduced in support of the views of the preceding chapter. The author says:

"Were it possible to take a portion of this air as it travels down the south-east trades, representing the general cause of atmospherical circulation, and to put a tally upon it by which we could always recognize it again, then we might hope actually to prove, by evidence the most positive, the channels through which the air of the trade-winds, after ascending at the equator, returns whence it came. . . . . As difficult as this seems to be, it has actually been done. Ehrenberg, with his microscope, has established, almost beyond a doubt, that the air which the south-east trade-winds bring to the equator does rise up there and pass into the northern hemisphere."

This is done by examining the Sirocco or African dust which is borne by the air over the northern portion of Africa; and it is found that the *habitat* of this dust is not Africa, but South America; and it must have been borne to the regions where it appears, by an upper current of air passing from the south-west to the north-east, over the intervening ocean.

The X chapter is devoted to a consideration of the "Geological Agency of the Winds," and is not inferior in the interest and ability which attach to it, to any other. Here is brought out the unity of nature, the mutual adaptations and dependencies of the various forces and phenomena about us; and not a little evidence is presented—to take a rather remarkable case—going to show that the lofty mountain ranges of South America have contributed to depress the level of the Dead Sea, and form the great deserts of the Eastern Continent.

And the ocean currents, it is alleged, not without reasons, may be considerably affected by the secretions of the mollusks and corallines to form their shells and build up the coral reefs.

We have done nothing more than simply to glance at the volume, whose title we have given. The book itself must be read and studied in order to be appreciated. There is scarcely a class of readers who could be induced to read it but would find it ministering to gratification and profit. Many topics are discussed, which, at first view, would seem to have no important connection with the subject of the volume; but, as the grand unity of nature becomes disclosed, their bearing is easily seen. There is a discussion of the probable "relation between magnetism and the circulation of the atmosphere;" another on the "Open sea in the Arctic Ocean;" "The Salts of the Sea;" "The Equatorial cloud-ring;" "The depths of the Ocean;" "The climates of the Ocean;" "The drift of the Sea;" "Storms;" "Routes," etc., etc. The plates in the work are very valuable; and the most abundant evidence appears respecting the practical character of these investigations. Life on the ocean will have new securities if this book be generally studied; perils will be more clearly apprehended and effectually warded off; less merchandise will be sunk in the insatiable sea; and the mariner will at length find abundant food for thought while pacing the deck and looking out eagerly for land; and every road to the ocean will yield a large harvest of facts whose possession will add to the highest wealth the human spirit ever knows.

An extract or two, whose character will be an adequate apology for their insertion, and we will take our leave of the volume.

"The mechanical power exerted by the air and the sun in lifting water from the earth, in transporting it from one place to another, and in letting it down again, is inconceivably great. The utilitarian who compares the water-power that the Falls of Niagara would afford if applied to machinery, is astonished at the number of figures which are required to express its equivalents in horse power. Yet what is the horse power of the Niagara, falling a few steps, in comparison with the horse-power that is required to lift up all the water that is discharged into the sea, not only by this river, but by all the other rivers

in the world, as high as the clouds? The calculation has been made by engineers, and, according to it, the force for making and lifting vapor from each area of one acre that is included on the surface of the earth, is equal to the power of 30 horses; and for the whole area of the earth, it is 800 times greater than all the water power of the world."

Under the head of "Quantities of solid matter in the Sea," after quoting from the log-book of the United States ship *Levant*, showing the strength of the ocean current setting into the Mediterranean Sea through the Straits of Gibraltar, our author speaks as follows :

"Now, suppose this current, which baffled and beat back this fleet for so many days, ran no faster than two knots the hour. Assuming its depth to be 400 feet only, and its width 7 miles, and that it carried in with it the average proportion of solid matter—say one-thirtieth—contained in sea-water; and admitting these postulates into calculation as the basis of the computation, it appears that salts enough to make no less than 88 cubic miles of solid matter, of the density of water, were carried into the Mediterranean during these 90 days. Now, unless there were some escape for all this solid matter, which has been running into that sea, not for 90 days merely, but for ages, it is very clear that the Mediterranean would, ere this, have been a vat of very strong brine, or a bed of cubia crystals."

If these morsels, and our commendation, shall induce the purchase and study of this volume by our readers, we are sure they will find themselves invited to a scientific and literary repast of no ordinary character; and one too in whose enjoyment the spirit of devotion will be likely to kindle with new fervor and adoration.

## ART. IX.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

**THE PIONEERS OF THE WEST, or Life in the Woods.** By W. P. Strickland. New York: Carlton & Phillips.

These sketches of western scenery, and character, and life, are pleasant and appreciative, some of them bold, vivid, and impressive. The book is eminently a readable one, and the moral tone of it most unexceptionable.

**MEMOIR OF REGINALD HEBER, D. D., Bishop of Calcutta.** By his widow. Abridged by a Clergyman. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1856.

The two large octavos in which alone the biography of Bishop Heber has been heretofore issued, precluded the great mass of readers from securing any definite acquaintance with the facts of his life and the features of his character. He has been heretofore more widely known in this country as the author of a few canonized hymns, than in any other capacity. It will be no slight gratification to many readers to possess this faithful portraiture of the eminent minister and missionary, exhibited in the volume before us. Nothing essential to a just comprehension of his life and character we are assured has been omitted in the abridgment; and the work is executed with taste and skill.

**POEMS,** By Richard Chenevix French, etc. New York: Redfield. 1856.

The previous publications of this eminent author would hardly have suggested poetic ability and taste. An eminent analyzer and critic, nice in his discriminations and patient in his philosophic researches, one would have judged that his chief mental quality was the cool, penetrating intellect. But this volume shows another mine of spiritual wealth which has been worked to some advantage. The pieces here are mostly brief, a large part of them suggested by some slight incident or common scene, and the question respecting the quality and extent of the poetic power may hence be regarded as an open one. No great thing has been attempted, but there are some fine specimens of the unambitious verse. Of his own power as a poet he thus modestly speaks:

“ And what though loftiest fancies are not mine,  
 Nor words of chiefest power, yet unto me,  
 Some voices reach out of the inner shrine,  
 Heard in my heart of hearts, and I can see  
 At times some glimpses of the majesty,  
 Some prints and foot-steps of the glory trace,  
 Which have been left on earth, that we might be  
 By them led forward to the secret place,  
 Where we perchance might see that glory face to face.”

Here is a little gem which of itself would make its author remembered and loved.



“Some murmur when their sky is clear,  
 And wholly bright to view,  
 If one small speck of dark appear  
 In their great heaven of blue.  
 And some with thankful love are filled,  
 If but one streak of light—  
 One ray of God’s great mercy, gild  
 The darkness of their night.

In palaces are hearts that ask,  
 In discontent and pride,  
 Why life is such a dreary task,  
 And all good things denied.  
 And hearts in poorest huts admire  
 How love has in their aid,  
 (Love that not ever seems to tire,)  
 Such rich provision made.”

But we have no space for quoting. The readers of the volume will always find the spirit of a strong Christian man appearing through the rhyme, and will now and then be reminded of the saying of Bunyan’s Pilgrim, whose very notes are triumphant outbursts of heroism, and the prelude to another moral battle.

THE POETICAL WORKS OF ALFRED TENNYSON, Poet Laureate, etc. Complete in one Volume. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1856.

POEMS. By William Cullen Bryant. Collected and arranged by the author. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856.

Both these poets are too well known to require anything to be said respecting them or their productions in these pages. We only call attention to these neat little pocket editions, as most admirably got up.

Tennyson’s whole poems are here—his “Princess,” his “In Memoriam,” his “Maud;” and yet these do not take up more than half the space in the volume. Within the compass of a volume which a lady could carry in her pocket without inconvenience, the poet laureate’s whole works are to be found; and the type is not unpleasantly small either. How this was spread over the pages of three or four quite large duodecimo volumes, or how what thus spread over them was compressed within these limits, is a sort of secret with the publishers. Perhaps they can explain.

Our own Bryant, whose verse we read as an exercise in the district school and admired its majesty even there, has also collected his poems and sent them out in this little pocket volume to make thousands glad. If it contained only his “Thanatopsis,” his “Monument Mountain,” and his “God’s first temples,” everybody would want it. How much more when the singing of thirty years is here crystallized and classified.

THE ROMAN EXILE. By Guglielmo Gajani, Professor of Civil and Canon Law, and Representative of the People in the Roman Constituent Assembly in the year 1849. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1856.

Whoever wishes to comprehend the political and ecclesiastical movements in Italy which brought in the revolution of 1848, the spirit that presided over

its forces, and the secret reasons for its failure, can hardly do better than read this book. The author is a young man, but little more than thirty years of age, and yet he acted no unimportant part in the transactions which turned the eyes of the world toward Italy. He was a member of that secret and powerful association known as "Young Italy," whose plans, and policy, and spirit he freely lays bare, and presents it in a light much more favorable than it has been hitherto regarded among us. He has a soul of fire; and writes after the same vivid abrupt style which distinguished the speeches of Gavazzi and Mazzini. The book is full of information, and full, also, of magnetism, which the most stoical reader will be almost sure to feel.

**THE NEW AGES OF GOLD; or the Life and Adventures of Robert Dexter Romaine.**  
Written by himself. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856.

Here is a book modelled after Robinson Crusoe, quite as interesting, more wonderful, and scarcely less instructive or forcible as an illustration of certain great truths. We challenge any young person to read the first seventy-five pages and then lay it calmly down.

**FOREST AND SHORE, or Legends of the Pine Tree State.** By Charles P. Usley. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1856.

We remember to have read some of these sketches and tales in the columns of the "Portland Transcript," some years since, of which Mr. Usley was then editor. He is a graceful writer, and has a very clear insight into character, portrays it happily, and keeps his reader's sympathies constantly alive and interested in his heroes and heroines. His description of the "Old Scout" is admirably done; and the adventures with which we are made familiar bring out the old man's qualities to perfection. That is a genuine creation, proving the fine qualities of Mr. U.'s genius. It is a pleasant volume for a tourist.

**THE PIAZZA TALES.** By Herman Melville, Author of "Typee," "Omoo," etc. New York: Dix & Edwards, etc. 1856.

This author has acquired quite a literary reputation, and has unquestionable talent; but we don't like him as an author at all. His style is artificial, there is a strain after originality and effect, he seems forever giving promise of doing something and never fulfilling the pledge. We have tried half a dozen times, but can't read him with profit or patience, and have at last given up the effort as hopeless.

**VASSAL MORTON: A Novel.** By Francis Parkman, etc. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856.

This is a fine story; well plotted, well executed, and well intentioned. Not many things of its kind have appeared of late, showing a truer appreciation of the mission of the novelist, and a clearer perception of the elements of success than the author has developed here. He will find readers as often as he presents an entertainment like this.

THE SELECT REMAINS OF THE REV. JOHN MASON. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1856.

The eminence enjoyed by Dr. Mason during his life and since his death, is perhaps a sufficient warrant for exhuming these remains, and offering them to the Christian public. They consist largely of brief sententious sayings, mostly on subjects strictly religious, and often indicate a variety of perception, an aptness in the employment of metaphor, simile, and antithesis, a richness of thought, a power of expression, and a spirituality of soul, not often met in the same man in the same degree. The book is printed in the style of a half century since. The phraseology is often quaint, and the appearance of the page to our eyes, very peculiar. To minds of a decidedly religious and devotional turn the volume would have many and special attractions.

THE CATHOLIC. Letters addressed by a Jurist to a young kinsman proposing to join the Church of Rome. By E. H. Derby. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., etc. 1856.

There is little apology now for being ignorant of the real spirit, and character, and claims of the Romish church. The weak and unmanly charity which leans apologetically toward it, on the ground that its history has some of the noblest passages, that its ceremonies are imposing, and that eminent Christian virtues live and flourish within its pale, is deserving of not much respect; and the superstitious horror and fearful forebodings in view of its growth among us, would give place to other feelings, if definite knowledge were to take the place of vague conjecture. An attendance upon the Grand Mass at a Cathedral, and an inspection of the wood cuts in Fox's Book of Martyrs, are alike untrustworthy as testimonies to the real significance of Papacy.

Dowling, and Gavin, and Murray, and Gavazzi, and Leo, and Beecher, and many others, have opened for us the sealed books of Romish history, and disclosed the inner life of the great hierarchy. And yet among all the treatises that have appeared, none have done the precise work of this volume. The author shows himself remarkably well versed in ecclesiastical history, he has a full acquaintance with the dogmas of "the church," he exhibits a strong logical tendency, and displays a fine skill in dealing with the specific points that appeal with so much force to the spirit of the young kinsman in whose behalf he writes these letters. The effort of the Jurist was successful in convincing the young man, who was all ready to commit himself to the guidance of the papacy, that he was running into a mesh of absurdities and a citadel of presumptuous sins; and the author, we think, has done a wise thing in sending the letters abroad for the benefit of other minds similarly affected, as well as for the instruction and confirmation of the whole Protestant public.

The letters are written in a familiar though dignified style, they are close in their reasonings, and instructive in their facts; and though only certain phases of the whole subject are presented, yet from these alone one will find himself possessed of a clear view of the difficulties which lie in the way of a reception of the authority and divinity of the Romish church. The Episcopalian stand-point occupied by the author, it seems to us, has, in some instances, prevented him from making as strong a point as it would have been easy for

him to do in the absence of those ecclesiastical trammels. Nevertheless, the volume is deserving of a general circulation and an attentive perusal.

**THE EARNEST MAN.** A sketch of the Character and Labors of Adoniram Judson, first Missionary to Burmah. By Mrs. H. C. Conant. Boston: Phillips, Samson, & Co. 1856.

The question which our readers might naturally ask on reading this title, is: Why *another* memoir of Dr. Judson should be written—we prefer to let Mrs. Conant answer in her own words.

“While Dr. Wayland’s Memoir of Dr. Judson was yet in preparation, a briefer history of his life and labors, to meet the wants of a large class of readers, was planned by Mrs. Judson. This work . . . . her declining health did not allow her to execute, nor, so far as I know, even to commence. Near the close of her life, application was made to the writer, by her executors, to perform the task in her stead, with the assurance that it was with her entire concurrence and approbation. The present volume, prepared in accordance with this request, is the property of Dr. Judson’s orphan children to whom the publishers generously relinquish, as in the case of the memoir, the larger share of the profits.”

Mrs. Conant is not unknown as an author. She has shown herself to possess no small share of mental vigor, discrimination, learning, skill and taste, in other fields of literature. It will therefore be enough to say that she has evidently aimed in the volume before us to be as thorough and impartial, in giving us the portrait of Dr. Judson, as her unquestioned abilities, deep sympathy with her subject, and eminently favorable stand-point would allow. Her insight into his character seems to us to have been deep and accurate, and her clear and graceful exhibition of his interior life, it is that imparts a great share of the real value possessed by this volume. It is in no sense an abridgement of the larger work, but an independent and complete production of her own. Five hundred pages of more pleasant and chastened biographical reading have not recently come from the press. Both for the inherent value of the work and for the sake of Dr. J.’s children, we hope it may find a large and ready sale.

**THE PSALMS,** Chronologically arranged, with Historical Introductions; and a General Introduction to the whole Book. By F. G. Hibbard, author of the “History and Geography of Palestine, etc. In two parts. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1856. 1 Vol. 8vo. pp. 589.

The arrangement and style of the Psalms, as they appear in King James’ translation, are such as to conceal a large portion of their literary beauty from the eye of ordinary readers, and at the same time serve to increase the difficulties of comprehending their lessons. The poetic measure is not preserved, the circumstances under which the various Psalms were written are not directly indicated, the arrangement is in defiance of all chronological order, and the various authors are frequently unknown. In spite of all these disadvantages under which ordinary readers labor, the Psalms are still precious to the pious heart, and the deep and thrilling experiences which they express and denote become interpreters of the inner life of every Christian reader. The

soul's defeats and victories, its raptures and agonies, its quiet trust and its torturing fears, its outbursts of love, and the sluggish sleep of its sensibility—all these are portrayed so vividly, and utter a tone so deep and impressive that the Psalms will long remain canonized in the heart of Christendom. And that is especially a welcome service which any one renders us when he invests these divine strains with added force, puts us into a closer union with the life they reveal, and enables us to catch the tone of prayer or the shout of gratitude while it is yet parting the lips of the fervent pleader for the help of heaven, or the enraptured leader of the temple choir.

It is just precisely this position into which the author of this volume aims to put the reader, and he has been in no small degree successful. The work evinces research, but there is no offensive pedantry. He has not so written for the learned and critical that ordinary readers are puzzled instead of being helped; and there is no divesting the sacred poetry of its high attributes in the attempt at simplification. He seeks to give information on just those points where the inquiring and intelligent reader desires it; and he neither wearies our patience nor fills up space with refined hypothesis where evidence cannot be had, or with elaborate criticism where no practical purpose is to be subserved.

The General Introduction covers some 125 pages; and discusses the Historic occasions of the Psalms; the authors; titles; the character and form of the Hebrew Poetry; the Doctrinal teaching of the Psalms, etc., etc. A large amount of really valuable information is here found condensed into a brief space, and presented in a simple and attractive style. The Psalms are then chronologically arranged, so far as the information that is available enables him to fix upon their dates; and to each is prefixed a brief historical introduction, so far as the historical occasion can be ascertained, and throw light upon the language of the composition. They are printed according to the received text; but the poetic measure being preserved, they will doubtless often read like a new translation. We accept the work as a needful and valuable contribution to sacred literature, and a help to teachers in the Sabbath school, and to families who make the scriptures a familiar volume at the fireside; and not a few occupants of the pulpits would find themselves newly interested in this portion of the Book by the study of this treatise. The mechanical excellencies of the volume are of the highest order—both type and paper offering a pleasant sight to the eye.

SINAI AND PALESTINE, in connection with their history. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley M. A. Canon of Canterbury. With Maps and Plans. Redfield, No. 34, Beekman St. New York: 1857.

This is the reprint of an English work, and is furnished to American readers at a price much below that of the English edition. After all that has been written on "The Holy Land," let not our readers suppose that this is a superfluous work. The author was evidently possessed of large information respecting the localities before visiting them, and he carried with him a habit of independent and critical observation. And besides, the object of the author

was specific, and somewhat different from that of preceding travellers.—The statement of that object is best made in his own words:—"Much has been written, and still remains to be written, both on the history and the geography of the chosen people. But there have been comparatively few attempts to illustrate the relation in which each stands to the other. To bring the recollections of my own journey to bear on this question—to point out how much or how little the Bible gains by being seen, so to speak, through the eyes of the country, or the country by being seen through the eyes of the Bible—to exhibit the effect of the 'Holy Land' on the course of the 'Holy History,'—seemed to me to be a task not hitherto fully accomplished."

This is the author's aim; and he has been eminently successful. It is certainly one of the best works yet issued on the subject of which it treats. The author's mind is both a religious and philosophical one, and his style varies according to the scenes with which he deals. Letters written home while prosecuting his travels and researches, are occasionally introduced into the body of the work, and usually contain picturesque descriptions of the various objects of interest, and are written in a pleasant and vivacious style. The accompanying maps add greatly to the value of the work; and one need not fail to obtain definite views of the country which has been selected by Providence as the theatre of some of the grandest and most significant events that tramp across the stage of history.

ENGLISH TRAITS: By Ralph Waldo Emerson. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856.

Whatever may be thought of Mr. Emerson as a trustworthy philosopher or a reliable theologian, there is and can be no question respecting the clearness and depth of his spiritual insight, the strength and originality of his thought, and the purity of his English. This volume is much more practical and mundane in its spirit and aim than are some of those which preceded it. The transcendental tendency is much less prominent, the sterling common sense everywhere prevails. Mr. Emerson is perfectly original in his methods of thought and expression. He is wholly destitute of cant, and writes without at all having the fear of the critics before his eyes. He deals with the English character as a faithful and familiar friend might do; never saying a word to flatter vanity, never withholding a rebuke or criticism when it is deserved, and telling frankly what pleases him as though he were assured there were good sense enough to keep a weak self-complacency in check. It is a volume having much to commend it, very fruitful in suggestions, exhibiting a genial and yet a decided philosophy, and evincing a high appreciation of whatever is vigorous and noble in both individual and national character.